

## FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Report on Faculty Salaries, 1987: second part.

The Committee has presented the factual bases of its deliberations in the first part of this Report, published with the Agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting held on September 2, 1987 (pp. A6-15). Documents have been made available to faculty in the Senate Office and several faculty members have communicated suggestions for the consideration of the Committee.

At the General Faculty meeting on September 2, President James B. Holderman stressed that salaries continued to be the Administration's 'highest priority', pointing out that the University had allocated to salaries in recent years significant amounts above monies appropriated by the State for University salaries. He stated that he was disappointed in the Committee's report, commenting particularly on the observation that 'There are no grounds for U.S.C. aspirations to regional (let alone national) distinction when its performance -- in respect of faculty salaries -- is mediocre within a substantially mediocre group [the S.E. sample]' (p. A9), and he observed that statements concerning mediocrity may become self-fulfilling prophecies. It bears emphasis that the Committee's report dealt not with future conditions but with actually existing conditions as they have developed over the past ten years.

In the first, substantially factual part of its Report, the Committee forebore the observation that the faculty's general salary situation (as previously documented) is strong evidence that the University's substantial progress towards excellence in recent years has been in some part at the expense of the faculty in general. If there is any aspect of faculty salaries which deserves to be described as excellent, the Committee cannot identify it. However, we are pleased that the President's assurance that faculty salaries are the Administration's highest priority offers the prospect of quick redress of faculty salary inequities.

The Committee considered a wide variety of measures suggested to it that might, with the support of Senate and the Administration, improve faculty salaries.

Among those considered but rejected as unsuitable at the present time were:

- (1) Collective bargaining through an agency such as the American Association of University Professors or the American Federation of Teachers;
- (2) Appointment of a lobbyist with the Legislature on behalf of faculty interests;
- (3) Action dramatising faculty discontent, such as the cancellation of classes;
- (4) Public airing of faculty grievances in the media;
- (5) Advocacy of a classified salary scale such as that enjoyed by the University of California and other universities.

Our conclusions have been tempered by the considerations that the University competes with other State institutions for a share of the State

budget, that the State is not a rich one, and that Senate resolutions have no mandatory force beyond the University and even, in some areas, within it. Nevertheless, the prevailing perception of injustice in the manner in which service to the University and community is rewarded -- as communicated to the Committee -- suggests a variety of measures that are practical and attainable within the realities of the University's relationship with the State.

The Committee recommends that

Approved

- (1) The Administration be enjoined to take prompt measures designed to bring U.S.C. salaries at least to the S.E. regional averages.
- (2) The Administration be strongly urged to undertake, within an appropriate but specific period, a department-by-department, college-by-college review of faculty salaries, designed to remedy current individual inequities within units, and to report those actions to Senate.
- (3) Deans be requested to collect and maintain annual salary data for College units in order to establish the most appropriate basis of salary comparison between U.S.C. and comparable and competitive colleges and departments; such data to be made available to the Faculty Budget Review Committee.
- (4) The Administration be invited to discuss and establish with the appropriate Faculty committees (e.g. Budget, Welfare) a comprehensive, explicit, salary policy for the University. Such a policy should contain the following minimum features:
  - (i) Indexation of base salaries to the Consumer Price Index annually;
  - (ii) Separate merit increases, distinct from cost of living increases;
  - (iii) Determination of the basis for and method of calculation of merit increases in each unit;
  - (iv) Provision to remove or diminish longterm effects of fluctuations in State appropriations for University salaries;
  - (v) Formal periodical review of salary status, for all faculty.