FEEDBACK RECEIVED BY OPE[1] ON LAWS AND POLICIES CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW
(as of 10/8/2025)

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
1	8/29/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy could potentially impact the ability to retain long-term high-performing faculty and staff and at the same time reward poorer performing faculty and staff. The current pool leaves almost no room to reward consistently higher-performing faculty and staff beyond the merit increase authorized by the regents. Further, this policy will likely lead to a loss of knowledge and increased turn over which will increase costs for the school and university as a whole.	Staff	CU AMC
2	8/29/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11F.- note if enacted without adding an exception clause, you will likely compel those in cat C with higher salaries to leave CU and seek fair compensation based on national market rates and value-added to the university. Capping increases leaves little incentive to commit to CU and several advanced job descriptions are specialized, requiring unique education and skills, and are very much in high demand across many institutions.	Staff	CU Boulder
3	8/29/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am a little confused about this policy, so I wanted to make sure I was understanding it correctly. From what the policy states, that the highest earning staff will not receive across the board salary adjustments, including the annual merit-based compensation. If from what I am reading, it removes the incentive for staff with higher compensation levels to perform at a higher level, as their merit will be capped, when someone else who earns less, can potentially earn a larger raise even if they are not producing the comparable level of high quality work based on job duties. Am I totally off base here?	Staff	CU AMC
4	8/29/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	While I applaud Regent VanDriel's effort to reduce salary disparities across the CU system with this policy proposal, it should be noted that the coarse granularity with which the proposed base-building salary increases are applied will likely have a significant negative effect on the University's compensation — and resulting ability to retain — experienced mid-career faculty members who are emerging leaders in their respective fields. If the proposed tiering system is	Faculty	CU Boulder

[1] Office of Policy and Efficiency

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			implemented to include all system salaries from student emlpoyees to classified staff and academic faculty, many (if not all) tenured faculty members will find their annual merit raises capped significantly below the overall merit pool percentages (which, it should be noted, have not remotely kept pace with inflation over the past several years, in any case). The result would be a slow but significant erosion in the inflation-adjusted compensation of these key employees in the CU system. Faced with effective cuts to their base salaries over time, these faculty would be more likely to seek opportunity elsewhere, leaving a vacuum of experience and leadership within CU's academic units. I understand that there are public optics and pragmatic issues involved in applying percentage-based merit adjustments across the board, especially to provide salary increases for the very highly-paid tier of campus administrators who already have base salary rates many that are (many) multiples of the base salaries of the faculty members--let alone staff members--that they supervise. (Colorado newspapers were quick to note the current base salaries of campus Chancellors and Deans as a point of evidence.) But I would argue that Regent VanDriel's three-tiered proposal would not only rein in the salary increases for the relatively small number of these very well-paid campus administrators, it would also effectively penalize a large swath of mid-level CU faculty members, disincentivize merit performance that would warrant more than the minimal tier of salary adjustment in a given year, and lead to an increase in departures from the University. Yes, we need additional equity in CU's compensation structure, and we need to find pathways to advance for all members of our community. But effectively cutting the pay of a large portion of the faculty without whose work the university does not exist is not a sustainable solution to this problem.		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
5	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11.F - Policy 11.F proposes to restrict “annual merit-based, base building” salary adjustments and “across-the-board” increases for the highest earning faculty and staff (Classification C), while ensuring increases for the lowest earners (Classification A). While the goal of equity is commendable, the policy introduces several risks to employee retention, engagement, and legal compliance. Negative Impact on Retention and Engagement a. Disincentivizing High Performance: By capping merit-based increases for top earners, the policy removes a key incentive for high-performing employees. These individuals may feel undervalued, especially if their contributions exceed those of peers in lower classifications. Over time, this could lead to disengagement or attrition, particularly among top talent who have competitive opportunities elsewhere. Not to metion, many of these top earners may supervisor large teams or have more complex areas of expertise required. b. Undermining Meritocracy: The policy shifts compensation away from performance-based rewards toward a rigid percentile-based classification. This undermines the principle of meritocracy, which is essential for motivating employees to excel and innovate. c. Risk of Internal Equity Conflicts: Employees in Classification B may receive unrestricted merit increases, while those in Classification C are capped—even if their roles are more complex or impactful. This could foster resentment and perceptions of unfairness, especially if the classification system does not account for job responsibilities or market benchmarks. If the Colorado Equal Pay for Equal Work act takes experience and time in role into account for initial salary setting, why would merit increases completely ignot that. Doing so would completely throw off the frame work that the campuses spent years buildnig.	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
6	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	RE: Draft and Proposed Policy 11F 1. Undermines Merit-Based Compensation Philosophy CU has long emphasized performance-based compensation as a part of its talent strategy. By capping merit-based increases for the higher earners (Classification C), the policy risks disincentivizing high performance and innovation among senior faculty and staff. This could erode morale and diminish CU's ability to reward excellence, particularly in competitive academic and administrative roles. This is an inequitable solution and ultimately is a negative sum solution to today's. This is a budget reduction outcome, not an equitable annual increase outcome. 2. Threatens Recruitment and Retention of Top Talent CU competes nationally and globally for top-tier staff and administrators. Limiting salary growth for high earners may make CU less attractive to high-impact candidates, especially in specialized fields where compensation is a key differentiator. This includes areas like IT, HR, and Finance. 3. Oversimplifies Equity by Ignoring Role Complexity and Market Forces The policy's reliance on percentile-based classifications (A, B, C) fails to account for the complexity of roles, market benchmarks, and strategic value of certain positions. Equity should be pursued through nuanced approaches, such as targeted equity adjustments, pay transparency, and compression pools, not blanket restrictions that ignore context. 4. Lacks Flexibility for Strategic Compensation Planning CU's compensation strategy must remain agile to respond to evolving needs, including retention counteroffers, market adjustments, and strategic initiatives. This policy constrains leadership's ability to make timely and targeted compensation decisions that support institutional goals. It could potentially create negative consequences for employees promoting or growing while at CU. As someone may	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			promote through their career and move through classifications, it will reduce their salary growth and they'll be incentivized to leave. While each campus has a unique strategy addressing their unique needs using their individuals budgets, there is need to coordinate more on compensation strategies. However, this misses best practice and pushes forced structure or rankings that have been rightfully criticized as culturally detrimental and unhelpful in policies impacting people.		
7	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11f Restrictions on Certian Salary Adjustments As a leader in Human Resources with a focus on compensation strategy, I appreciate the Regent's commitment to promoting equity across the CU system. However, I have concerns about how this policy may affect our ability to retain and support talented employees, especially in areas where CU already struggles to compete with external markets. CU's merit increase pools are typically modest and have not kept pace with rising costs of living or market compensation benchmarks. The proposed limitations on salary increases for employees in the highest earning tier (Classification C) could further restrict our ability to retain high-performing staff. In addition to limited merit pools, our current budget realities make it increasingly difficult to recruit top talent. This policy introduces another barrier. If employees and candidates perceive that they will not have opportunities for professional growth or meaningful compensation increases that support long-term financial stability, they may choose to work elsewhere. While many of our staff are motivated by more than just financial rewards, compensation remains a critical factor in their ability to live comfortably and support their families. It is not only about recognizing performance, but also about ensuring a basic standard of living.	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Employees who receive promotions, equity adjustments, or market-based increases may move into Classification C, where future merit-based increases are capped. This creates a disincentive for growth and advancement. It may unintentionally signal that CU does not value continued excellence or internal career progression. Using percentile-based classifications to determine salary adjustment eligibility simplifies a complex issue. Equity involves more than narrowing gaps. It also requires recognizing the unique value of roles, responding to market conditions, and supporting career development. A more nuanced approach would allow us to address disparities without limiting our ability to reward excellence or respond strategically to retention risks. I respectfully encourage the Board to consider alternative approaches that promote equity while preserving flexibility and competitiveness. These could include: -Targeted equity adjustments informed by role complexity and market data -Transparent compensation practices that build trust and understanding -Compression pools to address pay disparities without penalizing top performers -Merit systems that allow for meaningful recognition across all levels CU's long-term success depends on our ability to attract, retain, and support talented individuals. I hope this feedback contributes to a thoughtful and inclusive conversation about how we can best achieve that goal.		
8	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I would like to strongly discourage the Regents from adopting proposed policy 11F. As a new faculty member, I can't imagine I would be part of the highest earning group. However, preventing my higher earning colleagues from receiving raises (which are not that large to begin with), would not put me in any better of a financial position. I have no desire to see my colleagues deprived of raises that they have	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			budgeted for and are relying on. CU's salaries are significantly lower than peer schools to begin with and further reducing compensation benefits will make recruitment efforts more difficult, especially when seeking to recruit lateral candidates. If the Regents are concerned about salary equity, I urge them to consider providing lower-earning faculty with larger raises, rather than restricting the raises of higher-earners. If part of this plan includes using the money saved by limiting the raises of high-earners to provide lower-earners (groups A and B) with larger raises, then I would reconsider my support.		
9	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F--the proposed policy seems like an unnecessary and arbitrary constraint on employee compensation that will further hinder our ability to recruit and retain top talent.	Faculty	CU Boulder
10	9/3/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Once again, CU leadership is diminishing and devaluing the profession and discipline of Human Resources. Did the Board of Regents consult with an HR professional on this proposal? Someone in the CU HR offices, outside of CU or any of our business school faculty who teach HR practices? As CU professionals are reacting to the chaotic leadership in our federal government, this policy proposal feels similar in that it is not rooted in any HR methodology and is an individual idea that is being fast-tracked into policy. Now to the individual points on how/why this policy is concerning. 1. This policy is in conflict with Regent Law 11: "The university shall compensate faculty and staff in a manner that is competitive in the marketplace and that rewards meritorious performance within fiscal limits. University employees shall have an annual cycle in which merit, market, retention, equity and/or across-the-board increases may be provided." This would need to be revised to include that compensation are limited in their annual cycle based on where their salary lines up with all other employees at the university. The proposal does not reinforce our ability to be competitive in the marketplace limits meritorious increases for the top third.	Staff	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			2. The current compensation practices at CU place individuals in a competitive salary range. This range is based on their job duties and review of comparator institutions and industries. This policy proposal completely ignores that the starting market salary of an English professor is lower than the starting market salary for an Engineering professor. It the further punishes the Engineering professor to lessen their increases over the course of their tenure. How will this translate to hiring and retaining top talent? The same example could be made for staff in comparing the CFO to the food server in the residence hall. 3. The policy justification claims to create salary equity between the highest and lowest paid employees. As stated above, there is not an HR methodology that would compare a custodian's salary to the Chancellor's salary. If equity is something that is desired, what data was analyzed to show there isn't equity? At CU, market salary ranges are established with a minimum and maximum and is divided into four quartiles. Are the top 10% of earners at midpoint, Q3 or Q4 at a higher percentage than the lower earners? This would indicate that CU does provide more consistent salary increases to high earners. If they are not at midpoint, Q3 or Q4 at a higher percentage than lower earners, it means CU is not paying their high earners competitively with the market. There are so many ways to evaluate salaries with good methodology, none of which were used in this proposal. 4. Lastly, CU loves exceptions. The policy already exempts Anschutz faculty alternate compensation plans from the policy. As this unfolds, what about Athletics? Then those on contracts, which includes the Chancellor's and President? There is always a reason why certain departments need different rules and therefore will dilute any grand idea of policy statement.		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
11	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments - What if an employee in classification A is under-performing? It seems that merit considerations are being ignored by this policy. -Years since degree / years of experience / years at CU seems to be excluded from the classification step. Will older employees then be harmed by the policy? -CU already doesn't pay as much as our competitors and barely anyone can afford to live in Boulder -- it really doesn't make sense to cap raises. -This policy seems overly broad, focuses too much on internal controls, and does not give any consideration to market factors.	Faculty	CU Boulder
12	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	"Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments" Regarding this policy: I think the policy will likely have the most impact on associate and full professors. While it is certainly not the case for me individually systemically at CU-Boulder more senior faculty are less well compensate relative to colleagues at peer and aspirational institutions and CU-Boulder has lost several faculty members due to such issues. I believe this policy with exacerbate that challenge. One modification that might be considered it to consider staff and faculty in different groups, such that faculty raises are compared those of other faculty and staff with staff. That may impact for some whether they fall in category C or B and enable all but the highest paid faculty to benefit from being in class B vs. C. This may decrease the number of costly retentions or loss of faculty.	Faculty	CU Boulder
13	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Out of fear of retribution and retaliation, I'm not including my name or email. Passing and enacting this policy, as currently written, will have unintended consequences that will hamper the University on top of the already challenging issues it currently faces. 1) This policy harms long time servicing staff 2) This policy will cause faculty retention costs to increase exponentially	Staff	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			3) As one of the largest employers in the State of Colorado, other entities will look to this policy and harm their own workers 4) This policy will create complacency within the top leadership of each campus as there is no longer monetary incentive to produce outstanding work 5) This policy will create additional open records actions and claims against the University. 6) Merit pools are small anyway and don't even keep up with inflation, so what other purpose besides harming long time employees is this policy supposed to address? 7) Equity and Merit are two completely different things and cutting Merit to fund Equity harms everyone 8) Lastly, it's very telling that the policy name isn't very transparent. This policy isn't "Certain Salary Adjustments". It's a full-scale attack on Merit increases, which is the only way base salaries can be increased. The Regents would do good, to call it as such if they are truly going to be transparent about this policy		
14	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments in response to Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments: I am writing to express significant concerns regarding the proposed Policy 11.F, which seeks to restrict annual merit-based and across-the-board salary adjustments for the highest earning faculty and staff within the university system. While the policy's intent to promote salary equity is understood and appreciated, its current structure introduces substantial risks to our institution's strategic goals, talent management, and operational effectiveness. Talent Retention and Recruitment: The policy imposes artificial limits on compensation growth for top earners, many of whom occupy critical leadership, research, and technical roles. These individuals are often subject to competitive market pressures. By capping their merit-based increases, we risk losing high-performing talent to other companies/peer institutions that offer more flexible and	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			performance-aligned compensation models. Erosion of Meritocracy: The policy decouples compensation from performance for Classification C employees. This undermines the principle of merit-based advancement and may foster a culture of stagnation and disengagement among our most productive contributors. Misalignment with Equity Principles: True equity is achieved by uplifting underpaid roles through targeted investment—not by penalizing high earners. This policy risks conflating equity with equalization, which may inadvertently harm morale and institutional cohesion. Cultural and Strategic Impact: The classification system will create divisions among employees and discourage ambition. It sends a message that success and high performance are liabilities rather than assets, which is counterproductive to our mission of excellence. I respectfully urge the Board to reconsider the adoption of Policy 11.F in its current form. While equity in compensation is a vital goal, it must be pursued in a manner that supports—not undermines—our ability to attract, retain, and reward excellence. Thank you.		
15	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments As a manager of the Compensation function for System Administration, I must voice strong concern regarding this proposed policy. While I appreciate the interest and concern in the operation of this important Human Resources function, I adamantly believe that this proposal will be difficult and costly to impliment, detrimental to keeping critical talent paid competitively, will make it difficult to attract and retain skilled labor and leaders, and that it over simplifies an annual activity that we have successfully managed with careful planning and intent for years.	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			It is my job day in and day out to strategically manage what we pay our staff, both in hiring decisions and in annual pay increase activities. Having managed these types of programs for 15 years, I am confident that this proposal will hinder our ability to fulfill our mission of supporting students and higher education in our state and will cost us in the long run as we struggle to remain competitive as we compete for talent with other leading university systems. While there are many elements of this policy proposal that will have an adverse impact, I'd like to focus on two in particular. 1 - Erosion of Managerial Authority and Accountability This policy removes a critical tool from managers. The ability to recognize and reward performance through merit-based increases. When leaders lose discretion over compensation decisions, it diminishes their ownership of team outcomes and undermines their ability to lead effectively. Over time, this can foster disengagement, deflect accountability, and create a culture of blame rather than empowerment. 2 - Risk of Rewarding Poor Performance The policy may inadvertently reward underperformance. Employees in the lowest pay tier could receive higher increases regardless of their actual contributions. Conversely, top performers may receive minimal increases simply due to their salary level, which can feel punitive and unfair. This approach weakens performance management and makes it harder to address poor performance constructively. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my insight. I request that this proposed policy be reconsidered.		
16	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	These comments are in relation to proposed Policy 11.F restricting certain salary adjustments. I do not support this proposed policy for at least three critical reasons:	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			1. Market forces drive higher salaries in some fields; restricting raises significantly increases retention risk in these areas. Simply put, we will lose our best people in these fields who will be replaced by lower quality individuals willing to accept below market compensation. 2. Caps remove performance/merit from raises, signaling that excellence is not valued. 3. Raises already lag inflation; this cap effectively reduces real pay for those affected.		
17	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy is a terrible idea that will have very bad downstream outcomes on the pursuit of excellence and retention of faculty. The upshot of the policy is that merit increases would no longer be merit-based, and many tenure-track faculty at the university would see ongoing increases below inflation. It's obvious that under these conditions the university would be less competitive in attracting top faculty and that many of the best faculty would leave to receive market-based compensation at other universities. Moreover, this policy diminishes the meritocracy; raises for most faculty are given based on a coarse salary analysis and not based on performance. This will inevitably create perverse incentives the diminish the quality of research. This will also likely negatively impact morale and culture. Has a policy like this been instituted at any other serious university in the United States? I cannot find any examples, and for good reason. This idea makes no sense. It is arbitrary, poorly conceived and will harm the university's pursuit of excellence.	Faculty	CU Boulder
18	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Feedback on Policy 11.F Proposal While I appreciate the intent of promoting pay equity across the university system, I have several concerns about the unintended consequences of this policy: 1. Undermining Merit-Based Incentives Merit pay, by definition, is intended to reward exceptional performance. By capping increases for the highest earners, the policy	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			disincentivizes the very faculty and staff who contribute the most to CU's research output, teaching quality, and reputation. This is especially damaging in schools like Engineering, Law, Business, and the hard sciences, where faculty productivity is critical to maintaining CU's competitive standing. 2. Recruitment and Retention Challenges Talent acquisition and retention are already difficult, particularly in the Engineering, Law, and Business schools. These units compete in national and international labor markets where compensation is a decisive factor. Restricting raises for our most productive faculty will make CU less attractive to top candidates and increase the risk of losing current high performers. 3. Game Theory Perspective Basic game theory suggests a troubling outcome: the most talented faculty -- the "best and brightest" -- will leave CU for institutions that recognize and reward their contributions appropriately. Similarly, the strongest recruits will choose universities with more competitive compensation structures. CU risks being left with mediocrity or those who lack better options. This is not a sustainable equilibrium for a leading research institution. 4. Real Pay Erosion for Top Earners Under the proposed model, Class C employees cannot receive a raise larger than the Board-approved merit pool percentage multiplied by the salary of the highest-paid Class B employee. For example, if the Regents approve a 2.5% merit pool and the highest Class B salary is $100,000, the raise cap is $2,500. Applied to actual Class C salaries: $175,000 salary = 1.4% raise $250,000 salary = 1.0% raise $400,000 salary = 0.6% raise		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			This means the effective increase for Class C employees is only 0.5–1.5%, far below both the stated merit pool (e.g., 2.5%) and inflation (3% currently, with 2% as a long-term target). In real terms, this amounts to pay cuts for CU's top performers over time, which is not the way to retain or recruit world-class talent. 5. Impact on Revenue-Generating Schools The policy would disproportionately harm revenue-positive schools -- particularly Engineering and Business -- that help subsidize the rest of the university. Diluting the quality of these units threatens not only CU's academic prestige but also its financial health. Weakening the institutions that sustain the broader system is a counterproductive strategy. Conclusion While well-intentioned, this policy risks damaging CU's ability to reward merit, retain top faculty, and compete for future talent. I urge reconsideration of the proposal, or at minimum, exemptions for high-demand, revenue-generating units where market competitiveness is critical.		
19	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This comment regards proposed Policy 11F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. The proposed policy is not well founded. Policy supporters are likely misinformed as to whose pay would be limited. Proponents have argued that it will limit pay of deans, athletic directors, etc., who may not be sympathetic characters, given their high pay. Perhaps supporters believe faculty pay limits would be mostly limited to professors in the business and law schools. This is not remotely close to true. According to the university, "CU Boulder's campus is home to more than 2,100 academic faculty, nearly 2,000 research faculty, more than 700 visiting international scholars and over 4,000 staff members." That totals 8,800 employees. The university also presumably employs many workers who are not included in these numbers, such as	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			janitors, food service workers, landscapers, etc. All employees deserve fair pay and this is presumably the intent of the proposed policy, but regents should be aware that the top third of CU Boulder employees ranked by pay, who would be classified as "Class C" and subject to significant restrictions on pay increases, includes a substantial majority, perhaps most, of faculty across the university. Limiting pay increases for faculty may not affect retention for one or two years, but over time many faculty will be paid much less than they could earn elsewhere. There is a market for faculty talent just like there is a market for all labor. After 10 years of merit increases of 0.5% rather than 2.5%, for example, faculty will have over 20% lower pay. Many faculty will not be retainable at pay that far below market levels. Beyond the problem of divergent pay relative to other universities, faculty receive competing offers every year and the university needs the ability to match these offers. CU is proud that "our distinguished faculty have been the recipients of multiple honors including five Nobel Laureates, nine MacArthur Fellowships, and one Carnegie Foundation Professor of the Year." The university will not retain faculty like this with such strict limits on merit pay increases. Supporters of this proposal should be advised: it will affect most faculty and the effect will compound over time.		
20	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This feedback concerns Policy 11.F on restrictions on certain salary adjustments. While the goal of promoting equity is important, this policy risks significantly undermining the university's competitiveness in recruiting and retaining top faculty and staff. The ability to attract leading scholars and administrators is critical for producing world-class research and providing the highest quality education for our students. By imposing restrictions that effectively penalize high performers in the upper salary tiers, the university will create barriers to hiring,	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			increase the risk of losing outstanding employees, and foster an environment that disincentivizes productivity and excellence. These outcomes would ultimately weaken both the academic reputation of the institution and the experience we provide to students. I urge reconsideration of this approach and recommend exploring equity-focused alternatives that do not compromise competitiveness, performance incentives, or the university's broader mission.		
21	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Dear Sir, dear Madam, I am writing regarding the proposed Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. The stated goal of this policy is to "create more opportunities for salary equity between the highest- and lowest-earning employees, both faculty and staff, in the university system." As described, the scope of this policy would be to prevent the highest-paid employees from receiving "annual merit-based, base-building adjustments under Regent Policy 11.B.2(A)(1) or across-the-board increases under Regent Policy 11.C.2 that exceed the dollar amount of the merit pool percent approved by the Board of Regents, multiplied by the highest salary in Class B for their campus or system administration." I believe this policy is misguided, both in its objective and in its scope. Here is why: First, this policy undermines the principle of merit-based salary increases, which are intended to reward productivity, innovation, and excellence. By flattening differences, the system could reduce motivation for high performers to continue excelling if their salary growth is capped regardless of impact. Second, this policy will undermine the competitiveness of CU Boulder. Top faculty and staff are often in demand across institutions.	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			If compensation ceilings prevent competitive offers, the university risks losing its most talented employees to institutions that reward merit more directly. This impact is particularly relevant in research-driven or specialized fields, where external opportunities can be significantly more lucrative. Third, this policy operates under a very narrow definition of equity. Treating compensation differences as a gap to be bridged ignores the aspects of equity that justify these differences—such as recognizing expertise, seniority, and market scarcity. A system in which Class A employees are guaranteed increases at or above the merit pool (while Class C employees face restrictions) effectively punishes those who have invested in advanced training, possess unique skills, or carry heavier institutional responsibilities. Fourth, this policy will directly penalize higher earners for their loyalty to the university. While new recruits will continue to be hired at salaries dictated by market forces, existing high-earning employees will see a progressive erosion of their compensation. This will encourage faster turnover among the most senior and most talented employees of the university, with destabilizing consequences for departments and organizations. The University of Colorado has a strong commitment to equity, which all employees respect and appreciate. However, the current policy proposal will not contribute to this goal. Even if we accept the premise that the salary gap between employees reflects inequitable circumstances, freezing salary increases for the highest earners will not fix these inequities—just as breaking a thermometer will not stop a fever. Instead, if inequities exist, they must be addressed through structural solutions: offering career development pathways, identifying and fostering talent, and providing substantial merit-based salary increases to the most talented and hard-working employees, regardless of their base salary.		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			I thank you for your consideration.		
22	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy contains fundamental flaws that undermine effective compensation management. By guaranteeing the lowest earners (Class A) at least the full merit pool percentage while capping the highest earners (Class C) at a dollar amount based on the highest Class B salary, the policy creates a rigid system that ignores individual performance and market realities. The approach treats compensation as a zero-sum redistribution exercise rather than a tool for attracting and retaining talent across all levels. Most problematically, it could lead to the perverse outcome where exceptional performers in the highest salary tier receive smaller percentage increases than poor performers in the lowest tier, simply based on their current compensation level. While salary equity is important, this mechanism prioritizes mathematical formulas over merit-based recognition and could ultimately harm institutional competitiveness by discouraging high performance among top earners while failing to address whether the lowest earners are actually underpaid relative to market rates or job responsibilities. Recruiting and retaining top talent will be extraordinarily difficult under these constraints, as competitive universities will easily outbid these caps. Additionally, tenured faculty who are often the highest earners will be even more disincentivized to remain research productive, knowing their efforts will yield diminishing returns compared to lower-paid colleagues.	Faculty	CU Boulder
23	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I would like to comment on Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. The proposed policy is focused inward, on internal equity, but neglects the external labor market. It seeks to place "top down" administrative limits on pay raises, but these limits are not sufficiently responsive to market competition. Pay differentials are largely due to competition within different specialty areas, as well as to performance quality both within the classroom and for research productivity. Among faculty, for example, professional schools -- engineering, business, public health, law, and the like -- have higher	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			salaries because their faculty members could seek work in the private sector. These schools also tend to have strong placement rates for their graduates, as well as good starting salaries. Salaries are also somewhat higher in the so-called "hard" sciences -- physics, computer science, biochemistry, etc. These are demanding fields. They bring in grant funding, and they also train students for jobs in the new economy. As one might imagine, there is considerable competition for good scientists and limiting pay raises will put CU at a competitive disadvantage. It is vital that universities flexibly respond to market pressure, offering salaries that keep them competitive. A bureaucratic approach, such as that being proposed, would risk losing higher performers in domains that are important for student success and also for Colorado's economic development. There is another way to illustrate this point. Policy 11.F restricts growth among more highly paid individuals but allows for growth among those with lower pay. As I have discussed, those with higher pay tend to (a) be in more competitive disciplines and/or (b) have stronger performance records. Consequently, the policy would punish the individuals whom we most need to retain. This would render CU less competitive. If pay inequality is a concern, as the proposed policy implies, then it would make more sense to raise the pay among lower earners. I favor this idea. Raising lower salaries would reduce internal inequality but would not jeopardize market competitiveness.		
24	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments: This proposal is very problematic. There is an external market and if salaries are not aligned with merit as defined by that market, in the short run, your top performers will be underpaid and your low performers will be	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			overpaid. Then, when this happens, other schools will hire faculty from CU. And they won't hire the low performers or even a cross-section of faculty. They will cherry-pick our best. The outcome is that CU will be disproportionately left with more (tenured) poorer performing faculty, and fewer stars. There is an external market for those faculty who have the record to participate in it. Those tend to be the higher paid, top performing faculty. Of course, myy arguments fall down if Regents have evidence that our best faculty are being paid below market and our poorer performing faculty are being paid above market. But absent that, this policy will do irreparable harm to CU. Moreover, if I understand things operationally, this makes little sense. Am I correct in thinking that if you're the highest paid person in category B, your raise is unrestricted. But if you're the next person higher, you are restricted to the raise percent applied to that person B's salary. You're much better off being a lower performer to stay in the top side of category B, than be a better performer but lower in category C. To be honest, I'm dismayed that this passed the Board of Regents.		
25	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11f. It's stunning to think that the Regent's put this out for public comment. There are already 19 pages of comments pointing out problems and concerns, so I'll just say to the author and whoever approved this to go out - do better. Ask for advice, input, and the ramifications of the proposed policy before putting out a draft like this for public comment. Undoubtedly hundreds of hours of people's time will now be spend reacting to this poorly written and not well thought out document. Disrespectful. Almost all of us are already overworked. Again, do better.	Faculty	CU Denver
26	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Employees in this category, who are the highest earners, cannot earn “annual merit-based, base building” adjustments under Regent Policy 11.B.2(A)(1) or “across-the-board” increases under Regent Policy 11.C.2 that exceed the dollar amount of the merit pool percent approved by the Board of Regents multiplied by the highest salary in Class B for their campus or system administration (e.g., if the highest paid Class B employee on a campus has a salary of $100,000 and the	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Board of Regents approves a merit pool of 2.5% for that campus, Class C employees on that campus would be limited to an “annual merit-based, base building” or “across-the-board” increase of $2,500). If this policy is implemented, salaries at CU Boulder will gradually fall below market levels. As a result, the most productive faculty will leave for better-paying institutions, and the ones who remain will largely be unproductive and unable to move. This will also weaken our ability to recruit strong candidates, making us less competitive in the academic job market. In the long run, such trends would damage both the research output and the reputation of the department and the university.		
27	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the proposed Policy 11.F. While I appreciate the intent to promote salary equality across the university system, as a senior HR professional, with over 20 years in the function, I have significant concerns about the unintended consequences this policy may have on staff morale, leadership effectiveness, and the integrity of HR practices. 1. Erosion of Managerial Authority and Accountability This policy removes a critical tool from managers. The ability to recognize and reward performance through merit-based increases. When leaders lose discretion over compensation decisions, it diminishes their ownership of team outcomes and undermines their ability to lead effectively. Over time, this can foster disengagement, deflect accountability, and create a culture of blame rather than empowerment. 2. Misalignment with True Merit Principles The proposed framework is not a merit-based system. Merit should reflect an employee’s performance, impact, and growth—not their position in a salary range. By tying increases to percentile rankings rather than contribution, the policy risks rewarding tenure or historical pay placement over actual value delivered. This undermines the core principles of pay-for-performance and will demotivate high-performing individuals.	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			3. Risk of Rewarding Poor Performance The policy may inadvertently reward underperformance. Employees in the lowest pay tier could receive higher increases regardless of their actual contributions. Conversely, top performers may receive minimal increases simply due to their salary level, which can feel punitive and unfair. This approach weakens performance management and makes it harder to address poor performance constructively. 4. Potential to Reinforce Existing Pay Inequities Using salary range position as a primary factor for increases can perpetuate historical inequities. For example, individuals hired at lower rates due to market conditions or negotiation disparities may receive higher increases over time, even if their performance is average. This could unintentionally widen pay gaps among employees doing similar work with similar impact. 5. Lack of Strategic Talent Alignment It's unclear what talent strategy this policy supports. Effective compensation policies should align with broader goals, such as attracting top talent, retaining high performers, and driving innovation. This proposal lacks a clear strategic rationale and may hinder our ability to compete for and retain the best talent in a highly competitive academic and administrative landscape. 6. Challenges for HR Professionals Implementing and defending this policy places HR professionals in a difficult position. It complicates compensation planning, undermines performance-based frameworks, and may lead to increased employee relations issues. HR teams will be tasked with enforcing a policy that contradicts best practices in equitable and strategic compensation management. _____ Recommendation: I strongly urge reconsideration of this policy. We should explore different approaches, such as targeted market adjustments, equity		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			reviews, and performance/talent calibration processes, that support fairness without sacrificing merit principles or leadership autonomy.		
28	9/6/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11 F. salary increases. It seems challenging from a retention perspective to limit the salary increase of a "Category C" employee to the maximum of a Category B employee times the percent merit increase. "Category C Employees in this category, who are the highest earners, cannot earn “annual merit-based, base building” adjustments under Regent Policy 11.B.2(A)(1) or “across-the-board” increases under Regent Policy 11.C.2 that exceed the dollar amount of the merit pool percent approved by the Board of Regents multiplied by the highest salary in Class B for their campus or system administration (e.g., if the highest paid Class B employee on a campus has a salary of $100,000 and the Board of Regents approves a merit pool of 2.5% for that campus, Class C employees on that campus would be limited to an “annual merit-based, base building” or “across-the-board” increase of $2,500)."	Faculty	CU Boulder
29	9/6/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments on 11.F Retention risk at top/executives (Class C): High performers and hard-to-fill jobs (executives, IT, finance, faculty in market-driven fields) face capped raises → greater chance of leaving. Compression issues: Will widening gap between performance and pay at higher levels will worsen equal pay for equal work challenges (COEPEWA exposure). Middle group feels invisible (Class B): No guarantees or protections → possible morale dip. Complex to implement: Annual re-ranking, pro-rating, and exclusions create churn; employees may bounce between B and C each year. Faculty inequities: Doesn’t account for discipline pay differences;	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Anschutz carve-outs add inconsistency. Workarounds likely: More pressure for off-cycle adjustments, reclassifications, or retention bonuses to bypass caps. Performance: Gives more to the lowest paid employees but does not factor in overall performance or the complexity of what the employee performs, and the knowledge and skills needed to perform at that higher level. Restrictive: Campuses should be responsible for compensation and not be mandated to give an increase where one is not warranted. Confusion around Equity: Policy states this is for equity based on widening the gap, but equity means something different at the different campuses based on each unique compensation philosophy, structure, and procedures. Broad-Brush Approach: Classifying employees into thirds (A, B, and C) can be an oversimplification - an employee earning just above the 33.33% cutoff might be grouped with someone earning significantly more, but both would face the restrictions on their raises compared to a peer that may have received an increase due to being right below the 33.33% cut-off. Implications for UCCS Near-term: We'll need to re-run our data, simulate tertile splits, and prep managers with talking points to explain unequal outcomes. Perception: Class A: Positive, "finally guaranteed."		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Class B: Neutral/negative, “forgotten.” Class C: Negative, “punished for high performance, or higher career progression.” Long-term: Greater risk of losing top talent to competitors; more HR workload managing exceptions and compression; equity complaints will rise. Misalignment with Strategy: The strategy that UCCS has created and is working on implementing really focuses on the factors outlined in the EPEWA (skills, effort, responsibility), whereas this policy restricts pay decisions based on current pay rate only Potential Disadvantage to Faculty: If tiers are determined campus wide and not separated by staff and faculty, most faculty will end up in Class B or C and less will be in Class C and receive guaranteed increases. Potential Inequity amongst Employee Classes: If tiers are determined by staff vs. faculty, this may create more morale issues for our staff by having differing tiers for different employee groups.		
30	9/6/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments The proposed Regent policy would severely restrict merit pay increases for top earners who typically enjoy attractive employment options outside CU in business, law, engineering, economics, and other professional fields attracting the best talents in society. The policy would drive these highly sought after talent away from CU, leaving CU with at best mediocre faculty who could not land a job outside of the University. This would promote the terrible adage circulating that "those who can, do and those who cannot, teach". If we want to rely on these to grow the best talent for Colorado's and our Nation's future, I fear we would be ill-served and experience an	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			inevitable death spiral of reputation and quality.		
31	9/7/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Draft 11F The definition of 'percent' in the document is too vague to be useful. Amendments to this draft should include proposed AY25 cutoffs for categories A,B, and C to allow an honest evaluation of the impact on individuals. As written, it is too vague to really know. If by percent, then the implications for faculty are likely to be less harmful to wage growth. However, if by percentile and faculty are grouped with 'all employees' as the document states, then the impact will be devastating, and it sounds an awful lot like the regents are designing a policy to force faculty to search for more wage-growth competitive positions at other institutions. It would probably be more effective to institute an $ amount cutoff for inclusion in A because it would allow for normal wage increases for faculty to remain competitive with peer institutions, rather than locking in compression inequality linked to year of hire.	Faculty	CU Boulder
32	9/7/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11F The policy's intent (equity) is understandable, but the mechanism is flawed, overly rigid, and potentially damaging, with unclear definitions of the employee "classes" and vague cross-references to existing policies. The language makes it difficult to interpret how the limits would actually be applied across campuses, leaving significant room for inconsistency and dispute. More importantly, by imposing a rigid cap on raises for higher earners, the policy disregards fairness by merit: equally outstanding employees would face very different raise opportunities simply because of their salary percentile, not their performance. This undermines the purpose of merit-based pay.	Faculty	CU Boulder
33	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Feedback on Policy 11.F Proposal I am writing to express my strong concern and disappointment regarding the recently announced salary cap for CU Boulder employees. While I understand the need for fiscal responsibility, this	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			policy is profoundly damaging to the university's ability to recruit, retain, and support the very people who make CU Boulder thrive. Placing an artificial ceiling on compensation sends a troubling signal: that excellence, productivity, and long-term contributions will not be valued appropriately. It undermines morale, diminishes CU Boulder's competitiveness relative to peer institutions, and risks driving away top faculty and staff — all of which will ultimately harm our students and the university's reputation. We have seen the broader consequences of underinvestment in science at the national level: when grant funding is uncertain or insufficient, top researchers leave the United States for institutions abroad that provide better support. CU Boulder now faces the same risk on a local scale. If we fail to invest in our people, our most talented scientists and scholars will leave for universities that do. This approach also disregards the diverse realities of employees' personal and professional circumstances. For many, salaries reflect years of investment, sacrifice, and distinction in their fields. To arbitrarily restrict earning potential not only devalues that commitment, but creates a chilling effect for those considering building their careers here. I urge leadership to reconsider this policy and engage openly with faculty and staff about more constructive, equitable solutions to the university's budget challenges. Our people are CU Boulder's greatest asset, and policies that erode trust and commitment put the future of the institution at risk. I hope to see this issue addressed with the seriousness and transparency it deserves.		
34	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy: Please Specify in Comments Comments: Regarding 11F from the System Personal and Benefit Committee- The proposed compensation policy is too vague to	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			evaluate meaningfully and raises significant concerns. It risks locking in inequities, disadvantaging early-career faculty, and raising questions of age discrimination. By capping merit-based raises for higher earners, the policy could create salary compression, undermine the Regents' commitment to merit-based pay, and harm CU's ability to recruit and retain top faculty—especially in high-demand fields where CU salaries already lag behind peers. The carve-out for Anschutz appears arbitrary, and the lack of clarity about whether cost savings stay with units or the University further erodes confidence. Without modeling long-term impacts or benchmarking against other R1 institutions, this approach may damage institutional reputation, competitiveness, and equity rather than improve them.		
35	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent policy 11F: compensation: although I believe this policy is well intended, it will have significant detrimental effects on all 4 campuses. This will significantly limit the merit increases of our higher paid faculty and staff. We already have trouble competing against other universities that pay significantly more than the CU system and this policy will only increase those barriers. The result will be a loss of our upper end faculty, staff, and administrators and their subsequent critical thinking, experience, and historical knowledge. This will create a pattern of growing our faculty and staff until they reach a high end, at which time they will leave, and another university will benefit, while we start over with new faculty and staff. As such, I urge you to vote NO on this policy.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
36	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	If adopted, policy 11f would likely to create a brain drain situation for the University. Salaries for different positions are ultimately dictated by the competitive market. If CU is unable to offer competitive compensation packages to high-value employees, many will leave. This will hurt the University's reputation and rank, and ultimately hurt the students and state of Colorado. The idea of artificially capping merit increases based on an abritrary formula goes against free market principles. Allowing the ability to give competitive merit increases to deserving employees preserves flexibility and creates a culture where outstanding performance is celebrated.	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
37	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11:F. You all do know that a 2.5% or 3% increase is not a merit increase...it is not even a cost of living increase. So no matter the "merit" score the highest paid gets a lower raise? If a campus does not give out "merit increases" for two or three years, those in the higher bracket still get a lower increase? Everyone should get a cost of living (2.5-3.0%) increase and then the campus should create a pool of money and a criteria for those who truly deserve a merit. Great job of motivating your faculty and staff.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
38	9/8/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I appreciate this policy's intent to level compensation gaps between the highest and lowest earners at the University of Colorado. I do wonder whether there might be a more effective way to achieve salary equity for university staff, such as a cost of living salary adjustment for the lowest earners (class A), rather than tying parity ideals to small annual merit-based or across the board raises? It also would help to clarify why certain decisions were made: such as, why has the university grouped earners into 3 buckets (rather than 4, for instance)? What is the reasoning for setting the same dollar limit for the 67% earner as the 100% earner? What is the reasoning for excluding bonuses from base salary determinations, when most staff (especially in Class A) would not be eligible for those additional payments? How will it be communicated to employees which salary class they are in? Finally, how will it be assessed whether this policy is achieving it's intended effects over the next 3, 5, or 10 years? Thank you for your consideration.	Staff	CU Boulder
39	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11F Overall, this policy comes across as an attempt to treat symptoms of a problem rather than the root cause. The stated purpose is to create more salary equity by restricting salary increases for the top 33% of earners. I would have guessed the problem is more at the low end of earners than top end. If in fact, top earners are overpaid and we need to cut them back to stay on track with market rates, provide data to support this otherwise it just comes across as a penalty on 33% of the employees at the university.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			The policy describes how the merit pool will be limited for the top 33% of earners, but does not detail how the excess pool will be distributed to the lower 66% of earners to address equity issues. The policy assumes all faculty and staff are on similar contracts, but does not address how to normalize inherent differences, such as differences in pay for 9-month vs 12-month contracts. The policy does not address merit. Would an employee in the lowest earning category performing well below expectations be given a raise at the overall merit pool percentage, while someone in the highest earning category who is truly outstanding be given a much lower percentage increase? This could incentivize apathy in low earners and disincentivize excellence in high earners. The policy does not address market rates, rank, years of service, or previous merit in the assigning of the three tiers. This sends a message that these are not valued by the Regents or the CU system. A major issue that is ignored is the cost of living. The average merit pools over the last 15 years has not kept up with the average increase in cost of living. This seems like the crux of the issue, but is not addressed.		
40	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Feedback on Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments The goal of greater salary equity is understandable, but this proposal takes the wrong approach. By capping merit-based raises for top earners based purely on their position in the salary distribution, the policy undermines market principles and meritocracy. Universities compete in national and global labor markets, especially for top faculty and senior staff. If we limit their compensation through rigid internal formulas, we risk losing our best people to other institutions. Salary growth should reflect performance and market demand—not arbitrary internal rankings.	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Moreover, this approach weakens incentives. Exceptional performance should be rewarded, not penalized simply because someone is already highly paid. Over time, such rules discourage productivity and innovation, while fostering frustration among those who drive the university's success. Equity matters, but it should be achieved through smart, market-aligned policies, not command-and-control mechanisms that resemble central planning. This proposal moves us away from a competitive, merit-based system and toward something that will ultimately harm both excellence and fairness.		
41	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am writing about the proposed new Regent policy 11 F that aims to curtail annual merit increases for high-earning faculty. The policy seems to ignore that some faculty are high earners because of their fields and because of their productivity. The result of this policy will force highly productive faculty in areas like engineering, economics, and finance to leave the University. Those are exactly the areas with large undergraduate student demand. The converse is that the policy will favor low earners who are low-productivity faculty in fields with little undergraduate student demand. This seems counterproductive.	Faculty	CU Boulder
42	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Policy 11F Feedback The proposed policy on salary adjustments poses significant risks to both equity and organizational culture. While a consistent 2.5% merit-based adjustment for all Class A employees is recommended, the broader approach under consideration appears detrimental because it does not sufficiently account for merit in raises. This omission undermines fairness and has the potential to negatively affect morale and culture across the institution. Furthermore, although Class C employees may appear highly compensated, their pay levels are often the result of market-driven factors. Restricting raises for these individuals creates a serious retention risk, as top performers are likely to be drawn to more competitive opportunities elsewhere.	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Finally, raises at CU are already so modest that they barely outpace inflation. In this environment, the implementation of a restrictive policy would likely be viewed especially negatively by high performers, amplifying dissatisfaction and threatening long-term retention of talent.		
43	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This policy is extremely vague and leaves a lot of room for interpretation. It is impossible to make an informed decision on this policy. Clearly those who would be categorized in A would want to select this, but we are unable to know how or what we will be classified as. Additionally, if I was looking to not stay in the system for long, then again, I would like to adopt this, but there is no motivation for this with the policy presented. Motivation would fall as you advanced and people would grow complacent with no reason to improve or advance their own skills and development. Faculty also is not subject to this on AMC so it would be only applied to Staff which would further the distance between these two groups and widen the divide that Staff has worked hard to bridge. Overall, this policy needs to be further worked to include additional information on how it would be implemented across the different campuses and allow for further time to discuss (such as townhalls, etc.).	Staff	CU AMC
44	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Mark VanDriel has proposed Regent Policy 11F. This policy, although potentially well intentioned, will be disastrous for the research mission of the university. The highest paid faculty are those who are in high demand due to the value their expertise provides to their students and the degree to which their research is groundbreaking and attracts external funding. As a university, we already struggle to attract and retain these faculty, many of whom have attractive non-academic career options in private industry. The proposed policy would force these faculty to accept salary cuts in inflation-adjusted terms and would dramatically reduce the attractiveness CU Boulder as an employer. I strongly recommend that the Regents reject this policy proposal. Although reining in the costs of administration is a worthy goal, this policy is much too blunt of an instrument and will create substantial collateral damage.	Faculty	CU Boulder
45	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regarding "Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments." This policy will severely hamper the ability of CU Boulder to compete nationally for top talent--especially when our salaries are already	Other	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			lagging and when the cost of living in the Front Range is so high. I am disappointed that this proposed policy is so out of touch with the field of higher education in general and high quality, public flagships in particular.		
46	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F - Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This change has both positive and negative impacts that overall would benefit our system. By ensuring that the lowest earners at CU always get the full increase offered by the regents, they are protected and shielded from inflation. This is fantastic in supporting our lowest-earning and most at-risk employees. By restricting the increases on the highest earners, this also prevents massive wage gaps between executives / leaders and other employees. I'm in full support of this conceptually. My concern lies in the implementation. Currently, our campus struggles with retaining employees, and a massive part of that is that we have no way to reward high performers in any meaningful way. The current mechanism is that high performers would essentially be guaranteed the percentage increase prescribed by the Regents, but this is typically 2-3% per year, and often it ends up being the same or incredibly close to performers who barely meet expectations. This does not feel rewarding to high performers. Our campus also struggles in trying to offer increases outside of this process -- the HR system does not approve raises for merit unless done through an "equity review," which is only intended to bring salaries up to the same level as peers -- it does not give anyone a chance to perform above average and feel rewarded for that. Currently, in practice, the Denver campus has two choices for rewarding high performers: 1. Give them a promotion to a new title -- This is effective, but can only be used once or twice before there are no more promotions to be offered. People are typically placed at the lowest end of the pay range for that job title and only get increases according to the Regents increase distributed annually, thus keeping everyone the same. 2. Help them find placement in another department.	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Once thing our campus does well is giving folks reasonable compensation when they are first hired into a role. So the only way we can help someone get rewarded for their performance is to help them move onto another role that would compensate them better. There is no way to retain them in their current position as-is. This policy helps protect people, but takes away the merit aspect of it. Although I think the policy's intent is overall positive and I would vote for it if asked, I still think the underlying issue of not being able to retain employees in their current positions is not addressed here and is only exacerbated by this policy.		
47	9/9/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Folks who have spent the greater part of their careers in higher-ed never benefited with handsome financial compensation packages like their peers, neighbors, and friends in the private sector have, but stayed true to the mission anyway. And now to receive this slap in the face--unreal! If you are going down this path why not just enroll class C employees into the "Jelly of the Month Club" instead of any raise at all, at least that would taste better.	Staff	CU Denver
48	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy: Please Specify in Comments Comments: For Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments -- It's never a good thing to take away incentive for staff or to create a capped salary. Incentive regarding potential annual raises will always keep work quality and efficiency at a high.	Staff	CU Denver
49	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This policy will be detrimental to the success of CU as a whole and it's competitive standing. Why are we not utilizing our highly qualified HR compensation experts and salary survey data instead of crafting a policy that will deter qualified applicants from applying to CU and will most certainly have a negative impact on retention.	Staff	CU Denver
50	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy 11.F: Evaluations for Officers of the University and Officers of the Administration Comments: While I have seen some higher level administrators award themselves overly generous raises (while also not supporting raises for	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			low paid staff), I'm not sure this policy is the right move. This policy seems like it will limit growth for many, but also not actutally solving the issue of exorbitant raises and pay. Plus, selfish people will always find a way to use a policy to benefit themselves, while also using the same against others.		
51	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy 11.F: Evaluations for Officers of the University and Officers of the Administration Comments: How about instead of this policy, we actually hold the highest paid staff and faculty to the standards of their job? For example, why pay a faculty top dollar to teach an intro level undergraduate class online and nothing else? Or, why allow certain staff to award themselves 30%+ raises, why denying raises to others? Leadership isscared of holding people accountable to do their actual job, which just passes the work down to the lowest paid folks.	Staff	CU Denver
52	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I'll keep it brief: this is the most asinine myopic proposal I've ever seen. Although the intent may have been noble, the impact if this is approved will be far-reaching and incredibly detrimental to the entire CU System for years. With the meager raises that come each year retaining staff is already difficult in a competitive market and to kneecap those who may be the top performing or the most tenured is asking for an exodus of those staff in 2-3 years at most. There are way too many unknowns for this to be effective or equal. 1) If you truly care about pay equity why are you giving CU Anschutz a waiver? The top 224 paid employees in the entire CU System are CU Anschutz. 2) Why 1/3s? What is the difference between the highest salary and the bottom of that top third? ----- [This is looking across the system and it could still pan out across a campus, but it would actually probably end up being MORE stark]: A quick search shows $1.5m as the top salary (with the top 100 all being over $500k and all at Anschutz) the bottom of that top 1/3 of all CU employees is at	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			$91,119 (coincidentally also at Anschutz), a difference of $1.4m. The second third low is $52,776, a difference of $40k. Why should the lowest of that top 1/3 be penalized because you arbitrarily drew a line in thirds? 3) What is your actual retention policy? How do you plan to recruit talent when that will need to be disclosed at some point (and/or is public record)? Not only will you lose talent but the ability to recruit top talent will disappear.		
53	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Policy 11.F The purpose of the policy is to create more opportunities for salary equity between the highest and lowest-earning employees, both faculty and staff, which is an admirable goal. However, as written it appears that the policy will not achieve that goal, and will likely make salary equity issues worse, rather than better. 11.F.2 Mechanism—"Each year, each campus and system administration will separately rank the adjusted total salaries of all employees, excluding students, by percent, with 0% reflecting the lowest earner and 100% reflecting the highest earner within the campus or system administration." As written, this sentence appears to indicate that faculty, staff and administration adjusted total salaries on each campus will all be ranked together for determining the employee classification as A, B, or C. If that is the intent, what is the rationale behind including all employees in one group rather than ranking the staff, faculty and administrators as separate groups? If that is not the intent then this section needs to be rewritten to clarify that the staff, faculty and administrators will be ranked as separate groups. The following comments address the proposed restrictions to "annual merit-based, base building" adjustments under Regent Policy 11.B.2(A)(1).	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			The requirements and restrictions for Classification A and C completely ignore section Regent Policy section11.B.2(A)(2) which allows for “other base-building adjustments, for example, to address market, career merit inequities, salary equity, promotion, or institutional priorities”. Instead the proposed requirements and restrictions for Classification A and C will likely make career merit inequities and salary equity worse, not better. Classification A—By requiring each faculty member in this classification “should receive at least a compensation adjustment percentage equal to the merit pool percent approved by the Board of Regents for that campus” this means that faculty who receive “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations” on their annual faculty performance reviews will receive a compensation adjustment that is equal to what a faculty member who “meets expectations” would typically receive. This is a disincentive for faculty who do not meet expectations to improve their performance and is the opposite of what equity should represent. Requiring the additional paperwork of justifying any deviation from the required compensation adjustment percentage equal to the merit pool percentage in order to receive specific approval from the chancellor likely means that many faculty in this category who have not met expectations will just receive a merit increase that they did not earn so the additional paperwork can be avoided. Classification C—By limiting the faculty in this category to annual merit-based, base building adjustments under Regent Policy 11.B.2(A)(1) that cannot “exceed the dollar amount of the merit pool percent approved by the Board of Regents multiplied by the highest salary in Class B for their campus” this proposed policy is denying these faculty recognition of merit they have earned through job performance that met or exceeded expectations. This is basically telling these faculty, many of whom are likely long-term faculty in the CU system, that their efforts and job performance are worthy of less recognition than those faculty in Classifications A and B simply because they have served the university for a longer period of		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			time. Over time, this policy will also create career merit inequities and salary inequity for faculty in this classification.		
54	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy: Please Specify in Comments Comments: The policy 11f on compensation and benefits seems to me like a severe mistake. The University of Colorado needs to be able to pay competitive market salaries in order to retain quality faculty. We already have a systemic problem with faculty salaries (at least in the natural sciences) being significantly lower (by as much as a factor of two) than peer institutions, and have been seeing a slow bleed of star faculty leaving for better offers elsewhere. This policy will make it much harder to pay competitive salaries, and risks a death spiral where many of the best faculty decide to leave for better paid positions elsewhere, with CU being left only with those who cannot get an outside offer. Note that this problem cannot be `fixed' merely by aggressive retention offers, since (a) the faculty in question will all know that they would never get another real raise again, and (b) once someone has gone all the way to interviewing and securing an offer elsewhere, they are much more likely to depart than someone who never starts the process because they are happy with where they are! In short, this policy seems like a disaster for faculty retention (and also recruitment).	Faculty	CU Boulder
55	9/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	If this were to be enacted, any top faculty member will immediately try to leave. The ones who can get external offers will be the best of the best. CU will not be able to hire good faculty given such an egregious policy; I could never in good conscience encourage any young person to accept a faculty offer here if this policy is enacted. Salaries at CU are already very low compared to peer institutions and the cost of living in the area has skyrocketed in recent years. The regents should focus less on "equity" and more on trying to foster an environment where excellent faculty feel valued. Salary is a big part of that.	Faculty	CU Boulder
56	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11.F Seems fine to me.	Staff	CU Boulder
57	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Dear Board of Regents,	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			I appreciate the Regents' effort to address equity concerns in faculty and staff compensation across the CU System. The stated purpose of proposed Policy 11.F—to create greater equity between the highest- and lowest-paid employees—is commendable. However, I share the same significant concerns of other faculty that this policy attempts to retroactively correct problems that stem less from gaps in Regent policy than from inconsistent application of the policies and laws already in place. 1. Current Regent Policy and Colorado Law Already Require Equity • Regent Policy 11.A (Compensation Principles) commits CU to provide "fair and competitive compensation" and "equal pay for substantially similar work in accordance with state and federal law." • Regent Policy 11.B.5 (Explanation of Terms) states clearly: "Merit is the prevailing factor in all salary increases" and "salary adjustments...must be simultaneously based on merit." • APS 5008 (Faculty Performance Evaluation) requires annual, peer-reviewed evaluations and provides that the annual rating is the basis for merit increases. • The Colorado Equal Pay for Equal Work Act (C.R.S. § 8-5-101 et seq.) requires that compensation practices provide equal pay for substantially similar work, with transparency and accountability in salary decisions. In other words: both CU policy and Colorado law already obligate the university to achieve the very goals that 11.F is designed to promote. 2. The Core Issue is Enforcement, Not Policy Gaps The difficulty across campuses has not been a lack of rules, but rather inconsistent enforcement and application of these policies: • Annual merit evaluations are disconnected from actual salary outcomes, contrary to Regent Policy 11.B more often than not. • Equity reviews required by Regent Policy 11.B are not always		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			conducted transparently or with clear remedies. • Salary pool allocations and campus-specific adjustments often lack the consistency and documentation required under Regent Policy 11.B and 11.C. 3. Risks of Policy 11.F in Practice • Contradiction with merit-based principles. Regent Policy 11.B.5 makes merit the prevailing factor in salary increases. Imposing hard caps on certain groups (Class C) while guaranteeing raises for others (Class A) directly undermines that principle. • Compression and retention concerns. Limiting salary growth for top performers will impair CU's ability to retain nationally competitive faculty, especially in high-demand disciplines, without addressing the underlying cause: uneven application of existing market/equity adjustments. • Administrative burden without real reform. Ranking all employees annually and capping/guaranteeing raises by tier adds complexity but does not resolve the root issue—that existing rules, policies, and/or laws are not being uniformly enforced. 4. A Better Path Forward Rather than enacting a new section that overlays an additional compliance structure, the Regents could: 1. Direct each campus to demonstrate documented compliance with existing requirements in Regent Policy 11 and APS 5008 (e.g., transparency of salary pool allocations, periodic equity reviews, reporting on merit/equity outcomes). 2. Ensure all campuses are conducting and publishing the periodic salary equity reviews already mandated under Regent Policy 11.B.1. 3. Require annual attestation from Chancellors that salary adjustments are tied to merit ratings as required by policy and law. 5. Accountability for Policy Adherence Finally, should the Regents approve Policy 11.F, it is essential that the		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Board provide clarity on how failures to adhere to existing policies will be addressed moving forward. Without mechanisms to ensure compliance, any new policy risks becoming symbolic rather than substantive. Faculty and staff deserve assurance that Regent policies—whether long-standing provisions like 11.A–11.C or new additions like 11.F—are consistently followed and enforced across all campuses. Otherwise, the question becomes: what good is any policy if it is not applied in practice? 6. Conclusion The commitment to equity and fair compensation is already enshrined in CU policy and Colorado law. The central challenge is that these commitments are not consistently applied. Adding Policy 11.F risks diverting attention from the true issue—compliance and enforcement—while introducing new constraints that may conflict with established principles of merit-based advancement. I respectfully recommend that the Regents focus first on ensuring rigorous enforcement and transparent reporting of existing compensation policies before layering on new restrictions that will produce unintended negative consequences. Respectfully,		
58	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy essentially says: the better you do, the less you can be rewarded. Imagine applying this logic to our students: those in the top third of the class cannot receive an A higher than the best B student. Such a rule would rightly be seen as absurd. Yet that is exactly what is being proposed for faculty and staff compensation. CU should not institutionalize a system that punishes its highest performers simply for being successful.	Staff	CU System
59	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy undermines one of CU's core principles, which is rewarding merit. By capping raises for individuals simply because they fall in the top	Adminstrator	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			third of salaries, the policy substitutes income level for performance. That is inequitable in its own right and creates legal exposure. Because the highest paid categories often include older employees and particular demographic groups, the cap could result in disparate impact and expose CU to class action claims. Instead of limiting recognition for excellence, CU should strengthen equity by lifting the bottom while still rewarding the highest performers.		
60	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11F risks creating a long-term greening effect across CU. By capping raises for senior and higher-paid employees, the university will inevitably lose experienced, high-performing faculty and staff to competitors. They will be replaced by less experienced hires at lower salaries, which may appear to save costs but erodes institutional knowledge and stability. At the same time, Colorado and the nation face well-documented shortages in health care, STEM, IT, and other critical fields. CU should be positioning itself as the destination for top talent in these areas, not signaling that success is penalized. Limiting recognition for those already in demand will only accelerate departures and make it harder to recruit. Higher education is already facing fierce and stiff headwinds, including declining enrollments, funding pressures, and rising competition. CU cannot afford to weaken its hand in this environment. Navigating these challenges requires the very best faculty, researchers, and administrators. Top talent costs money, and CU must remain willing to reward excellence in order to secure its future. Finally, the proposal undermines CU's merit-based culture. Compensation should be tied to performance and impact, not to arbitrary position in a percentile chart. Over time, this approach will discourage excellence, drain away leadership capacity, and weaken the very areas that generate CU's academic and financial strength.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
61	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Staff	CU

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
		Certain Salary Adjustments	While this policy has a good intention on the surface, it will have severe unintended consequences. Philosophically, it does not align, and moreover contradicts, with Regent Law 11.A, which states, in part: "The university shall compensate faculty and staff in a manner that is competitive in the marketplace and that rewards meritorious performance within fiscal limits." At its core, 11.F would prevent rewarding meritorious performance. Many of the professional staff have skills that are easily transferable to other industries, which will have higher compensation and better elasticity to cost of living. The current wording of the proposed policy does not take market into consideration. While the pools have been 2.5%-4% in the last few years, they have barely been enough to keep up with inflation/cost of living. It has already been challenging to create performance differentiation and reward/incentivize good performance. Should 11.F be adopted, it would become extremely difficult to attract and retain professional staff who are strong performers and support so many of the "back-office" processes that enable successful delivery on the university mission statement. As someone has already mentioned, it may take two or three cycles/years to lose talented professionals but it will most certainly happen. This policy would be punitive to high performing professionals.		System
62	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments Regent Policy 11.F, which restricts “annual merit-based, base building” salary adjustments and “across-the-board” increases for the highest-earning faculty and staff, may unintentionally undermine the effectiveness and sustainability of departments across the university system. Many departments are often staffed by highly skilled professionals	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			whose compensation reflects years of experience, specialized certifications, and deep institutional knowledge. Under Policy 11.F, many of these professionals would fall into Classification C, thereby becoming subject to strict limitations on merit-based and across-the-board salary increases—even when their performance warrants it. This restriction poses several risks: 1. Retention Challenges - Professionals in our department are in high demand across both public and private sectors. Limiting their compensation growth could lead to increased turnover, especially among top performers who may seek more competitive opportunities elsewhere. Losing experienced staff not only disrupts continuity but also increases recruitment and training costs. 2. Reduced Incentive for Excellence - Merit-based pay is a key motivator for high performance. By capping salary increases for Classification C employees, the policy diminishes incentives for staff to go above and beyond in their roles. This could result in lower morale and reduced productivity. 3. Equity vs. Expertise - While the policy aims to promote salary equity, it overlooks the reality that roles that require a high level of expertise and accountability. Equating salary restrictions with fairness may inadvertently penalize those whose compensation reflects the complexity and critical nature of their work. Equity should not come at the expense of operational excellence. 4. Impact on Succession Planning - Senior-level staff often mentor junior staff and play a key role in developing future leaders. If experienced professionals are disincentivized to stay due to stagnant compensation, the department risks losing institutional knowledge and weakening its leadership pipeline. While the intent behind Regent Policy 11.F—to promote salary equity—is commendable, its implementation risks unintended consequences for		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			some departments. These teams play a vital role at the university. Restricting their compensation growth could compromise their effectiveness, reduce morale, and lead to talent loss. A more nuanced approach that balances equity with performance and market realities is essential to sustaining a strong, competitive workforce.		
63	9/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments While this policy stipulates it is intended to increase equity among salaries, it in effect would only serve to continue to undermine CU's ability to attract and retain top talent, serve as a disincentive for strong & top performers and further take away the small ability that exists to try to reward performance. Under the current structure, it is simply not possible to provide effective merit increases, deal with market adjustments and overcome cost of living issues. Why? Because the pool is simply too small. AND if you further disincentivize - which is what this policy would do - high performance (which is already hard to reward in this system) you will lose good employees and not be able to attract or retain high quality employees. You have to increase the amount of funding dedicated to salary increases annually or you will never make any headway on this problem. The tiny amount of flexibility that currently exists is barely enough to retain the current staff - this will not make the problem any better. In fact as a multitude of others have noted it will only make it worse.	Staff	CU System
64	9/12/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11F - If faculty or staff presented a draft policy with so little justification, they would be laughed out of the meeting. This policy should not move forward as it does not address any basic content to make an informed decision. What problem are we trying to solve? I see it says pay inequity, but explain what you mean in this context. If it is truly the pay inequity between the custodian and the mechanical engineering professor, how large is the inequity in your analysis? Provide the examples,	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			research, data and peer comparisons. Has a full analysis of salaries even been run for the board to evaluate? The way we are going to solve the non-defined problem is clear - divide the entire population into thirds. Is there reasoning behind this approach? Will this approach fix the non-defined problem? Is there future modeling of what this approach will do in 3 years, 5 years, 10 years? Does if fix the non-defined problem? Where are the risks and rewards analysis to this proposal? How will this impact recruiting, retention, or reputation? Why the rush? CU is a complex machine that can rarely be turned on a dime. Compensation philosophies and practices take time to analyze current state, proposed changes, and impacts. I believe there are only a handful of people who can even generate this type of data for both faculty and staff and they have not been engaged in conversations. This is a half-baked idea with no data or analysis behind it. At this time, there is no Regent Law or Policy that is so prescribed and detailed which will require future generations to follow until it is revised or rescinded. If the board chooses to move their policy making into this detailed area, they are becoming an authoritative board, removing the ability for the chancellors to run their businesses as they need for their own faculty and staff.		
65	9/12/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This is pertaining to salary restrictions. As I am understanding it, this seems positive for our lowest paid professionals, which I support.	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			We have some folks on our campuses who are not making enough. However, it seems unequitable for folks who might be in class C, but then the lowest paid in class C. Also this is not transparent. What are the salary cut offs for each of these categories. For example, if someone who is making 150,000 is in the same class as someone making 500K, I don't think that's a fair distribution.		
66	9/12/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I think this change will discourage long term and loyal employees from going above and beyond.	Staff	CU AMC
67	9/12/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	The concept of "equal pay for equal work" includes not only equal base salaries but also fair chances for raises or merit increases when employees perform similarly. Limiting raises simply because someone is in the top third seems to punish performance or longevity if they already earn more. That can feel punitive rather than rewarding. If people see their raises limited simply because of their position in the salary range rather than based on merit, it can decrease motivation. It also sends a message that once you're "high paid," you're devalued or that your contributions matter less, which can harm the company culture. This can impact retention, especially among high performers. Risk of unintended bias or discrimination. Salary disparities tend to grow over time due to earlier increases, opportunities, or negotiation differences (which often favor certain groups). By limiting raises to a salary ranking rather than assessing pay equity, there is a risk of perpetuating existing inequalities — for example, if historically underpaid individuals are now in Class C, they could unfairly reach a "top out". Organizations that claim to value their employees must follow through with their compensation policies. If a policy systematically limits pay growth for some simply because of their position in the hierarchy (rather than their performance or role differences), it erodes trust in leadership and can appear arbitrary.	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
68	9/13/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Students do not come to a university to remain the same. They come to learn, to grow, and to be rewarded for their effort. They compete for grades, for scholarships, and for opportunities that reflect their performance. Nobody tells the best student in the class that her A will be lowered because someone else did not do as well. To do so would make a mockery of the whole idea of education. Yet that is what policy 11F proposes for faculty and staff. It tells the most accomplished people in the institution that their work will no longer bring proportional recognition. It lowers the ceiling for those who strive hardest and raise the bar for those who contribute the least. Over time, that will not create fairness. It will create mediocrity. Universities are meant to cultivate aspiration. When you strip out the reward for excellence, you kill aspiration at its root. The result will be predictable: the best people will go elsewhere, and those who remain will have little reason to give more than the minimum. That is not the path to greatness for CU or any university.	Student	CU Colo Springs
69	9/13/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Re: Proposed Policy 11.F I read the proposed policy with interest. Although I appreciate and support the need for equitable salaries, the proposed policy risks disincentivizing senior faculty who by the nature of their tenure and accomplishments at CU have higher salaries. There is a point of diminishing returns in which these faculty will no longer perceive appreciation or merit for their work. Please think carefully about the long-term implications of this policy before approving and implementing it.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
70	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	While I appreciate the intent behind this proposal, particularly the effort to create a more structured and equitable compensation framework, I believe it falls short in addressing the realities of CU's compensation practices and the long-term implications for staff morale and retention. The reality around merit salary adjustments are that their critical for the vast majority of our staff to see any increase to their salary, because CU does not currently offer cost-of-living adjustments (COLA), traditional raises, or performance-based bonuses easily (yes, individuals can be promoted and see increases due to changing titles, but within their	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			current positions the above is largely absent across the CU System). In that context, limiting salary increases based solely on an employee's position within the pay range feels especially discouraging. It risks penalizing those who have consistently performed at a high level or who have dedicated many years to the university. These individuals are often the backbone of institutional knowledge and continuity, and this policy could inadvertently signal that their continued contributions are less valued. Moreover, the structure as written seems to disincentivize excellence and longevity. If high performers or long-tenured employees are effectively "capped" regardless of their work, it undermines the principle of rewarding performance and could erode trust in leadership. In the long term, I believe this policy could have serious consequences for retention. Talented professionals—especially those with transferable skills—may seek opportunities elsewhere where their contributions are more fully recognized and rewarded. While the proposal may be well-intentioned, I urge reconsideration of its structure to ensure it aligns with CU's stated values and supports a culture of excellence, equity, and respect.		
71	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Capping raises for 33% of faculty and staff undermines equity because it ignores the academic labor market and penalizes employees based solely on their salary level. True pay equity in a university context means ensuring compensation remains fair both internally and externally. By denying inflation-aligned raises to higher-earning faculty and staff, our school will loose top scholars and skilled administrators to peer universities that continue to offer competitive adjustments. It also erodes trust in the administration's commitment to fairness, creating division within the academic community. Inflation affects everyone - faculty, researchers, and staff alike - and so equitable, consistent raises should apply across the board.	Faculty	CU Boulder
72	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments How will the Class C employees and faculty keep up with inflation?	Faculty	CU Boulder
73	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments Creating a policy that caps raises for exactly 33% of faculty and staff is inherently arbitrary. It imposes a rigid cutoff that does not reflect the complex realities of academic compensation. Faculty and staff salaries are	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			influenced by discipline, rank, tenure status, and external market factors, none of which align neatly with a fixed percentage group. Further, using an arbitrary percentage to cap raises can produce several unintended outcomes. Faculty and staff who fall just over the threshold are penalized disproportionately compared to peers who fall just under it, creating frustration and a sense of unfairness. Such a system may also incentivize gaming salary bands, where negotiations or appointments are shaped more by the desire to avoid the cap than by genuine merit or alignment with market realities. Over time, these distortions weaken the integrity of the university's pay structure and erode trust in the fairness of its compensation policies.		
74	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy: 11F While the Faculty Council Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS) Committee recognizes issues related to salary equity, the proposed policy 11.F appears to be a fundamentally flawed attempt that will not appropriately or meaningfully address them. Moreover, the proposal can have unintended consequences. Our two primary concerns are as follows: 1. This proposal represents a level of micromanagement that is inappropriate for Regent Policy. We believe campus administrators must be able to determine the allocation of merit-based and across-the-board salary increases in the manner that best meets the needs of their campus through consultation with faculty and staff governance groups. Imposing this structure on campuses is an unacceptable level of overreach. Therefore, the committee will not comment on the specifics of the draft as written. 2. The proposed mechanism would result in a worsening of existing compression issues. It will also harm the University's ability to recruit and retain talented personnel. If faculty and staff believe that they will ultimately be penalized for long-term service to the University, they will seek opportunities elsewhere. Furthermore, we are concerned that the proposal will do nothing to address systemic pay inequalities that already exist based on factors such as gender and race.	Faculty	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Commenting further on the specifics of this policy draft would lend it a level of credibility that this committee, which takes pride in rigorous policy analysis on behalf of university faculty, does not believe such a fundamentally flawed proposal deserves. We strongly urge the Board of Regents to reject this proposal and end further attempts to "improve" it.		
75	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy: Please Specify in Comments Comments: Regarding policy proposal 11.F, given the standard salary ranges for business school faculty nationwide, instituting this type of salary cap would: 1) negatively affect all tenure-track faculty at Leeds; and 2) result in significant, ongoing turnover at the school until the policy is reversed. If a long-term goal is for Leeds to be competitive with other business schools, do not implement this policy.	Faculty	CU Boulder
76	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am writing to comment on Policy 11.F, which caps merit pay. I am troubled by the cap, because it takes merit out of the salary process for highly compensated employees. If this were to occur, it would demotivate a highly paid employee bc they would not receive proportionate compensation adjustments relative to a lower-paid employee. I understand that it is a move to introduce equity into the compensation system, but it makes more sense to elevate the lower compensated employees and not cap the higher paid employees. A secondary issue that I'm struggling to wrap my head around is why the faculty at the medical campus is not governed by the same compensation policy as the rest of the system. I work in a no less competitive market than medical doctors, which I think is the logic for not governing them - that they operate in a more competitive market. I don't mind that they are compensated at a higher level bc of market forces - I do mind that they appear to be thought of as operating in a more competitive market, and as a result, should have no caps on their compensation - when the reality is, for all high performers, markets pay more. A tertiary issue is retention of high performers. Merit at CU does not	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			keep up with external market rates for high performers in my discipline. If one is loyal to CU and stays through one's career, one ends one's career having made much less than people who moved. The current merit structure at least mitigates some of that difference. I do not think we will be able to retain high performers in business schools if we artificially truncate the merit they receive, in order to address inequity in compensation across discplines. What we will end up, with a much weaker business school in the long term.		
77	9/15/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I believe the principle of this policy regarding salary adjustments is laudable. Yet, what is will accomplish is sadly not. My rough math and data analysis suggests that any one of us who make more than $91,620 per year (all Leeds TT faculty) will be limited to a raise of $2,290 under this policy, if the overall raise pool is 2.5%. Assuming average allocation of 2.5% in a future year, our highest paid professor will lose out on $8452 and our lowest paid TT professor (that is not a total outlier) will lose out on $1900 in the first year and more over time as the losses compound, but this will be mitigated a bit by the cutoffs changing as the Class A and B employees get higher raises, but I don't think it would be material over time. In other words, since our salary pool tends to not be much better than inflation, this policy will lead to drastically lower salaries over time. Given that we are already well below market, I predict the following results: It will be much easier to poach our most valued faculty. Faculty will start to go on the market more frequently, making the poaching easier. The rankings of Leeds and other professional schools will decline, and students will be less interested in coming.	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			As a bit of a communist at heart, I love the policy. Nevertheless, it will have very negative effects on the university as a whole.		
78	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	1. Disincentivizing Excellence and Leadership By capping merit-based increases for Class C employees based on the highest salary in Class B, the policy effectively punishes those who have achieved leadership roles or demonstrated exceptional performance. This undermines the principle of meritocracy and sends a discouraging message to those who aspire to advance within the university. 2. Arbitrary Classification System The division of employees into three salary-based classes—without regard to role, responsibility, or performance—oversimplifies a complex compensation landscape. Salary levels often reflect years of experience, specialized expertise, and market competitiveness. Treating all high earners as a homogeneous group ignores these nuances and risks unfairly penalizing individuals whose compensation is justified by their contributions. 3. Negative Impact on Recruitment and Retention Restricting salary growth for top performers will make it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain high-caliber faculty and staff, especially in competitive fields. The university must remain an attractive employer to maintain its reputation for excellence. This policy could drive talent away to institutions that reward merit without artificial constraints. 4. Equity Should Not Mean Penalization True equity involves lifting up those who are underpaid—not holding others back. A more constructive approach would be to invest in raising the salaries of Class A employees through targeted funding, professional development, and career advancement opportunities, rather than limiting the growth of others. 5. Administrative Burden and Lack of Flexibility Requiring units to justify deviations and seek approval from chancellors or presidents adds unnecessary bureaucracy and delays. It also removes flexibility from	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			department heads who are best positioned to assess performance and allocate merit increases appropriately.		
79	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I have read and re-read this policy a number of times and cannot come to any other conclusion than this is a huge overreach of Regent control and decision making that will negatively impact CU and its faculty, staff and researchers – the people who are responsible for CU achieving its mission. The policy assumes people paid less are paid inadequately while the people who make more are overpaid and that simply isn't true. Generally speaking, CU pays less than market across all earners. Is this policy proposal based on data or any understanding of CU? As somebody who has to think about pay decisions carefully with the limited funding the Regents approve each year, I don't think this proposal is based on any reality other than control of decisions that aren't in the Regent's scope or purview. Departments and units across the university need to maintain the authority to make pay decisions, focused on retaining top talent across all earners, taking into account performance, market competitiveness for similar roles and the impact on the organization if somebody were to leave. A one-size fits all policy will not work and will hurt the university's ability to attract and retain talent. And, turnover and loss of talent is a hugely expensive proposition, both in terms of dollars and our ability to meet our education, research, service and healthcare. Do you really want to limit income for somebody conducting important cancer or Alzheimer's research? Or somebody teaching our next generation to be engineers, doctors, business leaders or astronauts? Limit their pay, and they will go somewhere else and another university and/or state will benefit from their expertise. If the Regents care about pay, they should focus on strategies to bring everybody to their market rate and leave it to managers to differentiate between high performers and less high performers so CU can retain the the talent that makes the university so great.	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
80	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Proposed Policy 11F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. Please reconsider the proposal to restrict annual salary adjustments to the highest earners. Staff are already leaving CU for external private organizations for more money. This will only incentivize that more. Additionally, many high earners have historic knowledge, unique skill sets, and are taking on more responsibilities than colleagues. This would be very harmful and demotivating to those high earners. Instead, please think about required metrics or requirements for those earners. We can still hold them to a high standard without punishing them for earning more money. No one should feel guilty for earning a high salary.	Staff	CU AMC
81	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments Risks of Salary Compression and Talent Loss While the intent of the proposal is to improve equity, its mechanism could unintentionally exacerbate salary compression. High-performing employees with long tenure, who have already advanced into the upper salary ranges, would face restricted growth regardless of contribution. This may discourage retention of experienced faculty and staff and limit the University's ability to compete with peer institutions in attracting top talent. Ultimately, the policy could produce inequities of a different sort—penalizing loyalty and excellence. Limited Impact on Structural Inequalities The proposal frames itself as an equity measure but does not address deeper systemic inequities, such as disparities related to gender, race, or field of study/discipline. Without targeted interventions that address these underlying gaps, the policy risks functioning as a blunt instrument. Simply redistributing adjustment opportunities based on relative pay bands will not resolve persistent pay inequities tied to demographic or structural factors. Potential Unintended Consequences Recruitment: Prospective hires may be deterred by the ceiling placed on potential salary growth, particularly in competitive markets like	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			healthcare, business, and STEM. Morale: High-performing employees in Classification C may feel undervalued, creating morale challenges that outweigh the perceived equity gains. Implementation Burden: The annual recalculation and reclassification process adds administrative complexity and may be difficult to administer consistently across campuses.		
82	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments: 11F Policy. This policy is not well thought-out and will have severely negative and likely unforseen consequences leading to worsening compression issues, and forcing the most senior and high-achieving faculty and staff to leave the university, Cancel and drop this policy. It will be very bad for CU.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
83	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments: I do not support this policy. The compensation should be based on performance.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
84	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I would like to note my concern regarding this policy shift. I agree with the comments from UCCS EPUS committee regarding the overreach of system in deploying this policy and the ways in which compression issues will be exacerbated if this is implemented. I see value in the idea, but need more information and data to understand the reasoning behind the rationale for this change.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
85	9/16/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11F proposal regarding salary equity The most accurate description I can think of for this proposal is that it is aggressively dishonest, morale-killing, and contemptuous of faculty and staff alike. Here's a two-pronged proposal for the Regents to consider. First, advocate to the state and donors on behalf of the faculty and staff the way you do for Coach Prime and the football team. Second, work with appropriate constituencies to fund merit raises for faculty and staff beyond the rate of inflation. Case in point: some UCCS faculty members who have received outstanding annual merit reviews for their entire career earn salaries that, when adjusted for inflation, have the same purchasing power in 2025 as in 1995, which is to say that they have never actually had a raise and that their high merit has never actually been rewarded.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Thank you for the opportunity to comment.		
86	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11F If the Board is claiming we need to fix inequities, what is the equitable range between all faculty and staff? When we achieve that, how will this policy continue to help or hurt the targeted equity ranges? The policy also says all employees except students, this is vague and demonstrates the lack of knowledge of our complex employment at CU. Should this just be for those who are eligible for merit? How will additional roles be factored into the analysis, like department chairs? Retract this policy draft and hold people accountable to the existing laws and policies on compensation.	Staff	CU AMC
87	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I want to express my support for the proposed salary equity Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. As someone who has worked here for 17 years and is currently among the lowest-paid employees, I've experienced firsthand how difficult it can be when compensation doesn't reflect the scope of one's responsibilities. My current job title does not capture the additional duties I take on daily, and I've reached the ceiling for my position. During my interview, I was told there would be opportunities for advancement and a higher salary based on my experience and long-standing service to this campus. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. With the rising cost of living, fair and equitable pay is more important than ever. Many of the lowest-paid employees are the backbone of multiple departments, yet their contributions often go unrecognized. Meanwhile, there are individuals earning significantly more whose duties don't always align with their compensation. I believe this policy is a step in the right direction toward acknowledging and valuing the hard work of all employees, especially those who have remained committed to the university for many years. Thank you for considering this perspective.	Staff	CU AMC
88	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	For Proposed New Regent Policy 11.F - Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			This proposal is very problematic to our University and undermines a culture meant to reward performance, innovation and leadership. Several specific points are below as to why this proposal should NOT be approved. 1. Completely disincentivizes high performance and retention. Top performers often fall into Class C due to their experience, leadership or specialized skills. This proposal would reduce their motivation to excel, making it HARDER to retain talent - which the University already struggles with due to low salaries in comparison to other health systems and industry. Additionally, it would discourage internal promotion if employees know their salary growth will be capped. 2. Penalizes longevity and experience. Those who have served the University for many years and have historical knowledge will be disproportionately affected. This could punish loyalty as the employees who have served the University the longest are more likely to be in Class C. 3. While this proposal may be intended for equity, it would likely result in inter-campus tension if one campus' Class C earns less than another. 4. This policy completely disconnects reward from performance. 5. There is a high risk for talent drain when compensation growth is restricted. Academia is actively being threatened in our nation, progressing any policy that restricts your employees flexibility, professional growth and development is a mistake that risks mass attrition.		
89	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	NEW SALARY POLICY: GIven the inequities between campuses this seems unwise as a system-wide policy. We work at a campus where most people are making below the national averages (and below Boulder) and many are not making the wages necessary to live in the state; this is true of both the mid and high earners. This also impacts our ability to retain our most vaulable employees. And what about salary compression?	Faculty	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
90	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Dear Members of the Regents Governance Committee, Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Regent Policy 11.F. We recognize and support the Board's commitment to advancing equity in compensation across the university system. At the same time, we have significant concerns about the structure and likely effects of this proposal. Impact on Faculty Salaries and Retention The proposed cap on merit-based increases for employees in the highest salary tier will substantially slow the rate of salary growth for many faculty members. Because raises would be capped at a flat dollar value tied to Class B salaries, Class C faculty would receive increases well below the overall merit pool percentage. Over time, this mechanism will erode competitiveness with peer institutions, particularly in disciplines where CU already faces challenges in recruiting and retaining faculty. Erosion of Merit-Based Compensation By guaranteeing raises for all employees in the lowest tier while limiting raises for those in the highest tier, the proposal weakens the principle of merit-based advancement. Performance, innovation, and productivity have long been central to CU's compensation philosophy. This policy risks rewarding underperformance while discouraging excellence, especially among faculty whose contributions are critical to the university's teaching and research missions. Lack of Increase to the Salary Pool The central challenge is not only the distribution of the existing salary pool, but its insufficient size. Merit pools have not kept pace with inflation or with the markets in which CU competes. Redistributing a constrained pool does not address this underlying problem. We urge the Regents to consider strategies that expand the pool for faculty and staff salaries rather than reallocating existing, limited resources. Administrative Compensation and Structural Issues The proposal applies broadly to faculty and staff but does not directly address administrative compensation, where many of the university's highest salaries reside. A	Faculty	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			targeted review of administrative growth and costs could create opportunities to reallocate resources in ways that support equity while also preserving CU's ability to recruit and retain top faculty. Alternative Approaches We encourage the Board to consider other strategies that would advance equity without undermining merit principles. Options include targeted equity adjustments based on market data, compression pools to address long-standing disparities, and greater transparency in compensation practices. These tools can reduce inequities while preserving CU's competitiveness. Conclusion We respectfully urge the Regents to reconsider Policy 11.F in its current form. While we share the goal of promoting fairness in compensation, the proposed mechanism is blunt and risks significant harm to faculty retention, morale, and CU's standing among peer institutions. Addressing compensation equity should focus on growing the salary pool and reviewing administrative structures, rather than capping faculty raises. Thank you for your consideration.		
91	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. This is problematic on a number of levels. The University already lags behind competitive pay for high-end faculty around the country and is not prepared to do much to change that. Since our raises already do not keep up with cost of living, let alone the rising costs in Colorado, this is effectively a pay cut over time, beyond the compression that already exists in the faculty system. I would fully expect retention problems, even at the earlier stages as faculty understand that they will have compressed earnings over time and could logically consider outside offers when they are more junior and mobile.	Faculty	CU Denver
92	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11.F While I appreciate the intention behind this policy (i.e., to address salary equity and compression), this policnoy seems overly proscriptive and does not address pay inequity based on other factors such as gender, race, or unit on campus. This policy does not reward long-term service to	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			the university and will likely lead to loss of talent, greater turnover, and less stability. I do not support the adoption of this policy.		
93	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Proposed Policy 11.F I am very much against the proposed policy for several reasons 1. This policy will reduce the total raises among employees in disguise. A 2.5% raise will not be a 2.5% raise of total salaries. The cost of lower bounding raises in group C will be thwarted by the upper bound on raises in group C, likely by a factor 10 or more. The answer to the question if this needs fiscal review ("no") is outrageous. If the board of regents is sincere in this having no fiscal impact, they would need to announce a 3.5% pool to spend the same amount a 2.5% pool would have cost previously. This will be very difficult to sell politically, the public will get the wrong impression that universities raise their salaries much more than what actually happens. 2. This policy will create extra inequities on the boundary of groups B and C. A high performer (employee 1) at the top end of group B will surpass the salary of a high performer at the low end of group C (employee 2). Afterwards, due to the cap in group C, 1 will always have a higher salary than 2, almost independent of performance. 3. Any salary incentives for employees in group C (other at the very lowest paid in group C) are gone since even mediocre work will get the same raise as everyone else in this group. 4. Putting a cut off for the limitations of salary increases at Top 33% is way too large of a group. Every TT faculty in a discipline with higher salaries (e.g. STEM), including assistant professors, will be in that group. This will limit all these faculty to life long raises below inflation, other than two bumps for promotion. 5. CU's annual raises are already low compared to other universities. Salaries of high performing professors who are lifelong CU faculty will be comically low compared to other universities.	Faculty	CU Denver
94	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	RE: Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments Why would we want a policy that disincentivizes our highest paid workers to perform at their best? This does not make sense in terms of optimizing university performance and likely leads to retention problems among our best employees.	Faculty	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
95	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. The policy restricts the rewarding of highly productive faculty. I think either modification or exceptions to this proposal are needed. The campus risks having talented and successful faculty seek positions elsewhere. This is a poor strategy for building a research culture on the CU Denver campus. We have recently lost several talented faculty to higher ranked universities. The faculty perceived their work was undervalued here, and competing offers were not made for retention.	Faculty	CU Denver
96	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I have been a faculty member within the CU System for about 25 years, the last 14 years at CU Denver and prior to that, at CU Boulder. We clearly need baseline increases in compensation to reduce salary inequity amongst campuses, schools, and within departments, as there are substantial gaps in pay for employees with similar credentials and accomplishments, salaries have not met inflation rates adequately, as well as the fact that across campuses and schools, the lowest-paid faculty continue to teach the most combined student credit hours. A solution may exist, however, Policy 11.F is clearly not it. I object to this exceedingly brief draft (of only 2 pages) that appears to fall well short of what it intends to accomplish. To me, this seems more like a veneer to hide a the more serious underlying problem of substantially inadequate compensation across the board, especially to those employees most directly dedicated to the mission and vision declared by the University of Colorado: ** "Mission: The University of Colorado is a public research university with multiple campuses serving Colorado, the nation, and the world through leadership in high-quality education and professional training, public service, advancing research and knowledge, and state-of-the-art health care. ** Vision: The University of Colorado will be a premier, accessible and transformative public university that provides a quality and affordable	Faculty	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			education with outstanding teaching, learning, research, service, and health care. Through collaboration, innovation, technology and entrepreneurship, CU will expand student success, diversity and the economic foundation of the State of Colorado." Clearly, reading the above, high quality and affordable education, research, and health care are key. All together, I interpret Policy 11.F to be poorly written, lacking in depth, rationale, background and details (for example, why were the thirds proposed as the dividing lines, and what categories or majority of the employees fall into those lines and at what levels of pay? Without more information, it's difficult to understand much of anything about this proposed policy. To me, the policy attempts to increase equity in pay but unfortunately is not thorough or well designed, and seems like a band-aid that would inadequately rely on redistribution of compensation for the highest 1/3 of earners. Are not many of those in the bottom portion of the top, 1/3 earners, also potentially those who directly contribute to teaching and research, a major portion of the mission and vision central to CU itself?		
97	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11. F While I appreciate the perspectives offered, in regards to top-earner retention, I find it surprising that very little is stated about the financial realities of the lowest paid. Everyone seems to be applauding the intent, but sees some adjustments (or caps) for the lowest, as commendable, but ill advised. The "retention" arguments fail to recognize that some of the lower-tier faculty possess expertise that far exceeds their peers, in certain subjects. I think it would be terrible that CU would loose expertise because top-earners need to have larger raises.	Faculty	CU System
98	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11.F Faculty and Staff at UCCS, in particular, are already experiencing compression. Those of us who have been here for a long time have not experienced salary increases that keep up with inflation as it is, and people who haven't been serving the university for nearly as long are making very close to the same pay as those who have been here for many years longer. Why is this only applying to faculty and staff? Why not freeze the pay of the highest earners at the University (administration) and give all faculty and staff reasonable salaries.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
99	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments - It is not clear how this policy will reduce salary inequities – part of this is the lack of provided information about the distribution of earners in each of the categories. What are the ranges for the categories? What about the boundary salaries – those close to ClassA/ClassB? Would making a few thousand less really justify the resulting difference in respective merit awards? – depends on which side you land on. What is the baseline for highest earning – salary totals, rank, etc. There are considerable inequities across disciplines/programs/departments/campuses. This policy does not address how those inequities could be deepened with the proposed sweeping approach to raises. The board should recognize that everyone does not start from the same base, which makes this policy harmful for individuals at all salary levels. This policy will not incentivize participation in the merit process. Mediocrity will be normalized. How about evaluating why the lowest paid earners are receiving low salaries and work separately to adjust those? How about working to address salary inequities and salary compression outside of merit? Merit should be merit. The data and a deeper justification (e.g., provide examples) are needed. Make sure the policy works for all potential scenarios – ask programs to provide these scenarios for equitable evaluation before enacting the policy. The intent may be good but this policy is too generic and lacks the substance (clearly laid out data, support, and impact) needed to make for a successful policy. What other options have been explored?	Faculty	CU Denver
100	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	There are so many problems with this proposed policy I'm not sure where to begin. And I write this as someone likely to end up in B, for life, and so unlikely to feel any material effects. This shell game does	Faculty	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			nothing to bring significant change to our compensation practices. It will result in some compensation being based on merit and other compensation on a combination of merit and an arbitrary classification system. This note from the Justification document is all we really need to know: Fiscal Review Do you think a fiscal review is needed for these proposed changes? No If no, please explain. Staff does not anticipate an impact on the compensation pool, but there may be an impact on individuals within the compensation pool. Right--no impact, just a feel-good shell game for our Regents.		
101	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This feedback is for Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. This is a terrible policy and a slap on the face to 33% (!!!!) of campus employees. By capping merit-based and across-the-board increases for the highest earners, the policy effectively penalizes high-performing individuals. The university already does not offer competitive wages and has trouble retaining top talent. This will only motivate the best performing employees to seek opportunities at peer institutions or in the private sector. Instead of promoting "fairness", the policy risks creating resentment among a large number of employees, and eroding morale.	Faculty	CU Denver
102	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am against this policy, as it may artificially demote/promote folks on the fringe between categories where with a more individualized ranking system I believe a more equitable (rather than just 3 categories) would better represent work and time spent when considering annual adjustments in salary.	Faculty	CU AMC
103	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This policy, which would limit annual increases for higher-earning employees, is a terrible idea. The CU system already pays faculty less than comparable institutions and fails to provide annual increases that	Faculty	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			keep up with inflation. Now the regents want to further restrict salary growth for poor performers. If an employer wants me to work harder for less money while giving big raises to worse performers, looking for a new job with better conditions is the only choice that makes sense. This is how the university system will lose their best and brightest, along with the grant funding and tuition revenue that these names attract. This policy is a direct path to self-destruction and should be abandoned, though the university should absolutely prioritize bringing everyone's annual raises to match inflation at a minimum with highest increases for the best performers.		
104	9/17/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F is ill-conceived and will likely do more harm than good over the long term. In particular, this will negatively impact retention and recruitment. The CU system is not isolated from the rest of the world. We are competing both locally and globally to recruit and retain top tier talent to fill a variety of roles that each require distinct compensation packages to make them competitive. At the time of my writing this, there are already over 60 pages of feedback lambasting this proposed policy. I read through maybe 30 pages of it, and found I agreed with just about every criticism I read, so I will conclude my criticism by saying that this policy is a blunt, bureaucratic attempt to flatten salary growth at the top, which I can only assume is based on some misinformed worldview that there is no legitimate reason to explain why someone has a higher salary than anyone else despite job role differences, experience, performance, etc. As for a recommendation, I suggest the regents view any compensation policy as more nuanced and include language that encourages the use of discipline-specific benchmarks, targeted equity pools, and merit-based discretion rather than a single top/middle/bottom classification.	Faculty	CU Denver
105	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	1. Impact on Retention and Recruitment of Top Talent Many of the highest-paid faculty are compensated at that level because they are exceptionally productive, bring in significant grant funding, have national/international reputations, or fill critical roles that are highly competitive in the academic market. Restricting their salary growth may make it difficult to retain these individuals, as peer institutions may offer more competitive	Faculty	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			compensation packages. This could lead to loss of top talent, which in turn could negatively impact research output, grant revenue, and the university's reputation. 2. Merit and Performance Should Drive Compensation The policy requires the lowest tier (Class A) to receive at least the full merit pool percentage, regardless of individual performance. However, some employees may be in the lowest tier due to consistently low productivity, poor performance, or lack of contribution to the university's mission. Guaranteeing increases to all in the lowest tier, without regard to merit, could undermine a culture of excellence and accountability. It may also demotivate high performers if they see underperforming colleagues receiving the same or greater percentage increases. 3. Salary Compression and Equity Concerns Artificially capping salary increases for the highest earners while guaranteeing increases for the lowest could lead to salary compression, where the pay gap between high and low performers narrows regardless of actual contribution or market value. This could create equity issues of a different kind, where high performers feel undervalued and low performers are rewarded disproportionately. 4. Market Realities Academic and healthcare markets are highly competitive. Compensation must reflect market rates to attract and retain faculty who could otherwise move to institutions that value their expertise appropriately. Blanket restrictions do not account for differences in discipline, market demand, or individual achievement.		
106	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments: For Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. While I appreciate the spirit of this draft policy and the help it would provide to lower earning employees, I feel that as currently written it removes flexibility from units to leverage merit-based adjustments as a tool for rewarding and retaining employees across the earnings spectrum. This could prove particularly disadvantageous when seeking to retain specific skilled positions which are harder to recruit to begin with, and where a unit's lack of merit flexibility could negatively impact retention efforts for existing high achieving professionals in these roles.	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
107	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	While I appreciate the Regents' commitment to equity, this proposal would significantly reduce the flexibility compensation teams and departments need to achieve their goals. The restrictions in Policy 11.F may look equitable on the surface, but in practice they limit our ability to use funds strategically and effectively. Targeting Critical Needs: Departments must be able to direct limited dollars toward critical roles, retention risks, and employees whose placement in the range does not reflect their education, experience, or market value. The proposed restrictions would take that ability away. Preserving Salary Ranges: Salary ranges are designed to balance equity with market competitiveness. Hard caps on Class C increases prevent employees from progressing through their ranges as intended, creating compression and weakening the integrity of the ranges themselves. Impact on Morale: Categorizing employees into "classes" risks damaging trust and morale. Long-tenured and high-performing employees may feel penalized for their loyalty, while others see advancement blocked by arbitrary formulas. Maintaining Competitiveness: In high-demand areas, we must be able to reward and retain our best people. This policy limits our competitiveness by forcing the same treatment regardless of performance, skill, or market realities. Administrative Burden: Annual classification of employees into thirds, along with exception tracking, would add complexity while pushing departments to seek workarounds such as alternative bonuses or reclassifications — reducing transparency and complicating governance. Equity is a vital goal, but it cannot come at the expense of the flexibility needed to manage pay in a way that values people. Without that flexibility, we risk compression, weakened salary structures, loss of top talent, and declining morale. Most importantly, we risk sending the message that employees' performance, experience, and loyalty are not recognized. A policy that truly advances equity should also preserve the	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			ability to care for the employee experience — ensuring every person feels both equitably treated and genuinely valued.		
108	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11F1 -- I'm surprised by these many comments. The state of Colorado has decided to have much lower taxes and fund higher ed at a decidedly lower amount than other states. Without major changes there, the funding model requires difficult decisions. I am reading page after page of comments regarding merit and talent. I get it...to a point. At the end of the day there's only so much money that can be divvied out. I have very good staff on my team, many with multiple degrees, who are scraping by on the salaries. A 3-5% increase for these staff means they can breathe a little easier about rent or daycare. I will still receive the same increase by actual dollars as the person at the top of tier 2. Any increase for tier 1 just doesn't have the same life impact as tier 2 and 3. I don't see the pie growing bigger any time soon and in the meantime I'm willing to share my slice.	Staff	CU AMC
109	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	As the 2025-2026 UCCS Faculty Assembly Chair, I have been hearing from a number of faculty concerned about the proposed changes to policy 11.F. Although many faculty members express support for improving salary equity, I have yet to hear any support for this specific proposal. There appears to be widespread opposition, both in terms of process (Regents dictating salary adjustments at this fine scale) and in terms of substantive effects (increasing compression and stagnation for higher salaried faculty). I urge the Regents to reject this proposal and maintain the existing terms for salary determinations.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
110	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F I appreciate the intent to promote salary equity across the university system. However, I have concerns about the current approach and its potential unintended consequences: The policy explicitly restricts merit-based and across-the-board increases for the highest earners (Class C), regardless of performance. This could be perceived as punitive and may undermine morale among high-performing faculty and staff in this category. UCCS has tried this recently and some faculty pushed back and it has in my view stressed some working relationships, a policy to do this every year would have negative impacts and should not be in a policy.	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Limiting increases for top earners could create retention risks, particularly in competitive fields where market-driven salaries are essential to attract and retain talent, may drive those employees away especially considering how expensive it is to live in Colorado. Equity is important, the policy may unintentionally devalue performance-based recognition. UCCS has recently gone to a pass/fail annual performance review, which has some staff talking all I need to do is C-level work to keep my job and get a merit rise. This would be one more reason to not strive for excellence, and a more balanced approach could maintain equity goals while preserving incentives for excellence.		
111	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Policy 11.F I am opposed. It would only add to the compression issue that is evident across the board at UCCS.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
112	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	proposed policy 11F There is an underlying flaw to the approach of this policy that will exacerbate already existing salary discrepancies, by capping merit based salary adjustments (currently the only form of even remotely making any gains towards cost of living increases) for higher paid employees. While in some colleges the pay is inevitably higher because of "market demand", in many cases the employee being capped would be someone who has been committed to the CU system for a longer period of time, and now getting penalized for the same commitment to the University. Additionally, the existing compression issues are not going to be fixed with the arbitrary percentage categorization of employees into 3 buckets. The cutoff can be very damaging to someone who is just $5 above the line, as has already happened on our campus, with someone $5 below the arbitrary line would leap frog the one who was originally higher...simply because of an arbitrary line drawn in the sand. Under this policy it also appears that someone in category A without a satisfactory merit score can still actually receive merit adjustments, which is unacceptable.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			Is it not possible to figure out how to address the underlying cause of the existing salary inequities without penalizing a group of employees? Retention of quality faculty will be extremely hard when they know they aren't fully recognized for longevity and hard work. Please reconsider this divisive, harmful, and poorly thought out approach of this proposed policy that would create a nightmare situation for those that have to apply it and for those who will have to live with not being rewarded for commitment and excellent in their work. The proposed policy definitely does not "create more opportunities for salary equity" but in fact would create more problems than already exist.		
113	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments: I want to submit my support for this document as written. Thank you.	Staff	CU Colo Springs
114	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	This proposed policy may be well intentioned; however, it is poorly conceived and strategically detrimental to CU. The university desires and relies on top talent to differentiate CU in the competitive higher ed landscape - the policy as proposed will punish high performers in positions that have the highest cost of turnover. The University (especially CU Denver and UCCS) already struggle to recruit top talent because compensation is not competitive for employees who are 'in demand'. For years, the University has relied on non-compensation factors like quality of life and affinity for the mission to woo top talent away from more lucrative private institution, and private sector jobs. With higher ed under attack, CU is no longer the desirable employer it once was, and we see that these non-compensation aren't enough to attract the level of leadership needed to navigate this unprecedented moment. If the policy is implemented as proposed, it will reinforce for me the creeping suspicion that I must leave UCCS to grow in my career and be compensated fairly. For perspective, over the past 4 years my salary has increased by 5.4% despite receiving consistent 'exceeding expectation' or 'outstanding' performance ratings. CPI during that same period is 19.5%. This policy as written rubs salt in the wound	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			created by CU's inability to compensate its employees fairly. I urge policymakers to scrap the policy as proposed, or revise the tiers to limit "class C' employees to only those employees at the very top of the pay scale (perhaps the top 5 to 10%), or perhaps to University officers. Please do better, CU!		
115	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	1. Consider salary bands, not rigid thirds. Instead of slicing employees strictly into three equal-sized groups, set objective salary ranges (e.g., below 60 % of market median, 60–120 %, 120 %+) or use quartiles based on market benchmarks. Thirds are blunt and can create perverse cliff effects when someone barely crosses a line. 2. Tie caps to external market data. Rather than linking Class C raises to the highest salary in Class B—which could swing wildly with one high outlier—link the allowable increase to a recognized market index or percentile (for example, CUPA-HR or AAUP discipline-specific data). That keeps high-end pay competitive and predictable. 3. Build in periodic review and sunset clauses. Require a formal review after, say, three years to examine unintended consequences on recruitment, retention, and equity outcomes. A sunset clause forces a re-vote, ensuring the policy remains evidence-based rather than becoming a permanent fixture by inertia. 4. Allow targeted exceptions with clear criteria. Spell out explicit circumstances (critical hires, hard-to-retain researchers, externally funded positions) where Class C increases can exceed the cap, provided there's documented justification and public reporting. This balances equity with competitiveness.	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			5. Reconsider the “no fiscal impact” statement. Acknowledge that while the total pool may stay flat, downstream costs—like higher turnover, counteroffers, or the need for market adjustments—are likely. Require a lightweight annual fiscal impact report to track these. 6. Emphasize communication and transparency. Mandate that campuses explain how classes are determined each year, and give employees a way to verify or appeal their classification. Transparency prevents suspicion and builds trust.		
116	9/18/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Proposed New Regent Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I agree with the need and intent to create and advance salary equity between university employees; however, the approach proposed in the draft policy is misguided; oversimplifies a complex issue; stands to negatively affect employee recruitment and retention; and has the potential to perpetuate or create new challenges related to salary equity. I agree with much of the feedback and concerns my peers and colleagues – particularly our Human Resources experts with extensive and direct experience in compensation – have articulated. Instead of reiterating the same concerns, I’m offering my ideas about what a proposed policy related to salary adjustments in support of salary equity should include, instead. A more effective policy – or amendments to our existing Regent Policy 11 on Compensation – should: 1. provide a clear framework that defines how elements of compensation - including salary bands/scales, salary positions within ranges, market salary data, and other salary metrics (e.g, compa ratios) – should be	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			factored in decisions about salary adjustments (merit-based or otherwise); 2. include recommendations or a framework for how to address salary challenges that create or perpetuate inequity, including the determination of starting salaries and salary compression or inversion; 3. establish clear recommendations for how to address salary inequity across multiple dimensions, including by protected class; 4. outline clear guidance for how compensable factors (e.g., years of service, education/training credentials, field expertise, etc.) should be accounted for in decisions about salary adjustments; 5. create institutional accountability by establishing processes for evaluating, addressing, and providing transparency about salary equity; and 6. call for changes to related processes that directly affect employee salaries. For example, there is no consistency in performance evaluation criteria within and across positions, which contributes to significantly subjective assessments of performance and contributes to inequitable outcomes in salary increases. Regent Policy 11.A: Compensation Principles already outlines our commitment to all university employees: “the University of Colorado is committed to providing fair and competitive compensation that will attract, retain, and reward a diverse and high-performing workforce with the requisite experience and skills to execute the university’s		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			goals." As proposed, this policy directly contradicts and undermines our university's position and philosophy on compensation.		
117	9/19/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments Though not mentioned, I suggest that some university salaries, initially elevated to compete with strong external markets, should be re-evaluated and lowered if those markets decline. This is rooted in fiscal responsibility and market alignment. CU pays too high a salary to some who initially argued that "market pressure" was a necessary strategy for attracting or keeping top talent. However, when a university only adjusts compensation upward, it creates a moral hazard. The institution – staff, faculty, students, and programs, bear the continued financial burden of an outdated compensation model. Maintaining inflated salaries after a market downturn is unsustainable. In the "real world" the external competitors who were used as the justification for a higher salary, might be downsized or have pay cuts. But in the university, the employees whose compensation benefited now create internal pay inequities and the misallocation of resources, as funds are tied up in salaries that no longer reflect current conditions. Adjusting salaries downward when the market dictates demonstrates a commitment to fair and sustainable compensation practices, ensuring the university can use its resources effectively for its core mission.	Faculty	CU Denver
118	9/19/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments I do not support this policy. I do not think this approach provides for equity. Given our current budget situation and the small percentage increases this policy would only create compression over a long period of time while still only increasing our lowest earners salaries by small percentages each year. This will also limit our ability to attract and retain high performing employees. Some of our higher earners are also performing at the highest levels with massive work loads that continue to increase as budget cuts occur. We will lose our ability to attract the quality employees we need to perform at high levels and our lower earners will not see large enough increases to create any real impact. Equity is also meant to exist within similar jobs and many of the high	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			earning positions are inherently different than the lower earning positions. If someone has performed well for years and continues to perform at a high level they should not be limited to the increases their high performance merits.		
119	9/19/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	RE: Policy 11.F – Salary Adjustment Restrictions While I fully support the university's commitment to equity and fairness in compensation, I have concerns about the implementation of this proposal, particularly as it relates to Category B/C employees. The intent to redistribute merit increases to support lower-paid staff is admirable. However, the rigid cap based on the highest salary in Category B may unintentionally penalize top specialized talent whose contributions are critical to the university's mission and competitiveness. In practice, this approach risks disincentivizing high performance, discouraging retention, and creating barriers to attracting experienced professionals in high-demand fields. Equity should not come at the cost of excellence. I believe a more balanced model—one that supports both fair compensation and strategic retention—would better serve the university in the long term. A possible solution of restricting category C employees to a 3-4% max increase in a year may help curb the gap, without diminishing the reward that is expected when one is managing significantly advanced responsibilities, is a top performer or high achiever.	Staff	CU AMC
120	9/19/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	11.F. Restrictions on Certian Salary Adjustments. I would like to share my perspective regarding the compensation policy, particularly as it relates to long-standing employees. I have been with CU for over 25 years, and during that time, I have experienced multiple periods where raises were not provided due to financial constraints. It also took a significant amount of time for me to be promoted, largely due to funding limitations. While I understand and support many aspects of the current policy, I can't help but feel that employees like myself—who have dedicated decades of service—are being left behind. Despite my commitment and contributions over the years, my compensation does not reflect my	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			experience or role. As an Associate Director with a master's degree, I find it disheartening to see newly hired employees or recent promotions receiving higher salaries, even when they hold only a bachelor's degree. This disparity is especially difficult to reconcile in an institution that promotes the value of higher education. While I recognize I may not fall into the Class C category, I felt it was important to express my concerns and highlight the need to consider equity and recognition for long-term employees who have continued to support the University through both challenging and prosperous times. Thank you for taking the time to consider this feedback.		
121	9/20/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Re: Policy 11.F I am very concerned about this policy. I strong agree with the comments submitted by the systemwide EPUS Committee: "While the Faculty Council Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS) Committee recognizes issues related to salary equity, the proposed policy 11.F appears to be a fundamentally flawed attempt that will not appropriately or meaningfully address them. Moreover, the proposal can have unintended consequences. Our two primary concerns are as follows: 1. This proposal represents a level of micromanagement that is inappropriate for Regent Policy. We believe campus administrators must be able to determine the allocation of merit-based and across-the-board salary increases in the manner that best meets the needs of their campus through consultation with faculty and staff governance groups. Imposing this structure on campuses is an unacceptable level of overreach. Therefore, the committee will not comment on the specifics of the draft as written. 2. The proposed mechanism would result in a worsening of existing compression issues. It will also harm the University's ability to recruit and retain talented personnel. If faculty and staff believe that they will	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			ultimately be penalized for long-term service to the University, they will seek opportunities elsewhere. Furthermore, we are concerned that the proposal will do nothing to address systemic pay inequalities that already exist based on factors such as gender and race. Commenting further on the specifics of this policy draft would lend it a level of credibility that this committee, which takes pride in rigorous policy analysis on behalf of university faculty, does not believe such a fundamentally flawed proposal deserves. We strongly urge the Board of Regents to reject this proposal and end further attempts to "improve" it."		
122	9/20/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments As a health care professional and University faculty member, I have significant concerns that implementation of this policy will limit recruitment and specifically retention of health care professionals, especially physicians and physician-scientist, who will essentially all be in Category C. Physician and physician-scientists chose to work at CU Anschutz Medical Campus because of strong alignment with the mission to advance education, clinical innovation and medical research - often for compensation that is notably different than other health care contexts. Physicians and physician-scientists are essential contributors to a collaborative relationship between the CU School of Medicine and University of Colorado Hospital, as well as leading and/or participating in NIH-funded transdisciplinary science.	Faculty	CU AMC
123	9/21/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This is a poorly crafted policy. Since the raises are generally below or equal to inflation, the net effect is a salary cut with a $100,000 cut off.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
124	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I strongly urge you not to adopt Policy 11.F in its current form. While the intent to address inequities is commendable, the policy is likely to exacerbate our system's longstanding compensation challenges. CU faculty salaries already lag behind market averages across many disciplines. Internal market studies and task forces have consistently shown that a significant share of faculty members are below peer midpoints, with some staff members even falling below minimums. This	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			pay gap already undermines recruitment and retention. Policy 11.F, rather than closing the gap, will likely deepen it by redistributing limited funds in ways that demotivate high performers and accelerate salary compression. Basing raises primarily on lifting the lowest earners' risks renders annual evaluations meaningless. For roughly one-third of our faculty, the time and effort invested in high performance will have little impact on compensation. This not only diminishes morale but may drive away talented faculty who already have more competitive options at peer institutions. The underlying issue—low pay across the CU system—is a real and urgent concern. But this policy's mechanism is flawed. It fails to address broad market deficits and risks creating new problems of compression, inversion, and disengagement. Instead, I encourage the Regents to pursue a comprehensive strategy: increase the overall pool for compensation so both market adjustments and meaningful merit increases are possible; protect strong performance incentives; and implement targeted, discipline-sensitive adjustments where external competition is most significant. Policy 11.F is well-intentioned but ultimately counterproductive. I urge you to reconsider, revise, or delay adoption until a more balanced and sustainable approach is developed.		
125	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regent Law or Policy: Policy 3.F: Evaluations for Officers of the University and Officers of the Administration Comments: Specifically, this is feedback about Policy 11.F which deals with faculty compensation: why would Regents, rather than the relevant campus administrators, decide on compensation questions? I find it inappropriate to have such micromanagement. Besides, using the terminology of "equity," "fairness," and concern for faculty compensation while potentially hurting some faculty and increasing compression over time is Orwellian, to be kind to the Regents and their overreach.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
126	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments: If Proposal 11F passes, my concerns are as follows. First, I am not certain that campuses that are not as financially "well-endowed" as the CU Boulder will be able to satisfy the compensatory adjustments that are proposed, and the risk would appear to be one of requiring permanent faculty lines to be cut unfairly to avoid the non-CU Boulder campuses from creating a deficit in their budgets. Further, while CU Boulder does not historically have "commuter" students, other campuses do, and if students are required to pay more for their tuition may be financially persuaded to seek their undergraduate education at less expensive Colorado institutions. Finally, I am not convinced that this proposal should be the purview of the regents to make.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
127	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Re: Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments 1. This proposal represents a level of micromanagement that is inappropriate for Regent Policy. We believe campus administrators must be able to determine the allocation of merit-based and across-the-board salary increases in the manner that best meets the needs of their campus through consultation with faculty and staff governance groups. Imposing this structure on campuses is an unacceptable level of overreach. Therefore, the committee will not comment on the specifics of the draft as written. 2. The proposed mechanism would result in a worsening of existing compression issues. It will also harm the University's ability to recruit and retain talented personnel. If faculty and staff believe that they will ultimately be penalized for long-term service to the University, they will seek opportunities elsewhere. Furthermore, we are concerned that the proposal will do nothing to address systemic pay inequalities that already exist based on factors such as gender and race.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
128	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments (NEW) I'm concerned that this would take the merit increases to the regent level. It should stay at the campus level so that the campus can come to the conclusion of how to distribute merit increases. This policy seems like it may create issues as the campus level potentially.	Staff	CU Colo Springs

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
129	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Comments: Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments - While I agree with the spirit of this policy, I am curious whether this has been modeled to understand the full implications. For example, will this approach risk creating compression at the top of the pay scale with leaders or reduce our ability to competitively recruit top talent to lead our institutions? If we can set aside concerns about that, then I think it makes sense to invest in our lower paid people in this way - especially since these are often the people closest to students.	Staff	CU Denver
130	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This policy will harm CU and would create more problems than it would solve. This policy disincentivizes merit and will significantly harm morale among high performers. Implementing this policy would seriously damage the Regent's reputation and cause faculty and staff who are performing well to seek employment elsewhere. Please, please listen to the overwhelming negative feedback concerning this proposal and do not implement this policy.	Faculty	CU Denver
131	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	My feedback is regarding Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. I am a new faculty at UCCS, and am really hoping to build a life here. The compensation for my position is already lower than equivalent positions in other institutions, but I accepted it because I loved the area and community here. However, the cap on salary increases for Class C employees will make me fall far behind my peers and make it unsustainable to stay here. I imagine other new hires feel similarly, and I think the school will lose a lot of talent. I hope the policy is reconsidered, as I would REALLY like to make a career in UCCS.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
132	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. I am strongly against the policy. (1, major issue, cannot be fixed) The proposed policy is an overreach and goes beyond the purview of Regents Policies and Regents Laws. (2, major issue, cannot be fixed) The policy will drastically limit salary increase for highest earners. We have enough issues to retain our top employees like this. (3, minor issue, can be fixed) It will reduce the salary pool. Instead of increasing by 2.5% (say), since highest earners will be cut, the overall pool will not increase by 2.5%. The salary pool merit increase should be fully used.	Faculty	CU Denver
133	9/22/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. I am strongly against the policy. (1, major issue, not fixable) This policy is an overreach	Faculty	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			and is beyond the purview of Regents Laws and Regents Policies. (2, major issue, not fixable) It will limit salary increases for highest earners. We have enough issues retaining our top employees (who, in general, earn more). This policy will decrease CU ability to retain top employees. (3, major issue, not fixable) My definition of fairness is that, if your salary brings 2.5% of your salary in the merit salary increase pool, you should get a shot at this 2.5% if you perform on par. (4, minor issue, fixable) if the merit pool is to increase by 2.5%, highest earner will be limited and therefore the total increase for the pool of salary will not be 2.5% but less. The pool of salary will not increased by 2.5%.		
134	9/23/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments This policy will have deleterious impacts on the university's ability to recruit high quality faculty within the professional schools. By limited the growth of their salary, junior faculty will likely move to another university within a few years as their salary growth and potential will not be commensurate with other universities. This will lead to many looking for greater salaries and other employment within just a few years of working with us. This will further increase the amount of expenses associated with hiring faculty, which includes the search process, offloads, startup packages, etc. Please do not support this policy.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
135	9/23/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments The efforts behind this policy proposal are understandable. Indeed, we take great efforts each academic year to review the salary bands and address salary compression issues during the budget planning sessions for each academic fiscal year. Nonetheless, the 2024 average faculty salary at research intensive CU System universities are below other R1 doctoral universities across faculty rank categories (American Association of University Professors, annual Faculty Compensation Survey). Therefore, Policy 11.F - if implemented - would result in the CU System becoming less competitive over time in our efforts to attract and retain the most productive faculty members. Given the current degradation of the professoriate as a career path as a result of evolving national policies and priorities, constraining our options to attract the best faculty would be a strategic error regarding long-term workforce development and national competitiveness.	Adminstrator	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
136	9/24/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	My comments are in response to a review of the proposed BOR Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments and include the following key concerns with this proposed BOR policy. 1) The current Regents Policy 11 emphasizes "competitive pay with relevant external job markets" to attract, retain, and reward a "high-performing workforce with the requisite experience and skills to execute the university's goals." I believe the proposed 11.F policy undermines that effort. Market-competitive compensation practices are not just vital for clinical faculty recruitment and retention, but for all employees (staff, faculty and research personnel) working in multiple fields and disciplines on campus. 2) A rigid percentile ranking system such as the one proposed, diminishes merit-based salary adjustments for higher wage workers. This penalizes employees in higher paying jobs and risks employees feeling undervalued, or punished, for being in those higher-paying roles that are most often determined by discipline/field of work (e.g. software engineers, attorneys, campus architects, enrollment managers, etc.) 3) There is risk of demotivation for higher paid employees which may result in employees coming to CU only to exit to other external employers who continue to compensate based on market value for their role once they attain a certain level of experience (e.g., years of service, degree/certification attainment, promotion, etc.). 4) A top-down percentile mandate risks sidelining our thoughtful and responsive compensation decisions in favor of a one-size fits all formula that fails to recognize that CU does not operate in a vacuum. While income disparity is a legitimate societal issue, CU seeking to address this issue in a silo will only disadvantage our institution at a time when higher education and research is already under significant pressures from federal transition impacts.	Adminstrator	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			5) The proposed language does not contemplate a true merit-based annual salary adjustment pool. As written, the proposed language may result in demotivation within the Class A grouping. The language implies that all Class A employees would receive the merit pool designation as a minimum and uses 2.5% as an example. In order for higher performing employees rated between 3 to 5 on the performance appraisal scale to receive more than 2.5%, employees with ineligible performance ratings of 1 or 2 are skipped. However, the drafted language does not address employees that are underperforming. As written, this would result in less funds being available for highly rated employees in the bottom third to receive an increase larger than the minimum merit pool. CU Anschutz has worked diligently to ensure increases in minimum wage for all staff positions over the last four years, along with special salary adjustment pools to address compression and market alignment gaps. These funds have been separate from the annual merit pool and were designed to elevate the salaries of our lowest wage employees and move them toward the mid-point or higher of the market salary range for their job profile/discipline. In summary, while minimizing salary disparities can feel equitable, the proposed percentile-based mechanism erodes core compensation principles of competitiveness and performance alignment. It risks unintended consequences such as demotivation in higher paid disciplines at a time when we need to keep our seasoned employees motivated to stay in higher education, research and healthcare. Highly trained and experienced staff are the keepers of institutional knowledge that is critical in responding to the current onslaught of federal transition impacts. There are alternative approaches that could be considered by the BORs if they are seeking to minimize what they view as an outsized annual salary adjustment to base salary for our highest earners.		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			I recommend that this draft should not move forward at this time. Thoughtful dialogue and collaboration with campus compensation specialists should be prioritized to ensure any proposed language involving compensation practices and principles is well-informed and appropriately developed. Additionally, any future efforts should preserve the flexibility to maintain an individualized approach that reflects the unique needs and contexts of each campus. Thank you for the opportunity to share feedback.		
137	9/24/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments will have a negative effect on faculty commitment and retention, particularly in certain schools. Please do not pass/implement this policy. Thanks.	Faculty	CU Boulder
138	9/25/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	With due respect, draft Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments is a bad idea, and it should not be implemented. It would lead to negative unintended consequences for the university system--and particularly CU Boulder. Specifically, it would reduce our competitiveness as an institution by undermining our ability to retain top faculty and staff. CU already over-relies on the 'sunshine premium' of Colorado to offer compensation that is often below market rates relative to large state system peers. This change would worsen an already problematic state of affairs. Typically, our most highly paid faculty and staff are highly paid because they are high performing contributors in roles that are highly competitive: if they do not feel well acknowledged, well compensated, and well taken care of by CU, many of them can--and may--move to other institutions. If we lose our star faculty and most instrumental staff, we will hollow out the core of our institution. In order to prevent such outcomes, the likely consequence of policy 11.F would be that many academic units may start engaging in regulatory arbitrage to enable them to offer merit-based compensation increases necessary to retain their top people. Such ad hoc arbitrage will result in inconsistencies that are the opposite of improved equity, which is the stated aim of the policy. Compensation at CU is already very 'flat,' the proposed policy will further reduce the institution's ability to reward outperformance. Any gains in perceived equity would be more than offset by eroding our	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			competitiveness and encouraging end-running of the rules. Please do not implement Policy 11.F as proposed.		
139	9/25/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. This will create an unnecessary administrative burden to the merit process to track and to ensure compliance. Additionally, salaries do not keep up with inflation, and the proposed policy seems to penalize folks who may be higher compensated. (It is possible that those folks are the only income-generating member of their household.) This policy will also create greater salary compression issues (which already exist). Also, our distinguished faculty will seek positions in other universities if their salaries are not comparable to their peers.	Staff	CU Boulder
140	9/25/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	Regarding Policy 11(f): I respectfully and adamantly disagree with this proposed policy because it appears to limit the University's ability to attract and/or retain top teaching talent. The University should strive to keep its best and brightest instead of unreasonably imposing a cap that attempts to redistribute compensation in the name of "equity." Not all faculty members are created equal; as in any institution, some are great, some are not. Our goal here should be to continue striving for excellence, rather than embracing mediocrity, and the implications of enacting this policy could have deep, far-reaching consequences by potentially leading to a brain drain among the University's top faculty members, which will then lower the quality of education offered to students and, over time, make our University a less desirable institution for applicants and employers. Please explore creative means to supplementing compensation of high-achieving but underpaid faculty members instead of enacting a system that, in essence, penalizes those on the upper end of the compensation spectrum.	Faculty	CU Boulder
141	9/26/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am concerned about the negative impact this policy would have on the College of Business' ability to recruit new faculty as it would weaken our already under-market compensation package. Restricting raises would also lead to pay compression, reducing morale among existing faculty.	Faculty	CU Colo Springs
142	9/30/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I am commenting on Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments. I believe that this proposed policy is a great way for CU to lose many of their most hardworking staff and faculty to either industry or to another college where they will be paid what they are worth. From what I am	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			understanding from this policy and the justification behind it, the university is seeking to reduce pay inequities, which in and of itself is a worthy cause. However, to do this by simply stating that a number of employees will no longer be eligible for increases to their salary, with respect to what they are currently making, no matter how well they are performing, while another set of employees will be given increases regardless of how poorly they are performing is ridiculous. This policy is essentially spitting in the face of any employee who has worked hard, advocated for themselves in terms of their salary and who has been dedicated to the university by staying with CU for many years, because now, no matter how hard they work, their merit raises will be limited, while at the same time, no matter how poorly another employee performs, they will be rewarded because they are in Class A. CU already doesn't give out inflation-based increases each year, and employees must rely on a favorable merit review score to receive a meager merit-based increase, which may or may not keep up with inflation. Now, to say that the university would then limit certain people's raises even further?? That is ridiculous. If CU wants to reduce inequities for employees, while not outright insulting employees who work hard and care about their jobs, then they should institute an annual inflation-based increase for ALL employees, to help all employees keep up with the cost of living, and then institute separate merit-based increases for employees who perform well on their annual reviews. But to institute a policy that punishes the employees in Class C who have worked hard, negotiated their contracts, advocated for their wages, and who are dedicated to this university by outright limiting what increases they will receive each year, while rewarding employees in Class A who perform poorly, and are not committed to their jobs tells me that this university and our Regents do not actually care to foster a workplace where hard work and dedication are rewarded. Instead the Regents would rather lose the employees who do care (because I guarantee that if this policy is instituted, people will leave) in order to pretend as though they are solving all salary inequity issues.		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			I urge the Board of Regents to reconsider this policy before they institute something that will inevitably drive away all of their best employees.		
143	10/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	While Regent VanDriel's initiative to address salary equity across the University of Colorado system is commendable and reflects a genuine concern for fairness, the current proposal appears to have been developed with limited stakeholder engagement and lacks the necessary nuance to be effective across the diverse university landscape. It is encouraging to see that both faculty and staff are included in the scope of the proposal. However, the framework does not sufficiently differentiate between high-performing, mission-critical employees and those who may not meet performance expectations. This lack of distinction risks undermining the University's ability to attract, retain, and reward top talent—particularly at institutions like the Anschutz Medical Campus, where the stakes are exceptionally high. Our faculty and staff are not only advancing academic excellence but also directly impacting public health outcomes. Recruiting and retaining such individuals requires a compensation strategy that reflects the complexity and competitiveness of their roles. The policy seems to support our Chancellor's vision in terms of equity, compliance, and ethical culture, but it conflicts with goals of talent acquisition, retention, and innovation competitiveness. While the proposal may improve retention among lower-paid employees and help address pay disparities, several critical concerns remain unaddressed: 1. Performance Incentives: The model does not account for high-performing individuals who may fall into Category C, potentially disincentivizing excellence. 2. Accountability and Advancement: Category A employees face no clear incentive to improve or maintain satisfactory performance, which could hinder managerial efforts to address underperformance. 3. Career Progression: There is no recognition of job classifications, educational attainment, or promotional pathways, which are essential to a fair and motivating compensation structure.	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			4. Inflationary Pressures: The proposal does not address inflation, and current salary increases are insufficient to keep pace with rising costs of living. 5. Funding Mechanism: Merit pool funding currently comes from individual departments rather than centralized sources. This creates inequities, as departments with limited budgets may struggle to meet the proposal's requirements without additional support. 6. Faculty vs. Staff Salary Structures: The proposal does not distinguish between faculty and staff salary structures, which vary significantly in scale, market competitiveness, and job function. Without separating these categories, comparisons become misleading—akin to comparing apples to oranges—resulting in flawed equity assessments and policy decisions. These gaps suggest that the proposal, while well-intentioned, may inadvertently create new challenges and inequities. A more holistic and data-informed approach—one that incorporates performance metrics, market competitiveness, and departmental resource disparities—is essential to ensure that any changes to the salary structure truly support the University's mission and long-term sustainability. In short, while reform is needed, this proposal in its current form may do more harm than good. A collaborative, transparent process involving faculty, staff, and administrative leadership would be a more effective path forward.		
144	10/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	We, the undersigned faculty of the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Center Faculty Assembly, respectfully submit this statement in opposition to the proposed Regent Policy 11.F, which seeks to restrict annual merit-based and across-the-board salary adjustments for the highest-paid third of employees on each campus. While we support efforts to promote equity and transparency in compensation, we believe this policy sets a dangerous precedent that undermines the University's ability to retain, reward, and motivate its most experienced and productive faculty members. We are concerned this proposed policy punishes long-term commitment and performance, disincentivizes excellence and leadership, threatens retention and	Faculty	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			institutional stability, encourages uniformity over equity, and will have unintended consequences for academic units — particularly those on the Anschutz Medical Campus. We offer the following concerns: 1. Punishing Long-Term Commitment and Performance Many faculty members who now fall into the "Classification C" tier have spent decades contributing to the University's mission—often enduring years of modest percentage-based raises as junior faculty. These colleagues accepted lower early-career compensation with the understanding that sustained excellence would eventually be rewarded. This policy reverses that promise and penalizes those who have consistently delivered high-impact teaching, research, clinical care, and service. 2. Disincentivizing Excellence and Leadership By capping merit-based increases for higher-paid faculty, the policy removes incentives for continued high performance. It risks creating a culture where excellence is no longer rewarded, and where leadership roles—often accompanied by higher salaries—are disincentivized due to stagnant compensation. 3. Threat to Retention and Institutional Stability Faculty in Classification C include many mid- and late-career scholars whose expertise, mentorship, and leadership are vital to the University's academic reputation. Limiting their salary growth will make CU less competitive nationally and may accelerate attrition to institutions that value and reward experience appropriately. 4. Equity Should Not Mean Uniformity We agree that salary equity is a worthy goal. However, equity must be pursued through transparent market analyses, equity reviews, and targeted support for underpaid faculty, not through blanket restrictions that ignore merit, market value, and disciplinary differences. 5. Unintended Consequences for Academic Units This policy may inadvertently affect units with higher external salary benchmarks (e.g., engineering, law, medicine), making it harder to recruit and retain top talent. It also risks creating internal disparities where faculty with similar roles and contributions are compensated differently based solely on percentile rankings.		
145	10/7/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	These "annual merit-based, base building" salary adjustments should remain performance-based. "Merit-based" refers to a system that is based on objective qualifications, skills, and achievements. If you are	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			restricting a group of employees from earning above a certain percentage, you remove the incentive to go above and beyond. Find a way to properly compensate Group A without limiting Group C, as Group C is likely highly qualified to work elsewhere, and will leave for other opportunities when you limit their growth potential.		

145	10/7/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	These “annual merit-based, base building” salary adjustments should remain performance-based. “Merit-based” refers to a system that is based on objective qualifications, skills, and achievements. If you are restricting a group of employees from earning above a certain percentage, you remove the incentive to go above and beyond. Find a way to properly compensate Group A without limiting Group C, as Group C is likely highly qualified to work elsewhere, and will leave for other opportunities when you limit their growth potential.	Staff	CU System
146	10/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I disagree with this approach and believe it will encourage our most long-term employees to change employers due to the restrictions on the high earning employees.	Staff	CU Boulder
147	10/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	One of the major differences between US universities and those in other countries (eg Europe) is that US universities reward achievement through variable merit increases rather than a standard rate for all faculty. This proposal undermines this incentive and would lead to a significant drop in output and effort on the CU campuses. It would also encourage flight from high-achieving faculty whose salary raises are capped in this policy. It would also discriminate against faculty with a long-standing commitment to CU and lead to further salary compression. If compression is the goal, this policy certainly encourages it. I would have thought that a Republican regent would encourage effort and achievement and match those traits to compensation. It is one of the worst ideas that I have seen is US higher academic circles.	Faculty	CU Boulder
148	10/10/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	It is clear this policy could have significant implications for how performance and loyalty to the University are recognized and rewarded across the campus community. This policy obviously may undermine merit-based advancement at all levels, erode employee morale—especially among long-serving staff—and further limit the autonomy of department and program leaders to retain and reward their teams effectively. This seems like in trying to	Faculty	CU Boulder

			solve one problem (pay inequities) it is potentially creating many other unintended challenges and ultimately punishing longstanding employees.		
149	10/11/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	I support this policy draft, given that the highest earners increase in salary would not exceed the lower earners increase. This does ensure a more equitable salary distribution. However, the Regents are also encouraged to limit unreasonably high offers to new administrator positions in the upcoming years, such that the increase in the administration's pay is in fact in line with the actual historial increase in pay of the middle earners.	Faculty	CU Boulder
150	10/12/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	As a faculty member at CU Boulder, I have two main concerns with this proposed policy. 1) It disincentives high performing faculty by not rewarding high research impact faculty who regularly make higher than average salaries (usually due to outside offers). We already have enough problems we faculty not being rewarded for high performance in their jobs and this policy will further erode any incentives for faculty to excel in research, teaching and service. 2) It will make recruiting and retaining faculty considerably harder than it already is. Without the ability to offer merit and cost-of-living salary adjustments, we will quickly fall below market salaries and thus lose faculty to other schools as well as make recruiting difficult. The high cost of living in Boulder makes this even more challenging already.	Faculty	CU Boulder