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Transmittal Form for Bills Approved by the Faculty Senate

From: The Chairman, Faculty Senate.
To: The President, Dr. Francis H. Horn

2. The official original and eight copies for your use are attached.
3. This bill was approved by vote of the Faculty Senate on **June 6, 1963**.
4. After your consideration, will you kindly indicate your approval or disapproval, as appropriate, and either return it or forward it to the Board of Trustees, as you may deem appropriate, completing the appropriate endorsement below.
5. Attention is invited to the fact that this bill will become effective on **June 22, 1963** (three weeks after its approval by the Senate), in accordance with paragraph 8.2 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate as amended, or in accordance with provisions of the bill, unless it is disapproved by the President or by the Board of Trustees, or unless referendum is petitioned for by the Faculty.

---

**Endorsement I.**

From: The President, University of Rhode Island
To: The Chairman, Board of Trustees of State Colleges

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

---

**Alternate Endorsement I.**

From: The President, University of Rhode Island
To: The Chairman, Faculty Senate.

1. Returned.
2. Approved _____, Disapproved _____.
3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Trustees would not be desired by the Board and is unnecessary.

---

(Continued on reverse side.)
Endorsement 2.

From: The Board of Trustees of State Colleges.
To: The Chairman, Faculty Senate.
Via: The President, University of Rhode Island.

1. Returned.
2. Approved _____. Disapproved _____.

(Date) (Signature)

(Office)

Endorsement 3.

From: The President, University of Rhode Island
To: The Chairman, Faculty Senate.

1. Forwarded. Approved by Board of Trustees, Sept. 4, 1963,
   with provision that new salaries become effective with the
   academic year 1964-65.

   Sept. 4, 1963
   (Signature) President, University of R.I.

Received 5. Sept. 1963

(Date) (Signature) Chairman, Faculty Senate.
Recommendations:

1. It is recommended that, in order to maintain our present relative position with regard to the ten North Atlantic Public Universities, the same faculty salary increases be given for the fiscal year 1964-1965 as have been given for fiscal year 1963-1964, and that the sum of $245,000 plus the proper additional sums for new positions, etc. be requested for faculty salary increases for 1964-1965.

2. It is recommended that the following hourly rate schedule of compensation in extension teaching be introduced at the earliest possible time:

- Instructors and assistant professors: $13 per hour
- Associate and full professors: $16 per hour

Pertinent information on which the recommendations are based.

Recommendation 1.

Comparative salary figures for 1962-1963 for ten North Atlantic Public Universities* have been presented to the University of Rhode Island by the U.S. Office of Education. The information is furnished excluding the professional schools of the universities and is for academic year personnel only. These figures are in column B below, and the other columns contain data for comparisons as indicated.

Average Salaries in Each Rank at Ten North Atlantic Public Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$10,416</td>
<td>$10,380</td>
<td>$11,260</td>
<td>$11,230</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assit.</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>6,307</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. 4 ranks</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>URI 1962-1963</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$10,416</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assit.</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Senate approved a salary committee report earlier this year which dropped C.C.N.Y. as one of the eleven North Atlantic Public Universities with which we are classified by the U.S. Office of Education. Because C.C.N.Y. has a high salary scale, this omission of C.C.N.Y. from the eleven universities dropped the averages in each rank at the ten remaining universities to a level where the differentials between U.R.I. and the ten universities in the three lower ranks are not very large. In the full professor rank, however, the differential is still appreciable. This is shown in column F above.

The omission of C.C.N.Y. from comparison purposes did not have much influence on the rate at which the averages in each rank are increasing. This is shown by column C, which indicates the increase in the averages in each rank at the ten universities in a one-year period. Column D shows the increases which were predicted by the Senate Salary Committee on the basis of salary trends of these institutions for the last three years. It should be noted that in each case the slope of the salary curves has increased during the last year.

In order to continue to maintain our present relative position with regard to the ten North Atlantic Public Universities, it will be necessary for the University to ask for and receive essentially the same salary increases for the fiscal year 1964-1965 which have been allocated for fiscal 1963-1964. The salary increases for 1963-1964 will do little more than help us to maintain our present position, because our competing schools increased their salaries at approximately the same rate in the preceding year.

Pertinent to Recommendation 2.

On an hourly basis the rate of compensation in extension teaching is considerably below the rate for on-campus teaching. The extension division has been successful in the past in attracting superior teachers from the Kingston campus because of the desire of these teachers for extra compensation. The percentage of Kingston faculty members among the total faculty of the extension division is declining at present. In order to continue to attract top quality teachers from the Kingston campus to extension division teaching, it is highly desirable that extension teaching rates be raised as soon as possible.
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