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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

1. The attached bill, entitled **Endorsement of Recommendations in the Senate Salary Committee Statement on the AAUP Salary Report of 7 February 1964** is hereby forwarded to you for your consideration.

2. The official original and eight copies for your use are attached.

3. This bill was approved by vote of the Faculty Senate on 20 Feb. 1964.

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 (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 returned disapproved by the President, or unless referendum is petitioned for by the Faculty, or unless the President decides to forward it, with his approval, to the Board of Trustees for their approval. If it is to be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

   25 February 1964
   (date)
   Robert W. Harrison
   (Signature) Chairman, Faculty Senate

Endorsement 1.

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

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

   (date) (Signature) President, University of R.I.

Continued on reverse side.
Alternate Endorsement 1.

From: The President, University of Rhode Island
To: The Chairman, Faculty Senate
1. Returned.
3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Trustees would not be desired by the Board and is unnecessary.

(date) (Signature) President, University of R.I.

Endorsement 2.

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

(date) (Signature)

(Office)

Endorsement 3.

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

(date) (Signature) President, University of R.I.

Received 9 March 1964 (Signature) Chairman, Faculty Senate

Original forwarded to Secretary of the Senate and Registrar, E. Farrell, for filing in the archives of the University.
Salary Committee Statement on the AAUP Salary Report of 7 February 1964

The first recommendation of the AAUP report calls for a continuing investigation of the average salaries in each rank at the ten North Atlantic Public institutions. The salary committee regards this as a prime obligation. It will continue to gather such information each year and will make this information available to the faculty. Our information source is the U.S. Office of Education. This agency publishes salary statistics each year for eleven North Atlantic Public Institutions including C.C.N.Y. The Senate has voted, at the president's request, to exclude C.C.N.Y. from the list because it is not comparable to the other ten Land-Grant Institutions. There will always be a delay in getting figures excluding C.C.N.Y. because this requires a special service calculation for us by the U.S. Office of Education.

At this time the Senate Salary Committee can present figures comparing us with eleven North Atlantic Institutions including C.C.N.Y. for the information of the faculty. It is reasonable to assume that the figures will not be changed substantially when C.C.N.Y. is excluded. This applies particularly to the rate of increase of the average over last year and is not as true with regard to total salary averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary--Av. Increase</td>
<td>Av. Salary--Av. Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>$11,554 $977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>9,449 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>7,904 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>6,420 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,580 $1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,350 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,550 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,130 510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there is a one-year lag in these figures for the North Atlantic Institutions. Until we receive the later figures from our Division of Institutional Research these statistics should be regarded as a trend indication. It has been our observation, however, that the slopes of salary curves for the average of eleven institutions has not changed appreciably. It would appear that our salary increases during this three-year period of 1962-1965 are enabling us to just about keep up with the North Atlantic Institutions with which the U.S. Office of Education compares us.

The second recommendation of the AAUP report calls for a continuing increase in the amount requested for salary increases in view of the fact that the size of the faculty is increasing each year. The Faculty Senate endorses this view and regards this as an automatic feature which should not require endorsement by the Senate but rather automatic implementation by the administration in its asking budget each year. Part II of the AAUP report merely restates the policy of salary increases which was recommended by
the Senate last year. We are in accord with the AAUP report in endorsement of this method for the next fiscal year. Part III of the AAUP report recommends larger sums of salary money to be requested on the grounds that more than 90% of the faculty are deserving of a normal increment. The Senate Salary Committee's position on this matter is that we have suggested a sum of money for salary increases which will enable us to keep up with comparable schools. We do not believe that we should ask for larger sums because such requests would be in violation of our tentative agreement with the President of the University. In short, we regard the distribution of the total sum of money for salary increases to be an administrative matter. We believe, however, that it is the responsibility of the salary committee to make suggestions to the administration concerning methods of distribution of salary increase which we think will be satisfactory to most of our faculty members. The salary committee believes that in a situation of limited funds for salary increases that most of the faculty would favor a system of allocating the special increment first to every one in accordance with the plan. Then, the Board of Review should grant the normal increment to every faculty member who is truly deserving after rigorous evaluation of his performance by the Board of Review. (It should be noted that such a review might result in denial of the normal increment to two per cent of the faculty or it could result in denial of the increment to twenty per cent of the faculty. The percentage of recipients would depend upon standards of performance set by the Board of Review and not upon the limitation of funds.

Any additional money allocated for salary increases should be used for merit increases.

Some faculty members believe that last year some of the department chairmen were told that one or two members of their department could not get the normal increment because of limitation of funds and that it was necessary for that department chairman to select the members of his department who were to be denied the normal increment. This is not administration of the increment system in accordance with the faculty manual. Such a policy can lead to a system of rotation of normal increments within a department and is highly undesirable from an administrative point of view. The Faculty Senate Salary Committee requests that the Board of Review adopt a policy as outlined in this statement.

Part IV of the AAUP report is regarded by the Senate Salary Committee as an administrative matter. We think that a special committee for each case in which a normal increment is denied might be administratively cumbersome. We do believe, however, that department chairmen should notify with full candor the department
member who is denied a normal increment.

Part V of the AAUP report is regarded by the Senate Salary Committee as an administrative matter. The Senate made a similar recommendation to the president last year. He refused to implement it. We consider that to be his prerogative.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Owens
Dorothy Massey
John Hatch
Eugene Winslow, Chairman
Professor Robert W. Harrison  
Chairman, Faculty Senate  
Ranger Hall, Campus  

Dear Bob:

I am returning to you the original of Senate Action, Serial #20, neither signed nor unsigned. This is one of those situations in which your transmittal form is not appropriate.

The Senate proposals were discussed at great length by the Board of Review. It was our consensus that it would not be the wisest way to allocate the funds that were available for faculty increases in salary. The administration continues to accept as its salary goal the bringing up of the average URI salaries to the average of those for the eleven Northeastern public universities, excluding the City University of New York. We are pleased to note that we have made some progress toward this goal in the current year, as a result of action taken on salaries for this year. According to last year’s figures, we were behind in this average in the following percentages for each rank: professors, 8.1, associate professors, 1.8, assistant professors, 3.7, instructors 2.4. The figures for this year, just provided by the Office of Institutional Research, show that the figures are now 7% for professors, 1.3% for associate professors, .05% for assistant professors, and 3.2% for instructors. We have bettered our record in the three top ranks and for assistant professors we have actually erased the difference that existed. We must continue to work to meet the goal and I have informed the Board of Trustees that next year we must have another special appropriation to help us do this. We shall, therefore, continue to study the average salaries in each rank at the ten North Atlantic public institutions as is recommended by the Senate. I would point out, incidentally, that the fact we have bettered our position this year makes the statement incorrect that we are enabled "to just about keep up with the North Atlantic institutions with which the U.S. Office of Education compares us."

We are continuing to request more money each year for salary purposes and will continue to do so. On the other hand, the original request made by the Senate to the administration was to obtain about $100,000 each year for three years, which was estimated necessary to bring us into line with the averages in the other institutions. We were not asked, and we did not promise, to request an amount to make a double increment available every year to every member of the faculty, but more money was requested to handle the increments.

No percentage figure has ever been set with regard to the percentage of the faculty who "are deserving of a normal increment." The Board of Review considered every case on its merit and we had no idea how many we were actually withholding until the meeting was over. It then turned out to be approximately 6% of the faculty
who did not receive their normal annual increments. I believe that, judging by the careful consideration of each of these cases, the decision was correct. Let me assure the Senate that the belief of some faculty members, as reported in the AAUP statement, is not the way that the increment system is being administered. There will be no "system of rotation of normal increments within a department." Like the faculty, we believe that this would be an undesirable system. We concur that in some years there might not be more than a handful of increments withheld; some years there might be as many as 15 or 20% as the Senate statement states, but I would be much surprised if it ever got that high. Personally, I think most of our faculty are on the ball and doing a satisfactory job. We are justified in withholding increments, under the present system, only when faculty members are not performing satisfactorily or are substantially below what could reasonably be expected of them, even though it might not be possible to say that they were doing an unsatisfactory job.

I am not quite certain that the way the Board of Review voted to distribute the money for salary increases, a proposal which was approved by the Board, was actually in contradiction of the recommendation of the AAUP Salary Committee, as endorsed by the Senate. The AAUP Committee reports that "the Salary Committee believes that in a situation of limited funds for salary increases that most of the faculty would favor a system of allocating the special increment first to everyone, in accordance with the plan." In effect, this is what we did. We had $100,000 in the budget for "a pay plan adjustment." In terms of the number of faculty that we have, this made an across-the-board adjustment possible for every member of the faculty; that is, $50 below the normal annual increment for academic-year people and $65 beneath the normal annual increment for calendar-year people. In other words, the across-the-board adjustment, which goes to every member of the faculty, is, according to rank, in the academic-year, $350 for professors, $250 for associate professors, $200 for assistant professors, and $150 for instructors. The figures for the calendar-year are $395, $280, $220, and $165.

The normal annual increment was awarded to everyone except the approximately 6% from whom it was withheld. We did not, however, utilize the balance of money available for merit increases. This would be a violation of the purpose for which the merit increase was established by the Board of Trustees. The Board set this up to provide additional compensation for individuals of exceptional ability or especially meritorious performance. On the basis of the Senate arguments last year, we were agreed that we were including too much money in the budget to make merit increases available only to those with "exceptional ability and especially meritorious performance." However, no percentage, again, was stated. We went through the faculty and considered each case on its merit. In the end, forty-nine individuals were given a single merit and one individual was given a double merit. This amounts to approximately 14% of the faculty. In our opinion, it would have been a flagrant violation of the merit principle to provide only as many merit increases as there was money left over from the other salary arrangements.
As a result of the salary adjustments voted by the Board of Trustees after consideration of individual cases by the Board of Review, members of our faculty will have salary advances ranging from a minimum of $150 for instructors to a maximum of $1,135 for full professors. In a few cases where individuals have been promoted, the actual increases may amount to more than this top figure because of the necessity of bringing someone up to the minimum for his rank. These have not yet been computed. I would point out that, in salary improvement for our faculty for the coming year, there will be allocated $237,000. This does not include any administrators or allied academic personnel, such as librarians. For a faculty of approximately 350 members, this is not an inconsiderable sum. It will, we hope, help to bring us closer to the objective we have agreed upon for URI salaries. Incidentally, the chairman of the Senate Salary Committee, Professor Winslow, met with the Board of Review before the decision was made final, and succeeded in getting the amount of money allocated to salaries for next year increased. He felt that it should have been increased somewhat more, however, and, had he wished to do so, would have had an opportunity to go before the Board of Trustees. On the basis of our compromise solution I think that he was wise, as I feel certain that the Board, having suffered a cut in a very tight budget of $156,000, would have been disinclined to do more than they had originally committed themselves to do. They have met the original commitment of a normal annual increment for everyone, less those from whom it could be reasonably justified in withholding, and a full $100,000 for an across-the-board increase for everyone. Merit increases, in addition, have been provided for all those for whom the Board of Review recommended this special treatment.

We have agreed that each person from whom a normal increment has been withheld will have the reasons explained to him by his dean. The Senate report recommended that this be done by the departmental chairman.

I appreciate the Senate decision on Part 5 of the AAUP report. Were this endorsed by the Senate, I would once again have to return it to the Senate unapproved. I believe that the recommendation was unsound and have not had any evidence brought to my attention that would lead me to reverse that decision.

I hope that this fully explains the action on salary in connection with Senate Action, Serial #20.

Cordially yours,

Francis H. Horn
President

P.S. I should have made it clear that the recommendations of the Senate regarding salaries were presented to the Board.