RESOLUTION

CONCERNING

Professional Development Leave for

F. Don James, President, Central Connecticut State College
Richard L. Judd, Dean of Student Affairs, Central Connecticut State College
Peter A. Durham, Director of Public Information, Central Connecticut State College

June 7, 1974

WHEREAS, The Personnel Policies of the Trustees provide for leaves for professional development; and

WHEREAS, The above named persons have been invited by leaders in the Korean education and business communities to establish the liaison by which future exchanges may be developed in the areas of programs, faculty, and students; and

WHEREAS, Such exchanges will enrich the educational programs at Central Connecticut State College, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Trustees approve for the above named persons a special educational leave with pay for the period June 15 through July 5, 1974, in order that they may accept the invitation issued by the Korean education and business communities.

A True Copy:

James A. Frost
Executive Secretary
Dr. James A. Frost  
Executive Secretary  
Board of Trustees for State Colleges  
1280 Asylum Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Jim:

This is to request approval by the Board of Trustees for State Colleges of a special educational leave with pay for the period June 15 through July 5 for the following administrators at Central:

Dean Richard L. Judd, Dean of Student Affairs  
Mr. Peter A. Durham, Director of Public Information  
Dr. F. Don James, President

Dean Judd, Mr. Durham, Dr. Kwang L. Koh and I will be travelling to Korea and Japan during this time at the invitation of leaders in the Korean Education and Business communities. In particular, we shall be visiting Cheju College of Education on Cheju Island off the South Coast of Korea, Cheongju University in Cheongju, Korea, several universities and colleges in Seoul, and several Korean educators in Tokyo. The purpose of our visit and their invitation is for us to establish a liaison leading to possible faculty and student exchange and exchange of programs and ideas with these Korean institutions and Central.

I feel this opportunity will be an unusual one for Central in that we have long had an interest and programs in East Asian Studies and our visit and exchange with the Korean leaders in education will be, we hope, of mutual benefit to them and to our college.

Since Professor Koh is on the faculty calendar, it is not necessary to request an educational leave for him.

RECEIVED  
MAY 24 1974  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
FOR THE STATE COLLEGES
I would assume that this request for leave for the three of us would be covered under Part Three, Section IV, Professional Development of our Personnel Policies and Procedures.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

F. Don James
PRESIDENT
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WHEREAS, The Faculty Advisory Council has requested that promotion to
the rank of Professor be made to Salary Group 28 and that
promotion to Associate Professor be made to Salary Group 25,
and

WHEREAS, Salary adjustments for faculty members at the rank of Professor
will be made to Salary Group 28 and salary adjustments for persons
at the rank of Associate Professor will be made to Salary Group 25,
and

WHEREAS, The Board has not yet developed guidelines to determine how salaries
within an academic rank shall be raised from one Salary Group to
another, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That promotions made by the Board on this date and this date only
shall be to Salary Group 28 for the persons promoted to the rank
of Professor and to Salary Group 25 for persons promoted to the
rank of Associate Professor.

A True Copy:

James A. Frost
Executive Secretary
May 28, 1974

Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik
Chairman
Board of Trustees for State Colleges
Alexander Lake
Danielson, Connecticut 06239

Dear Mrs. Niejadlik:

As you may recall from the "rumor-scotching" memo distributed to the Board at its May meeting as part of the Faculty Advisory Council input, the Council met last Friday to consider, among other items, the implementation of the new salary schedule within those ranks for which there is now a spread of two or more salary grades. I have been directed to communicate to you the following information for your guidance in implementing the adjusted schedule for those faculty members whose recommendations for promotion will be considered at the June meeting of the Board and at the June 3 meeting of the Personnel Committee.

At the special meeting of the Presidents' Council on May 16, it was decided that promotions would ordinarily be made at the lowest salary grade of the rank to which the person is promoted; the matter of merit or formula as these apply to promotions was also considered at the April 22 meeting of the Presidents.

Since the purpose of the recently successful cooperative effort to upgrade salaries was to raise morale and to bring the state colleges closer to an as yet unrealized but now realizable parity with comparable institutions in neighboring states and across the nation, we question the wisdom of using, at this time, only the lower grade where there is a spread of two or more salary grades. We realize that during the strenuous period of greatest pressure to secure these benefits for the faculties, no one had sufficient time to explore the implications of the newly-created double or triple salary gradings for individual faculty positions, nor to test their legality. We respectfully request the Board to do so as soon as possible and to inform the faculty of its findings and of the guidelines to be followed in granting merit promotions within the salary grades assigned for the two upper professorial ranks.

In view of the fact that the faculty members most recently recommended for promotion had no knowledge of such guidelines and were therefore unable to comply with or fulfill whatever requirements might have been set for promotion...
to the higher grade within their new rank, and since promotions this year are relatively few in number, we therefore request that those most recently recommended for promotion be approved for the higher rather than the lower of the two usable grades within the ranks of associate and full professor. Until the publication of guidelines, this action would be more in accordance with the faculty's understanding of the rationale for the recent upward adjustment of the salary schedule, especially as results of the various studies showed the Connecticut State Colleges to be less competitive here than in the lower two ranks.

One of the major problems confronting all of us in assessing this matter is the fact that until the new Personnel Policies take effect, we are still bound to act in accordance with the provisions of the 1968 Policies (section III revised 1971). Realizing that this present state of affairs is a new and untried situation for the state colleges in general, we respectfully request that the Board advise us as to its thinking on the following specific points of interest and importance to the future order, security, morale and well-being of the faculty:

1. Is there any legal stricture on the creation of two separate salary grades for a single unclassified position and job description? Part Seven, Article I of the existing Personnel Policies states, "Compensation for each position is based upon a salary schedule established for the colleges. The schedule provides a minimum and a maximum salary for each class of position..." It would appear that the lowest and highest salary figure for a two-group spread cannot be considered a true minimum and maximum, as for a single range, since each of the two salary grades in question carries a separate increment. We raise this question also because of the "equal pay for equal work" provision of the Fair Employment Practices Act which we would like to avoid as a future issue.

2. What procedures will be followed in moving Associate and Full Professors from the lower to the higher of the two usable grades within the newly established salary structure? We do not wish to be misunderstood as opposing merit increases and note that these are already provided for in the current Personnel Policies under Part Seven, Article III: "...outstandingly meritorious service may be rewarded by an increase of one or more increments in addition to any regular annual increment. No increase for outstandingly meritorious service shall be given which will result in a salary in excess of the maximum established for the faculty members' class of position." Part Three, Article I, 0: "Any faculty member who
has fulfilled the requirements of a rank higher than his own shall be eligible to apply for promotion in rank." Since those faculty members most recently recommended for promotion could not have attained the higher grade within their new rank by fulfilling the requirements (no requirements or guidelines had as yet been promulgated), nor could they have attained the higher grade by recommendation of the Presidents under the Personnel Policies now in force which forbid merit increases exceeding the maximum for one increment range, we therefore request that the Board move that those recommended this year be approved at the higher rather than the lower of the two usable grades within the ranks of Associate and Full Professor.

We would hope that the issuance of reasonable guidelines would obviate such situations in the future. Since we realize the present state of affairs poses unique problems. Faculty uncertainty concerning the phrase, "unless he is recommended for such advancement and salary adjustment by the appropriate College President" would also be removed by clearly stated guidelines, since all explanations given thus far of presidential recommendation have included the analogous situation of granting of the annual increment which, under Part Seven, Article II of the current Personnel Policies, is granted for "acceptable" service rather than for merit.

3. Since the rationale for the cooperative efforts of the Board, Presidents and faculty to achieve the new salary scale and the appropriations with which to implement it was to improve the relatively low rating of the Connecticut State Colleges on local area and national salary scales, especially in the upper two professorial ranks, will the mere establishment (on comparative tables) of higher grades within those two ranks, without sufficient numbers of actual working faculty enjoying those benefits, fulfill the Board's intention of improving our standing, raising faculty morale and upgrading professional goals within the state college system? This is obviously a rhetorical question and we are quite sure we are united with you in thinking that the answer must be "No." We felt compelled to communicate to you our view of the situation this year, when pressing matters of mutual concern have occupied time that might otherwise have been spent on further study of this new problem, so that the Board might be apprised of the facts as we see them before it takes action at the June meeting. Thank you for all your patience and consideration of our faculty advisement.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten name]