Dear Colleagues:

We have published a salary survey every year since 1976, the only exceptions being those years without raises. The attached file UIFY2015 will show salaries for each department and percentage raises from FY14 to FY15.

As soon as the FY16 salaries are posted by the Budget Office, we will publish the department list for this coming year. In the past we have always waited for the AAUP national data published the following spring, but because of that long gap we will no longer do that.

We have national salaries for full professors and principal administrators all the way back to 1982. (See attached file Survey15.pdf.) For FY82 UI full professors were only 17 percent behind their peers at Ph.D.-granting institutions. For that rank there is now a 26 percent gap. Fourteen years ago, UI associate professors were 13 percent behind, but now they lag 17 percent. During that same year, UI assistant professors were deficient by only 9 percent, but now they are 19 percent behind. Look at Table III in the attached file Survey15.pdf to see where you would be if we had gone to a salary step system in 1976.

**Promotion Increments Help Full Professors, but They still Lag**

One of the principal AFT salary recommendations over the years has been a plea for larger promotion increments, primarily to alleviate salary compression in the upper ranks. Years ago they used to be $1,000 for promotion to associate and $1,500 to full; and, with new assistant professor coming at market level, salary compression became a huge problem. We take credit for the fact that the Hoover administration increased those increments to $5,000 and $6,500 respectively. (We will also take credit for the corresponding increment boosts at ISU and BSU.) About 10 years ago they went to $6,000 and $8,500, and finally we are seeing an appropriate gap between associate and full professor salaries.

**Administrative Raises Up 395% over 33 Years vs. Full Professors at 226%; CPI at 236**

In 1995 we thought that we had succeeded in curbing excessive increases in administrative raises, but as Table II shows, they have outstripped full professors by 169 percent over 33 years. During the period 1990-1995 raises for the higher administration rose by 21.34 percent compared to 16.5 percent for faculty. When the AFT made these increases an issue in 1995, the next year administrator pay rose only 2.33 percent, and since then their annual raises have not been larger than the faculty’s. The huge differentials since then have been due to new people hired at “market” rates. *For example, the new provost was hired at 31 percent above his predecessor.*

**Staben’s $350,000 is a 513% increase over Gibb’s 1982 Salary;
New Provost’s $280,000 is 433% increase since 1982; UI Fulls at 226%**

In 1972 new assistant professors made about $10,000 and President Ernest Hartung made about $30,000. When President Richard Gibb was hired in 1977, his salary had risen to four times that of entry level faculty. Faculty complaints became more vocal when Elizabeth Zinser’s FY94 salary was $125,039, five times entry level salaries. Zinser promised that her “high tide” wage would float all faculty boats, but instead our boats have been swamped. Chuck Staben’s $350,000 is now seven times that of entry level liberal arts faculty.

Those who justify these huge administrative salaries say: “This is what the market demands, and we are still paying less than peer institutions.” If faculty salaries had been keeping up, this would have been persuasive. But, as the State Board of Education (our Regents) continues to approve these administrative increases each year, faculty salaries have fallen further and further behind.

**Across the Board Raises Before Merit Pay**

The Hoover administration committed itself to “across the board increases” for “all employees showing at least satisfactory performance.” This promise stands first in a list that includes promotions, merit pay, and equity adjustments. The AFT position has always been that as a long as salaries do not keep up with the cost of living, then merit pay is a moot point. When legislative raises are applied according to merit, many faculty end up with pays cuts because of the decline in general buying power.

**Collective Bargaining is the Only Answer**

During the late 1960s there was a large expansion of our public higher education system. This was good for educational opportunity, but bad in the way that this system developed according to a business model. University presidents became less like academic leaders and more like CEOs, and their salaries, as well as those of their bloated management teams, have skyrocketed. (The UI has just added a new Vice-President for Infrastructure.) A natural response to the industrialization of the university was the rise of faculty unions. They now represent a large majority of faculty in states where collective bargaining is allowed. Idaho, unfortunately, is not one of them.

**An Idaho University Salary Step System**

A central feature of these union contracts is a salary step system that guarantees cost of living increases as well as raises above that in good years. It also provides for substantial promotion increments. If UI faculty had gone for our salary step proposal in 1976 (see Table III), we would now be at the top of our peers rather than at the bottom. Furthermore, faculty without “market value”–those in the library, humanities, and social sciences–would be making decent wages.

**PLEASE JOIN US IN PROTECTING FACULTY RIGHTS;
INCREASING SALARIES AND BENEFITS**

Members of the American Federation of Teachers receive a $1,000,000 professional and legal liability policy, access to legal and moral support, and national/state AFT publications. Biweekly dues range from $7-18 depending on your salary. See the attachment for an application form.