## Short-Term Goals of the Faculty Senate Finance Committee Minority Report

The first short-term goal of adding both health care benefits and retirement benefits to all full-time faculty members while laudable in concept does not take into consideration the realities of the status of current compensation administration at SU. For example, according to Dave Parker's figures, the mean pay for lecturers is \$35,946 and for instructors is $\$ 47,517$. Not having access to the data and the differences in responsibilities, we have no idea why the variation. In addition, we have no idea as to what the variation may be for either individual lecturers or instructors or what the justification may be for such variations. According to 2004-2005 Faculty Salaries in Graduate Departments of Psychology, the mean salary for lecturers and instructors (APA does not distinguish between the two) in psychology departments with a master's, but not a doctoral program the mean salary is $\$ 36,542$. It might be construed that some of the salaries, especially for those of instructor's, at SU may have already been adjusted to make up for the lack of benefits. Frankly, we do not know how else to explain such a high mean salary for the instructors at SU. However, we will acknowledge there may be other factors.

University pay administration normally considers factors such as type of university, type of department, rank, years in rank, geographic region, cost of living of region, individual credentials, and individual accomplishments. Instead of an across the board change in compensation at this point, we would strongly suggest a case by case analysis and where appropriate adjustments be made.

Second, we would like to suggest the following alternative to the one suggested by the committee:

We recommend all full-time, tenure and non-tenure track, faculty members salaries be reviewed to ensure that they are internally fair and externally competitive. Each salary shall be reviewed to ensure that it reflects fairly each individual's rank, years in rank, contributions, and years of service. In particular, unjust inversions, compression, and other inequities shall be prioritized for expedited remediation. The review will begin with the department chair and the dean of the school, who will meet to consider similar situated individuals in the department, school, university, peer institutions, and aspirational institutions in determining whether a faculty member's salary should be increased.

Further, we recommend that each Dean should be responsible to develop an estimate of the total underpayment for his/her faculty and to report it to the faculty and administration at the first meeting of the senate, annually.

Salary compressions and inversions are to be expected and applauded in cases where there is a high performing person of a lower rank and a low performing person at a higher rank. For both the good of the students, the faculty and the university, and to be
good stewards of tuition, taxpayers' support and of other funds, pay administration must reflect external economic realities. What is desirable is to have pay administration make it desirable for high performers to remain attached to SU both physically and mentally. Unfortunately, the way pay has been administered and constrained locally and by the University of Maryland System has worked against this principle.
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