

May 2, 1990
Joint Report
Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Budget Committee

For the second year the pool of funds available for salary increases was divided into salary increases based on current merit and salary increases designed to alleviate longer term salary inequities. The purpose of this report is to inform the Faculty of the actual distribution of the salary increases which became effective this academic year.

In relative terms the aggregate distribution was to be two-thirds current merit and one third inequity. The guidelines for deans of colleges and schools established by the Provost is summarized as follows:

1. Each college was allocated seven (7.0) percent of its adjusted continuing faculty salary total. Deans were requested to allocate approximately two-thirds of that total (4.7 percent) on the basis of current merit (including retention) and one-third (2.3 percent) of the basis of long term unrecognized merit.
2. The Provost reserved one percent of the total salary pool to be used as a Provost's Reserve designed to address cases of extraordinary merit or unusual salary inequity brought to his attention by deans.
3. Promotional increments were funded separately from the raise pool.

Table 1 compares the distribution of 1989-90 faculty salary increases to redress long term inequities based on merit with the distribution of the 1988-89 allocations.

From Table 1 it is tempting to conclude:

1. The Colleges of Health, Library and Information Services, Science and Mathematics and the School of Law have substantial inequities based on long term merit. These units allocated approximately one-third to redressing inequities.
2. The Colleges of Business Administration, and Pharmacy, along with Libraries and other Academic Units have insignificant inequities. These units allocated less than 10 percent to redressing long term inequities.
3. All other colleges except for Engineering and Education allocated approximately 25 percent to redress inequities and thus apparently still have significant equity concerns. The concern seems to be somewhat less in the Colleges of Education and engineering where approximately 15 percent was allocated on the basis of equity considerations.

Such conclusions are probably misleading if not erroneous, however, they do suggest some serious questions and concerns that might be pursued.

1. If the data accurately reflect the state of affairs, should salary allocations for equity be revised drastically? To illustrate: Should each college receive say a 6 percent allocation for merit and additional amounts for equity considerations based on this year's actual equity adjustments?
2. Are the salary allocation guidelines being distributed by the Office of the Provost being taken seriously? Are deans and department chairmen making a good faith effort to identify, correct and report inequities conscientiously?

These questions are still under study by the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Budget Committee. In the meantime these committees recommend that for the coming academic year one-third of the raise pool continue to be used to redress long term salary inequities.

Table 1 Percentage of Faculty Salary Increases Allocated for Inequities

<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
Col. of Applied Professional Sciences	19.2	25.5
Col. of Business Administration	22.5	3.8
Col. of Criminal Justice	47.5	26.4
Col. of Education	22.9	15.5
Col. of Engineering	27.1	13.2
Col. of Health	9.2	31.5
Col. of Humanities & Social Sciences	29.6	24.6
Col. of Journalism	26.8	24.8
Col. of Library & Information Services	31.7	31.3
Col. of Nursing	35.9	23.0
Col. of Pharmacy	1.6	4.8
Col. of Science & Mathematics	27.9	33.2
Col. of Social Work	7.7	28.4
School of Law	39.6	36.4
School of Medicine	1.1	27.4
Libraries (Thomas Cooper & S.C.)	13.5	7.6
Other Academic Units	5.6	3.7