

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2737-06/FGA/FA (Rev)
March 9-10, 2006

Re-Examination of the Faculty Salary Structure

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the bargaining teams of both the CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA), during the current round of contract bargaining, to re-examine and modify, where necessary, the existing CSU faculty salary structure for the purpose of addressing problems including salary compression and inversion.

RATIONALE: The current faculty salary structure in the CSU system remains essentially unchanged since its last major revision in the mid-1990s. Problems with the salary structure have been noted on numerous occasions, most notably those of salary “compression” for faculty at the upper levels of their ranks and—more recently—salary “inversion” for some junior faculty hired in recent years. [“Salary compression” refers to the situation where senior faculty members at the top of their ranks are no longer eligible for Service Salary Increases (SSIs). “Salary inversion” describes the case where experienced faculty in the CSU earn a lower salary than faculty newly hired at the same rank.] The salary inversion issue, in large part the result of a lack of salary increases in recent years, has generated significant concerns on multiple CSU campuses over the past several months, inducing a number of them to address this issue at the local level. These issues, however, are most appropriately addressed on a systemwide basis. Both salary compression and inversion issues challenge the system’s ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty.

Given that the Chancellor has recently made faculty compensation a priority as evidenced by his five-year plan announced in Fall 2005 to raise faculty salaries, it seems appropriate that a review of the existing faculty salary structure be undertaken at this time. In addition, the fact that CFA and the CSU are currently engaged in contract negotiations reinforces the appropriateness of such a review by both parties

Approved Unanimously – May 4-5, 2006