SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS OF THE FPPC/FDSC FACULTY SURVEY

We have posted this summary report plus the full results of the FPPC/FDSC Survey at the FPPC section of the Provost’s Website. We have also provided the raw data for anyone who wishes to reanalyze the information.

For Question 1, the lower the number the higher the priority responding Faculty members assigned to the item. Thus, 3.13 represents the highest priority of the nine items listed and 5.49 represents the lowest priority.

Key Findings from the survey associated with question 1 include:

a) Overall the faculty rated increasing the amount of money in the general merit pool as the highest priority (3.13 with 41% of the respondents giving this item the highest priority).

b) Providing adjustments for ranks that fall below the AAUP IIB average received the next highest priority from respondents (3.37 with 27% assigning it a top priority).

c) Increasing the amount of money in the special merit pool received the lowest priority from respondents (5.49 and only 13% assigning this item a top priority rating).

d) Respondents are relatively evenly divided regarding the elimination of special merit with 27% assigning this issue a top priority and 23% assigning it the lowest priority.

Key Findings regarding q2 - In years in which the general merit pool is smaller than the increase in the Lehigh Valley cost-of-living for the previous year, the College should distribute only general merit increases (and not “special” merit increases):

78% of the respondents are either very interested or somewhat interested in eliminating special merit in years in which the general merit increase falls short of the increase in the cost of living for the previous year.
Key Findings regarding q5: - *In determining general merit levels for individuals meeting the high expectations of the college, instead of computing salary increases as a percentage of an individual faculty member’s base salary, the general merit increase should be calculated as a percentage of the average base salary for each cohort from the previous academic year. Cohorts would be determined in terms of blocks of time in rank [Assistant Professors 1-3 yrs and 4-6 yrs - Associate Professors 1-4 yrs, 5-8 yrs, 10 and more yrs - Professors in 5 yr intervals (1-5 yrs, 6-10, etc.)] This will mean that each faculty member within the cohort will receive the exact same general merit raise (in dollar amounts) for each academic year, before additional merit increases. This would provide for an automatic adjustment for faculty members earning below the average salary in their rank.*

56% of respondents are either very interested or somewhat interested in exploring the merits of a cohort based general merit system.

Regarding the demographics of respondents:
  a) Lecturers were slightly under represented among respondents.
  b) Female faculty were slightly under represented among respondents.

Cross-tabulations revealed that there were no significant differences among any of the demographic subdivisions (rank, gender, division) in the responses to any of the questions.