

FEEDBACK RECEIVED BY OPE¹ ON LAWS AND POLICIES CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW
(as of 9/5/2025)

#	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
			<p>implemented to include all system salaries from student employees 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
5	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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.</p> <p>Negative Impact on Retention and Engagement</p> <p>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 mention, many of these top earners may supervise large teams or have more complex areas of expertise required.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 ignore that. Doing so would completely throw off the framework that the campuses spent years building.</p>	Staff	CU AMC

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
6	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>RE: Draft and Proposed Policy 11F</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>promote through their career and move through classifications, it will reduce their salary growth and they'll be incentivized to leave.</p> <p>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.</p>		
7	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Policy 11f Restrictions on Certian Salary Adjustments</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Staff	CU Denver

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I respectfully encourage the Board to consider alternative approaches that promote equity while preserving flexibility and competitiveness. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 <p>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.</p>		
8	9/2/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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</p>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Staff	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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?</p> <p>The same example could be made for staff in comparing the CFO to the food server in the residence hall.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
11	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments -</p> <p>What if an employee in classification A is under-performing? It seems that merit considerations are being ignored by this policy.</p> <p>-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?</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-This policy seems overly broad, focuses too much on internal controls, and does not give any consideration to market factors.</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder
12	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>"Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments"</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder
13	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Out of fear of retribution and retaliation, I'm not including my name or email.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>1) This policy harms long time servicing staff</p> <p>2) This policy will cause faculty retention costs to increase exponentially</p>	Staff	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>3) As one of the largest employers in the State of Colorado, other entities will look to this policy and harm their own workers</p> <p>4) This policy will create complacency within the top leadership of each campus as there is no longer monetary incentive to produce outstanding work</p> <p>5) This policy will create additional open records actions and claims against the University.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>7) Equity and Merit are two completely different things and cutting Merit to fund Equity harms everyone</p> <p>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</p>		
14	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Comments in response to Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>performance-aligned compensation models.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
15	9/4/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Policy 11.F Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments</p> <p>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.</p>	Staff	CU System

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>While there are many elements of this policy proposal that will have an adverse impact, I'd like to focus on two in particular.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide my insight. I request that this proposed policy be reconsidered.</p>		
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
			<p>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.</p> <p>2. Caps remove performance/merit from raises, signaling that excellence is not valued.</p> <p>3. Raises already lag inflation; this cap effectively reduces real pay for those affected.</p>		
17	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder
18	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Feedback on Policy 11.F Proposal</p> <p>While I appreciate the intent of promoting pay equity across the university system, I have several concerns about the unintended consequences of this policy:</p> <p>1. Undermining Merit-Based Incentives Merit pay, by definition, is intended to reward exceptional performance. By capping increases for the highest earners, the policy</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>\$175,000 salary = 1.4% raise \$250,000 salary = 1.0% raise \$400,000 salary = 0.6% raise</p>		

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
19	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Supporters of this proposal should be advised: it will affect most faculty and the effect will compound over time.</p>		
20	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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.</p> <p>By imposing restrictions that effectively penalize high performers in the upper salary tiers, the university will create barriers to hiring,</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
21	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>Dear Sir, dear Madam,</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>I believe this policy is misguided, both in its objective and in its scope. Here is why:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Second, this policy will undermine the competitiveness of CU Boulder. Top faculty and staff are often in demand across institutions.</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

#	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	<p>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.</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder
23	9/5/2025	Policy 11.F: Restrictions on Certain Salary Adjustments	<p>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</p>	Faculty	CU Boulder

#	Date Received	Article/Policy	Feedback	Affiliation	Campus
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		
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
			<p>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</p> <p>(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, my 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.</p>		