

10-4-2004

Currently, what is the established procedure for dealing with salary disputes?

Debra Sabia
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sabia, Debra, "Currently, what is the established procedure for dealing with salary disputes?" (2004). *Faculty Senate Index*. 194.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/194>

This request for information is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Question regarding G, Section A., Number 6, Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures: Currently, what is the established procedure for dealing with salary disputes?

Submitted by: Debra Sabia

10/4/2004

Question:

Question regarding Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures, Section A., Number 6: Currently, what is the established procedure for dealing with salary disputes? Why shouldn't the FGC include salary disputes within its purview?.

Rationale:

Since the FGC is only a recommending body it seems reasonable to suggest that salary disputes be among those issues it can and should consider (especially in those cases dealing with alleged violations over qualitative judgments). Obviously, access to bring such a grievance would widely benefit all faculty.

SEC Response:

From the SEC: Currently, qualitative salary disputes are handled at the department head, dean, and/or provost level(s) and are not eligible for FGC involvement. However, salary disputes charging violation of established practices, etc., and salary issues arising as collateral to complaints about improper action/treatment are indeed open to be grieved. This topic is appropriate for discussion during debate on the Revised Grievance Procedures at the October Senate Meeting.

Senate Response:

Debra Sabia's second request for information queried why salary disputes were not part of item #6 of the Revised Grievance Procedures to be submitted to the Senate at the current meeting. She specifically asked what the established procedures for dealing with salary disputes were and why this should not be under the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) purview. Rice Jenkins explained that she herself had served on the FGC and that, as such, was able personally to provide a response to this RFI. The response was that salary disputes arising collaterally in complaints about improper action or treatment are open to be grieved. The current method for resolving other salary complaints were through the Unit Head, the pertinent Dean, and the Provost. Rice Jenkins also welcomed discussion of allowed salary grievances at the appropriate time later in the meeting.

Debra Sabia asked about salary grievance procedure under the revised policies. Marc Cyr, speaking from the gallery, noted that Section A-6 of the Revised Grievance Procedures put in writing a previously unwritten agreement that existed between former Provost Vandegrift and the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) insofar as grievances having to do with salary are concerned. Grievances of the "I'm worth more than you are paying me" variety are not considered by the FGC. Salary issues that are collateral with other grievances where practices, procedures, or established criteria have not been followed can be appealed to the FGC.

Sabia asked who makes the decision that a grievance is of one type or another. Cyr replied that this determination would be made by the Chair of the FGC.