

TO: Br. Ronald Gallagher, President

FROM: Tomas Gomez-Arias, Chair
Academic Senate

DATE: September 30, 2011

RE: Senate Action S-11/12-4
Senate Resolution Re: Report and Recommendations
of the Faculty Salary Task Force

At the September 29, 2011 meeting of the Academic Senate, the attached Resolution Expressing the Sense of the Academic Senate re: Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Salary Task Force was unanimously approved by roll call vote with all Senators present. This action was assigned Senate Action # S-11/12-4.

cc: Beth Dobkin, Provost
Ellen Rigsby, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

Resolution Expressing the Sense of the Academic Senate *re*:
Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Salary Task Force

Resolved:

Respecting the Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Salary Task Force (FSTF), the sense of the Academic Senate is shaped by the following observations:

- The largest swathe of the ranked faculty is strongly attached to the existing *uniform, transparent scale*, although a significant number support the existing policy with reservations or desire a new one¹;
- The FSTF report and recommendations command the widest, least qualified faculty support where they are most consistent with the existing uniform, transparent scale:
 - ▶ the national, select group of peer comparators;
 - ▶ scaled, stepped progress through faculty ranks, under peer review and by administrative confirmation;
 - ▶ increase of the steps at professorial rank from 7 to 10;
 - ▶ retention of the present concept of equity across faculty ranks;
 - ▶ yearly public review of the policy's functioning and periodic public review of its design;
 - ▶ explicit adjustment of the common scale to the differential cost of labor in the Bay Area;
- Certain aspects of the FSTF-recommended design generate polarities (for and against) in faculty opinion and occasion widespread concern:
 - ▶ For many, the categorization of faculty by finely drawn, disciplinary distinctions—comparative data requisite for implementation of differential salaries—is at odds with a collegiate culture shaped by conspicuous faculty-wide, inter- and supra-disciplinary curricula;
 - ▶ For many, the scope of administrative discretion entrusted by the policy to the ‘Provost in consultation with the Deans’ stands in cognitive dissonance with ideals of deliberative community and their expression through shared governance;
 - ▶ The proposal bifurcates: because the differential salary policy—funding, administration, and market rationale—is entirely separable from the revised common scale (except in the data to be elicited from the new list of comparators), one invites adoption independently of the other;
- Concerns over design aside, faculty express deep reservations over some FSTF recommendations for implementation or administration of the policy:
 - ▶ While the fact and fiscal dimension of off-scale salaries will be transparent, the concrete arrangements continue *sub rosa*, elude peer review, and so are available for uses inconsistent with FSTF's declared intent;
 - ▶ FSTF recommends that new endowment or other resources be developed to fund differential salaries, but the question of the sustainability, over the long term, of the proposed common scale increases goes unaddressed;
- Comprehensive resolution of the disorder and distress occasioned by the unilateral administrative decision to disregard the present *Handbook* policy is a matter of good faith and a plain duty to the common good.

¹ Cf. Saint Mary's College Faculty Welfare Committee, “Faculty Salary Policy Survey 2010,” <http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/faculty-and-staff/faculty-governance/academic-senate/faculty-welfare-committee/docs/Survey_Results_Overall.pdf>

Accordingly, it is the sense of the Academic Senate that:

- If College policy is to be amended in favor of paying differential salaries, then Saint Mary's longstanding commitment to transparency *via* public disclosure of a common scale and a roster of faculty by rank should be preserved in appropriately modified form, *viz.*: publication of a Rank and Tenure Roster paired with the actual salaries reported by the College to the annual American Association of University Professors/*Academe* survey;

- ▶ The practice, or its equivalent, would provide unambiguous, accessible evidence that the College were adhering to expressed policy;

- ▶ In kind, the practice is not uncommon in the local academy—CSU and UC faculty salary data are public by law; adverse effects on academic comity are not alleged at these public institutions;

- ▶ At Saint Mary's, IRS Form 990 disclosures of salaries paid to senior administrators and coaches have not been a source of friction, and it is possible that salaries of senior faculty in the hard-to-hire lines foreseen by the FSTF, would in any case be liable to IRS Form 990 reporting;

- ▶ Far from a history of fractious behavior over compensation, the faculty community at Saint Mary's has a history of un-self-seeking, generous attitudes and behaviors;

- Any structural enhancement to salary policy—whether to the common scale or by way of differential salaries—should be accompanied by expressed commitment from the Board of Trustees to some long-term funding mechanism(s);

- ▶ The present policy was vacated, expressly, on the ground that funding for the attainment of Goal 2 was not, and would not be, forthcoming; nevertheless, by FSTF estimate (FSTF Presentation, #17) implementation of the proposed scale enhancement is, as a percentage of operating budget, on the order of magnitude of the cost to attain Goal 2 *circa* 2004-05;

- ▶ FSTF's formula *re*: funding of differential salaries would (if adopted) have the Board enunciate a College mandate: "the College will . . . seek and find additional endowment and other resources to cover the cost of off-scale differentials" (Salary Goals, 5.); a similar commitment should accompany enhancements to the proposed common scale;

- Absent the foregoing emendations or their equivalent, the FSTF Report and Recommendations do not merit broad faculty support.