

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE'S
STATEMENT ON THE IMPACT OF SEPARATING RANK AND SALARY ON WOMEN
IN THE CSU [AS-2129-93/FA(Rev.)]
(#36-92/93-FA)

- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University has received the attached resolution [AS-2129-93/FA(Rev.)] from the Statewide Academic Senate concerning the potential impact of separating rank and salary on women faculty in the CSU; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University concurs that this issue is one of tremendous importance and concern to all faculty; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University strongly endorses the resolution.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2129-93/FA (Rev.)
March 4-5, 1993

**IMPACT OF SEPARATING RANK AND SALARY
ON WOMEN FACULTY IN THE CSU**

- WHEREAS, The California State University should ensure equitable treatment of male and female faculty; and
- WHEREAS, An American Association of University Professors' report from the Committee on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession shows that, where rank and salary are separated, there is a gap between men's and women's salaries because practices for setting salaries individually or by discipline disadvantage women¹; and
- WHEREAS, In 1986 the Academic Senate CSU adopted a Developmental Paper (AS-1687-86/FA) which lists devaluation of the liberal arts and sciences, deterioration of morale and self-esteem, conflict between faculty groups, erosion of peer review, and debasement of teaching as deleterious consequences of separating rank and salary, but does not directly address the impact upon salary equity between men and women; and
- WHEREAS, Separation of rank and salary creates salary setting practices which are inequitable to women; and
- WHEREAS, The 1987 study "Level of Female Participation: An Overlooked Factor in Salary Differences among Faculty Disciplines?"² demonstrates that a substantial increase of women in a profession is associated with a drop in the relative salaries paid to jobholders; and
- WHEREAS, The 1990 study "Understanding Gender-Based Wage Discrimination: Legal Interpretation and Trends of Pay Equity in Higher Education"³, tracing the history of litigation of pay equity issues, suggests that universities and colleges identify possible problems and take voluntary action before pay-equity issues arise; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University express its opposition to any salary setting practice which is inequitable to women; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call upon the CSU's Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association to ensure that the next Memorandum of Understanding contains no salary setting practices which create salary gaps inequitable to women faculty in the CSU⁴; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU amend and bring up to date its 1986 Developmental Paper (AS-1687-86/FA) on the separation of rank and salary to address the evidence that doing so will be inequitable to women.

¹ See Salary-setting Practices that Unfairly Disadvantage Women Faculty," Academe, July-August 1992, pp. 32-35.

² Staub, Kay. Level of Female Participation: An Overlooked Factor in Salary Differences among Faculty Disciplines?" Presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, October 28-30, 1987.

³ Journal of Law of Education, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 347-84 (1990).

⁴ Designated Market Differential Discipline Salaries are a salary setting practice in the CSU. In the CSU only 14.2% of the faculty in disciplines designated to receive market differential salaries are female, compared to 28.9% of the faculty as a whole, while disciplines such as nursing, which have a high percentage of women and serious problems in competing for qualified faculty, are not designated for market differential salaries. This is an example of a practice which should be examined to determine whether it is inequitable to women.

SECOND READING - May 6-7, 1993

**CSU Tenure-track Faculty
Excluding Ferp's**

	Female	Male	Total	% female
DMD	288	1,738	2,026	14.2%
Not DMD	2,646	5,495	8,141	32.5%
Total	2,934	7,233	10,167	28.9%
% DMD	9.8%	24.0%	19.9%	

Data as of Oct. 30, 1992

December 17, 1992

Salary-Setting Practices that Discriminate Against Women: References

- Becker, William and Rebecca Goodman, "The Semilogarithmic Earnings Equation and its Use in Assessing Salary Discrimination in Academe," Economics of Education Review (1991) Vol. 10:4, pp.323-32.
- Hensel, Nancy, "Realizing Gender Equity in Higher Education: the Need to Integrate Work/Family Issues," ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 2 (1991).
- Luna, Gave, "Understanding Gender-Based Wage Discrimination: Legal Interpretation and Trends of Pay Equity in Higher Education," Journal of Law and Education (1990) Vol.19:3, pp.371-84.
- Cadet, Nancy, "Marginalia: Women in the Academic Workforce," Feminist Teacher (1989) Vol. 4:1, pp.16-18.
- "Academic Women and Salary Differentials," Academe (1988), Vol. 74:4, pp.33-34.
- McMillan, Liz, "Women Professors Pressing to Close Salary Gap; Some Colleges Adjust Pay, Others Face Lawsuits," Chronicle of Higher Education. (1987), Vol .33:4, pp.1;14.
- Stecklein, John E. and Gail Lorenz, "Academic Women: Twenty-four Years of Progress?" Liberal Education (1986), Vol. 72:1, pp. 63-71.
- Graham, Dee et. alia , "Costs and Benefits of Advocacy for Faculty Women: A Case Study" Journal of Social Issues (1985) Vol. 41:4, pp. 85-98.
- Ott, Mary Diederich, " Faculty Salary Review. University of Maryland Office of Institutional Studies. College Park: 1990.
- Weiler, William, "Time Effects in Earnings of Faculty Members," Economics of Education Review (1984) Vol 3:3, pp. 223-30.
- Thomas, Salley J. , "Out of the Kitchen: the Transformation of Teachers College. Columbia University, 1913-33 (Ashe 1988 Annual Meeting Paper) St. Louis, Mo., Nov. 3-6, 1988 (ED 303072).
- Robin, Hellenen and Stanley S. Robin, "Women's Salaries in Higher Education: a Case Study," Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership (1983), Vol3:1, pp.39-56.

Salary-Setting Practices that Unfairly Disadvantage Women Faculty

The report which follows, prepared by a subcommittee of the Association's Committee W on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession, was approved for publication by Committee W in April 1992 for the information of the profession. Comments are welcome, and should be addressed to the Association's Washington Office.

Background

That male faculty members outearn their female colleagues is well established. In 1973, male professors across all institutions outearned females by 9.2 percent; male instructors' advantage was 4.5 percent. By the 1990-91 academic year, the disparity for full professors had climbed to 11.5 percent and for instructors to 6.7 percent.¹ Almost two decades after scholars first called attention to it, the wage gap among faculty has widened, testifying to the continuing need for procedures to identify sex disparities in faculty salaries that need correction.

In 1977, the American Association of University Professors began distributing a *Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit*,² and Committee W members and others have detailed strategies for documenting and rectifying the male-female pay gap in academia.³ Faculty on many campuses have conducted salary

studies and negotiated remedies, although sometimes only after litigation.⁴ For example, after a 1988 University of Connecticut study found that women faculty members earned on average \$1806 less than what men with similar characteristics earned, the university allotted \$1800 per woman faculty member in every administrative unit for pay adjustments.

Until now, attention to salary disparities by sex in higher education has largely been restricted to statistical studies showing the failure of universities to compensate female faculty for factors that affect pay at the same rate they did men in the same departments. However, such studies, and the remedies they have motivated, have failed to address the problem of interdepartmental differentials that disadvantage women. Nor have they addressed problems caused by certain common salary-setting practices that systematically and unfairly disadvantage women. These practices need to be examined on every campus and modified. Unless that occurs, the salary gap will persist.

Pay Equity

Differences in pay between specialties can be an important source of disadvantage for women. When occupational segregation by sex is present, it opens the way for employers to structure pay scales in such a way that predominantly male occupations pay more than predominantly female ones.

The social scientists who have made empirical studies of this issue in the whole economy have concluded that the sex composition of an occupation does in fact affect its rate of pay, with the pay being lower the higher the proportion of women in the occupation.⁵ These systematic differences in the pay of male- and female-dominated occupations persist after factors that legitimately affect compensation are taken into account.

The underpayment of female-dominated specialties

1. Figures for 1974-75 are from "Academic Women and Salary Differentials," *Academe*, July-August 1988, p. 33. Those for 1990-91 are from *Academe*, March-April 1991, p. 22, Table 5.

2. Elizabeth L. Scott, *Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1977).

3. Jane Loeb and Marianne A. Ferber, "Representation, Performance, and the Status of Women on the Faculty." In Alice S. Rossi and Anne Calderwood (eds.), *Academic Women on the Move* (N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), pp. 239-34; Mary W. Gray and Elizabeth L. Scott, "A 'Statistical' Remedy for Statistically Identified Discrimination," *Academe* (May 1980): 174-81; Mary W. Gray, "Achieving Pay Equity on Campus," Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1990.

4. Jane Loeb and Marianne A. Ferber, *op. cit.*; Deana Finkler, David T. Van Dyke, and Jeffrey D. Klawnsky, "How Statistics, Law, and Politics Influence the Evaluation of Gender Salary Disparity in Higher Education," Unpublished paper, University of Nebraska, Omaha, n.d.; Dale Baum and Harry Jones, "Salary Equity: Statistically Identified Discrimination Against Texas A & M Female Faculty Members." Unpublished report, March 5, 1987.

5. Donald J. Trieman and Heidi I. Hartmann, *Women, Work, and Wages* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1981); Helen Remick (ed.), *Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984); Robert T. Michael, Heidi I. Hartmann, and Brigid O'Farrell (eds.), *Pay Equity: Empirical Inquiries* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1989). Only Randall Filer, whose paper appears in the Michael, *et al.*, volume finds no significant effect on wages of proportion of the occupation that is female. This paper was subjected to strong criticism by discussants on grounds of its methodology.

is plausibly associated with the propensity, observed in many cultures, to put a low value in terms of esteem and recompense on work associated with women. The recognition of this phenomenon by social science research has given rise to a call for equal pay for jobs that can be shown, through job evaluation, to make similar demands on the worker in terms of responsibilities and other requirements. The demand for "pay equity" (also known as "comparable worth") calls for removing from compensation schemes any bias associated with the sex composition of jobs or their sex labels.⁶

Although an increasingly conservative judiciary has dealt harshly with plaintiffs' claims for pay equity brought under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a large number of state and local governments have responded to the call for pay equity by analyzing wages of sex-segregated occupations in the public sector, and some have implemented remedies that have reduced the pay gap between male and female public employees.⁷ However, remedies have rarely extended to disparities among university professors across disciplines or administrative units.

Pay Equity for University Professors

In the university context, differentials between and among departments on a given campus may be legitimate if they are the result of differences in the cost and length of required training, of off-campus possibilities for lucrative use of the skills involved, or of the rarity of the necessary talent. Inequities in pay occur if the sex composition of a discipline affects faculty salaries, net of legitimate determinants of salary, or if tasks that are disproportionately assigned to female faculty members (e.g., teaching large service courses, advising students) are systematically underrewarded. That considerable sex segregation exists in academic institutions makes possible substantial pay inequity.

The tendency for salaries to be lower in disciplines with higher proportions of women is well known,⁸ although only a few researchers have directly investigated pay equity among faculty. In an important

study, Staub found that the sex composition of disciplines affected both salaries and salary increases among institutional members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.⁹ Moreover, her time-series analyses showed that a substantial increase of women in a discipline was associated with a drop in the relative salaries paid to jobholders. In a subsequent study of both NASULGC institutions and those included in salary surveys conducted by the College and University Personnel Association, Bellas (1992) found that greater proportions of women in academic disciplines were associated with lower entry-level salaries, even after controlling for labor-market conditions appropriate to the discipline.¹⁰

Women's Pay and "the Market"

It is sometimes claimed that all pay differences between men and women, including those within and between occupational specialties, can be explained by the operations of "the market." Those who make this point go on to explain that attempts to revoke the market's verdict, for example by rearranging occupational pay scales, are bound to cause damage: shortages of labor in some occupations, and oversupplies in others, with resulting unemployment.

But market-determined wages and discrimination that merits correction are by no means mutually exclusive. The prices or salaries that a market sets depend on supply and demand. If persons operating on the demand side of the market—those with the power to make salary offers and to hire—behave in a discriminatory manner because of societal tradition, and if competition is not rigorous enough to eliminate such discriminatory behavior, then the market itself will produce discriminatory results.¹¹

The correction of intradepartmental differentials resulting from the undervaluation of women's traditional fields will work best if the movement for reform is widespread and coordinated. If this occurs, the demand side of "the market" will quickly come to consist of a majority of nondiscriminatory employers. The more involved colleges and universities are in pay equity adjustments, the sooner the market itself will come to support nondiscriminatory salaries. However, the failure of others to reduce discrimination should not serve as an excuse to delay adjustments in any institution.

Within disciplines, female faculty members may be "less marketable" than male colleagues of equal merit, because discriminatory attitudes on other campuses reduce their likelihood of getting an outside offer. More-

10. Bellas, Marcia. *Comparable Worth in Academia: Analysis of the Effects of Faculty Salaries on the Sex Composition and Labor-Market Conditions of Academic Disciplines*. University of Illinois, Champaign, 1992.

11. William P. Bridges and Robert L. Nelson, "Markets in Hierarchies: Organizational and Market Influences on Gender Inequality in a State Pay System," *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (November 1989): 616-58; Marlene Kim, "Gender Bias in Compensation Structures: A Case Study of Its Historical Basis and Persistence," *Journal of Social Issues* 45 (1989): 39-50; Alice Kessler-Harris, *A Woman's Wage: Historical Meanings and Social Consequences* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1990).

6. Note that the meaning of the term "pay equity" differs from the term "equal pay," which refers to paying persons in the same job equally.

7. Ronnie Steinberg, "Radical Challenges in a Liberal World: The Mixed Success of Comparable Worth," *Gender & Society* 14 (December 1987): 466-75; Linda Ames, "Pay Equity: What Works?" *Proceedings of the First Annual Women's Policy Research Conference*, Washington, D.C., May 1989; Joan Acker, *Doing Comparable Worth* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); Sara M. Evans and Barbara J. Nelson, *Wage Justice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

8. Lois Haignere, "Salary Equity Four Cells." Forthcoming in the *Proceedings of the Annual Conferences on Collective Bargaining in Higher Education*, 1991.

9. Kay Staub, "Level of Female Participation: An Overlooked Factor in Salary Differences among Faculty Disciplines?" Presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, October 28-30, 1987.

long to two-career couples, so that the ability of women to seek and accept outside offers is on average lower. These facts suggest that salary gaps between equally meritorious people can open up if outside offers result in salary adjustments without attention to internal equity in pay-setting. One solution would be to review internal equity analyses whenever pay adjustments are made to meet outside offers.

Further Common Practices that Disadvantage Women

On many campuses salaries are adjusted with reference to the previous year's activities. Those who are judged to have an equally meritorious year are given the same percentage increase. This practice can sometimes perpetuate inequities. For example, consider the case of a man and a woman hired as beginning professionals at different salaries, who then have identically meritorious careers. The year-by-year increment process will perpetuate the original percentage gap, and widen the absolute gap, despite the fact that their merit, based on their entire career, is equal.

Adjusting salaries based on the faculty member's total scholarly record will correct inequities across cohorts such as those stemming from being hired in periods of budget stringency, as well as any legacy of sex inequity in starting salaries or in past raises. Paying women faculty members lower salaries than men simply because they started at lower salaries is illegal, even if women and men have received equal percentage raises (*Bazemore v. Friday* 478 U.S. 285, 1986).

Other practices may disadvantage women faculty in salary-setting. Individualized bargaining in fixing entry salaries may result in candidates judged of identical merit starting at differing salaries. As noted above, such differences, which may have little to do with merit, get perpetuated if year-to-year adjustments are based solely on reviews of the previous year.

Maintaining the confidentiality of salaries (and in some instances even of the routinely updated CVs used in the determination of salary) may spare people with low salaries from embarrassment vis-à-vis their colleagues and students. However, such confidentiality also serves to mask and thus perpetuate inequities. Experience has shown that allowing access to data almost always reveals inequities by sex, and within sexes as well. Therefore, on balance, openness is to be preferred.

Wage compression—allowing people who have been in the institution longest to lag in salary—may have a disparate impact on women because they are perceived as less mobile. Institutions sometimes underpay for the "invisible" work that some teaching and service involve, because it is disproportionately assigned to women.

Recommendations

Based on the considerations above, we make the following recommendations:

1. The national AALP and campus chapters should gather and publicize data on salary disparities across disciplines, departments, and other administrative

sociation with units' sex composition.

2. Every institution should work toward achieving a just compensation system. Differentials between and among departments should be carefully examined, and those that derive merely from a traditional devaluation of "women's fields" should be eliminated, even if the "market" remains largely unreformed.

3. In particular, internal institutional departmental differences should be compared with survey data from other institutions. If an institution reflects larger differentials than the external market, adjustments may be in order.

4. Institutions should examine differing faculty work loads in teaching, advising, and service across departments as well as within departments and correct inequities.

5. In fixing entry salaries, institutions should discourage individualized bargaining, which favors men owing to their advantage in a discriminatory market. Similarly, rewarding a woman less than a man judged to be of equal merit who is receiving more outside offers reproduces within the institution the market's discriminatory behavior. Institutions should consider standardizing pay practices across constituent units.

6. Institutions should acknowledge, measure, and reward the various contributions they expect of faculty, and should not unfairly downgrade the reward of contributions disproportionately assigned to women faculty. Whenever possible, institutions should develop objective indicators of such activities (e.g., number of hours student contact), as well as of vital services faculty perform for their institutions, communities, and professions (e.g., hours of committee service per semester).

7. Institutions should disseminate criteria for the setting of pay standards widely, both to those who determine salary and to all faculty members.

8. In making regular yearly salary adjustments, and in implementing remedies to reduce inequity, institutions should compare faculty members' total scholarly record when adjusting salaries, rather than simply basing raises on recent productivity.

9. In reviewing salary structures, institutions should address issues of equity by age and experience. Institutions should not exploit the inability of faculty members to move because of discrimination in the academic labor market or because they belong to two-career couples.

10. Campus Committees W should:

a. work to conduct salary-equity studies at regular intervals. Committees conducting such studies should involve faculty from disproportionately female fields such as nursing, library science, and social work.

b. press their universities to review personnel practices to ensure that they do not disproportionately relegate women to non-tenure-track positions, to demanding service courses, or to heavy advising and committee assignments.

c. press their universities to review promotion practices to identify any tendency to deny tenure disproportionately to women or to promote them more slowly than men.

d. make all faculty and administration salaries

and all CVs readily accessible to faculty.

e. ask that job candidates be given data on departmental salary structures and salaries of recent appointees and—as long as a university's salaries are not standardized—encourage candidates to negotiate for starting salaries in line with those of other faculty members with similar credentials.

f. encourage their universities to take into account in evaluating the performance of administrators their progress in achieving equitable salary structures and salary-setting practices.

g. cooperate in pay-equity campaigns with non-faculty employees and (where they exist) their unions.

BARBARA RESKIN (Sociology),
Ohio State University, Chair

DEANA LIDDY (Psychology),
University of Nebraska, Omaha

LOIS HAIGNERE (Research Director, United
University Professions),
State University of New York

LESLEY LEE FRANCIS, Association Staff

The Subcommittee

RONNIE J. STEINBERG (Sociology),
Temple University, Consultant

Addenda to the 1991-92 Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession
Data for the following institutions were submitted too late for inclusion in the March-April issue of *Academe*:

Institution	Category	Average Salary:					Average Compensation:				
		PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
Arcadio Tech. University (PR)	IB	24.5	21.8	17.8	16.1	19.7	29.2	26.1	21.4	19.3	23.6
Bellevue College (Neb.)	IB	—	30.3	27.1	—	29.4	—	35.8	32.2	—	34.8
Chadron St. College (Neb.)	IIA	46.6	36.2	34.0	24.6	37.8	56.0	44.0	41.5	30.8	45.8
Concordia Teachers (Neb.)	IB	31.9	29.3	25.4	—	29.0	37.8	35.2	32.1	—	35.1
Concordia College of the Bible (Neb.)	IB	—	—	—	—	21.2	—	—	—	—	27.7
Lincoln University (Pa.)	IB	39.6	31.1	30.5	26.5	33.1	48.3	38.5	35.3	31.6	38.5
Manhattanville College (NY)	IIA	55.3	45.5	40.9	29.1	44.1	67.6	56.2	50.9	37.4	54.6
Mid-Plains Technical Community Area (Neb.)	IV	—	—	—	—	30.3	—	—	—	—	39.6
Midland Lutheran College (Neb.)	IB	35.4	32.0	26.6	22.2	29.0	42.9	41.6	33.2	27.3	35.9
Minnesota Community Colleges:											
Anoka-Ramsey Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.1	—	—	—	—	55.7
Austin Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	44.1	—	—	—	—	58.7
Brainerd Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	40.3	—	—	—	—	54.3
Fergus Falls Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	41.4	—	—	—	—	55.5
Hibbing Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	39.3	—	—	—	—	53.1
Inver Hills Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	41.8	—	—	—	—	55.2
Itasca Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	40.0	—	—	—	—	53.9
Lakewood Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.8	—	—	—	—	56.4
Mesabi Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.1	—	—	—	—	56.3
Minneapolis Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	43.8	—	—	—	—	57.6
Normandale Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	43.5	—	—	—	—	57.2
North Hennepin Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.8	—	—	—	—	56.5
Northland Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.0	—	—	—	—	56.2
Rainy River Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	39.4	—	—	—	—	53.2
Rochester Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.2	—	—	—	—	56.4
Vernilion Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	40.2	—	—	—	—	54.1
Willmar Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	42.2	—	—	—	—	56.5
Worthington Community College	IV	—	—	—	—	41.7	—	—	—	—	55.8
New Mexico Highlands University	IIA	39.3	35.6	29.9	—	34.3	48.0	43.6	36.6	—	42.0
Polytechnic University (NY)	IB	61.5	46.2	46.6	25.5	51.8	75.5	58.0	58.5	33.7	64.3
Pratt Institute (NY)	IIA	45.3	40.0	34.3	—	41.7	48.8	43.0	36.9	—	44.8
Rockefeller University (NY)	I	43.2	48.2	31.0	26.5	40.9	110.5	60.9	39.1	33.6	50.7
Sul Ross State University (Tex.)	IB	40.0	34.1	29.1	—	32.3	50.4	43.5	37.1	—	40.7
University of Houston-Victoria (Tex.)	IB	—	33.8	32.9	—	32.8	—	42.2	41.2	—	43.2
West Texas State University	IIA	41.6	35.4	29.9	24.9	33.0	53.4	46.0	39.5	33.6	43.2

Notes: "Blank" is for no one in rank and "—" for rank with fewer than 6 individuals. All figures rounded to nearest \$100.
PR = Professor, AO = Associate, AI = Assistant, IN = Instructor, and AR = All Ranks.

(Item 1)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1687-86/FA
November 6-7, 1986

DEVELOPMENTAL PAPER
SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University adopt the Developmental Paper On Separation Of Rank And Salary dated November 7, 1986.

A

APPROVED

January 8, 1987

DEVELOPMENTAL PAPER
SEPARATION OF RANK AND SALARY

The Academic Senate of The California State University has a responsibility to help ensure that the determination of criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure not become the subject of collective bargaining. The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act Section 3562(r)(4) gives the responsibility for determining "criteria and standards" jointly to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.

In order to meet this responsibility, the Academic Senate, after much consultation, decided in January, 1986 that when collective bargaining proposals appear to have significant academic implications or consequences or affect criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, or tenure, the Senate will address its concerns to the Board of Trustees and its appropriate committees, to the Chancellor and appropriate members of her staff, and to the California Faculty Association (CFA) leadership. The mechanism used for consideration of issues by the Senate committees and the Academic Senate has been the "developmental paper." Developmental papers are viewed as a means of crystallizing the Senate's thinking on a particular issue and of providing a point of departure for discussions with the Trustees and administration on matters of criteria and standards.

A proposal to change the structure of the faculty salary schedule in the CSU has been a major issue in the 1986 bargaining of the new Unit 3 contract. Similar changes in the structure have been proposed prior to the advent of collective bargaining in the CSU and during the bargaining of the first contract. In January 1986 the Academic Senate notified the Trustees, administration and CFA that proposals to separate rank and salary might raise issues of criteria and standards within the purview of the Academic Senate. The Senate has adopted the view that "criteria and standards" are "those things which are the basis for the personnel action or decision in question, i.e. appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure. Criteria and standards are necessarily the substantive requirements the faculty member, or prospective faculty member, must satisfy."

The Senate believes the separation of rank and salary would require the creation of two separate sets of criteria and standards for appointment. In addition it might be necessary to alter the criteria and standards for later promotion or evaluation of the faculty.

Current campus policies for appointment and retention enunciate one set of criteria and standards by which the faculty make recommendations regarding rank and salary for new hires. The separation of rank from salary would necessarily require two decisions to be made for each new hire, i.e. placement on a salary schedule and rank of appointment. Each of these decisions would necessarily be made on the basis of criteria and standards developed for that particular determination.

Similarly campus policies for promotion enunciate one set of criteria and standards for promotion. If questions of salary following promotion are uncoupled from a decision about rank, new criteria and standards must be developed for that decision concerning salary.

In the Senate's view any separation of rank and salary would require the development of policies clearly establishing the criteria and standards for rank of appointment and promotion separate from the criteria and standards for placement on a salary schedule. These policies should be developed through normal campus senate processes in consultation with the administration. To be consistent with current personnel policies, faculty recommendations would be the primary determinant of both rank and salary questions. As a matter of principle, no administrator should unilaterally determine salary upon appointment or promotion.

In addition to the questions of criteria and standards, the Senate is also concerned about the educational and academic effects of the separation of rank and salary. Those potential effects, whether positive or negative, are best examined in light of the specific proposal. While the Senate does not have the detailed proposal before it, an outline of the proposal has been provided. The separation would not affect current faculty directly. It would apply to new hires, allowing for placement on the salary schedule of approximately 20 steps separate from the assignment of rank. Once placed on the salary schedule, a faculty member would move through four additional steps. Merit step increases in salary would then stop until promotion to the next rank was granted. (As we understand it, the proposal would not alter the methodology of merit step increases for faculty under the current salary schedule.) Once promoted, new placement on the salary schedule would be determined as a separate question. Promotion could lead to a significant increase in salary over the last step achieved in the prior rank.

Such a proposal, if implemented, could permit assignment at a low academic rank coupled with a high salary, or assignment at a high rank coupled with a low salary (a salary lower than that associated with the current salary schedule for that rank). The Senate is not informed whether a new hire assigned to the rank of full professor could under the proposal be assigned a salary so low that his or her salary would be capped due to the lack of opportunity for promotion. This problem could be resolved by establishing a minimum salary for the advanced ranks.

No formal explanation of the CSU proposal has been provided to the Academic Senate. We believe, however, that the genesis of the proposal was the "rank inflation" that occurred in earlier years. The separation of rank and salary could be viewed as one way to address the difficulties in hiring highly qualified faculty while respecting the traditional meaning of rank. It has been argued that hiring relatively inexperienced faculty at advanced rank in order to provide an adequate salary distorts the traditional meaning of rank. Recent statistics, however, seem to indicate that "rank inflation" is not a current problem in the CSU.

The separation of rank and salary along the lines of the proposal does present the potential for benefits and for risks and dangers to the educational mission of the system.

The potential benefits or advantages of separation include greater hiring flexibility in assigning rank and salary coupled with the possibility of increasing the number of reviews to which a faculty member would be subject. We have examined these potential advantages and do not view them as compelling when compared with the potential risks, both known and unknown.

Significant dangers and risks inhere in the separation of rank and salary. While all the potential negative effects on the educational process cannot be predicted, some can.

Such separation could lead to a devaluation of the liberal arts and sciences in undergraduate education if the salary appropriations to the CSU are distributed in a more market oriented fashion. The University must compete with private industry, non-profit organizations, other universities, and other public sector employers for the most qualified faculty in any given field. Current hiring and retention programs focus on the so called hard to hire disciplines such as business, engineering, and computer science. The future turnover and retirement of faculty may lead to hiring difficulty in many other disciplines. If the most highly qualified teachers-scholars are to be attracted to the CSU, the salaries offered by the state certainly must be competitive. However, such pragmatism should not override the University's commitment to the liberal arts and sciences. If separation of rank and salary were to lead to a marked lower salary level for professors in the liberal arts and sciences, the values of a liberal education would be denigrated. The University's public commitment to maintaining the liberal arts and sciences as the core of undergraduate education requires that we honor and recognize that value in our own internal reward systems. We must recognize the powerful message we send when we pay the professor of philosophy significantly less than the professor of accountancy.

The morale of and collegial relations among the faculty could suffer under a two-tiered salary system - one set of salaries for "old" faculty and one set for "new" faculty. As retirements lead to a large number of new hires in the future, the separation of rank and salary could lead to an unhealthy competition for salary funds if it is not accompanied by additional funding. In order to raise the salaries of some faculty, the salaries of others will have to be stabilized or increased less; furthermore, for purely budgetary reasons the use of temporary faculty in the CSU would probably increase. Because, as we understand it, additional funding is unlikely in the near future, a change in salary administration would mean that qualified faculty would compete against each other for limited resources. The personnel management literature emphasizes the importance of expectation of fair and consistent compensation for one's skills and efforts. If expectations of fair and equitable pay conditions are not met, adjustments in salary administration cannot make up for that lack of fairness. Suppose the faculty in two disciplines are paid different average salaries. The average workload of teaching, professional and scholarly activities, and committee work is the same. Morale and self-esteem in the lower paid discipline must suffer. Those who earn less will likely be viewed as less productive or less valued. They may also derogate the qualities that justify a higher pay scale in another discipline in order to protect the perceived value of their own contributions. Collegial decisions about curriculum, program development, resource allocation, and personnel matters become more difficult in the context of such a zero-sum game.

Other problems must be addressed as well. Any separation of rank and salary would need to recognize the importance of peer evaluation in establishing rank and salary through establishing criteria and making recommendations regarding individual faculty. Nevertheless, conflicts between faculty groups (departments and schools) competing over limited salary dollars as to where their faculty would be placed on the salary schedule following

appointment or promotion would most likely have to be resolved by an administrator such as the academic vice president or president. Any process which would assign greater authority to the president or another administrator to set individual salaries would give that administrator significant control over the direction and priorities of the institution and make him or her the arbiter of standards and criteria for appointment and promotion questions. While ultimate authority on a campus always rests with the president, that authority is exercised in the context of policies and procedures developed jointly by faculty and administration. Decisions concerning hiring of new faculty and promotion of faculty must be made in the context of collegially determined missions and goals of the campus.

Perhaps more threatening to some faculty is the view that any separation of rank and salary for new hires is only a first step to a later uncoupling of rank and salary for all faculty. This fear might appropriately be addressed by a fuller explanation of the need for rank and salary separation at this time.

Other factors need to be considered prior to any separation of rank and salary. Currently the State of California is examining the Master Plan for Higher Education. In connection with that examination, the CSU has recently proposed a restatement of its mission. Among other things, the restatement retains the centrality of teaching while affirming the public service function of the CSU. From the proposals debated in this public arena will come refinements in the character of higher education in California and in the statement of mission for the CSU. This statement will help determine the kinds of faculty that will be needed and the types of incentives to best attract and retain that faculty. Simultaneously a task force is conducting a study of the future staffing needs of the CSU in light of changing demographics of both the faculty and the population of the state. An expected bulge in retirements in the 1990's and the need to provide for the gradual turnover of faculty, necessitate a complete examination of incentives. Federal income tax reform may change the attractiveness of certain incentives as well. Financial incentives may be worth more if they lead to reduced taxation, e.g. providing benefits, which are not treated as taxable income, for health care, travel, faculty development opportunities, computer resources, books, and housing assistance in high cost areas. It seems premature to change the structure of salary administration without considering the effects of these forces over which the CSU has limited control.

We must also state that the CSU's present system of fixed salary steps within rank has clear benefits. The present system is equitable within ranks across disciplines and is a powerful factor for cohesion of faculties. Affirmative action standards and goals are furthered by our system of equal pay for equal academic status. This is regrettably rare in academe. A reasonable degree of pay equality fosters a spirit of unity and is a cornerstone of cooperation and collegiality in the academy. While equitable treatment benefits minorities and women, it also benefits disciplines and the quality of education itself. To preserve the sense of the university as a single body of academics, and to communicate these values as a counterpoint to the values generated by the marketplace, is our obligation.