

May 11, 1979

LB 587

become part of the permanent base. So what happens in many departments is you have two assistant professors, one who has emphasized teaching or has published but has not published those articles that have "gained national notoriety" or I mean "attention", and the situation has been that others who have gained this notoriety or attention get an increase. The next year they also get this automatic budgeted increase and so what you have is two assistant professors in the same department doing essentially the same job, one may have more classroom teaching hours than the other which allows the other to do a little more writing and publishing. He gets the award and soon you have this tremendous differentiation since it has happened over multiyear period. You have this differentiation where one assistant professor is receiving \$15,500 a year while the other assistant professor, the same rank and the same teaching assignment and so forth, receives a substantially higher because he gets a percentage, an extra percentage built onto his base which is already higher. Now what he might receive is some \$23,000 as opposed to the \$15,000 the other individual has. So what I have done is two things, one, I have introduced a resolution to suggest to the University that if they want to provide incentives for those faculty members to publish that they could do that as a grant instead of as a fixed percentage built into the base which greatens or expands or elongates the differentiation between two employees. If you are going to award an employee, you should award an employee in a consistent manner and it should be a grant, not a dollar percentage amount that goes into his base. Now one of the greatest problems of this whole system is this, that because of the different policies that the Appropriations Committee has had over the years, what has happened is that one year there is one percent for merit, one year there is three percent for merit. Another year there might be five percent for merit, and so depending upon the years in which you get a merit increase, you know, that merit increase can be much more lucrative than at other times. Now I know a faculty member at the University of Nebraska in Omaha who talks about the fact that he has gotten merit increases for three years but those merit increases have been very small amounts because those are the three years that the University...that the Appropriations Committee did not grant large percentages for those kinds of grants. Another individual, his cohort, only got a merit increase one year and yet his salary is higher because the Appropriations Committee had allowed a larger pot in that year and the faculty or the administration allowed him a higher increase. So one guy who was awarded for three different years actually ended up getting less than the individual that was awarded for only one year. So what I am saying is that it is time now to

5189