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UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION

Approved by the Faculty Senate

TO: President Francis H. Horn
FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The attached RESOLUTION, titled Report of the Salary Committee, (as amended) with three recommendations concerning 1) the distribution of salary adjustment funds, 2) the basis for the salary adjustment item in the asking budget, and 3) the President's reaction to the Senate proposal (Jan. 10, 1963) dealing with the basic contract time period, is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.

3. This RESOLUTION was approved by vote of the Faculty Senate on January 20, 1966.

4. After considering this resolution, will you please indicate your approval, disapproval or other comment and return the original copy, completing the endorsement below.

February 1, 1966
Chairman of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: The University President

1. Returned. □ Parts (1) (2) □ Action deferred on Part (3)
2. Approved □ Disapproved □ Other (explanation attached) □

(date)
President Francis H. Horn

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

(date)
Chairman of the Faculty Senate

Form approved 11/65
UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Faculty Senate Salary Committee Report
January 20, 1965

A. Committee Recommendations:

The committee makes the following recommendations:

1) The $135,000 in salary adjustment funds should be allocated to the respective ranks in the following way:

   Professors      $50,000
   Assoc. Prof.    41,500
   Asst. Prof.     34,000
   Instructors     9,500

   (This would increase the average salary level of the various ranks by about: 500, 300, 275, 125 dollars respectively.)

2) The Administration should use the salary goal agreed upon, namely, that average salaries for each rank shall equal those of other North Atlantic state universities, as basis for the salary adjustment item in its asking budget.

3) The basic contract for all faculty members shall be based on the academic year (9 months) with service for the remaining months contracted individually.

B. Comments:

The Senate Salary Committee has again this year accepted the task of giving advice on how to allocate the salary adjustment funds requested in the asking budget among the various ranks of the university faculty. This task is becoming increasingly difficult due to lack of consistency in the series on salaries obtained by the Administration from the other North Atlantic State Universities. Last year the Universities of Delaware and Maryland did not report, this year those two reported but Pennsylvania State University and the University of Connecticut did not report. This inconsistency makes it difficult to obtain reliable data. Salary projections for universities not reporting could be made, but this committee receives the salary data from the other universities through the Office of Institutional Research in coded form, which prevents the committee from identifying the individual institutions. The Administration feels that the key to the code cannot be given to the Senate Salary Committee without breach of confidence. We find ourselves, therefore, in a rather peculiar position that this committee is giving the administration advice based on information the Administration has, but to which this committee has no access. If we face this same problem of non-reporting institutions next year, the salary projections and the allocation of
salary adjustment funds should be carried out by the Administration. It should also be stressed that when this committee receives the salary data less than 3 weeks before the Board of Review meets, this committee and the Faculty Senate have insufficient time for deliberation. The primary function of this committee should be to advise the Administration before the asking budget is submitted, as to the funds needed to reach our salary goal. To reach this goal in 1966-67 about $100,000 over and above the present funds requested would have been needed. This year the same amount was asked for by the Administration for salary adjustment as last year despite the fact that we have about 30 more faculty. Of principal concern to the Senate Salary Committee is not only the magnitude of the salary adjustment funds in the asking budget, but the fact that accepted salary policy and salary goals are not being considered whatever by the Administration in the preparation of the budget.

The program of salary adjustments which has been in effect for the last 3 years has been vital in preventing a rapid deterioration of the relative salary position at this university. Very little progress, however, has been made in improving our relative position or towards reaching our salary goal.

Salary deficits at URI in comparison with 10 North Atlantic State Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1962-63</th>
<th>1965-66*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>-844</td>
<td>-545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>-158</td>
<td>-214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>-267</td>
<td>-221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two institutions (Connecticut and Pennsylvania) not reporting which gives this series a downward bias.

Over the last 3 years it seems as if we have made some progress in closing the gap for professors and instructors, while for assistant professors the gap is of about the same magnitude and for associate professors the gap is wider than it was 3 years ago. This means that most of the funds for salary adjustments have been needed to maintain our relative position.

The average annual salary increases at the 10 North Atlantic State Universities (using URI reflection rate) over the last 3 years have been about as follows: (the downward bias in last years data is included)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asso. Prof.</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over and above the normal annual increments at URI the following amounts have therefore been needed just to maintain our relative position:

- **Professor**: 450
- **Assoc. Prof.**: 300
- **Asst. Prof.**: 250
- **Instructors**: 150

During the last year (1964-65 to 1965-66) the average salary increases by rank for the Faculty at URI on an academic year appointment were as follows:

- **Professors**: 9.4%
- **Assoc. Prof.**: 4.1%
- **Asst. Prof.**: 3.7%
- **Instructors**: 4.8%

The gap, however, is still widest for professors and smallest for instructors.

The Salary Committee in proposing the allocation of salary adjustment funds for 1966-67 has projected the gaps for that year and allocated the funds to close about the same percentage of the gap for each rank (including the 15% differential for calendar year faculty). If the Board of Reviews decision on allocation of salary adjustment funds differs from the one recommended by the Faculty Senate, the Administration should inform the Senate of the criteria used in their allocation.

The Board of Trustees has hired an accounting firm in Providence to look into business practices and salaries at the three state institutions of higher education. The Salary Committee does not share the President's opinion that he, because of this action by the Board of Trustees, has been "taken off the hook" on the Senate's proposal of January 10, 1963, concerning the calendar-year faculty. We feel that the President's opinion on this issue will carry considerable weight with the consulting firm and subsequently with the Board of Trustees. We would, therefore, after 3 years of waiting, again request the President to inform the Faculty where he stands on this issue.

**Senate Salary Committee**

- R. Baumann
- R. Skogley
- J. Dirlam
- B. Vittimberga
- A. Holmsen, Chairman
Section Part V of the January 10, 1963 Salary Committee report referred to in recommendation 3 is as follows:

PART V - ACADEMIC - YEAR EMPLOYMENT

The Committee recommends that the academic year contract be the basic contract for faculty personnel other than administrative officers, and that the salary scale in Part II of this report be the single scale for University faculty.

The Committee further recommends that:

(a) Salaries of present calendar-year faculty be converted to an academic-year basis by reducing them 10 per cent. (This figure approximates the present salary differential between the academic and calendar-year faculty in each rank.)

(b) Those faculty members whose services are needed for the calendar year (as determined by the Dean of the College and the Department Chairman) be recontracted in the amount of 15 per cent of their academic-year salary or the equivalent of pay for two summer school courses (whichever is the larger sum) in addition to their academic-year salary.

(c) Present calendar-year faculty members not be forced to go on the academic-year basis with corresponding salary reductions.

(d) Those present calendar-year faculty who are close to retirement be permitted to remain on the calendar-year contract in order to realize increased retirement pay benefits.

(e) The base salary of all faculty except those mentioned in (d) above be the academic-year salary.