



## STATE OF CONNECTICUT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
FOR THE STATE COLLEGES

P. O. Box 2008                      NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT 06050  
TEL. NEW BRITAIN: 203-229-1807              TEL. HARTFORD: 203-566-7373

## RESOLUTION

concerning

PER DIEM RATES FOR  
TEN-MONTH UNCLASSIFIED PERSONNEL

July 18, 1975

- WHEREAS, The General Assembly at its 1975 Regular Session amended Section 3-119 of the General Statutes by adding the requirement that "salaries of full-time permanent employees who are employed on a less than twelve-month basis shall be prorated and paid bi-weekly on a twelve-month basis"; and
- WHEREAS, It is necessary to establish per diem rates to be used in computing earnings of ten-month unclassified personnel during partial work periods; and
- WHEREAS, A total of two hundred seventeen (217) payroll days has been the accepted obligation of ten-month personnel in the past; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the per diem rate for ten-month unclassified personnel shall be the current annual salary divided by two hundred seventeen (217) or, in the case of temporary appointments, the first step of the applicable salary group divided by two hundred seventeen (217).

A Certified True Copy:

James A. Frost  
Executive Secretary

Resolutions microfilmed - July 21, 1975 - July 18 resolutions not prepared at that time.



July 22, 1975

TO: College Presidents: Dr. Ruth A. Haas, Western Connecticut State College  
Dr. F. Don James, Central Connecticut State College  
Dr. Charles R. Webb, Eastern Connecticut State College  
Dr. Manson Van B. Jennings, Southern Connecticut State  
College

FROM: James A. Frost, Executive Secretary

CONCERNING: Resolutions 75-30, 75-31, and 75-32

Enclosed are copies of Board Resolutions 75-30, 75-31, and 75-32, all dated July 18, 1975. These resolutions will be needed by persons who work with payrolls. Questions should be addressed to either Dr. Clow or Mr. Boynton.

JAF:v

July 18, 1975

Dr. Clinton M. Ritchie  
Executive Officer for Academic Affairs  
Board of Trustees for the State Colleges  
New Britain, Connecticut 06050

Dear Dr. Ritchie:

When we received your letter of July 15, including resolutions pertaining to 1. per diem rates for ten-month unclassified personnel; 2. anniversary dates for ten-month unclassified administrative personnel; 3. revision of the June 13 Personnel Policies which we still do not have, and 4. request by the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees to solicit the comment of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Administrative Faculty, we were pleased that the Personnel Committee was requesting our comment but extremely disappointed, again, with this eleventh hour request. It is impossible to hold a meeting of each local chapter of OAF and a meeting of the Executive Committee of OAF to formalize a written response to the Board for a meeting on Friday, July 18, when the information is not received until Wednesday, July 16. Further, one of the State Colleges did not even receive a copy of the letter.

However, even within this short time frame, we believe the following comments must be made. They are of matters of concern and possibly, interpretation.

Attachment A Per Diem Rates

1. In the third WHEREAS the term working days is used. Do working days mean days at work or do they mean a group of days representing the sum of days at work, vacation days, sick days, and personal leave days? There is a significant difference between the two interpretations. If the former is correct an individual may have as many as two hundred forty-seven (247) days of responsibility. These two hundred forty-seven (247) days representing two hundred seventeen (217) days at work, plus twelve (12) vacation days, plus fifteen (15) sick days, and plus three (3) personal leave days. This situation would apply to all ten-month unclassified administrative faculty. If the latter interpretation is correct then there is a serious question on how it is applied to instructional faculty. Probably, substituting the word "payroll" for "working" in the third WHEREAS would make the statement vague enough so that these differences between instructional faculty and ten-month administrative faculty would not be as obvious.

2. It is, indeed, satisfying to see in this statement of per diem rates the groundwork laid for an idea that OAF presented to the Personnel Committee of the Board on July 15, 1974. At that time OAF stressed the importance of equitable treatment in the salary reclassifications and, hopefully, demonstrating that when ten-month administrative faculty are given the same increase as instructional faculty because the administrative faculty are slotted into instructional faculty positions, they are short changed because their work year is about six weeks longer. Also in this regard was the equity that should exist for twelve-month administrative faculty, especially deans. To cite, for an example, a ten-month administrative faculty member with the

July 18, 1975  
Dr. Clinton M. Ritchie

rank of professor: his reclassification when compared to the dean's reclassification showed the dean's salary needed to be increased by about another twenty per cent to provide equity on a per diem basis. The principle of establishing per diem rates in this resolution is supportive of our argument of a year ago. If a ten-month administrative faculty member is converted to a twelve-month administrative faculty position his per diem rate will have to be multiplied by two hundred sixty-one (261) days and therefore result in a twenty per cent increase in salary,

New Payroll (Working) Days	-	Old Payroll (Working) Days	=	Increased Days
<u>261</u>		<u>217</u>	=	<u>44</u>

Rates are per diem, therefore the individual will be paid for forty-four (44) additional days.

Increase $\frac{44}{217}$ Old Days	=	Per Cent Increase
$\frac{44}{217}$	=	20

Now that the Trustees have recognized the principle, are they planning to make the proper adjustment for their present twelve-month administrative faculty?

You will find copies of this July 15, 1974 presentation contained herein.

Attachment A Anniversary Dates

1. In the second WHEREAS if an individual is in a ten-month unclassified administrative position but not one of those certain unclassified administrative positions he will follow the academic year which is a nine-month, not a ten month, calendar. This contradicts what the Board is hoping to accomplish in Attachment B. Just deleting the second WHEREAS would solve the problem.

2. The changing of the anniversary date for ten-month administrative faculty to July 1 will result in them receiving increments on about August 1. This is before they start their services for the year. We wonder how the instructional faculty feels about this. They do not receive equal treatment.

We hope these comments have been useful in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

*Walter Petroskey Jr.*

Walter Petroskey, Jr.  
President  
Four State College Organization of  
Administrative Faculty

A STATEMENT OF SUMMARY

Presented to the Personnel Committee,  
Connecticut Board of Trustees for the State Colleges

By the Organization of Administrative Faculty  
Connecticut State Colleges

July 15, 1974

The Organization of Administrative Faculty requests that the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees for the State Colleges review past and present salary upgradings in light of the information presented today.

1. 12-month administrators work 11-½ months; 10-month administrators work 9-½ months. (It should be pointed out that those 10-month administrators who follow the academic calendar actually work only 8 months.) Should not 12-month administrators receive larger salary increases in recognition of their longer working year?

2. 12-month administrators lost seven days of vacation by State Personnel Department edict endorsed by the Board of Trustees. Conversely, the working year calendar for faculty and 10-month administrators has decreased from 3-6 weeks in recent years. (It also should be noted that state college systems in surrounding states as well as the University of Connecticut grant at least four weeks of vacation to their administrators.) Has the board considered that simple justice dictates that additional compensation is due to 12-month administrators for this loss of vacation time?

3. In 1972, when increments were withheld for unclassified State College employees, 12-month administrators were considered as faculty for the purpose of withholding the increments. In 1974, when the Board of Trustees adjusted the salary plans of unclassified employees, 12-month administrators were not considered as members of the faculty as were 10-month administrators. What is the basis of the board's inconsistency in viewing the status of 12-month administrators?

Several salary adjustment plans for 12-month administrators have been presented today. We hope that the Personnel Committee will correct the widening inequities created by the latest round of salary reclassifications by fully revising upward the compensation plan for 12-month administrators. Factors to be considered in these revisions are:

1. Loss of Vacation Time for 12-month Administrators
2. Compacted Academic Year for 10-month Administrators
3. Varying Length of the Working Year for Various Professional Employees
4. Nationwide Statistics on Total Administrative Costs
5. Past Inequities in Salary Upgradings

## II. Ratio Plan (Comparison Between Faculty - Administration)

In 1969 the Board passed a resolution, which we shall refer to as the Ratio Plan. This plan recognized the difference in length between the faculty and administrative calendar. This Ratio Plan, based on the Full Professor's salary, was designed to automatically raise administrators' compensation when teaching faculty salaries were increased.

At this point, we would like to present a few positions from this plan and propose how they should be revised to keep them in line with the reclassification of professors from Salary Group 26 to 28.

Position	A	B	C	D
	S.G. Endorsed By BOT 2/7/69	Present S.G. of Incumbent 6/21/74	Suggested S.G. to keep ratio Based on New Full Prof.	Suggested S.G. to keep ratio Based on New Calendar
V.P. -- Academic Affairs	38	37	40	42
Dean-Graduate Studies	36	35	38	40
Director-Data Processing	31	29	33	35
Director-Nursing Education	26	28	28	30
Registrar	26	27	28	30
Director-Audio Visual	24	26	26	28
Director-Housing	24	25	26	28

This table is based on Full Professors being in Salary Group 28. For the next year, 1975-76, it should be noted that Full Professors have already been promised an upgrading to Salary Group 29.



III. Ten Month Versus Twelve Month  
 (Comparison Between Administrator-Administrator)

The proposed reclassifications for ten month administrators and twelve month administrators have further increased the inequities between these positions. In some situations the twelve month administrator will be earning less than his ten month assistant. Let's compare what has happened to ten and twelve month administrators in the same salary group as of June 1, 1974.

A. Position	S.G. as of 6/1/74	S.G. as of 6/21/74 or 8/28/74	S.G. For Parity*
10-Month Administrator	26-4	28-3 (+\$1300)	28-3 (+\$1300)
12-Month Administrator	26-4	27-4 (+\$ 968)	29-3 (+\$1629)
Difference		-\$332	+ \$329

B.

10-Month Administrator	23-4	25-3 (+\$1071)	25-3 (+\$1071)
12-Month Administrator	23-4	24-4 (+\$ 822)	26-2 (+\$1323)
Difference		- \$ 249	- \$ 252

C.

10-Month Administrator	19-4	20-4 (+ \$700)	20-4 (+\$700)
12-Month Administrator	19-4	20-4 (+ \$700)	21-3 (+\$960)
Difference		0	+\$260

Again these tables do not reflect the upgrading of the Full Professor to Salary Group 29 for the year 1975-76. Also, not included is the \$2,500 a ten month administrator can earn by working summers or the proposed increase in summer session pay which is based on the 16-2/3 per cent rule.

\*Equal to ten month administrator's upgrading plus 16-2/3 per cent of the



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
FOR THE STATE COLLEGES

P. O. Box 2008      NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT 06050  
TEL. NEW BRITAIN: 203-229-1607      TEL. HARTFORD: 203-566-7373

July 15, 1975

TO: Dr. Philip Smith, Chairman, and Members of the Faculty  
Advisory Committee

FROM: Clinton M. Ritchie, Executive Officer for Academic Affairs

CONCERNING: Resolutions prepared for Trustee action

The attached resolutions were reviewed and approved by the Personnel Committee at its meeting on July 14, 1975. They are being presented to the Board for action at its meeting this Friday, July 18, 1975. The Committee has asked that I share copies of the resolutions with you for your information and any comments you wish to convey.

The rationale behind the resolutions is evident in the whereas clauses in each. Dr. Clow and his staff have invested considerable study and effort in developing these resolutions to meet the needs identified.

If there are questions, please call.

CMR/eh  
enc.

cc: Dr. Frost  
Mr. Wood

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Clinton M. Ritchie', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FOR THE STATE COLLEGES

P. O. Box 2008

NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT 06050

TEL. NEW BRITAIN: 203-229-1507

TEL. HARTFORD: 203-566-1373

July 15, 1975

TO: Executive Committee of the OAF

FROM: Clinton *M. Ritchie*, Executive Officer for Academic Affairs

- CONCERNING:
1. Resolutions regarding per diem rates for ten-month Personnel and Anniversary dates for ten-month Personnel
  2. Proposed technical refinement in the Personnel Policies

In a letter from J. Hahesy and J. Pikiell dated 5-12-75, our attention was called to dual and conflicting references to the span of service required of ten-month Administrative Faculty.

page 15 "Administrative faculty employed on a ten-month basis shall commence their annual service on the day the Trustees designate as the academic year's beginning and shall continue their service until the same day of the tenth month thereafter;"

page 32 "The obligation of such persons begins with the day they are called to the campus for the fall semester and does not end until the last day of the tenth month thereafter.

Considerable time has been spent studying the problem as it was further complicated by legislative action relative to payment of ten-month employees, annual increments and anniversary dates. After a review of the alternatives proposed by the Executive Staff, the Personnel Committee is taking the following steps:

- 1) Recommending for Board action at its July meeting attachment A. Action at the July meeting is necessary to implement on schedule the new payment plan and annual increments for all unclassified personnel. You will find rationale for each is evident in the whereas clauses.
- 2) Preparing to recommend to the Board for action at its September meeting the technical changes in the Personnel Policies as proposed in attachment B.

The Personnel Committee has asked that I solicit your comment on both matters. If there are questions or if I can be of any assistance, please call.

CMR/eh  
encl.

cc: Mr. Wood, Chairman, Personnel Committee  
Dr. Frost