



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
JANUARY 9, 1991
3:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the December 5, 1990 meeting
- II. Approval of the agenda for the January 9, 1991 meeting
- III. Report of the Steering Committee, F. Leysieffer
- IV. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. Budget Advisory Committee, F. Standley
- V. Unfinished Business
- VI. University Welfare
- VII. Announcements of Deans and other administrative officers
- VIII. Announcements of the President of the University

ANNOUNCEMENT

The College of Law and the University Club will host the University Club Wednesday Social in the Garnet and Gold University Room (202A University Union) immediately following the Senate meeting. The University Club will collect \$1.50 to help defray their expenses. Everyone is welcome!

THE NEXT SENATE MEETING WILL BE FEBRUARY 13, 1991



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1030

Faculty Senate
904-644-6876

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Moore Auditorium
January 9, 1991
3:45 p.m.

I. Regular Session

The regular session of the 1990-91 Faculty Senate assembled on Wednesday, January 9, 1991, at 3:45 p.m. Senate President Alan Mabe presided.

Since Senators did not receive the Agenda prior to the meeting and there was not a quorum present, the meeting was not officially constituted. Dr. Mabe announced, with the concurrence of those Senators present, that the meeting would be an informational meeting and not an official meeting of the Senate.

II. Approval of the minutes of December 5, 1990

Since the meeting was not officially constituted, action on approval of the minutes was deferred to the February meeting.

III. Approval of the agenda for January 9, 1991

The Agenda was announced with the following additions:
Dr. Larry Abele will give a report on the Presidential Search Committee
Provost Gus Turnbull will provide remarks on Summer School and administrators teaching in the summer.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, F. Leysieffer

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee met three times since our last Faculty Senate meeting. I will list the major issues considered by the Steering Committee this past month.

Budget: The Steering Committee along with the Senate Budget Committee met with Provost Turnbull and Associate Vice President McCaleb to discuss the latest budget cuts and how those cuts will impact upon the summer session. Needless to say, the situation is fluid. The administration is given very short turn around times for responses to the Board of Regents. The Steering Committee is keeping up with developments as best as possible. Professor Fred Standley, chair of the Senate Budget Committee will give a detailed report later in this meeting.

The Presidential Search: The Steering Committee met with Professor Larry Abele, Chairman of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Professor Abele will bring you up to date on the progress of that committee later in this meeting. Professor Doris Clack has replaced Professor Tonya Edwards on that committee. Professor Edwards was called to active duty with her reserve unit.

Administrative Overhead: The Steering Committee discussed the policy proposed by Vice President Roeder which would have changed the university policy to impose an administrative overhead charge on all auxiliary accounts, including educational quasi-auxiliary accounts. Senate President Mabe is preparing a report to President Sliger pointing out the difficulties with this policy and strongly recommending that educational quasi-auxiliary accounts not be subject to an overhead charge.

Response to Newspaper Column: The Steering Committee discussed the suggestion made at the last Senate meeting that it respond to the column which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat, critical of university faculty. The decision was made not to respond.

Arts and Sciences Dean Search: The Steering Committee has met with four candidates for the position of Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences thus far. Two more candidates are expected to be interviewed in the next several weeks.

Renaming of the Department of Public Administration: The Steering Committee met with Professor Richard Chackerian, chair of the Department of Public Administration regarding the proposed name change of that unit to a School of Public Administration. It was determined that the proposal received strong faculty and administrative support within the College of Social Sciences and that appropriate procedures for the renaming were being followed. This school will remain within the College of Social Sciences. Senate President Mabe will issue a clarification of our constitution indicating that schools within colleges are, for governance purposes, to be considered as departments.

Land Purchases: The Steering Committee heard from Professor Fred Standley, chairman of a committee to make recommendations on future land purchases for FSU. The State Legislature appropriated \$5,000,000 this year for the purpose of purchasing land. The committee is considering various sites for possible purchase now.

Curriculum Committee: All faculty are reminded of the dates of the meetings of the curriculum committee this semester. They are January 25th, February 15th, March 29th and April 19th. To be considered at a particular meeting, curricular changes must be received in 314 Westcott at least one week in advance of that meeting date.

Meetings: The Steering Committee will meet weekly this semester on Mondays at 2:15 to 3:45 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge of the Kuersteiner Music Building.

Senator Perrin Wright asked when materials were due for the 1991-92 University Bulletin. President Mabe reported that they would be due by the last meeting in April.

V. Report of the Budget Advisory Committee, Fred Standley

Senator Fred Standley announced that the Budget Advisory Committee report would be given by Associate Vice President Tom McCaleb since he had been involved with the appropriations consultation.

Dr. McCaleb introduced his report by saying that the University wanted to protect against layoff of faculty and staff members as much as is possible, and wanted to protect empty faculty lines. He said the budget reduction was in four phases and provided the following report:

Reductions Included in 1990-91 Legislative Appropriation

Total reduction = \$3,188,371

Major components

Increase Salary Lapse from 2% to 3%	\$1,357,794
Reduce Salary Costs to Continue	763,382
Increase Faculty Productivity	519,170
Reduce Institute of Government	300,000
Reduce Institutes and Centers	185,865
Reduce Plant Operations	62,160

On balance, however, University's operating budget increased as a result of new funding received for such issues as enrollment growth, library staffing, student services, and such special programs as Structural Biology, Film, and the National Magnet Lab.

General Revenue Budget Reduction, Phase 1

Mandated budget reduction in September of \$3,589,517 (approximately 2.5% of University's general revenue budget)

Major components

Library Resources	\$1,050,000
Plant Operations	500,000
I&R Enrollment Growth	780,912
6.60 Faculty Positions	
5.63 Support Positions	
Library Staffing	165,527
6.29 Positions	
Student Services Enhancement	166,799
3.84 Positions	

General Revenue Budget Reduction, Phase 2

Mandated budget reduction in December of \$3,669,083 (approximately 2.7% of University's general revenue budget)

Major components

Reduce Summer Salary Reserve	\$2,023,751
Reduce Enrollment Growth	729,030
9.57 Faculty Positions	
11.39 Support Positions	
Reduce Plant Operations	410,000
Delete Vacant Non-I&R Positions	323,353
10.52 Support Positions	

The summer reduction constitutes about one-third of the total summer instructional reserve. However, for 1990-91 the entire reduction must be effected in the first half of Summer 1991; this is approximately 55% of the first half reserve. We believe we have funds to bring this down to one-third. We will continue to seek and evaluate available options to further improve summer funding with the hope that ultimately a normal summer, or a reasonable facsimile thereof, will be possible. Our instructions to deans are to plan for a normal summer, but to include in their plans sufficient flexibility to reduce by one-third as late as April if necessary.

The additional reduction in enrollment growth funds eliminates all positions in the Provost's Reserve. OPS and expense had already been depleted. There remain substantial OCO and STOCO funds in reserve. However, these funds may be needed in whole or in part to replace funding already deleted in the summer, in library resources, and in plant operations both for this year and next year.

Total Current Budget Reductions to Date = \$10,446,971

For perspective, the University's total E&G (state-appropriated) budget for 1990-91 is between \$190 million and \$200 million.

1991-92 Budget Reduction

The above reductions will carry over into 1991-92 and beyond absent legislative action. In addition, Governor Chiles has indicated his intention to impose a further reduction in state agencies effective in 1991-92. The University's share of this reduction is \$5.7 million.

Major components

Eliminate Programs

- Warm Mineral Springs Project
- Windover Archaeological Project
- Institute of Government
- Growth Management Conflict Resolution Center
- Center for Educational Policy and Research
- Center for Employment Relations and Law

Delete State Appropriations
Faculty Awards Program

Transfer Programs to Other Budget Entities
Developmental Research School (Division of Public Schools)

Reduce Budget Allocations
Collins Center (47%)
Faculty Salary Reserve (a small amount used to balance the total)

Dean Bickley asked if teaching awards would be cut for this year. The response was that they would not be cut for this year.

Associate Vice President McCaleb announced that \$200,000 had been given to the Library from Blockbuster Bowl funds. He also confirmed that we have funded instruction needs and travel to and from Panama City. He stated that serious decisions must be made in the next few weeks regarding lifting the freeze for next year's positions. There are no answers to questions at this time regarding approving deviations for next year and for recruiting for the 1991-92 academic year.

VI. Report of Presidential Search Committee, L. Abele

Dr. Larry Abele, Chairman of the Presidential Search Committee, reported that the Committee met for the first time on November 9. Advertisements were placed, and faculty, staff, alumni, and other interested individuals were contacted for nominations. As of January 9, 1991, there were 98 nominations, 77 men and 21 women. Of that 98, there are 28 who have applied, 27 men, and one woman. The deadline for nominations was Friday, January 4. The list of candidates will go to the Presidential Search Committee on January 18. The Committee will consider candidates to elevate to the next level on January 22. Ten candidates will be identified by the BOR Selection Committee and invited to campus on January 29, 30, and 31 for ninety minutes interviews in Starry Conference Room. Five will be selected to be invited to campus between February 11 and February 26 with their spouses and family members. During that time, Chancellor Charles Reed and Vice Chancellor Roy McTarnaghan will visit the campuses of the candidates while the candidates are here visiting the University. Approximately fifty copies of video tapes of the ten candidates will be available in the Library Reference Room where there are numerous facilities for viewing. Questions will be prepared for the candidates.

VII. University Welfare

Senator Launer requested the floor to speak on two issues: the paycheck questionnaire and combating salary compression and salary inversion.

Copies of a memorandum with updated figures to President Sliger, and a report on combating salary compression/inversion are appended to these minutes.

I'd like to discuss two issues today. One of them is the paycheck questionnaire. Those of you who are senators should have received a copy of the memo I sent to Dr. Sliger reporting the results of that survey as of December 14. That memo reproduced all of the comments that were appended by the respondents.

Today I am distributing an update of those results. Dr. Sliger recently told the UFF Executive Committee that, despite rumors to the contrary, it is not illegal in this state to spread one's nine- or ten-month salary over the full year. (Copies of this document and the December 14 report are appended to the minutes.)

Moreover, Florida is one of the very few states in which this option is not available to university faculty as well as K-12 teachers. I can tell you that my parents, who were public school teachers in Connecticut, had such a plan in place in the 1950s. And the various university systems in California all provide faculty with the option of a 12-month pay cycle for their nine-month salary. Right now in Westchester County, NY, public school teachers not only have such an option, they have the right to change how they will receive their pay every year. To my knowledge, nowhere in the country has such a system ever threatened summer supplements for teaching or grant-supported research.

In addition, because several respondents wondered about the interest that might be lost--as compared to saving for the summer themselves--I have calculated the amount for a bi-weekly take-home of \$1060. If one currently receives such a paycheck, the "lost" interest would amount to \$158 annually--that's just \$3.04 per week.

I might add, however, that if all faculty were to participate in such a program, the cumulative total would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000 every year. And if the university were allowed to control the monies involved, this sum would make a very nice contribution to Jack Waggaman's Library Committee, to the Merit Scholars fund, or to Gene Nichols' committee for faculty travel. Alternately, the university could accumulate such monies and create a new endowed chair every three years!

The other topic I would like to discuss today is one that faculty have raised for several years--salary compression and salary inversion. [I should mention that UFF will sponsor a workshop on this issue. The workshop is scheduled for Monday, February 4th, from 4:00--5:30 in the Hecht House basement.] Every one of us is painfully aware of the extent to which FSU's faculty salaries lag behind those at comparable institutions throughout the country--and, in some disciplines, even within the State of Florida. In addition, we face the demoralizing situation whereby productive, active senior scholars in many programs see new hires offered salaries that rival--and often exceed--their own. Increasingly, their doctoral students--the ones they have trained--are getting job offers elsewhere at salaries greater than their own. Aside from the obvious morale problem that salary compression entails, the entire salary situation makes it virtually impossible for FSU to attract senior faculty from other institutions; and older faculty who might consider retiring to make way for younger blood literally cannot afford to.

During a.y. 87-88 I sent a plan to the Provost. That plan involved establishing minimum salaries for each rank; it also contained a methodology for combatting

the growing gap between the highest and lowest salaries in each rank. The Provost investigated the situation and determined that implementation of the plan would cost less than half a million dollars. But resistance from the Council of Deans, if I am not mistaken, led him to scrap the idea.

You should have received today another handout describing a different proposal to address both of these issues. I hope that you will read it seriously and be prepared to discuss it next month, when I intend to offer a resolution recommending that the President, the Provost, and the Council of Deans give top priority to addressing salary compression and salary inversion here at FSU.

During a meeting this fall with the UFF Executive Committee, Dr. Sliger indicated that since the beginning of his tenure as FSU's president he has sought approval from the SUS Council of Presidents to institute a tuition-differential program. Such a program would generate uncommitted funds that could be used to address the overall salary problem. As we all know, however, Dr. Sliger has not been successful in that endeavor.

We also know it is fatuous to expect a sympathetic hearing either from BOR staff or, more importantly, from the Legislature.

But I submit to you that we can handle this problem internally ourselves, here at FSU, with the resources we can reasonably expect to receive from the state, and without outside help. To achieve this would require just two things: it would require the good will of those faculty members in every rank who receive the highest nine-month salaries; and it would take leadership and commitment on the part of the central administration.

My personal opinion is that our vaunted collegiality stops at the pay window. Or, as one wag put it, the reason faculty squabble over their raises so bitterly is that there is so little at stake! For example, this past year the 30+ faculty members in the Department of Modern Languages & Linguistics got to share a *total discretionary pool* of about \$8500, almost half of which went to two people. That left around \$4000 for the rest, which averages out to about \$150 per faculty member. Given such a situation, I find it deplorable that a Dean--or anyone else for that matter--could be granted a \$26,000 *raise*. That's more than most of our assistant professors make, and close to what many of our associate professors earn.

We all know there are individuals who believe certain disciplines (even whole colleges) have no legitimacy and should never be remunerated at a professional level. It seems to me, however, that when we perpetuate such ideas, all we really succeed in doing is demeaning our profession as a whole. And in demeaning the profession, we demean ourselves. It's not surprising that the public has so little respect for us: if we don't respect ourselves, why should anyone else?

Last semester I listened to Harry Edwards, the sports sociologist, discuss the problems in America's ghettos. Perhaps you did, too. Dr. Edwards' message was very simple. Blacks in the ghetto, he said, have to stop blaming the government and the white power structure for their troubles. They have to take control of their own destiny; and they have to start solving their own problems with their own resources. The first step in this process is to begin respecting and cease demeaning themselves.

I think we can all learn something from Harry Edwards. I believe we should quit blaming the BOR, the legislature, and the people of Florida. We need to stop demeaning--to begin respecting--ourselves and all others who choose to become college teachers. All of them. I believe we have the resources to help ourselves. But I wonder . . . Do we have the determination, the goodwill, and the grace?

Senator Waggaman announced that the Library will be open until 10:00 p.m. on Martin Luther King's holiday, Monday, January 21, 1991.

VIII. Announcements of Deans and Other Administrative Officers

Provost Turnbull reviewed the status the University Budget and provided the following report.

Summer is a question mark. We anticipate regular schedules, and we have substantial non-recurring expenditures we hope to be able to use in the summer. The issue will be faced directly when the Legislature comes to town. The Board of Regents has requested all qualified administrators to teach if there is a need and or if there is a mesh between capability and student needs. We hope to know by January 15 how many will teach; the administrators will teach additional sections and will not replace any regular faculty.

There are two very important meetings today for the University System and for Higher Education. The Board of Regents Planning Committee has had its first meeting to review hearings which addressed how the State will meet the demand for admission, the quality of maintaining programs with budgets being cut, and what new programs should be put in place. They are addressing maximum accommodation of each university in this decade and the next to meet growth demand.

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission is reviewing community college funding, looking at how we will meet demands of students who desire admission, debating the consultants' report on this topic, and discussing criteria for new universities.

IX. Announcements

Senator Mabe reminded the Senate that January 25 is the deadline for submitting ballots for Sabbatical Committee candidates. Nominations will be taken from the floor at the February meeting.

He announced that President Sliger was attending the NCAA meeting.

Professor E. P. Miles said that issues of war or peace should be debated by the Faculty Senate. It was reported that there would be a peace rally at the Viet Nam War Memorial on Saturday, January 12. Senator Mabe said the Steering Committee will address the issue raised by Professor Miles.

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Barbara T. Yon

Barbara T. Yon
Academic Administrator

MEMORANDUM
4 January 1991

TO: Dr. Sliger
FROM: M. Launer
IN RE: Paycheck Questionnaire--Response Update

Earlier (17 Dec 90) I reported a total of 637 responses to the Paycheck Questionnaire. Since that time I have received an additional 25 responses. Below are the figures for these additional responses, plus new totals. As you can tell, there are no substantial changes, and the conclusions outlined earlier still appear valid. Comments were minimal (4) and similar to those reported earlier.

QUESTION ONE--regarding a "uniform" system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	2	8.0	9.1
No	20	80.0	<u>90.9</u>
No Answer	<u>3</u>	<u>12.0</u>	
TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0

QUESTION TWO--regarding an "optional" system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	23	92.0	92.0
No	2	8.0	<u>8.0</u>
No Answer	<u>---</u>	<u>0.0</u>	
TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0

QUESTION THREE--regarding participation in an optional system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	10	40.0	45.5
No	12	48.0	<u>55.5</u>
Undecided	2	8.0	
No Answer	<u>1</u>	<u>4.0</u>	
TOTAL	25	100.0	100.0

ACTUAL RESPONSE PATTERNS

Question #----->	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Total</u>
Responses:	Yes	Yes	Yes	2
	Blank	Yes	Yes	2
	Blank	Yes	Undecided	1
	No	Yes	Yes	6
	No	Yes	No	10
	No	Yes	Undecided	1
	No	Yes	Blank	1
	No	No	No	2
TOTAL RESPONSES				25

THE FOLLOWING ARE REVISED TOTALS FOR 662 RESPONSES:

QUESTION ONE--regarding a "uniform" system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	106	16.0	18.3
No	473	71.5	<u>81.7</u>
No Answer	<u>83</u>	<u>12.5</u>	
TOTAL	662	100.0	100.0

QUESTION TWO--regarding an "optional" system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	553	83.5	87.5
No	79	11.9	<u>12.5</u>
No Answer	<u>30</u>	<u>4.5</u>	
TOTAL	662	99.9	100.0

QUESTION THREE--regarding participation in an optional system

		Pct.	Pct. Y/N
Yes	321	48.5	55.0
No	263	39.7	<u>45.0</u>
Undecided*	70	10.6	
No Answer	<u>8</u>	<u>1.2</u>	
TOTAL	662	100.0	100.0

* "Undecided" incorporates the following actual responses, all written in by hand: don't know; maybe; not certain; not sure; not sure probably; perhaps; perhaps later; possibly; probably; probably not; undecided; unsure; ?.

ACTUAL RESPONSE PATTERNS

Question #----->	<u>One</u>	<u>Two</u>	<u>Three</u>	<u>Total</u>
Responses:	Yes	Yes	Yes	95
	Yes	Yes	No	1
	Yes	No	Yes	1
	Yes	No	No	1
	Yes	Blank	Yes	6
	Yes	Blank	Blank	2
	Blank	Yes	Yes	67
	Blank	Yes	No	8
	Blank	Yes	Undecided	7
	Blank	Yes	Blank	1
	No	Yes	Yes	162
	No	Yes	No	154
	No	Yes	Undecided	52
	No	Yes	Blank	5
	No	Blank	No	22
	No	No	No	78
TOTAL RESPONSES				662

COMBATING SALARY COMPRESSION/INVERSION

Below is a model (algorithm) designed to combat the encroachments of salary compression and inversion that currently beset many senior faculty members at FSU. The chosen values for target salaries in rank, maximum adjustment allowed per annum, and years to achieve target salaries are examples, of course, and subject to modification.

The philosophical basis for this model is fairly straightforward: there should be a floor below which any, e.g., full professor's salary is deemed unacceptable, given the required training, the number of years in our profession, and the degree of success an individual must have experienced in order to achieve that rank. This may be viewed as compensation for career success, rather than for last year's publishing record.

Year "0" is the base year from which all calculations stem

" x_0 " is the nine-month salary for a given faculty member in Year "0"; " x_n " is the salary for a given faculty member in year "N"

"y" is the anticipated across-the-board raise (3%, = to a multiplier of 1.03)

"z" is the compression/inversion adjustment (maximum allowable = \$3000)

$$\text{Salary adjustment algorithm: } x_n = yx_{n-1} + z$$

Nine-month target salaries in rank are: Professors, \$50K; Associate Professors, \$40K; Assistant Professors, \$30K; Instructors, \$23K

1. Identify each faculty member by rank and x_0 , nine-month salary for Year "0"
2. Increase x_0 , the Year "0" salary, by "y", the anticipated across-the-board raise--in the example, $y=3\%$, so this step provides the value $1.03x_0$ for an "adjusted nine-month salary"
3. Subtract the adjusted nine-month salary of each faculty member in Year "0" ($1.03x_0$ in the example) from the target salary for that individual's current rank (this will be a positive value for faculty members with adjusted base salaries below the target for their rank, and a negative value for faculty members with adjusted base salaries above the target for their rank)
4. Eliminate from further consideration all faculty members who do not show a positive-valued figure in step 3.
5. For those individuals not eliminated in step 4, compare the figure obtained in step 3 with the maximum allowable adjustment, selecting the lower of the two values (whenever $1.03x_0$ [= the adjusted base salary] is at least \$3000 below the target salary, \$3000 is the selected figure; in all other cases, the selected figure will be less than \$3000)
6. Add the value selected in step 5 to the adjusted base salary to determine the salary for Year "1".
7. The process would be repeated after Year "1" and, if necessary, after Year "2" in order to adjust salaries in those cases where a faculty member's salary remained below the target for his/her rank. After Year "2" it should be possible to raise all adjusted base salaries to the target values for Year "3" without restriction by any maximum adjustment.
8. Whenever it becomes true that at least 75% of all faculty members within each rank have achieved a nine-month salary equal to or greater than the Target Salary in rank, then it would be appropriate to raise each Target Salary by \$5000 and begin the process once again. After the new Year "1", however, required adjustments should be minimal.

ASSUMPTIONS, COROLLARIES, AND IMPLICATIONS

9. If the sum of all compression/inversion adjustments (the step 5 values) does not exceed the total available pool of discretionary/merit increase monies, this formula will prove mathematically feasible. It will require a policy decision by the central administration, in consultation with a representative faculty committee, to determine the maximum politically acceptable percentage, thus allowing for some discretionary/merit increases for faculty above the Target Salary in rank.
10. It is assumed that all new hires into the university will receive initial salaries at or above the target salary for the rank involved. That, indeed, was the source of the problem to begin with, but in this model such salaries will not constitute a major locus of discontent among continuing faculty.
11. In the case of a faculty member who is promoted during Year "N", the computation of his/her salary for Year "N+1" would proceed as specified above assuming the target value of the faculty rank *prior* to promotion. Any promotional raise would then be added to that figure. After Year "N+1", this newly promoted faculty member would have his/her salary compared to the target value for his/her new rank. (In effect, Year "N+1" becomes Year "0" for this individual in his/her new rank.) The process would then be carried out, potentially into the third year at the new rank, before that individual's salary could be raised to the new target value, if necessary, without restriction by any maximum adjustment.
12. It is a by-product of this algorithm that a newly promoted faculty member whose salary remained below the Target Salary for his/her old rank in the last year at that rank would be guaranteed raises totally more than \$10,000 (including the promotion raise) over the first four years in the new rank.
13. The net effect of the system outlined above would be to ensure that, if necessary, the lowest paid faculty members in each rank receive a substantial raise each year for up to three years in order to reach the Target Salary in rank. [In most instances, however, only one or two years would be required]. In this way, it should be true that the worst abuses of salary compression and inversion would be redressed. Any faculty member whose salary in any given year *exceeded* the target salary in rank would receive an across-the-board increase plus perhaps a share of the discretionary/merit pool left over after the guaranteed adjustments had been distributed, whereas all others would receive an across-the-board increase plus as much as \$3000 additional increase, depending on how far their current salaries were below target.
14. Assuming that the Target Salaries in rank were raised at three- or four-year intervals, the lowest paid individuals in each rank might receive a substantial raise in the new Year "1", which should suffice to take most above the target. Few would need much, however, because across-the-board and discretionary/merit raises should suffice in nearly all instances. Distribution of discretionary/merit dollars during Years "2", "3", and "4" could revert to the current system for rewarding meritorious service, but the recursive cycle of depriving raises to some faculty members in order to reward others with scarce dollars will have been broken. Over time, there might occur a gradual process of leveling within each rank, with a cluster of salaries at or just above the target--but the target would be rising in \$5000 increments.

This model was conceived by Michael Launer. Discussion is invited.

EXAMPLES OF COMPRESSION/INVERSION ADJUSTMENTS
FOLLOWING THE ALGORITHM DESCRIBED ABOVE.

Full Professor ABC currently receives a (Year "0") nine-month salary of \$45,700.

$1.03 \times 45,700 = 47,071$
 $50,000 - 47,071 = + 2,929$
total raise: \$1371 ATB + \$2929 C/I Adjustment = \$4,300
x₁, salary in Year "1"-----\$50,000

$1.03 \times 50,000 = 51,500$
 $50,000 - 51,500 = -1,500$
total raise: \$1,500 ATB + \$0 C/I Adjustment = \$1,500 plus perhaps a discretionary/ merit
increase
x₂, salary in Year "2"-----\$51,500 plus perhaps a discretionary/merit increase

Associate Professor DEF currently receives a (Year "0") nine-month salary of \$27,900.

$1.03 \times 27,900 = 28,737$
 $40,000 - 28,737 = 12,263$ (max allowable, \$3000)
total raise: 837 ATB + \$3000 C/I Adjustment = \$3,837
x₁, salary in Year "1"-----\$31,737

$1.03 \times 31,737 = 32,689$
 $40,000 - 32,689 = 5,311$ (max allowable, \$3000)
total raise: \$952 ATB + \$3,000 C/I Adjustment = \$3,952
x₂, salary in Year "2"-----\$35,689

$1.03 \times 35,689 = 36,760$
 $40,000 - 36,760 = \$3,240$ (there is no maximum for C/I adjustment at this point--salary must
reach the target salary for this rank)
total raise: \$1,071 ATB + \$3,240 C/I Adjustment = \$4,300
x₃, salary in Year "3"-----\$40,000

$1.03 \times \$40,000 = \$41,200$
 $40,000 - 41,200 = -\$1,200$
total raise: \$1,200 ATB + \$0 C/I Adjustment = \$1,200 plus perhaps a discretionary/ merit
increase
x₄, salary in Year "4"-----\$41,200 plus perhaps a discretionary/merit increase

Assistant Professor GHI currently receives a (Year "0") nine-month salary of \$23,400

$1.03 \times 23,400 = 24,102$
 $30,000 - 24,102 = 5,898$ (max allowable, \$3000)
total raise: \$702 ATB + \$3,000 C/I Adjustment = \$3,702
 x_1 , salary in Year "1"-----\$27,102

$1.03 \times 27,102 = 27,915$
 $30,000 - 27,915 = 2,085$
total raise: \$813 ATB + \$2,085 C/I Adjustment = \$2,898
 x_2 , salary in Year "2"-----\$30,000

$1.03 \times 30,000 = 30,900$
 $30,000 - 30,900 = -900$
total raise: \$900 ATB + \$0 C/I Adjustment = \$900 plus perhaps a discretionary/ merit increase
 x_3 , salary in Year "3"-----\$30,900 plus perhaps a discretionary/merit increase

Associate Professor JKL currently receives a (Year "0") nine-month salary of \$33,600
During Year "0" Dr. JKL gets promoted to Professor

$1.03 \times \$33,600 = \$34,608$
 $40,000 - 34,608 = 5,392$ (max allowable, \$3000)
total raise: \$1,008 ATB + \$3,000 C/I Adjustment + \$1,500 Promotion = \$5,608
 x_1 , salary in Year "1"-----\$39,208

$1.03 \times \$39,208 = \$40,384$
 $50,000 - 40,384 = 9,616$ (max allowable, \$3000) [comparison to new Target Salary]
total raise: \$1,176 ATB + \$3,000 C/I Adjustment = \$4,176
 x_2 , salary in Year "2"-----\$43,384
-----this is now redefined as Year "0" in the new rank-----

$1.03 \times \$43,384 = \$44,686$
 $50,000 - 44,686 = 5,314$ (max allowable, \$3000)
total raise: \$1,302 ATB + \$3,000 C/I Adjustment = \$4,302
 x_1 , salary in Year "1" at new rank-----\$47,686

$1.03 \times \$47,686 = \$49,117$
 $50,000 - 49,117 = 883$
total raise: \$1,431 ATB + \$883 C/I Adjustment = \$2,314
 x_2 , salary in Year "2" at new rank-----\$50,000

$1.03 \times \$50,000 = \$51,500$
 $50,000 - 51,500 = -1,500$
total raise: \$1,500 ATB + \$0 C/I Adjustment = \$1,500 plus perhaps a discretionary/ merit increase
 x_3 , salary in Year "3" at new rank-----\$51,500 plus perhaps a discretionary/merit increase