

LEG. FINANCE - BILLS 1975 - 1976 507

SB 76 cont.,

ENROLLMENT SUMMER 74 BY DIVISION

DIVISION	ENROLLMENT	STUDENT CONTACT HOURS	%
Academics	1,721	5,096	65%
Continuing Ed.	534	2,024	36%
Community Services	418	740	9%
			<u>100%</u>

Non-BUM Expense for Summer 75 at ACC

Dean's Office			
Dean	9,023		
Other	8,662	17,685	
Career Ed			
Director	6,823		
Asst. Dir.	4,086		
Other	17,740	28,649	
Community Services			
Director	5,725		
Counselor	4,851		
Other	5,549	17,125	
ACADEMIC			
Broderick	6,981		
Ehling	5,619		
Roberts	5,909		
Sears	3,831		
Other	20,841	43,261	
CONTINUING ED.			
Director	5,442		
Other	20,929	26,377	

GRAND TOTAL \$133,097
 Admin. at ACC for Summer 75 from
 Dean to Directors Level (Note - with
 one exception does not include Unit
 Heads & Program Coordinator Expenses)

ALASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

LOCAL 2404 AFFILIATED WITH AFL CIO

2533 PROVIDENCE DRIVE, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503

D. H. K.

TO: All Bargaining Unit Members
FROM: Edie Lynch, ACCFT President
SUBJECT: Check-off

DATE: 2/26/75

Please sign both of the attached deduction authorizations. The first authorization is for the monthly agency fee, which will be deducted beginning with the March 31, 1975 paycheck. The second authorization is for the retroactive agency fee from August 5, 1974 through February 28, 1975. The retroactive fee will be the amount still owed to the ACCFT on April 1, 1975.

The Community College Faculty Contract states "all bargaining unit members shall, as a condition of employment or of continued employment, provide the University with a written authorization to deduct from each paycheck the Union service fee."

These authorization forms must be returned to Edie Lynch, Dave Lamborn, or the Southcentral Payroll Office no later than Friday, March 7, 1975. A list of all bargaining unit members who have not submitted these authorizations by that date will be forwarded to the Comptroller of the University of Alaska for appropriate action.

me _____
(Please Print)

Social Security No. _____

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

To: University of Alaska

Subject to the limitations of applicable Alaska and federal laws, and pursuant to section 10.2 (checkoff) of the collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and Local 2404 Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, I hereby authorize deduction of the service fee of the Union from my pay.

Date Signed

Signature of Employee

Received _____
Comptroller

Date

Name _____
(Please Print)

Social Security No. _____

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA DEDUCTION AUTHORIZATION

To: University of Alaska

Subject to the limitations of applicable Alaska and federal laws, and pursuant to section 10.2 (checkoff) of the collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and Local 2404 Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, I hereby authorize deduction of the applicable service fee from August 5 through February 28 from the check for my retroactive pay increase.

Date Signed

Signature of Employee

Received _____
Comptroller

Date

Senators
Representatives
Alaska State Legislature

Senator Ray for your information - wally Olson
SENATE BILL 76
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

In regards to collective bargaining, the negotiated contract and the request for supplemental appropriations, we feel that some issues should be clarified and for that reason we respectfully submit a summary of our views:

1. It was the decision of the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska to delineate the Community Colleges as a separate unit for collective bargaining. Under this plan, an election was conducted last year to determine whether or not the American Federation of Teachers Local 2404 (now the Alaska Community Colleges Federation of Teachers Local 2404) was to be the representative body for collective bargaining. By an overwhelming proportion, the members of the bargaining unit selected the AFT to represent it. In the process of negotiations, it was determined that there would be an "agency shop" so that those who benefit from the Union representation would also bear some of the expenses through paying an agency fee. There are now some members of the bargaining unit who oppose this plan. However, on the contracts which they signed for this year it was clearly stated that the conditions of employment were retroactive to negotiations. Now as a condition for employment, all members of the bargaining unit must permit the University to deduct from their paychecks the agency fee. Those who do not accept the plan or find the agency fee excessive in their estimation have several options.
 - a) Since the Union members voted on the amount to be charged for agency fee, and can elect in the future to change this amount, all eligible bargaining unit members are free to join the union and through the democratic process, change the fee.
 - b) They may elect not to pay the fee and sign a release which will allow them to finish out the year and then terminate. This will allow them to complete the courses and thereby serve the students who are enrolled.
 - c) They may elect to not pay the fee and be terminated.
 - d) They may seek legal recourse against the Union and perhaps the University. However, since an election was conducted and through it the AFT was selected to be the representative for all bargaining unit members, then they must abide by the wishes of the majority until another election is held to select another representative.
2. We feel that the Union, in good faith, has pursued the matter of negotiations according to the State Statutes and policy. As negotiations proceeded, certain stalemates were reached and accordingly both parties went to a process of mediation. The Union members then went on strike and were enjoined by the Court to return to work and to go into binding arbitration. Out of that binding arbitration, came the salary settlement and several other aspects of the contract. We felt that we had proceeded in every proper way and complied not only with the law, but the spirit of it. We are aware of the fact that the Legislature has the responsibility for the fiscal matters of the State and so must either fund or not fund the costs of implementing the negotiated contract. We also realize that the arbitrator who set the salary amounts was not selected by the Legislature, but that he indirectly obligated the State. In the future, perhaps there may have to be changes in the process and statutes not only for collective bargaining on the part of University personnel, but on a wider basis for all State employees who belong to the APEA. However, for the present contract, we feel that we have complied with the intent of the Legislature and the law via the court, so that the supplemental appropriation should be granted to provide the benefits provided in the contract.

3. In preparing the request for supplemental appropriations, the personnel in the Union have done a great deal of research. It was only after personnel were placed in the salary scale that they determined what the actual cost would be both for salary increases and potential rises in the cost of living. We do not find these salaries to be excessive considering the fact that the placements were made on the basis of graduate training or experience in non-academic fields and actual teaching or discipline-related experience.
- It has been the goal of the Union to provide quality education for the students in our community colleges. As you may already know, previously many of the teachers were paid below the national average if you consider the higher cost of living in Alaska. The new salary scale will attract those who are well qualified and the method of salary increase will encourage them to remain within the system rather than having frequent turnovers and reduced continuity in the system. We feel, then, that the salary requests are fair and equitable and that they are for the betterment of the whole community college system.
4. In the event that you see your way to funding this supplemental appropriation now proposed in Senate Bill 76, we ask you to keep in mind that those of us in the Community College Bargaining Unit have been designated as a unit within the University system. Hence, the appropriation for this supplemental amount does not necessarily mean that you must extend salary increases and benefits for the entire University of Alaska; it deals only with the Community Colleges. We further ask that if you appropriate the funds that you, in some manner, direct that they be expended for the benefit of the Bargaining Unit

We know that you will scrutinize the proposed budget very carefully. We hope, for example, that questionable matters can be worked out amicably with the University so that there will be few, if any formal grievances. We have only a very limited amount of money for legal fees and if the University were granted a large sum for grievances, we could almost be grievied out of operation into bankruptcy. So, in such matters, we ask that you consider the matters very carefully.

As local residents of Juneau, we are at your service as our teaching schedules and obligations permit so that if you have further questions or wish any clarification on our part, feel free to contact us.

Bargaining Unit Members, Juneau-Douglas Community College.

Walter M. Olson
 Melvern E. Graham
 Jyll Hubbard
 Ron Silva
 Connie Nunn

PUT WITH BILL

March 21, 1975

Honorable Governor Hammond:

March 15 I wrote a letter and sent it to you with James Irany along with copies to Senator Ray and Representative Bradner. The letter was written very late at night in order to get it to Mr. Irany to be handcarried the next morning.

Having just reread that letter for the first time since writing it, I realize that it does not convey quite what I had intended when I referred to not funding the contract.

There is little, if any, doubt that many of our faculty members at the Community Colleges are underpaid and have been for several years in some cases. And there is no doubt that past efforts by the University have been unsuccessful in attaining necessary funds to upgrade the salaries of these underpaid faculty members. Likewise there is no doubt that the University has not taken the most active role possible to improve the salaries. Thus I did not intend to suggest that none of these salary increases covered in the University-Community College contract be funded.

What I did wish to convey^{was} that in addition to the salary schedule there are several aspects or conditions of the contract that are not good for the University - and I do not refer to the administration but rather to the students and the University's capability to serve the students.

The agency shop clause, in particular, plus the methods of the Union in carrying out the negotiations and pursuing the contract settlement they wished to obtain are detrimental to the University and would be so to any University. Thus I would hope, and wished to convey in my letter of March 15, that you would consider carefully the effects of the contract as a whole and the precedents it would set for future negotiations before giving carte blanche approval to fund all the financial provisions of the contract.

I would like to see my colleagues get salaries comparable with faculty members elsewhere and have comparable working conditions. But I would not like to see the contract funded and have such funding seem to be unconditional approval of what the Union has done to the University of Alaska.

Granted Alaska statutes give or seem to give the Union the right to legally do all or most of what is being done related to arbitrarily assessing a fee or terminating faculty members. But it is a sad day for education when a University is staffed by faculty members who consider that maintaining the reputation and power of a Union on campus is more important than exercising human decency, respecting the rights of colleagues to stand up for their principles and allowing free expression of ideas contrary to those of the Union. The past few weeks have shown that the Alaska Community College Federation of Teachers' leadership considers the Union to far outweigh in importance the University, the students and individuals be they Union or non-Union. In no way can such a faculty serve the State when their primary concern is to serve the Union.

Sincerely,

David Hoke

MEETING ON SENATE BILL NO. 76
February 11, 1975
1:25 p.m.

Senator Sackett met with Max Hullinger from the University of Alaska regarding SB 76, An Act making a supplemental appropriation of \$900,000 to the University of Alaska to pay costs of the arbitrated 1975 contract for community college instructors.

Mr. Hullinger gave Senator Sackett a copy of the Community College Faculty Contract between the University of Alaska and the Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers Local 2404.

Mr. Hullinger explained that under the Collective Bargaining Act, they were petitioned by the Anchorage Community College Faculty. The Board of Regents said they didn't accept a bargaining unit any smaller than the total community college faculty in the State. This necessitated Local 2404 in Anchorage to change their designation from Anchorage Community College to Alaska Community College. (See bottom of page 3-top of page 4 of Contract for composition of Bargaining Unit.) The Contract came out on August 5, 1974. They held an election and had a review of the election, and 2404 was designated as the exclusive bargaining representative. On August 6, they started meeting with the collective bargaining team of the union. There were four members for the University. Mr. Hullinger was Chief Negotiator for the University Team, and many meetings were held. There was a one day strike, and they went into mediation with the Federal Mediation Service in Anchorage. They met as a group in Anchorage and continued to negotiate. He didn't know the date of the strike off hand, but during that period, the negotiators reached an impasse. In the meantime, they went to court for an injunction to stop the strike, but it was denied. However, the Judge told them to come back a week or ten days later. At that time, Judge Hanson accepted their injunction and indicated he wanted them to go to arbitration. Three people were involved in this, a neutral arbitrator and the chief negotiators from both sides, so Mr. Hullinger became a member of the arbitration team.

The arbitration team held a series of hearings over four days on 12 remaining issues. Arbitration proceedings were held and the neutral arbitrator drew up his recommendations. The final result was the present contract, which will go until June 30, 1976.

Mr. Hullinger pointed out that certain facets of the Contract were retroactive. Charging of dues to members of the Bargaining Unit go back to August 5, the point at which they were named; salaries are retroactive to September 1, 1974; and everything else is made applicable January 1, 1975.

Mr. Hullinger stressed that under the terms of this contract, the items costing money are subject to appropriation by the Legislature, and that this is "hit" in several places.

Mr. Hullinger noted that when he was in the Dept. of Administration Office he was asked to put down figures which were his best estimates for FY 75 and 76. He had no data to work from other than hunches and guesses, so SB 76 was submitted based upon that. Since then, this has been reviewed and some of the factors have changed. The total dollars are within the \$900,000 request, but two factors which changed significantly are the cost of the salary increases which has been raised to \$616.4 and the area cost of living which is now \$104.8. (See Enclosure for listing of new costs.) Mr. Hullinger explained that a factor which effected the \$616.4 is that he had not anticipated cost for placement of people on the schedule. Now this is included.

Mr. Hullinger also mentioned the figure of \$98,000 which they threw in to give them a contingency if this doesn't work out. The new figures are closer to what they are going to be needing.

Mr. Hullinger stated that one thing not funded is a cost of living differential that would have application on March 1, 1975. That is based upon the cost of living factor that appears on page 31, Section 8.3 of the Contract. They didn't know whether that should be a part of this bill or a separate bill for all State employees. He said he had no estimate for the University on this. Senator Sackett requested that he come up with one.

Mr. Hullinger went on to say there were three different schedules in this Contract--three different applications of increases in the negotiated statement. These are illustrated beginning on page 28 of the Contract. The July 1, 1975 schedule would be adjusted if there is a cost of living escalator on March 1. He said there could be no projection unless they knew exactly what the rate of increase was. He noted the State was talking 9%, but he didn't know. Senator Sackett asked that he check that out.

Senator Sackett asked for further explanation of the salary schedules. Mr. Hullinger said the salary schedules were the Lock Step Plan that most school districts have. He referred Sen. Sackett to page 26 of the Contract for lane placement criteria. A faculty member is placed in one of the lanes based upon educational experience and work experience. Each year a faculty person is with them staying within a lane, there is a 5% increase. Mr. Hullinger said that in the future the negotiators will only negotiate the first figure in the lane. Everything else is mathematical calculations. No merit is involved--only education and experience

Mr. Hullinger said they did not yet have faculty placed on this type of criteria, although they expect to have it by February 21, and then they will know what the salaries will be.

He added that at this point, they have taken a rough projection as to what salaries will be. They have taken people at their current salary and location and multiplied them out. Mr. Hullinger said that he would get the information to the Finance Committee a couple of days after the 21st of February.

Senator Sackett requested specific breakdown in terms of the number of teachers in each area, etc. He said he wanted each of the figures itemized, but didn't require extreme detail. He needed to know how accurate the figures were.

Senator Sackett also asked whether during the negotiations they had come up with any other increases that would be requested, either by supplemental or within the General Budget. He wanted the total picture in terms of what was happening.

Senator Sackett requested that he receive all information as soon as possible. Mr. Hullinger didn't think he could get it to him before the end of next week.

Senator Sackett said he was going to ask that the supplemental bill be held off until they received accurate figures.

The meeting concluded at 2:00 p.m.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

ADDITIONAL COST OF CONTRACT
 WITH
 COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>
Substitutes	3.0	6.0
Special Courses	5.0	10.0
Overload Contract (1/30 of salary)	50.0	150.0
Summer Contracts (no make)	-0-	10.0
Mileage between teaching locations	1.5	4.0
Offices (remodel)	35.0	35.0
Professional Leave	-0-	100.0
Area Cost of Living	112.8	137.7
Parking	10.0	10.0
Continuing Education	12.0	30.0
Personal Services (including salary schedule placement)	616.4	1635.2
Estimated Cost	<hr/> 845.7	<hr/> 2127.9
Escalator Clause (3/1 and 9/1)	?	?
Salary based on 1400/1300 for 4 months	7.7%	
1550/1300 for 5 months	19.2%	
1700/1300 for 9 months (76)	30.8%	

Introduced: 1/28/75
Referred: Health, Education
and Social Services and
Finance

1 IN THE SENATE

BY THE RULES COMMITTEE BY
REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

2 SENATE BILL NO. 76

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 NINTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act making a supplemental appropriation to the
7 University of Alaska; and providing for an effective
8 date."

9 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

10 * Section 1. The sum of \$900,000 is appropriated from the general fund
11 to the University of Alaska for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, to
12 pay the following estimated costs of the arbitrated 1975 contract for
13 community college instructors:

14 Substitute pay	\$ 3,000
15 Special assignments, Alaska	5,000
16 Overload contracts	50,000
17 Mileage between teaching locations	1,500
18 Office space	35,000
19 Area cost-of-living differential	185,500
20 Reserved parking	10,000
21 Continuing education, spouse and children	12,000
22 Salary increases	500,000
23 Cost-of-living increases	<u>98,000</u>
24	\$ 900,000

25 * Sec. 2. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.-
26 10.070(c).

COPY COMMITTEE

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

POUCH K - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU 99801

April 9, 1975

Senator Bill Ray
Chairman
Senate Finance Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Senator Ray:

In your memorandum of March 11 you asked the following questions:

1. Must the legislature fully fund the Community College faculty labor agreement?
2. Must non-union members of the bargaining unit receive the same benefits as union members?

AS 23.40.215 states as follows:

Funding. The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the terms of the Public Employment Relation Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation.

It is our belief that the effect of this provision is to reserve for the legislature the responsibility to review the monetary terms of labor agreements entered into pursuant to the Public Employment Relations Act. The legislature has the power to treat an appropriation requested for this purpose in the same manner as it treats any other request for an appropriation. The legislature may refuse to appropriate any funds or may appropriate the funds at any level it deems proper. Since the Department of Law has considered your first question on several occasions, I am attaching copies of our earlier opinions which consider this question in greater detail.

With reference to your second question it is our opinion that all the employees of a bargaining unit, including both union and non-union, must be treated in the same manner. (The bargaining unit from which management is contracting is the union as agent of the bargaining unit. This is recognized in the contract in its preamble:

CORRECTION

THIS DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED
TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY

COPY COMMITTEE

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

POUCH K - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU 99801

April 9, 1975

Senator Bill Ray
Chairman
Senate Finance Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Senator Ray:

In your memorandum of March 11 you asked the following questions:

1. Must the legislature fully fund the Community College faculty labor agreement?
2. Must non-union members of the bargaining unit receive the same benefits as union members?

AS 23.40.215 states as follows:

Funding. The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the terms of the Public Employment Relation Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation.

It is our belief that the effect of this provision is to reserve for the legislature the responsibility to review the monetary terms of labor agreements entered into pursuant to the Public Employment Relations Act. The legislature has the power to treat an appropriation requested for this purpose in the same manner as it treats any other request for an appropriation. The legislature may refuse to appropriate any funds or may appropriate the funds at any level it deems proper. Since the Department of Law has considered your first question on several occasions, I am attaching copies of our earlier opinions which consider this question in greater detail.

With reference to your second question it is our opinion that all the employees of a bargaining unit, including both union and non-union, must be treated in the same manner. (The party with whom management is contracting is the union as agent for the entire bargaining unit. This is recognized in the contract which states in its preamble:

This agreement is entered into by and between the University of Alaska (hereinafter referred to as the University) and the Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, Local 2404, (hereinafter referred to as the Union) as the exclusive bargaining agent for faculty members in the bargaining unit.)1/

This position is supported by our understanding of the nature of the role played by the union in the collective bargaining process. The union represents not only its own members but all of the employees in the bargaining unit. 2/

Thus we conclude that the contract applies equally to all members of the bargaining unit and that any appropriation made to cover wages and fringe benefits agreed to in the contract must apply equally to all of the members of the bargaining unit.

Sincerely,

AVRUM M. GROSS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: *Mark Ertischek*
Mark Ertischek
Assistant Attorney General

Attachments:

Letter from Mark Ertischek to Mr. Warwick March 12, 1975.
Memorandum from Avrum Gross to Governor Hammond January 21, 1975.
Memorandum from Norman Gorsuch to Wes Coyner May 2, 1973.
Letter from John Havelock to Representative E.J. Haugen Jan. 24. 1973.

1/ Community College Faculty Contract August 5, 1974-June 30, 1976
pg. 3.

2/ Ford Motor Co. v Hoffman, 345 US 5330, 31 LRRM 2548, 2551 (1953). See also Truck Drivers Local 568 U. NLRB 379 F1d. 137, 65 LRRM 2309 (CACD, 1967), and Hughs Tool Co. 104 NLRB 81, 32 LRRM 10 10 (1953).

ME:jw

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

PINK
(JLH)
JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

POUCH K - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU 99811

January 21, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Jay S. Hammond
Governor

FROM: Avrum M. Gross
Attorney General

RE: Payment of Recently Negotiated Pay
Increase for Supervisory Employees

A question has been raised regarding payment of the recently negotiated pay raise for supervisory employees. More specifically, is the Department of Administration, because of the December 13, 1974 agreement, obligated to institute the supervisory pay increase immediately, despite a possible lack of appropriated funds? Our understanding of the facts leading to this question is as follows.

On December 13, 1974, negotiators for the State of Alaska and the Alaska Public Employees Association reached an agreement regarding the terms of a contract for supervisory employees. Included in this new contract was a provision for a pay increase retroactive to November 16, 1974. Currently, Mr. Robert Stephen, Executive Director of the Alaska Public Employees Association, is asking when this pay raise will be implemented by the State. However, the Department of Administration, through Commissioner Warwick, states that there will be no pay increase for supervisory employees until there has been a specific Legislative appropriation for that purpose. The situation is complicated by the pay increase recently granted to ferry system personnel. Pay increases retroactive to July 1, 1974 were provided for in agreements reached with two maritime unions on November 18 and 24, 1974. Contrary to the position taken by the Department of Administration regarding the supervisors' pay increase, the Department of Public Works implemented the raises for ferry system personnel by sending out retroactive payments in December, 1974, despite the fact that present projections indicate a deficit in the Marine Transportation budget if a supplemental appropriation is not granted.

0210-1

Initially, we note that it is clear that the agreement binds the State of Alaska to do all that is legally within the State's power to implement the pay increase. 1/ This would include seeing that the terms of the agreement are referred for Legislative action when Legislative action, including appropriation is required. 2/

There are, however, certain restrictions on the payment of the raise at this time. The first restriction is contained in Article IX, Section 13, of the Alaska Constitution, which provides in part that:

No money shall be withdrawn from the treasury except in accordance with appropriations made by law. * * *

Clearly the requirement of Legislative appropriation is superior to and, in fact, a part of, any agreement entered into by the executive branch which requires the expenditure of public monies. In other words, the Department of Administration cannot pay the negotiated pay increase unless sufficient funds have been appropriated by the Legislature. 3/

If this were the only legal restriction on implementing the monetary terms of the December 13, 1974 agreement, two possible methods of immediate implementation would exist. The first is provided by the Executive Budget Act in AS 37.07.080(e) which states that:

Appropriation transfers or changes as between objects of expenditures or activity areas within a program may be made by the head of a state agency upon approval of the division. Appropriation transfers or changes between programs within an agency may be made upon review by the division and approval of the governor, and shall be reported to the legislature quarterly. No transfers may be made between agencies.

Thus, if sufficient funds existed in the line items of the budget of each department, these funds could be shifted to the personal services portion of its budget in order to pay the negotiated wage increase. However, this shift of funds should only be done

1/ State v. State, County & Munic. Emps., Local 1726, 298 A 2d 362 (Del. Ch. 1972).

2/ Informal Opinion of the Attorney General, January 24, 1973 (letter to State Representative E. J. Haugen).

3/ See Director, Bureau of Legislative Research, v. Mackrell, 204 S.W. 2d 893 (Ark. 1947); Calif. State Employees Ass'n. v. State, 108 Cal. Rptr. 60 (App. 1973).

The Honorable Jay S. Hammond
Governor

January 21, 1975

- 3 -

if to do so would not materially affect the operations of any department so as to frustrate the intent of any prior Legislative appropriation.

The second alternative would involve immediate implementation of the pay raise, accompanied by a request from the Governor for a supplemental appropriation with which to fund it. Authority to seek a supplemental appropriation is provided by the Executive Budget Act in AS 37.07.100, which provides that:

The governor from time to time may transmit to the legislature proposed supplemental or deficiency appropriations which in his judgment are necessary on account of laws enacted after the transmission of the budget, or are otherwise in the public interest. He shall accompany each proposal with a statement of the reasons for it, including the reasons for its omission from the budget.

However, it must be kept in mind that this alternative is restricted by Article IX, Section 13, of the Alaska Constitution, noted earlier. Immediate implementation followed by a request for a supplemental appropriation could only be considered if so doing would not result in the possibility of deficit spending. That is, since the possibility always exists that the Legislature might not approve the supplemental request, spending could not be commenced if it would result in deficit spending absent the supplemental appropriation.

However, as noted earlier, there are two restrictions on immediate implementation of the monetary agreement. The second restriction on meeting the obligations imposed by the December 13, 1974 agreement is contained in AS 23.40.215, which provides that:

The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the Public Employment Relations Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation.

Two interpretations of this provision are possible. First, it can be argued that the Legislature intended to require Legislative ratification of the specific monetary terms of any collective bargaining agreement entered into before any money could be paid to implement that agreement. Note that this interpretation would rule out immediate implementation by either rebudgeting under the Executive Budget Act or seeking a supplemental appropriation. A second interpretation of AS 23.40.215 is also plausible. It can be argued that this provision is an indication that the Public Employment Relations Act, while permitting collective bargaining, is not a grant of authority to the bargaining representatives to spend public monies without Legislative appropriation. While it might be argued that this interpretation is merely repetitive of

Article IX, Section 13, of the Alaska Constitution, it should be remembered that AS 23.40 is applicable to all public employers and employees, i.e., state, city, borough, etc. 4/ Hence, AS 23.40.215 can be seen as an extension to all public employers of the principle contained in Article IX, Section 13, of the Alaska Constitution: appropriation by some legislative body is required for the funding of the monetary portion of any agreement entered into under the Public Employment Relations Act.

On the surface, it appears there is little difference between these two interpretations. Certainly the first prevents immediate implementation of a pay raise and the second, by restricting the right of bargaining agents to commit public monies, appears to do the same thing. It can, however, be argued under the second interpretation that if the immediate implementation of the raise does not result in deficit spending or does not otherwise frustrate Legislative intent in the budget, some readjustment through the Executive Budget Act might be made to permit immediate implementation of a pay raise. It is not clear that this second interpretation is the preferable one and there is no judicial authority to substantiate the possible immediate expenditure of funds under such an interpretation. 5/ Therefore, we do not feel we can in good conscience advise the departments of the State to implement a pay raise immediately without first obtaining Legislative authorization for their action.

I know that this interpretation is not entirely consistent with the past actions of some of the departments of State government. Apparently in past instances the departments through use of the Executive Budget Act or other means not readily apparent, did immediately implement certain pay raises. I do wish to note, however, that the question has been reviewed by two previous Attorneys General, and our opinion is basically consistent with that of Mr. Gorsuch and Mr. Havelock. For your benefit, I am attaching copies of their opinions on this subject.

4/ Sec. 4 of Ch 113 SLA 1972 makes the Public Employment Relations Act applicable to organized boroughs and municipalities unless their legislative body specifically chooses (by ordinance or resolution) to make the act inapplicable.

5/ The legislative history of Ch 113 SLA 1972 is not helpful. Ch 113 SLA 1972, the Public Employment Relations Act, was enacted as HB 683 as amended in the Senate. There is almost no legislative history of this bill. HB 736, which was introduced on March 16, 1972 by the State Affairs Committee, was basically the Public Employment Relations Act as later adopted. However, it did not contain AS 23.40.215. This provision first appeared in the Committee's substitute for HB 736 on April 7, 1972. No explanation for this amendment could be found.

The Honorable Jay S. Hammond
Governor

January 21, 1975
- 5 -

I want to reiterate that the administration does have an obligation to support this pay raise before the legislature. I would also like to suggest that to avoid any future questions in this area, each negotiated pay raise contain the specific provision that pay raises will only be implemented after subsequent appropriation by the Legislature.

AMG:as

To Mike Peterson

Re: Retroactive wage increases
Revised 10/1/75

Mike - Jim -

Re memo of May 2, 1973
and memo of January 10, 1975.

As I read these memos,
they imply that Public Works'
payment of retroactive wage
increases before getting a supplemental
appropriation is illegal because
it is deficit spending.

I do not know the status
of the ferry wage negotiations, but
it is my impression the course
of dealing that has developed
is exactly that — payment
of the wage increase without
an appropriation for it.

Before you leave, Mike,
I'd like to get your thinking on
what is practical.

I doubt the accuracy
of the 1973 ~~AS~~ memo where
it concluded AS 23.40.040 is
repealed by implication. However,
apparently the PER Act applies
(except, I would say, where it
is inconsistent with the specific
provision — .040). However it is
obvious, it appears the marine
unions cannot be expected to

wait for legislative appropriation
when that hasn't been the
best practice, unless the
state is willing to buy into some
major marine labor problems
and the charge.

It seems to me the second
sentence of AS 23.40.040 can
be read to say the marine
union agreements are "final"
when approved by the Commissioner
of Public Works, that a course
of dealing grew up consistent with
the realities of running a marine
operation and that unless the
PERA specifically repealed
.040 or existing practices thereunder
it can be presumed the legislature
intended those practices to continue.

This does not meet the
constitutional question and I
don't claim it is perfect legal
reasoning — but what else
is there?

xerox: Jim Haley

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

TO: Honorable Senator Chancey Croft
President of the Senate

DATE: January 29, 1975

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Dickerson Regan
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Law

SUBJECT: Memorandum of May 2, 1973

Your office asked for a copy of this office's memo on ferry system wages. In passing on to you the enclosed memorandum of May 2, 1973, we note that the Department of Public Works did not change its past practices as to paying marine union pay increases upon passage of the Public Employees Relations Act. Marine union wage increases have been paid retroactively at such time as contracts were signed, although the legislature had not at that time appropriated funds for the "monetary terms" of the agreement.

Bargaining changed slightly. The governor designated the commissioner of Public Works as the spokesman and chief bargainer for the state and the commissioner of Administration and director of the Division of Personnel made up the balance of the bargaining team.

Attachment

DR:jdg

7,500,000
by
300,000.00

May 2, 1973

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Wes Coyner
Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor

FROM: John E. Havelock
Attorney General

By
Norman C. Gorsuch
Deputy Attorney General

SUBJECT: Authority of the Commissioner of Public Works to negotiate a pay increase for Ferry Personnel effective July 1, 1973 - legal analysis.

Our understanding of the background of the above referenced situation is as follows:

A proposed pay increase for ferry system employees, the particulars of which are were to be negotiated after the legislature adjourned, was included in the general pay increase proposed for all state employees which the legislature rejected. Currently, ferry system personnel appear to be demanding a pay increase regardless of the legislatures failure to appropriate funds for such an increase. In January 1971, the Department of Public Works obtained a supplemental appropriation to finance pay increases for ferry system employees which had been negotiated in 1970 and became effective July 1, 1970. However, the Legislative Finance Committees had been alerted to the probability of such a supplemental at the time of the original appropriation to the Department of Public Works. Presently, Public Works is interested in negotiating a wage increase for ferry personnel effective July 1, 1973, and seeking a supplemental appropriation in January 1974 to pay for the increased cost of operation the pay increase would cause. This Department has been asked to comment on the legality of such action.

I.

AUTHORITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS TO
NEGOTIATE WITH FERRY PERSONNEL

It is our conclusion that the Department of Public Works no longer has the authority to independently negotiate with ferry system personnel.

AS 23.40.010 states as follows:

UNION CONTRACTS WITH STATE AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS. (a) The state or a political subdivision of the state including but not limited to . . . , may enter into a contract with a labor organization whose members furnish services to the state or the political subdivision.

(b) Nothing contained in this chapter requires the state or political subdivision of the state to enter into a union contract.

AS 23.40.010 was repealed by the legislature in 1972 when it enacted the Public Employment Relations Act.

AS 23.40.040 which was not repealed by the legislature states as follows:

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT. The commissioner of public works or his authorized representative, in accordance with sections 10 - 30 of this chapter, may negotiate and enter into collective bargaining agreements concerning wages, hours, working conditions, and other employment benefits with the employees of the Division of Marine Transportation engaged in operating the state ferry system as masters or members of the crews of vessels or their bargaining agent. No collective bargaining agreement is final without the concurrence of the commissioner of public works. The commissioner of public works may make a provision in the collective bargaining agreement for the settlement of labor disputes by arbitration. (Emphasis added)

It is the conclusion of this Department that the repeal of AS 23.40.010 also had the effect of repealing AS 23.40.040. The rationale for this conclusion is the particular language of AS 23.40.040 and the obvious intent of the legislature in enacting the Public Employment Relations Act (AS 23.40.070-266; Ch. 113, SLA 1972).

In perusing the references in AS 23.40.040, it becomes clear that AS 23.40.040 is simply a refinement of AS 23.40.010 and by its language is operative only in conjunction with AS 23.40.010. The repeal of AS 23.40.010 by sec. 5 of the Public Employment Relations Act thus impliedly

repeals or negates AS 23.40.040, ^{as} AS 23.40.040 only described how the Department of Public Works is to implement the basic grant of authority to enter into collective bargaining agreements which was repealed by the legislature.

The second reason for concluding that AS 23.40.040 was impliedly repealed with the repeal of AS 23.40.010 is : the broad scope of the Public Employment Relations Act. Basically, the Public Employment Relations Act encompasses the whole sphere of collective bargaining at the state level. It grants state employees the right to organize and bargain with the state and imposes on the state the obligation to bargain in good faith with state employees. Further, the Act designates certain practices as unfair labor practices and creates a labor relations agency to handle unfair labor complaints. The Act also contains a grandfather clause - AS 23.40.240- designed to protect organized employees in the state ferry system. This grandfather clause specifically protected existing collective bargaining agreements in effect at the time of the enactment of the Public Employment Relations Act. There is nothing in the language of that section which preserves any right of the Department of Public Works to continue to be the exclusive employer bargaining agent.

Indeed as the Commissioner of Public Works does not possess the legal authority to negotiate under the old statute, he could be construed to be bargaining in bad faith as he would have no authority to bind the executive branch.

The comprehensiveness of the Public Employment Relations Act is a forceful manifestation that the legislature intended the Public Employment Relations Act to supercede AS 23.40.040.

We should point out however that the Governor can designate the Commissioner of Public Works as the State's negotiating representative under the Public Employment Relations Act. AS 23.40.250(b).

II.

AUTHORITY TO COMMIT THE LEGISLATURE TO NEGOTIATED MONETARY TERMS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.

As the negotiations with the ferry system employees must be conducted under the Public Employment Relations Act, the question arises as to the authority under that Act to bind the legislature to the monetary terms negotiated.

Article IX, Sec. 13 of the Alaska Constitution states as follows:

"No money shall be withdrawn from the treasury

except in accordance with appropriations made by law . . ."

The legislature has chosen to reserve unto itself the ultimate approval of the monetary terms of any agreement negotiated under the Public Employment Relations Act through the appropriation process.

AS 23.40.215 states as follows:

FUNDING. The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the Public Employment Relations Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation.

Therefore, by the plain meaning of those statutory terms, the executive branch cannot negotiate a binding agreement in the area of monetary terms with any collective bargaining representative of the employees without it being specifically subject to subsequent funding through the legislative appropriation process.

Recent case law in the area of School Board - Teacher Relations indicates that where the legislature has by legislation provided that the terms of a collective bargaining agreement between a municipal corporation and a teachers union are specifically made subject to final approval and funding through an appropriations agency, the school board cannot be compelled to pay the negotiated wage rates if the appropriating agency does not appropriate sufficient funds to pay for them.

In Town of Scituate, et al., v. Scituate Teachers Association, et al.; State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Superior Court, Civil Action 71-2718, Feb. 8, 1972, the Court ruled that the Town must pay the negotiated wage increases to the teachers because under the Rhode Island statutes the legislature did not preserve the supremacy of the appropriating body and did not make any collective bargaining agreements entered into by school boards subject to the will of an appropriating agency.

Similarly in Francis M. McDonald Jr., State's Attorney for the County of New Haven at Waterbury v. Raymond J. Quinn, Jr., Connecticut Superior Court, New Haven County Case No. 32, 856, May 8, 1969, the Court denied a Connecticut school boards request for a court order to force appropriation of funds by the City's Board of Finance to pay increased salaries negotiated with teachers. The question at issue was whether provisions of the charter of the City of Waterbury granting ultimate review and control of teachers salaries to the Waterbury Board of Finance and Board of Alderman take precedence over a contract executed pursuant to the state's teacher negotiation act. The court found that the legislature intended

that the charter provisions take precedence explaining its decision as follows:

The court recognizes that many of our teachers are sadly under paid and would like to see corrections in the existing inequities of their position with relation to other groups whose work is less demanding of vitally skilled education and equally vital educational skill. However, until the legislature decrees otherwise, the final say as to the teachers salaries rests with the ultimate budgetary control of the Board of Finance and Board of Alderman.

The Court advised the teachers to seek a political remedy rather than a legal remedy. In doing so, the Court stated as follows:

If the teachers ultimately decide that their goal would be best served by receiving the same treatment with respect to salary increases as that afforded to other municipal employees . . . : they should ask the legislature to change or better define the respective powers of the Boards involved . . .

Crucial to the Court's reading of legislative intent was a comparison of the Act permitting negotiations for teachers with Connecticut's Municipal Employees Relations Act passed during the same session of the legislature. Noting that unlike the latter act, the act authorizing teacher negotiations is silent as to repeal of local charter provisions, the Court concluded that the difference "seems to indicate a definite legislative direction that agreements with municipal employees other than teachers, once ratified must be funded and paid in accordance with the terms thereof and that in the case of agreements with teachers, there is no such requirement of funding and no requirement that either party agree to any proposal or make a concession." See also Waterbury Teachers Association v. Arnold Furlong, et al.; Waterbury Teachers Association v. Board of Education; Waterbury Board of Education v. Waterbury Teachers Association; Connecticut Supreme Court October term (Feb. 29, 1972).

Therefore, it is our conclusion that in view of the specific legislative reservation of its approval of any monetary terms through the appropriate process found in the Public Employment Relations Act, the Executive Branch cannot negotiate a binding pay increase, effective prior to specific legislative appropriation to pay for it. It does have a duty however, after concluding negotiations and signing an agreement to present the agreement to the legislature for appropriate funding.

Attached hereto is an earlier opinion issued by this office to Representative Haugan which speaks to this issue.

III.

EFFECTS OF THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET ACT ON THE ABILITY TO OBTAIN A SUPPLEMENTAL FOR A PAY INCREASE WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE PRIOR TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION.

If the Department of Public Works could revise its marine transportation program to glean from its other line items sufficient surplus funds which then could be transferred to the personal services portion of its budget in order to pay for a negotiated wage increase without seeking a supplemental, the Executive Budget Act may provide the methodology to achieve this.

The Executive Budget Act is applicable to the Department of Public Works. The granting of a pay raise effective July 1, 1973, and the embarkation upon a course of deficit spending can be permitted by the Division of Budget and Management only if Public Works submits a revised program and there is a commitment by the administration to seek a supplemental appropriation. The specific statutory restrictions against a simple course of deficit spending read as follows:

AS 37.07.080. PROGRAM EXECUTION. (a) Except as limited by policy decisions of the Governor, appropriations by the legislature, and other provisions of law, the several state agencies have full authority for administering their program service assignments and are responsible for their proper management.

(b) Each state agency shall prepare an annual plan for the operation of each of its assigned programs except for programs that are exempted from this requirement by the division. The operations plan shall be prepared in the form and content and be transmitted on the date prescribed by the division.

(c) The division shall:
(1) review each operation plan to determine that it is consistent with the policy decisions of the governor and appropriations by the legislature, that it reflects the proper planning and efficient management methods, that appropriations have been made for the planned purpose and will not be exhausted before the end of the fiscal year;

(2) approve the operations plan if satisfied that it meets the requirements under (1) of this subsection; otherwise, the division shall require revision of the operations plan in whole or in part;

(3) modify or withhold the planned expenditures at any time during the appropriation period if the division finds that the expenditures are greater than those necessary to execute the program at the level authorized by the governor and the legislature, or that the receipts and surpluses will be insufficient to meet the authorized expenditure levels.

(d) No state agency may increase the salaries of its employees, employ additional employees, or expend money or incur obligations except in accordance with law and properly approved operations plan.

Not approved ←
(e) Appropriation transfers or changes as between objects of expenditures or activity areas within a program may be made by the head of a state agency upon approval of the division. Appropriation transfers or changes between programs within an agency may be made upon review by the division and approval of the governor, and shall be reported to the legislature quarterly. No transfers may be made between agencies.

(Emphasis added)

The heart of the problem is thus propriety of the Governor seeking a supplemental appropriation under the current circumstances. AS 37.07.100 implies that a supplemental appropriation is inappropriate for an item which was included within the executive budget and rejected by the legislature. The text of AS 37.07.100 reads as follows:

The governor from time to time may transmit to the legislature proposed supplemental or deficiency appropriations which in his judgment are necessary on account of laws enacted after the transmission of the budget, or are otherwise in the public interest. He shall accompany each proposal with a statement of the reasons for it, including the reasons for its omission from the budget.

(Emphasis added)

The only possible way of avoiding the implication of AS 37.07.100 that a supplemental is inappropriate if the legislature has rejected an appropriation request for the same item, is to maintain that the legislature has never really separately considered the issue of a pay increase for ferry system personnel. It could be argued by the Administration that in the past session, the executive budget and the legislature only dealt with the issue of a pay increase for all state employees and because of the unique problems of the ferry system (no merit raises), it is in the public interest to grant ferry system employees a raise.

This same reasoning would not necessarily apply to a pay increase effective July 1, 1973, for all other state employees because it would be much more difficult to sustain the rationale that the legislature did not specifically address the issue.

Therefore in summary, the Department of Public Works cannot independently negotiate a salary increase but must act through the provisions of the Public Employment Relations Act. The Governor could designate the Commissioner as the negotiating representative for the Department of Public Works under the provisions of the Public Employment Relations Act anyway.

Secondly, absent specific prior appropriations by the legislature, all negotiated monetary terms are subject to approval by the legislature. Thirdly it is possible to manipulate the provisions of the executive budget act through a revised program that would collect sufficient funding from other areas in the marine transportation budget and provide a working fund against which the Department could negotiate and from which the Department could draw to pay for a negotiated wage increase effective July 1, 1973, without requesting any supplemental. It is also possible for the Administration to consider the manipulation of the executive budget act for the purpose of seeking a supplemental appropriation under the rationale discussed above. We believe however, that this course of action is subject to strong challenge if litigation is initiated to test its validity under the Constitution.

The alternatives to be considered under the circumstances given to us in order of those alternatives most legally defensible are as follows:

1. The Department can negotiate a contract ^{under the terms of} ~~order with~~ the Public Employment Relations Act with a provision for a retro-active pay increase and subject to legislative appropriation.

2. The Department can refuse to negotiate any pay increase at all and seek to hold the ferry system employees at the same wage rates (obviously impractical but legally sound).

3. The Governor could call for a special session of

the legislature prior to the expiration of this fiscal year to consider a special appropriation to the Marine Transportation Division of the Department of Public Works or the Department of Administration for a pay increase commencing July 1, 1973.

4. The Department of Public Works and Administration could obtain additional funds through the manipulation of the Executive Budget Act provisions through a revised program and not seek a supplemental appropriation.

5. Negotiate an immediate pay increase under the provisions of the Public Employment Relations Act effective July 1, 1973 and finance it with a supplemental appropriation which could be arguably justified under the provisions of AS 37.07.100.

6. Follow Commissioner Easley's suggestion outlined in his memo by giving him authority to negotiate under the old statute an immediate pay increase and start on a course of deficit spending. This is the least desirable alternative and the one most susceptible to being overturned if legally challenged as being in violation of the Constitution, Executive Budget Act and Public Employment Relations Act.

It is our legal judgment that the best course of action to follow is that outlined in number 1 above.

January 24, 1973

The Honorable E. J. Haugen
Alaska State Representative
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Haugen:

In your letter of this same date you have asked whether the grant of the right of collective bargaining for public employees provided for in Chapter 113, SLA 1972 constitutes a restriction, in violation of the Constitution of the State of Alaska, on the Legislature's prerogative with regard to the appropriation of state funds.

Your attention is invited to AS 24.40.215, enacted also in Chapter 113, SLA 1972, which provides:

"The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the Public Employment Relations Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation."

Under this provision, the terms of a collective bargaining agreement constitute an agreement by the negotiating public agency that the agency will see that the terms of the agreement are referred for legislative action when legislative action, including appropriation, is required.

The power of legislative review is superior to the contract and incorporated in the enabling Act, as to provisions requiring the expenditure of funds. There is no action for breach of contract arising only from the failure of the Legislature to appropriate the full amount required to fund the agreement. Legislative authority over appropriations is unimpaired by the adoption of Chapter 113, SLA 1972.

I hope this answers the questions you have raised to your satisfaction.

Sincerely,

John E. Havelock
Attorney General

March 12, 1975

The Honorable Andrew S. Warwick
Commissioner
Department of Administration
Pouch C
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Commissioner Warwick:

You have inquired as to the significance of AS 23.40.215 which provides as follows:

Funding. The monetary terms of any agreement entered into under the terms of the Public Employment Relations Act are subject to funding through legislative appropriation.

We have considered this question and in our opinion this clause would preclude the state from entering into a binding labor agreement with respect to its monetary terms.

AS 23.40.070 is a declaration of policy in which the legislature enunciated its reasons for establishing a collective bargaining system. It declares in AS 23.40.070(2) that this policy will be effectuated by:

requiring public employees to negotiate with and enter into written agreements with employee organizations on matters of wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment;

also AS 23.40.210 says in part,

Agreement. Upon the completion of negotiations between an organization and a public employer, if a settlement is reached, the employer shall reduce it to writing in the form of an agreement.

The provisions cited above do not conflict but rather they indicate the intention of the legislature to reserve the power to review the monetary terms of labor agreements between

The Honorable Andrew Warwick

March 12, 1975

-2-

the state and its organized employees entered into pursuant to the terms of the Public Employment Relations Act. As a party to the contract it is the duty of the Department of Administration to request a legislative appropriation, or supplemental appropriation for this purpose.

We believe that it would be improper to assume that the appropriation will be automatically approved by legislature and to begin paying the employees before the appropriation is approved. Such a practice would violate AS 23.40.215 which, as we have noted provides for the legislative review of the monetary terms of labor agreements. Any attempt to transfer funds into an object of expenditure against which employee benefits are usually charged would also be a violation of the spirit if not the letter of AS 23.40.215.

Sincerely,

AVRUM M. GROSS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By:
Mark Ertischek
Assistant Attorney General

ME:jw

Dr. Heatt

Compensation and Salaries

at the

University of Alaska

by

Richard J. Solie

February 18, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables and Appendix Tables

Introduction

Comparisons With Other Universities

Comparisons With State Civil Service

- Determining grade and rank comparability.
- Salary comparisons.

Comparisons With Federal Civil Service

Summary

Tables

Appendix Tables

LIST OF TABLES

- Table I, Average University of Alaska Instructional Staff Salaries and Compensation by Rank and Location, 1974.
- Table II, University of Alaska Instructional Staff Salaries--Present and Bargained or Proposed--1974-75 and 1975-76.
- Table III, University of Alaska Non-Community College Instructional Staff Compensation (Salaries Plus Fringe Benefits)--Present and Proposed--1974-75 and 1975-76.
- Table IV, Costs of Lower, Intermediate and Higher Standard Family Budgets in Selected Urban Alaskan Cities as Compared with U.S. Urban Average - Autumn 1974 and Projections to Autumn 1975.
- Table V, University of Alaska Equivalents of Projected 1974-75 AAUP Scales for Average Academic Year Compensation.
- Table VI, University of Alaska Equivalents of Projected 1975-76 AAUP Percentile Scales for Average Academic Year Compensation
- Table VII, University of Alaska Instructional Staff Compensation to AAUP Percentile Distributions of Compensation Adjusted for Alaska COLA, 1974-75 and 1975-76.
- Table VIII, State of Alaska Civil Service Salaries Compared to University of Alaska Senior College Instructional Staff Salaries.
- Table IX, Federal Civil Service Salaries Plus "COLA" (Cost of Living Allowance) Compared to Present University of Alaska Senior College Instructional Staff Salaries.

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

- Table I, Percentile Distributions of Average Compensation By Number of Institutions, 1973-74.
- Table II, 1974-75 Projected Scales of Average Compensation (Salary Plus Fringe Benefits), 9-Month Basis
- Table III, Projected 1975-76 AAUP Scales of Average Compensation (Salary Plus Fringe Benefits) 9-Month Basis
- Table IV, 1974-75 Projected AAUP Scales for Average Academic Year Compensation Adjusted for Alaska "COLA" of Selected Alaska Cities.
- Table V, 1975-76 Projected AAUP Scales for Average Academic Year Compensation Adjusted for Alaska "COLA" of Selected Alaska Cities.
- Table VI, U.S. Federal Civil Service Salary Schedule.

Introduction

This study follows the methodology of the 1973 Salary Study entitled "Professional Compensation at the University of Alaska, 1973-74," but it distinguishes between salaries and compensation for Senior College and Community College instructional staff since the latter are now included under a collectively bargained contract while the former are non-union.

Table I summarizes current average Senior College and Community College salaries and compensation by rank and location as of the beginning of academic year 1974. The table includes the 4% cost of living increase effective August 16, 1974, but does not include the increases bargained by the union or proposed for the rest of the University professional staff for 1974-75 and 1975-76.

Tables II and III include adjusted salaries and compensation levels based on the bargained and proposed increases for 1974-75 and 1975-76. These adjusted levels are shown for each rank and as an average for all ranks for Senior Colleges, but only as an all-ranks average for Community Colleges since the latter eliminated academic rank in their recently concluded negotiations. The average salaries shown for 9/1/74 include the cost of fitting the faculty to the new "base" salary schedule, application of area cost of living differentials, and a 7.7% increase in the base schedule. The cost of fitting faculty to this new base schedule represents the elimination of inequities among faculty and, in some cases, the reclassification of staff members in order to bring individual salaries into the proper relationship to each other. The cost of living differential applied for the Senior Colleges is based on the differentials between Anchorage and the "lower 48" estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the differential between Anchorage and other Alaskan cities incorporated into pay schedules

for State general government employees. Thus it provides a zero differential between Juneau and Anchorage and an 11.2% differential between Fairbanks and Anchorage. The differentials used for Community Colleges were based on a 1972 survey undertaken by the State Division of Personnel since these area differentials were included in the contract negotiated between the Community College union and the University. These differentials are cited in footnote 4 of Table IV and are the basis for the development of the cost of living differential indexes shown in Table IV.

Comparisons With Other Universities

Tables V and VI show the 1974-75 and 1975-76 AAUP compensation scales based on percentiles of distribution for universities and colleges throughout the nation. These figures have been adjusted for the Alaska COLD (cost of living differential) and thus they represent the amount which the University of Alaska would need to pay in order to provide the real income equivalent of the AAUP compensation scales.

Table VII is one of the key summary tables in the study since it reflects the way in which University of Alaska compensation, present and bargained (Table II.I), compares with that of other colleges and universities throughout the nation. (Tables V and VI.) Two comparisons shown for Senior Colleges are with Category I and Category IIA institutions. The definition of Category I includes those institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which, in the most recent three years, conferred an annual average of 15 or more doctorates

covering a minimum of three non-related disciplines. Category IIA includes institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate level which are not included in Category I. Although the University of Alaska is technically a Category IIA institution at the present time, Category I is probably the most relevant comparison for Senior College salaries and compensation for several reasons. First, Category I is comprised largely of State universities and includes all but three of the nation's land grant institutions (the only exceptions being the Universities of Alaska, Wyoming and South Dakota). Category IIA, on the other hand, is comprised largely of state colleges, and since in attracting faculty for the Senior College campuses the University competes mainly with other land grant institutions, Category I would appear to be the most relevant comparison. Second, although the University of Alaska does not technically qualify at present as a Category I institution, it is likely that it will do so in the not to far distant future. In 1971 the University conferred a total of 12 doctoral degrees, and although this dropped to only 3 in 1972, by 1974 the level had again risen to 8 Ph.D's. It seems likely that the number of Ph.D's granted will increase further within the next few years.

Two comparisons are also used for the Community Colleges, Category III and Category IV. Category III includes only two-year colleges while the Category IV institutions are those which do not have faculty rank. Most, but not all, of the Category IV institutions are two-year schools.

Examination of Table VII shows that in comparison with other Category I

institutions, present Senior College compensation levels would place the University of Alaska below the 10th percentile. In comparison with Category IIA institutions, University of Alaska Senior Colleges are currently at the 30th percentile. Proposed salary increases, which are based on those negotiated by the Community Colleges, would raise the University's compensation level for Senior Colleges to the 80th percentile in comparison with Category I institutions and the 95th percentile in comparison with Category IIA institutions by January 1st of 1975. The 9.7% increase proposed for July 1975 would be just sufficient to offset projected increases in "lower 48" salaries and the increased differential in cost of living between Alaska and the "lower 48."

Comparisons of Community College compensation revealed that the University of Alaska was in the 20th percentile in comparison with both Category III and Category IV institutions prior to the negotiated increases. The increases negotiated would, by January 1st of 1975, raise the University of Alaska Community Colleges to the 80th percentile in comparison with other Category III institutions and the 60th percentile in comparison with Category IV. Again, the 9.7% increase scheduled for 7/1/75 would be barely sufficient to maintain these ratings.

Comparisons With State Civil Service

Table VIII compares University of Alaska Senior College instructional staff salaries to those of State of Alaska Civil Service employees. A similar comparison is not undertaken for Community College instructional staff since there is no longer a rank designation in the Community Colleges on which this comparison is based.

Determining grade and rank comparability.

In making such comparison it is necessary to determine which State pay grades would be most comparable to the various University academic ranks. Thus an analysis was undertaken of the minimum requirements of over 100 different State job classifications which utilize similar training and experience to that required for University instructional positions. This analysis indicated that grade level 16 is the most common entry level for positions requiring at least a Master's degree, although in a few cases individuals with such qualifications might initially be hired as low as grade level 15 or as high as grade 17. The University of Alaska Senior Colleges require a Ph.D. degree for hiring at the Assistant Professor level, and although there are very few State jobs which require a doctoral degree, those which do require or recognize a doctoral degree in the hiring criteria stipulate an entry level of no less than grade 20. Minimum requirements for hiring in grades above this level for the State are generally stated in terms of additional experience requirements and the typical pattern is one in which an additional minimum experience requirement of one year would raise the hiring level by one pay grade. In contrast, an increase of one pay grade is the equivalent in percentage increase to two longevity steps and two longevity steps would normally require two years of experience. Thus, taking these two factors into consideration, it is reasonable to assume that two years of additional experience in the State pay pattern are the equivalent of an increase of between one and two pay grades. For University

of Alaska Senior Colleges, promotion to Associate Professor requires a minimum of five years experience as an Assistant Professor and thus the comparable minimum hiring level in the State pay pattern is assumed to be pay grade 23 and the range to extend to pay grade 25. Using a similar line of reasoning, the University requires at least five years of experience at the Associate Professor level for promotion to full Professor and thus the minimum State pay grade level that is assumed to be comparable to that of the University's full Professor is assumed to be pay grade level 25 and to extend up to pay grade 27. Admittedly, most State pay grades at or above level 26 would be for an administrative position, but the few non-administrative positions in this range require experience and training comparable to that for a University Professor.

Salary comparisons.

As indicated in Table VIII, the average University of Alaska Senior College salary is below that for comparable positions in State government at every rank. For instructors, the average Fairbanks salary is 5.2% below the comparable State salary for paygrade 15, and 41.3% below that for pay grade 19. For Assistant Professors, Anchorage Senior Colleges are 10.6% below that paid to State employees in comparable positions in pay grade 20 and 37.9% below those in pay grade 23. The differences for Juneau salaries are almost the same, but for Fairbanks the differentials are considerably larger and range from 23.5% for pay grade 20 to 54.0% in comparison with State employees in pay grade 23. The reason for this larger shortfall in the case of Fairbanks is, of course, the lack of any area cost of living differential in present University pay schedules such as exists for State employees. For Associate Professors, Anchorage

Senior College salaries are from 9.0 to 26.3% below those paid to State employees in comparable pay grades, and Juneau salaries are from 3.4 to 19.8% below the same State pay rates. Again, Fairbanks is farthest short of the State pay scales, with the shortfall ranging from 20.5% to 44.9%. For Professors, the differential for Anchorage ranges from 9.9% to 18.2%, and for Fairbanks it is 24.7 to 34.2%.

Comparisons With Federal Civil Service

Table IX compares University of Alaska Senior College Salaries with Federal Civil Service Salaries for comparable positions. This table incorporates both the base salary paid to Federal employees and the 25% "COLA." Since the COLA is not taxable for Federal Income Tax purposes, the COLA dollars must be adjusted upward to reflect this "tax break." Such an adjustment is made in Table IX and column 5 shows what would have to be paid in fully taxable income to provide the same amount of after tax income as does the Federal salary plus COLA. Column 6 reduces that annual equivalent to an academic year (9 month) basis for comparability with University instructional salaries.

Table IX shows that University salaries are below the comparable levels paid to Federal employees in all but two instances. The two exceptions are for Instructors' salaries compared with GS grades 7 and 8. Even for Instructors, however, the University average is 10.2% below GS 9 and 21.8% below GS 10, both ranges at which individuals with the qualifications of the University of Alaska Instructor could reasonably be expected to be hired. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Federal Government has been experiencing severe

problems in retaining qualified personnel at the lower pay grades for professional employees, especially in Fairbanks, which is where all of the Instructors considered in calculating average Senior College Instructors' salaries are presently located. As a consequence of the difficulties which they are experiencing, the heads of the Federal Agencies located in Fairbanks are currently making a very active effort to obtain an upgrading of Federal pay, particularly in the lower grades for professionals.

For Assistant Professors the comparable Federal GS pay schedule provides pay that ranges from 8.5% to 30.8% above the level for Senior College faculty, for Associates the shortfall ranges from 23.0 to 47.3% and for full Professors from 50.2 to 61.1%. A basic reason for the increasing differential as the pay grade rises is, of course, the fact that the non-taxable status of COIA becomes more important for higher income employees.

Summary

In summary it can be noted that while present University of Alaska Community College and Senior College compensation is quite low relative to that of their counterparts in the lower 48, the increases bargained and proposed would raise them to the point where it should be possible for the University to compete effectively for top quality faculty. Furthermore, whereas present University salaries are below those for their counterparts in State and Federal agencies, a larger than average salary increase for University employees should raise them to comparability with employees in the State and Federal governments.

TABLES

Table I

AVERAGE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
SALARIES AND COMPENSATION BY RANK
AND LOCATION, 1974

<u>Campus/Rank</u>	<u>Average Salary</u> ¹	<u>Average Fringe Benefits</u> ²	<u>Average Compensation</u> ³
<u>Senior Colleges</u>			
<u>Anchorage Senior College:</u>			
Professor (7)	\$ 26,947	\$ 2,986	\$ 29,933
Associate (15)	21,782	2,691	24,473
Assistant (15)	17,211	2,430	19,641
Instructor (0)			
Ave. All Ranks (37)	20,906	2,641	23,547
<u>Fairbanks Campus:</u>			
Professor (35)	26,522	2,962	29,484
Associate (50)	21,986	2,703	24,689
Assistant (53)	17,210	2,430	19,640
Instructor (14)	13,474	2,217	15,691
Ave. All Ranks (152)	20,581	2,623	23,204
<u>Juneau Senior College:</u>			
Professor (0)			
Associate (2)	22,962	2,759	25,721
Assistant (3)	17,124	2,425	19,549
Instructor (0)			
Ave. All Ranks (5)	19,459	2,559	22,018
<u>All Senior College Campuses:</u>			
Professor (42)	26,593	2,966	29,559
Associate (67)	21,969	2,702	24,671
Assistant (71)	17,207	2,430	19,637
Instructor (14)	13,474	2,217	15,691
Ave. All Ranks (194)	20,614	2,625	23,239

Table I (continued)

<u>Campus/Rank</u>	<u>Average Salary¹</u>	<u>Average Fringe Benefits²</u>	<u>Average Compensation³</u>
<u>All Community Colleges:</u>			
Professor (2)	23,373	2,782	26,155
Associate (17)	19,204	2,544	21,748
Assistant (34)	16,301	2,378	18,679
Instructor (79)	14,260	2,258	16,518
All Ranks (182)	15,764	2,346	18,110

¹ Source: Personnel Offices, University of Alaska. All Salary and Compensation figures are on an academic year (9 month) basis and include the 4% cost of living increase effective 8/16/74.

² Fringe benefits include the University Contribution to Social Security; hospital, medical, audio-visual, dental, and life insurance, and the University's 5.61% contribution to the State Teachers' Retirement System. Technically, the retirement contribution would not be included if AAUP guidelines were followed since the plan does not vest until the individual employee has a minimum of eight years of service in the plan and the American Association of University does not recognize contributions to plans which do not vest in 5 years or less.

³ Includes Salary and Fringe Benefits.

Note: Numbers in parenthesis represent the number of faculty in the particular rank at the Campus indicated during the Fall 1974. Under the newly negotiated Community College contract, academic rank has been abolished in the Community Colleges.

Table I (continued)

<u>Campus/Rank</u>	<u>Average Salary¹</u>	<u>Average Fringe Benefits²</u>	<u>Average Compensation³</u>
<u>Community Colleges</u>			
<u>Anchorage Community College:</u>			
Professor (2)	\$23,373	\$2,782	\$26,155
Associate (15)	19,215	2,545	21,760
Assistant (67)	16,209	2,373	18,582
Instructor (55)	14,220	2,259	16,479
Average All Ranks (139)	15,849	2,353	18,202
<u>Juneau-Douglas Community College:</u>			
Professor (0)	-	-	-
Associate (1)	19,125	2,539	21,664
Assistant (8)	16,243	2,375	18,618
Instructor (7)	12,559	2,127	14,686
Average All Ranks (16)	14,611	2,277	17,088
<u>Kenai:</u>			
Assistant (1)	16,569	2,393	18,962
Instructor (3)	15,057	2,307	17,364
Average All Ranks (4)	15,435	2,329	17,764
<u>Ketchikan:</u>			
Associate (1)	19,125	2,539	21,664
Assistant (2)	15,939	2,357	18,296
Instructor (2)	14,346	2,267	16,613
Average All Ranks (5)	15,939	2,357	18,296
<u>Kodiak:</u>			
Assistant (3)	17,262	2,433	19,695
Instructor (1)	17,532	2,448	19,980
Average All Ranks (4)	17,330	2,436	19,766
<u>Kuskokwim (Bethel):</u>			
Assistant (1)	18,585	2,509	21,094
Instructor (9)	15,399	2,327	17,726
Average All Ranks (10)	15,718	2,345	18,063
<u>Mat-Su (Palmer):</u>			
Instructor (2)	13,284	2,206	15,490
<u>Sitka:</u>			
Assistant (2)	17,262	2,433	19,695

Table II

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SALARIES
 --PRESENT AND BARGAINED OR PROPOSED--1974-75 AND 1975-76

	Present Average Salaries ¹	Average Salaries After 9/1/74 Increase (7.7%) & ² COLD Adjustment	Average Salaries After 1/1/75 Increase (10.7%)	Average Salaries After 7/1/75 Increase (9.7%)
<u>Senior Colleges:</u>				
Professor (42)	\$26,593	\$31,118	\$34,448	\$37,789
Associate (67)	21,969	25,486	28,213	30,950
Assistant (71)	17,207	19,961	22,097	24,240
Instructor (14)	<u>13,474</u>	<u>16,040</u>	<u>17,756</u>	<u>19,478</u>
Average All Ranks (194)	\$20,614	\$24,001	\$26,569	\$29,146
<u>Community Colleges:</u>				
Average All Ranks (182) ³	\$15,764	\$18,141	\$20,082	\$22,030

¹ Source: Table I.

² Includes the cost of fitting the faculty to the new "base" salary schedule, application of area cost of living differential (See Table IV for cost of living differentials applied for each city), and a 7.7% increase in the "base" schedule. The average increase from these three factors is 16.43% for Senior Colleges and 15.08% for Community Colleges.

³ Only the average for all ranks is shown for Community Colleges since the contract negotiated eliminated academic rank for their faculty.

Note: Numbers in parenthesis represent the number of faculty in each rank.

Table III

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA NON-COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF COMPENSATION (SALARIES
PLUS FRINGE BENEFITS)--PRESENT AND PROPOSED--
1974-75 AND 1975-76¹

	Present Average Compensation ²	Average Compensation After Proposed 9/1/74 Salary Increases & CCLD Adjustment	Average Compensation After Proposed 1/1/75 Salary Increase	Average Compensation After Proposed 7/1/75 Salary Increase
<u>Senior Colleges:</u>				
Professor (42)	\$29,559	\$34,342	\$37,862	\$41,447
Associate (67)	24,671	28,389	31,271	34,217
Assistant (71)	19,637	22,548	24,806	27,124
Instructor (14)	<u>15,691</u>	<u>18,403</u>	<u>20,217</u>	<u>22,090</u>
All Ranks (194)	\$23,239	\$26,819	\$29,533	\$32,310
<u>Community Colleges:</u>				
All Ranks (182)	\$18,110	\$20,624	\$22,676	\$24,788

¹ See footnote 2, Table I for a discussion of fringe benefits included in compensation. Increased compensation figures were obtained by adding appropriate levels of fringe benefits (discussed in footnote 2, Table I) to salaries shown in Table II and thus do not reflect the same rates of increase as do salaries.

² Source: Table I.

Note: Numbers in parenthesis represent number of faculty in each rank.

Table IV

COSTS OF LOWER, INTERMEDIATE AND
HIGHER STANDARD FAMILY BUDGETS IN SELECTED
URBAN ALASKAN CITIES AS COMPARED
WITH U.S. URBAN AVERAGE - AUTUMN 1974
AND PROJECTIONS TO AUTUMN 1975¹

	Autumn 1974 ²			Autumn 1975 ³		
	Lower	Intermed.	Higher	Lower	Intermed.	Higher
Urban U.S. Ave.	\$ 9,179	\$14,166	\$20,422	\$ 9,730	\$15,016	\$21,647
Anchorage ²	13,595	18,701	26,048	14,683	20,197	28,132

Cost of Living Differential Indexes
(U.S. Urban Average = 100)⁴

Anchorage	148	132	128	151	135	130
Bethel	210	137	181	214	191	184
Fairbanks	165	147	142	168	150	145
Juneau (Community College)	159	141	137	162	144	139
Juneau (Senior College)	148	132	128	151	135	130
Kenai	164	146	141	167	149	144
Ketchikan	149	133	128	152	135	131
Kodiak	169	151	146	172	154	148
Palmer	151	134	130	154	137	132
Sitka	163	145	140	166	148	143

¹ The "Lower," "Intermediate," and "Higher" budget figures are based on the three different budget levels utilized by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in its annual family living cost survey. For further discussion see Bracket, Jean C., "New BLS Budgets Provide Yardsticks for Measuring Family Living Costs," Monthly Labor Review, April 1969, pp. 3-16. These budgets are published for Anchorage but not for other Alaskan cities.

² U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures for Autumn 1973 (U.S. Department of Labor, "Autumn 1973 Urban Family Budgets and Comparative Indexes for Selected Urban Areas") were projected to Autumn 1974 by applying the increase in the Consumer Price Index for the U.S. as a whole (+12.2%) and Anchorage (+13.2%) for the period from October 1973 to October 1974 to the respective budgets.

³ Autumn 1975 budgets were estimated by projecting a 6% rate of inflation for the U.S. as a whole and an 8% rate for Alaska. This 2% higher rate is assumed because of expected pipeline construction impact.

Table IV (continued)

4 Fairbanks and Juneau (Senior College) indexes were estimated by assuming that the cost of living differential between these cities and Anchorage is the same as the area pay differentials included in the State of Alaska classified personnel pay schedule. This schedule shows no differential between Juneau and Anchorage, and an average of approximately 11.2% between Anchorage and Fairbanks. The indexes for Juneau (Community College) and all other Alaskan cities were developed by using the mean of the four indexes estimated by the State of Alaska, Division of Personnel in their 1972 survey ("Survey of Salaries and Benefits, Housing, and Food Costs and Salary Recommendations, Part III: Housing and Food Costs," December 1972), since these were the differentials included in the contract negotiated with the Community College Union. These differentials are (Anchorage = 100): Bethel - 141.8, Juneau - 107.1, Kenai - 110.5, Ketchikan - 100.6, Kodiak - 114.2, Palmer - 101.9, Sitka - 110.0.

Tab. V

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA EQUIVALENTS OF PROJECTED 1974-75
AAUP SCALES FOR AVERAGE ACADEMIC YEAR COMPENSATION

Rating ²	1*		1	2		3	4		5	
Percentile	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
Category I ³										
Professor (42)	44,690	43,480	40,870	37,980	36,990	35,100	34,700	33,760	32,460	31,310
Associate (67)	31,790	30,040	28,530	28,040	27,550	26,880	26,370	26,300	25,590	25,070
Assistant (71)	25,030	24,590	23,680	23,210	23,060	22,520	22,090	21,940	21,730	21,170
Instructor (14)	21,340	20,700	20,200	19,770	19,270	19,010	18,940	18,560	17,950	17,330
Average ⁴ All Ranks (194)	31,355	30,281	28,825	27,827	27,353	26,496	26,071	25,761	25,113	24,435
Category IIA ³										
Professor (42)	38,320	36,990	35,360	34,160	32,700	31,250	30,060	28,490	27,140	24,980
Associate (67)	29,660	28,470	27,400	26,930	26,210	25,440	24,760	23,670	22,940	21,530
Assistant (71)	24,630	23,890	22,990	22,590	22,210	21,590	21,070	20,430	19,890	19,160
Instructor (14)	21,260	20,630	20,310	19,840	19,370	18,930	18,610	18,090	17,840	17,020
Average ⁴ All Ranks	29,088	28,073	26,998	26,395	25,658	24,819	24,113	23,125	22,365	21,084
Category III										
Professor	43,910	37,110	31,370	29,520	28,100	26,500	25,610	25,040	23,070	20,860
Associate	33,950	28,780	25,870	24,560	23,200	22,280	21,680	20,680	19,210	18,540
Assistant	27,500	24,760	21,970	21,130	20,180	19,610	19,120	18,430	17,830	17,150
Instructor	24,300	22,490	19,650	19,080	18,650	18,300	17,780	17,240	16,800	16,460
Average ⁴ All Ranks	26,894	24,286	21,431	20,653	19,885	19,366	18,849	18,196	17,569	17,021
Category IV ³										
One Rank	27,250	26,630	25,230	23,820	22,610	22,060	20,270	18,960	18,100	16,870

Table V (continued)

- ¹ University of Alaska equivalents of AAUP scales are a weighted average of comparable figures for those cities in which University instructional staff (faculty) reside. (See Appendix Table IV.) The weights are based on the actual number of instructional staff in each rank and in each city in 1974-75 (see Table I for distribution of faculty). In averaging Categories I and IIA only Senior College staff was considered, while for Category III only Community College faculty was included.
- ² Interpretation of the Ratings:

 - 1* = 95th percentile (top 5 percent of the institutions)
 - 1 = 80th percentile (next 15 percent)
 - 2 = 60th percentile (next 20 percent)
 - 3 = 40th percentile (next 20 percent)
 - 4 = 20th percentile (next 20 percent)
 - 5 = less than 20th percentile (bottom 20 percent)

For a discussion of the AAUP rating system see AAUP Bulletin, Volume 57, June 1971, pp. 230-238.
- ³ Category I includes institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which, in the most recent three years, conferred an annual average of fifteen or more doctorates covering a minimum of three -non-related disciplines. Category IIA includes institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate but not included in Category I. Category III includes two-year institutions while Category IV includes institutions which do not have faculty ranks.
- ⁴ Weights are based on the number of faculty in each rank at the University of Alaska. See figures in parenthesis by rank titles in Table I.

Table VI

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA EQUIVALENTS OF PROJECTED 1975-76 AAUP PERCENTILE
SCALES FOR AVERAGE ACADEMIC YEAR COMPENSATION¹

Rating ²	1*		1		2		3		4		5
Percentile	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	
<u>Category I³</u>											
Professor	49,020	47,690	44,820	41,650	40,580	38,500	38,050	37,020	35,610	34,340	
Associate	34,850	32,930	31,280	30,710	30,160	29,430	28,880	28,800	28,020	27,460	
Assistant	27,410	26,940	25,950	25,430	25,270	24,670	24,200	24,050	23,820	23,200	
Instructor	23,380	22,630	22,050	21,580	21,030	20,750	20,680	20,260	19,600	18,920	
Average All Ranks	34,367	33,190	31,595	30,487	29,967	29,025	28,561	28,225	27,518	26,774	
<u>Category IIA</u>											
Professor	42,020	40,580	38,780	37,460	35,870	34,270	32,970	31,240	29,730	27,360	
Associate	32,520	31,220	29,990	29,490	28,700	27,860	27,110	25,930	25,130	23,600	
Assistant	26,980	26,170	25,190	24,750	24,340	23,660	23,100	22,400	21,720	20,920	
Instructor	23,300	22,520	22,170	21,660	21,150	20,660	20,310	19,750	19,470	18,580	
Average All Ranks	31,884	30,770	29,572	28,916	28,112	27,191	26,420	25,342	24,469	23,071	
<u>Category III</u>											
Professor	47,940	40,520	34,250	32,220	30,680	28,930	27,930	27,320	25,230	22,860	
Associate	37,080	31,430	28,220	26,830	25,360	24,370	23,740	22,660	21,070	20,280	
Assistant	30,030	27,050	24,050	23,140	22,130	21,510	20,990	20,150	19,490	18,750	
Instructor	26,580	24,770	21,500	20,870	20,400	20,020	19,440	18,840	18,370	18,000	
Average All Ranks	29,388	26,617	23,445	22,599	21,775	21,212	20,650	19,895	19,215	18,613	
<u>Category IV</u>											
One Rank	29,770	29,050	27,550	26,040	24,750	24,160	22,230	20,740	19,790	18,450	

¹ See footnote 1, Table V.

Table VI (continued)

² See footnote 2, Table V.

³ See footnote 3, Table V.

⁴ See footnote 4, Table V.

Table VII

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF
 COMPENSATION TO AAUP PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTIONS
 OF COMPENSATION ADJUSTED FOR ALASKA COLG,
 1974-75 AND 1975-76

Percentile Ratings of University of Alaska Compensation
 Based on:

Present Compensation	Inc. Bargained for 9/1/74 (7.7%) Plus COLG Allow. & Fitting to Salary Schedule	Additional Increase Bargained for 1/1/75 (10.7%)	Additional Increase Bargained for 7/1/75 (9.7%)
----------------------	--	--	---

Senior Colleges

Category I ² - Ave. All Ranks	Below 10th	50th	80th	80th
Category IIA ² - Ave. All Ranks	30th	70th	95th	95th

Community Colleges

Category III ² - Ave. All Ranks	20th	60th	80th	80th
Category IV ² - One Rank	20th	40th	60th	60th

¹ Percentile ratings are found by comparing the compensation figures in Table III with the percentile distributions in Tables V and VI.

² Category I includes institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which, in the most recent years, conferred an annual average of fifteen or more doctorates covering a minimum of three non-related disciplines. Category IIA includes institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate but not included in Category I. Category III includes two-year institutions while Category IV includes institutions which do not have faculty ranks.

*PACIFIC COLLEGES HAVE THE
 HIGHEST SALARIED FACULTY
 IN NATION.*

Table VIII

STATE OF ALASKA CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES COMPARED TO UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
SENIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SALARIES¹

Professorial Ranks and Grade Equivalents	State Civil Service Salaries - Academic Year Basis ²			Current University of Alaska Senior College Average Salaries ³ (Academic Year Basis)		
	Step	Anchorage-Juneau	Fairbanks	Anchorage	Juneau	Fairbanks
<u>Instructor:</u>				(4)	(4)	\$13,474
15	C	\$12,689	\$14,180			
16	C	13,664	15,264			
17	C	14,714	16,422			
18	C	15,833	17,679			
19	C	17,041	19,033			
<u>Assistant Prof.:</u>				17,211	17,124	17,210
20	D	19,033	21,252			
21	D	20,486	22,881			
22	D	22,047	24,616			
23	D	23,735	26,503			
<u>Associate Prof.:</u>				21,782	22,962	21,986
23	D	23,735	26,503			
24	D	25,551	28,535			
25	D	27,504	31,863			
<u>Professor:</u>				26,947	(4)	26,522
25	F	29,605	33,060			
26	F	30,704	34,297			
27	F	31,863	35,583			

¹ Grade equivalents were based on an analysis of minimum educational and experience requirements for State Civil Service positions as compared to those for academic ranks at the University of Alaska. Step levels were based on the average estimated time in rank for Senior College instructional staff in 1973-74 which were as follows: Instructor - 2.8 years; Assistant - 3.9 years; Associate - 3.6 years; Professor - 5.8 years. These were rounded to the nearest whole number to provide the step level.

Table VIII (continued)

- ² State Civil Service salaries are adjusted to an academic year basis to make them comparable with University of Alaska academic year salaries. An adjustment factor of 0.818 is used in conformance with guidelines from the AAUP.
- ³ Source: Table I.
- ⁴ Indicates that there are no Senior College instructional staff in this rank at the campus indicated.

Table IX

FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES PLUS "COLA" (COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE)
 COMPARED TO PRESENT UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SENIOR COLLEGE
 INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SALARIES ¹

Rank & G.S. Equiv. Grade	Federal Civil Service Salaries Plus "COIA"						U. of A. Senior College ⁵ Average Salaries (Academic Yr.Basis)
	(1) Step	(2) Annual Salary	(3) COLA	(4) COLA ² Factor	(5) Reg. Inc. Equiv. of Salary + COIA ³	(6) Academic Year Basis ⁴	
<u>Instructor:</u>							13,474
GS 7	3	\$11,222	\$2,806	1.273	\$14,794	12,101	
GS 8	3	12,416	3,104	1.292	16,426	13,436	
GS 9	3	13,697	3,424	1.301	18,152	14,848	
GS 10	3	15,059	3,765	1.328	20,059	16,408	
<u>Assistant:</u>							17,207
GS 11	4	17,029	4,257	1.362	22,827	18,672	
GS 12	4	20,308	5,077	1.418	27,507	22,501	
<u>Associate:</u>							21,969
GS 13	4	23,997	5,999	1.508	33,043	27,029	
GS 14	4	28,140	7,035	1.623	39,558	32,358	
<u>Professor:</u>							26,593
GS 15	5	33,794	8,449	1.780	48,833	39,945	
GS 16	5	36,000	9,000	1,818	52,362	42,832	

¹ Comparable G.S.--grade levels used here are the same as those used in the 1971 Salary Study (See: "A Challenge to Excellence: Professional Personnel Compensation at the University of Alaska," A Report of the University of Alaska Salary Review Committee, November 1971, Table XV, p. 30 and discussion pp. 29-32). These were based on an analysis of minimum educational and experience requirements for Federal Civil Service positions as compared with University of Alaska minimum rank criteria. The step levels were based on the average time in rank indicated in footnote 1, Table VIII. See Appendix Table VI for Civil Service Schedule Salaries.

Table IX (continued)

² "COLA Factor" is the factor by which COLA is adjusted to compensate for the non-taxable (for federal tax purposes) status of COLA. It is calculated by the following formula:
$$I_R = I_C \frac{(1 - .205F_S)}{(1 - 1.205F_S)}$$

Where I_R is the regular fully taxable income equivalent of I_C (COLA) and F_S is the federal tax rate on the appropriate level of marginal income. The appropriate federal tax rate was determined by assuming the 15% standard deduction up to \$2,000.00, or 10% deduction (whichever was greater) and a 4 - dependent family.

³ Annual Salary plus COLA adjusted by COLA factor.

⁴ Column 5 (Regular Income Equivalent of Annual Salary + COLA) times 9/11 (0.818).

⁵ Source: Table I.

APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix Table I

PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVERAGE COMPENSATION
BY NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, 1973-74¹

Rating ²	1*	1	2	3	4	5				
Percentile	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
Category I ³										
Professor	29,770	28,960	27,220	25,290	24,640	23,380	23,110	22,400	21,620	20,850
Associate	21,360	20,180	19,170	18,820	18,450	17,950	17,570	17,520	16,990	16,610
Assistant	16,530	16,260	15,600	15,260	15,150	14,760	14,450	14,350	14,200	13,800
Instructor	13,530	13,060	12,590	12,190	11,750	11,530	11,470	11,150	10,650	10,160
Category IIA ³										
Professor	25,520	24,640	23,550	22,750	21,780	20,810	20,020	18,970	17,970	16,380
Associate	19,930	19,130	18,340	17,990	17,450	16,880	16,300	15,590	15,060	14,060
Assistant	16,290	15,750	15,100	14,810	14,540	14,100	13,730	13,280	12,790	12,100
Instructor	13,480	12,990	12,690	12,260	11,840	11,460	11,190	10,760	10,560	9,920
Category III ³										
Professor	31,910	26,970	22,800	21,450	20,420	19,260	18,570	18,110	16,550	14,830
Associate	24,570	20,830	18,690	17,650	16,570	15,850	15,390	14,620	13,500	12,920
Assistant	19,590	17,500	15,350	14,710	14,000	13,570	13,210	12,510	11,920	11,280
Instructor	16,440	15,200	13,010	12,450	12,040	11,720	11,250	10,780	10,410	10,130
Category IV ³										
One Rank	19,130	18,660	17,570	16,490	15,580	15,170	13,840	12,760	11,920	10,800

¹ Source: AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 60, No. 2, Summer, 1974, Table 8, page 178.

² Interpretation of the Ratings:

- 1* = 95th percentile (top 5 percent of institutions)
- 1 = 80th percentile (next 15 percent)
- 2 = 60th percentile (next 20 percent)
- 3 = 40th percentile (next 20 percent)
- 4 = 20th percentile (next 20 percent)
- 5 = less than 20th percentile (bottom 20 percent)

For a discussion of the AAUP rating system see AAUP Bulletin, Volume 57, June 1971, pp. 230-238.

Appendix Table 1 (continued)

- 3 Category I includes institutions which offer the doctorate degree and which, in the most recent three years, conferred an annual average of fifteen or more earned doctorates in a minimum of three non-related disciplines. Category III includes two-year institutions while Category IV includes institutions which do not have faculty ranks.

Appendix Table II

1974-75 PROJECTED SCALES OF AVERAGE COMPENSATION
(SALARY PLUS FRINGE BENEFITS), 9-MONTH BASIS¹

Rating ²	1*		1		2		3		4		5	
Percentile	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10		
Category I ³												
Professor	32,003	31,132	29,262	27,187	26,488	25,134	24,843	24,166	23,242	22,414		
Associate	22,962	21,694	20,608	20,232	19,834	19,296	18,888	18,834	18,264	17,856		
Assistant	17,824	17,480	16,770	16,405	16,286	15,867	15,534	15,426	15,265	14,835		
Instructor	14,545	14,040	13,534	13,104	12,631	12,395	12,330	11,986	11,449	10,922		
Category II ³												
Professor	27,434	26,488	25,316	24,456	23,414	22,371	21,522	20,393	19,318	17,609		
Associate	21,425	20,565	19,716	19,339	18,759	18,146	17,609	16,759	16,190	15,115		
Assistant	17,512	16,931	16,233	15,921	15,631	15,158	14,760	14,276	13,749	13,008		
Instructor	14,491	13,964	13,642	13,180	12,728	12,320	12,029	11,567	11,352	10,664		
Category III ³												
Professor	34,303	28,993	24,510	23,059	21,952	20,705	19,963	19,468	17,791	15,942		
Associate	26,413	22,392	20,092	18,974	17,813	17,039	16,554	15,717	14,513	13,839		
Assistant	21,059	18,813	16,501	15,813	15,050	14,588	14,201	13,448	12,814	12,126		
Instructor	17,673	16,240	13,986	13,384	12,943	12,599	12,094	11,589	11,191	10,890		
Category IV ³												
One Rank	20,565	20,060	18,888	17,727	16,749	16,308	14,878	13,717	12,814	11,610		

¹ Projections were made by assuming that all classes experienced the 7.5% average increase reported by the AAUP in initial reports (See: "Pay Vs. Living Cost: the Unequal Race," Chronicle of Higher Education, Dec. 2, 1974, p. 1.) The 7.5% was multiplied times the actual 1973-74 decile distributions of Appendix Table I.

² See footnote 2, Appendix Table I.

³ See footnote 3, Appendix Table I.

Appendix Table III

PROJECTED 1975-76 AAUP SCALES OF
AVERAGE COMPENSATION (SALARY PLUS FRINGE BENEFITS)
9 - MONTH BASIS¹

Rating ²	1*		1		2		3		4		5	
Percentile	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10		
<u>Category I³</u>												
Professor	\$34,403	\$33,467	\$31,456	\$29,226	\$28,475	\$27,019	\$26,706	\$25,978	\$24,985	\$24,095		
Associate	24,684	23,321	22,153	21,749	21,321	20,743	20,304	20,247	19,634	19,195		
Assistant	19,160	18,790	18,028	17,635	17,508	17,057	16,699	16,583	16,410	15,948		
Instructor	15,636	15,092	14,549	14,087	13,579	13,324	13,255	12,885	12,307	11,741		
<u>Category IIA</u>												
Professor	29,492	28,475	27,215	26,290	25,170	24,049	23,136	21,922	20,767	18,929		
Associate	23,032	22,107	21,194	20,790	20,166	19,507	18,929	18,016	17,404	16,248		
Assistant	18,825	18,201	17,450	17,115	16,803	16,294	15,867	15,347	14,780	13,983		
Instructor	15,578	15,012	14,665	14,168	13,683	13,243	12,931	12,435	12,203	11,464		
<u>Category III</u>												
Professor	36,876	31,167	26,348	24,788	23,598	22,257	21,460	20,928	19,126	17,138		
Associate	28,394	24,072	21,599	20,397	19,149	18,317	17,785	16,895	15,601	14,931		
Assistant	22,639	20,223	17,739	16,999	16,179	15,682	15,266	14,457	13,775	13,035		
Instructor	18,998	17,566	15,035	14,388	13,914	13,544	13,001	12,458	12,030	11,706		
<u>Category IV</u>												
One Rank	22,107	21,564	20,304	19,056	18,005	17,531	15,994	14,746	13,775	12,481		

¹ Projections to 1975-76 were made by assuming that the same average rate of increase which prevailed from 1973-74 to 1974-75 (see footnote 1, Appendix Table II) also continued into 1975-76. Thus the data in Appendix Table I were compounded twice by 7.5%.

² See footnote 2, Appendix Table I.

³ See footnote 3, Appendix Table I.

Appendix Table IV

1974-75 PROJECTED AAUP SCALES FOR AVERAGE ACADEMIC YEAR
 COMPENSATION ADJUSTED FOR ALASKA "COLD"
 OF SELECTED ALASKA CITIES¹

Percentiles	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
ANCHORAGE CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	40960.	39850.	37460.	34800.	33900.	32170.	31800.	30930.	29750.	28640.
ASSOCIATE	29390.	27770.	26380.	25920.	25480.	24840.	24360.	24000.	23520.	23150.
ASSISTANT	23110.	22700.	21880.	21420.	21200.	20770.	20370.	20240.	20040.	19520.
INSTRUCTOR	19160.	18590.	18140.	17740.	17290.	17070.	17000.	16660.	16110.	15550.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.4800	1.3200	1.2300

FAIRBANKS CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	45440.	44210.	41950.	38610.	37810.	36490.	35230.	34920.	33000.	31930.
ASSOCIATE	32610.	30810.	29760.	28700.	28280.	27570.	27050.	26980.	26250.	25720.
ASSISTANT	25450.	25220.	24300.	23820.	23580.	23110.	22670.	22520.	22310.	21730.
INSTRUCTOR	21340.	20700.	20200.	19770.	19270.	19010.	18940.	18560.	17980.	17380.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
FAIRBANKS	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.6500	1.4700	1.4200

JUN - DCUG CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	40960.	39850.	37460.	34800.	32900.	32170.	31800.	30930.	29750.	28640.
ASSOCIATE	29390.	27770.	26380.	25920.	25480.	24840.	24360.	24000.	23520.	23150.
ASSISTANT	23110.	22700.	21880.	21420.	21200.	20770.	20370.	20240.	20040.	19520.
INSTRUCTOR	19160.	18590.	18140.	17740.	17290.	17070.	17000.	16660.	16110.	15550.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - DCUG	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.4800	1.3200	1.2300

ANCHORAGE CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	35120.	33900.	32400.	31300.	29970.	28630.	27550.	26110.	24800.	23650.
ASSOCIATE	27420.	26320.	25330.	24800.	24210.	23490.	22660.	21940.	21160.	20400.
ASSISTANT	22740.	22050.	21210.	20840.	20490.	19910.	19430.	19110.	18310.	17530.
INSTRUCTOR	19100.	18520.	18240.	17810.	17390.	16990.	16700.	16380.	15610.	15270.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.4800	1.3200	1.2300

FAIRBANKS CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	38960.	37610.	35950.	34730.	33250.	31770.	30540.	29250.	27400.	25400.
ASSOCIATE	30420.	29200.	28110.	27830.	26890.	26100.	25400.	24200.	23540.	22100.
ASSISTANT	25270.	24510.	23590.	23100.	22790.	22160.	21630.	20870.	20620.	19370.
INSTRUCTOR	21260.	20630.	20310.	19840.	19370.	18930.	18610.	18090.	17340.	17020.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
FAIRBANKS	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.6500	1.4700	1.4200

JUN - DCUG CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	35120.	33900.	32400.	31300.	29970.	28630.	27550.	26110.	24800.	23650.
ASSOCIATE	27420.	26320.	25330.	24800.	24210.	23490.	22660.	21940.	21160.	20400.
ASSISTANT	22740.	22050.	21210.	20840.	20490.	19910.	19430.	19110.	18310.	17530.
INSTRUCTOR	19100.	18520.	18240.	17810.	17390.	16990.	16700.	16380.	15610.	15270.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - DCUG	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.4800	1.3200	1.2300

Appendix Table IV (continued)

ADJUSTED SALARY SCALES										
Percentiles	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
ANCHORAGE										
PROFESSOR	43910.	37110.	31370.	26500.	21600.	16700.	11800.	6900.	2000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	33310.	28460.	23600.	18700.	13800.	8900.	4000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	26540.	22770.	18900.	14000.	9100.	4200.	1000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	22930.	21220.	19540.	17800.	16000.	14200.	12400.	10600.	8800.	7000.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.4000	1.3200	1.2600

BETHEL										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	42070.	35440.	28800.	22100.	15400.	8700.	2000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	31810.	27000.	22200.	17400.	12600.	7800.	3000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	26170.	22360.	18550.	14700.	10900.	7100.	3000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	22480.	20670.	18860.	17050.	15240.	13430.	11620.	9810.	8000.	6190.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
BETHEL	LOW	POD	HIGH
	2.1000	1.8700	1.8100

JUN - CDUG										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	47000.	39720.	32440.	25160.	17880.	10600.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	36160.	30880.	25600.	20320.	15040.	9760.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	28960.	25680.	22400.	19120.	15840.	12560.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	24520.	22240.	19960.	17680.	15400.	13120.	10840.	8560.	6280.	4000.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - CDUG	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.5500	1.4100	1.3700

KENAI										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	48370.	40800.	33230.	25660.	18090.	10520.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	37240.	31570.	25900.	20230.	14560.	8900.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	30890.	26770.	22650.	18530.	14410.	10290.	3300.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	25310.	23440.	21570.	19700.	17830.	15960.	14090.	12220.	10350.	8480.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KENAI	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.6400	1.4600	1.4100

1974-75 COMMUNITY COL DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVERAGE COMPENSATION III

KETCHIKAN										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	43910.	37110.	31370.	25600.	19800.	14000.	8200.	2400.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	33310.	28460.	23600.	18700.	13800.	8900.	4000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	26540.	22770.	18900.	14000.	9100.	4200.	1000.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	23010.	21330.	19650.	17970.	16290.	14610.	12930.	11250.	9570.	7890.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KETCHIKAN	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.4500	1.3300	1.2800

KODIAK										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	50080.	42330.	34580.	26830.	19080.	11330.	3500.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	38160.	32410.	26660.	20910.	15160.	9410.	3500.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	30250.	27710.	25170.	22630.	20090.	17550.	3500.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	26190.	24650.	23110.	21570.	20030.	18490.	16950.	15410.	13870.	12330.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KODIAK	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.7000	1.5100	1.4600

MAT - SU										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	44590.	37690.	30790.	23890.	16990.	10090.	3400.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	34340.	29110.	23880.	18650.	13420.	8150.	3400.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	27220.	24090.	20960.	17830.	14700.	11570.	3400.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	23260.	21930.	20600.	19270.	17940.	16610.	15280.	13950.	12620.	11290.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
MAT - SU	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.2900	1.2600

SIKKA										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	40020.	33920.	27820.	21720.	15620.	9520.	2700.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSOCIATE	31010.	26910.	22810.	18710.	14610.	10510.	2700.	1000.	1000.	1000.
ASSISTANT	24000.	21900.	19800.	17700.	15600.	13500.	2700.	1000.	1000.	1000.
INSTRUCTOR	20000.	18900.	17800.	16700.	15600.	14500.	13400.	12300.	11200.	10100.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
SIKKA	LOW	POD	HIGH
	1.6000	1.4500	1.4000

Appendix Table IV (continued)

1. The 1974-75 AAUP projected compensation scales (Appendix Table II) were adjusted to Alaska dollar equivalents by the following method: The compensation for each category, rank, and percentile in the AAUP scale was compared to the three levels of dollar budget cost projections for the urban U.S. for Autumn 1974 (see Table IV). If the particular compensation figure exceeded the higher budget figure, it was multiplied by the "higher budget" index for the Alaskan city to get its equivalent in dollars for the particular Alaskan city. For example: the projected compensation for the 95th percentile (1* rating) for Professors in Category I schools is \$32,003 (see Appendix Table II). Since this is greater than \$20,422 (the Urban U.S. estimated cost for the "higher" budget--see Table IV), the \$32,003 is multiplied by 1.28 to get its equivalent in Anchorage and Juneau (\$40,964--rounded to \$40,960 in the table) and by 1.42 to get its Fairbanks equivalent (\$45,444--rounded to \$45,440). If the particular compensation figure being adjusted was less than \$20,422 but greater than \$14,166 (the Urban U.S. estimated cost for the "intermediate" budget--Table IV), the following ratio was calculated: (Compensation figure - \$14,166) ÷ (\$20,422 - 14,166). This ratio is the fraction of the distance from the "intermediate" budget COLD index to the "higher" budget index for the compensation figure being adjusted. For example: the AAUP compensation figure for the 20th percentile for Assistant Professors in Category I is \$15,265. Calculating the ratio: $(15,265 - 14,166) \div (20,422 - 14,166) = 0.176$. Thus the \$15,265 compensation figure is 17.6% of the distance between \$14,166 and \$20,422. To translate this into Anchorage dollars, a COLD index is calculated which is 17.6% of the distance between the Anchorage "intermediate" and "higher" budget COLD indexes (i.e., 17.6% of the distance between 132 and 128 or $17.6\% \times 4 = 0.704$; and $132 - 0.704 = 131.296\%$). This multiplied times the \$15,265 figure is the Anchorage equivalent (\$20,042--rounded to \$20,040) of the \$15,265 compensation figure in the "lower forty-eight." A similar method is utilized for other cities and for compensation figures which fall between the "lower" and "intermediate" budget cost.

Note: See footnote 3, Appendix Table I for definitions of categories.

The COLD (Cost of Living Differential) indexes for each city are from Table IV.

Appendix Table V

1975-76 PROJECTED AAUP SCALES FOR AVERAGE ACADEMIC
YEAR COMPENSATION ADJUSTED FOR ALASKA
"COLD" OF SELECTED ALASKA CITIES¹

Percentiles	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
ANCHORAGE CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	44720.	43510.	40890.	37990.	37020.	35120.	34720.	33770.	32480.	31320.
ASSOCIATE	32090.	30320.	28920.	28270.	27770.	27110.	26500.	26530.	25920.	25310.
ASSISTANT	25270.	24330.	23920.	23460.	23310.	22760.	22330.	22190.	21930.	21430.
INSTRUCTOR	21040.	20370.	19920.	19410.	18920.	18670.	18500.	18230.	17820.	17310.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.3500	1.3000

FAIRBANKS CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	47820.	46530.	43910.	42380.	41290.	39180.	38720.	37670.	36250.	34940.
ASSOCIATE	35790.	33820.	32120.	31540.	30670.	29220.	28850.	28970.	28770.	28150.
ASSISTANT	29140.	27950.	26920.	26100.	25930.	25320.	24940.	24680.	24440.	23810.
INSTRUCTOR	23380.	22630.	22090.	21560.	21020.	20750.	20660.	20260.	19810.	19320.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
FAIRBANKS	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.6800	1.5000	1.4500

JUN - DRUG CATEGORY I										
PROFESSOR	44720.	43510.	40890.	37990.	37020.	35120.	34720.	33770.	32480.	31320.
ASSOCIATE	32090.	30320.	28920.	28270.	27770.	27110.	26500.	26530.	25920.	25310.
ASSISTANT	25270.	24330.	23920.	23460.	23310.	22760.	22330.	22190.	21930.	21430.
INSTRUCTOR	21040.	20370.	19920.	19410.	18920.	18670.	18500.	18230.	17820.	17310.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - DRUG	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.3500	1.3000

ANCHORAGE CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	39340.	37020.	35300.	34180.	32720.	31260.	30060.	28500.	27130.	25830.
ASSOCIATE	29940.	28740.	27620.	27160.	26440.	25670.	25000.	23910.	23100.	21790.
ASSISTANT	24870.	24130.	23240.	22830.	22460.	21840.	21320.	20660.	20060.	19310.
INSTRUCTOR	20960.	20270.	19580.	19450.	19020.	18590.	18270.	17760.	17510.	16710.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.3500	1.3000

FAIRBANKS CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	42760.	41290.	39400.	38120.	36500.	34870.	33550.	31790.	30250.	27930.
ASSOCIATE	33400.	32960.	30800.	30280.	29470.	28600.	27830.	26820.	25790.	24220.
ASSISTANT	27700.	26160.	25090.	24400.	24490.	24280.	23700.	22790.	22290.	21470.
INSTRUCTOR	23300.	22520.	22170.	21660.	21150.	20660.	20310.	19750.	19470.	18890.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
FAIRBANKS	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.6800	1.5000	1.4500

JUN - DRUG CATEGORY 2A										
PROFESSOR	39340.	37020.	35300.	34180.	32720.	31260.	30060.	28500.	27130.	25830.
ASSOCIATE	29940.	28740.	27620.	27160.	26440.	25670.	25000.	23910.	23100.	21790.
ASSISTANT	24870.	24130.	23240.	22830.	22460.	21840.	21320.	20660.	20060.	19310.
INSTRUCTOR	20960.	20270.	19580.	19450.	19020.	18590.	18270.	17760.	17510.	16710.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - DRUG	LOW	MOD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.3500	1.3000

Appendix Table 7 (continued)

Percentiles	95	90	80	70	50	50	40	30	20	10
ANCHORAGE										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	47940.	40520.	34280.	32220.	30980.	28930.	27930.	27320.	25230.	22480.
ASSOCIATE	35910.	31290.	27490.	26710.	25250.	24270.	23640.	22570.	20990.	21200.
ASSISTANT	29430.	24910.	23570.	22490.	21700.	21590.	20580.	19760.	19110.	18380.
INSTRUCTOR	25080.	23380.	20300.	19700.	19250.	18490.	18340.	17790.	17330.	16780.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
ANCHORAGE	LOW	MCD	HIGH
	1.5100	1.3500	1.3000

BETHEL										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	67850.	57250.	48480.	45610.	43420.	40950.	39530.	38670.	35700.	32350.
ASSOCIATE	52240.	44290.	39750.	37800.	35740.	34350.	33450.	31930.	29700.	28570.
ASSISTANT	41660.	37510.	33370.	32110.	30700.	29840.	29120.	27960.	27050.	26320.
INSTRUCTOR	35490.	33080.	28710.	27670.	27240.	26740.	25970.	25180.	24540.	24040.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
BETHEL	LOW	MCD	HIGH
	2.1400	1.9100	1.8400

JUN - DCUG										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	51260.	43220.	36020.	34460.	32800.	30940.	29860.	29200.	26950.	24400.
ASSOCIATE	39470.	33460.	30030.	28540.	26980.	25920.	25240.	24090.	22400.	21540.
ASSISTANT	31470.	28330.	25180.	24220.	23160.	22500.	21950.	21090.	20420.	19650.
INSTRUCTOR	26790.	24560.	21650.	21030.	20560.	20180.	19610.	19020.	18550.	18180.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
JUN - DCUG	LOW	MCD	HIGH
	1.6200	1.4400	1.3900

KENAI										
CATEGORY 3										
PROFESSOR	53100.	44880.	37940.	35690.	33980.	32050.	30930.	30250.	27900.	25260.
ASSOCIATE	40890.	34660.	31110.	29560.	27940.	26840.	26130.	24930.	23180.	22290.
ASSISTANT	32600.	29240.	26070.	25070.	23960.	23290.	22720.	21820.	21110.	20360.
INSTRUCTOR	27740.	25840.	22450.	21750.	21250.	20660.	20260.	19650.	19150.	18760.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KENAI	LOW	MCD	HIGH
	1.6700	1.4900	1.4400

Appendix Table V (continued)

1975-76 COMMUNITY COL DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVERAGE COMPENSATION III

Percentiles	95	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10
KETCHIKAN CATECCFY 3										
PROFESSOR	43310.	40930.	34520.	32470.	30910.	29160.	28140.	27510.	25350.	22920.
ASSOCIATE	37200.	31530.	28300.	26870.	25370.	24360.	23710.	22620.	21910.	20270.
ASSISTANT	35460.	34670.	23680.	22750.	21720.	21110.	20590.	19730.	19150.	18450.
INSTRUCTOR	28190.	23740.	20300.	19710.	19280.	18930.	18390.	17840.	17400.	17050.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KETCHIKAN	LOW	MID	HIGH
	1.5200	1.3500	1.2100

KODIAK CATECCFY 2										
PROFESSOR	54580.	46130.	39000.	36690.	34930.	32940.	31800.	31110.	28740.	26360.
ASSOCIATE	42020.	35630.	31980.	30420.	28770.	27660.	26940.	25730.	23940.	23040.
ASSISTANT	33510.	30190.	26880.	25970.	24750.	24060.	23480.	22540.	21000.	20950.
INSTRUCTOR	26870.	26650.	23150.	22470.	21950.	21540.	20910.	20270.	19750.	19350.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
KODIAK	LOW	MID	HIGH
	1.7200	1.5400	1.4600

MAT - SU CATECCFY 3										
PROFESSOR	42680.	41140.	34790.	32720.	31150.	29380.	28360.	27740.	25610.	23200.
ASSOCIATE	37430.	31780.	28520.	27120.	25640.	24640.	23990.	22910.	21300.	20500.
ASSISTANT	29880.	26910.	23940.	23030.	22020.	21410.	20890.	20070.	18420.	18690.
INSTRUCTOR	25460.	23730.	20600.	20000.	19560.	19200.	18650.	18090.	17640.	17280.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
MAT - SU	LOW	MID	HIGH
	1.5400	1.2700	1.3200

SITKA CATECCFY 3										
PROFESSOR	52720.	44570.	37690.	35450.	33750.	31830.	30720.	30040.	27710.	25090.
ASSOCIATE	40600.	34420.	30190.	29360.	27740.	26650.	25950.	24770.	23020.	22140.
ASSISTANT	32370.	29140.	25090.	24900.	23300.	23130.	22560.	21670.	20970.	20170.
INSTRUCTOR	27550.	25660.	22250.	21600.	21110.	20720.	20130.	19520.	19030.	18640.

COST OF LIVING INDEX			
SITKA	LOW	MID	HIGH
	1.6800	1.4800	1.4300

¹ See Appendix Table IV, footnote 1 for methodology in adjusting AAUP scales for Alaska "COLD."

111

Appendix Table VI
U.S. FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SALARY SCHEDULE

GENERAL SCHEDULE - BASIC PER ANNUM RATES

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 13, 1974

GRADE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	AMT. OF WITHIN-GRADE INCREASE
1	\$5,294	\$5,470	\$5,646	\$5,822	\$5,998	\$6,174	\$6,350	\$6,526	\$6,702	\$6,878	\$ 176
2	5,936	6,196	6,396	6,596	6,796	6,996	7,196	7,396	7,596	7,796	200
3	6,764	6,989	7,214	7,439	7,664	7,889	8,114	8,339	8,564	8,789	225
4	7,596	7,849	8,102	8,355	8,608	8,861	9,114	9,367	9,620	9,873	252
5	8,500	8,783	9,066	9,349	9,632	9,915	10,198	10,481	10,764	11,047	283
6	9,473	9,789	10,105	10,421	10,737	11,053	11,369	11,685	12,001	12,317	316
7	10,520	10,871	11,222	11,573	11,924	12,275	12,626	12,977	13,328	13,679	351
8	11,640	12,028	12,416	12,804	13,192	13,580	13,968	14,356	14,744	15,132	388
9	12,841	13,269	13,697	14,125	14,553	14,981	15,409	15,837	16,265	16,693	423
10	14,117	14,589	15,059	15,530	16,001	16,472	16,943	17,414	17,885	18,356	471
11	15,481	15,997	16,513	17,029	17,545	18,061	18,577	19,093	19,609	20,125	516
12	18,463	19,078	19,693	20,308	20,923	21,538	22,153	22,768	23,383	23,998	615
13	21,816	22,543	23,270	23,997	24,724	25,451	26,178	26,905	27,632	28,359	727
14	25,531	26,434	27,287	28,140	28,993	29,846	30,699	31,552	32,405	33,258	853
15	29,818	30,812	31,806	32,800	33,794	34,788	35,782	36,776*	37,770*	38,764*	994
16	34,607	35,761	36,915*	38,069*	39,223*	40,377*	41,531*	42,685*	43,839*		1154
17	40,062*	41,397*	42,732*	44,067*	45,402*						1335
18	46,326*										

* The rate of basic pay for employees at these rates is limited by section 5303 of title 5 of the United States Code to the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule (currently \$36,000). October 1974



UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
COLLEGE, ALASKA 99701

April 4, 1975

TO: Dr. Don M. Dafoe
FROM: M. M. Hullinger
RE: Salary Increases

As you are aware, there is a large group of employees within the University that have similar duties as a group of state employees that are represented by the Tri-Trades Agreement.

We compared the salaries for persons working for the state under the agreement with the salaries of persons working for the University performing similar duties and determined that for FY 75 it would require an additional \$550,000 for salaries and fringe benefits to implement the pay as contained in the Tri-Trades Agreement for our employees.

I believe the University should request funds to pay the University employees in the Tri-Trades category at the rates provided by the Tri-Trades Agreement.

This group of state employees will be renegotiating their contract with the state at an early date and we should ask that sufficient funds be given to the University to allow for extension of salary provision to our employees performing similar duties.

Attachment

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Maif".

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA
COLLEGE, ALASKA 99701

February 24, 1975

TO: M. M. Mullinger
Vice President for Finance and Comptroller

FROM: William N. Case *W. N. Case*
Budget Director

SUBJECT: Tri-trades Salary Analysis for University Employees

In conjunction with support efforts by Northern Region Personnel Office, it has been determined that placement of the University classified employees with Tri-trade job skills onto the Tri-trades bargaining agreement would cost 555.0 in salary and staff benefits. An additional cost of 81.4 would be required in the second year to cover the higher average wage after transition to the new scale.

For comparative purposes, general cost-of-living increases and negotiations of a new Tri-trade contract have been held without increase. Likewise, anticipated increases in State Employees salary schedules has not been estimated nor included.

mah

U OF A vs. STATE GOVERNMENT PAY RAISE COSTS

	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>Total</u>	
U of A System				
U of A Classified (General Government terms)	.6	2.1	2.7	
Feb. 16, 1975 COLA for Classified	.4	.5	.5	
Community College	.9	4.3	5.2	
U of A Professional Staff				
General Government Terms	1.3	4.0	5.3)	Choose One
General Government Terms & Area COLA	3.1	6.1	9.2)	
Community College Terms	4.3	12.3	16.6)	
U of A Aug. 16, 1974 COLA for 1975	1.0		1.0	
Feb. 16, 1975 COLA for Professional	.5		.5	
	-----	-----	-----	
 Total Pay Raises U of A	 (4.7 6.5 7.7	 10.9 13.0 19.2	 15.6) 19.5) 26.9)	 Choose One
 Total Pay Raises All Other	 15.1	 32.5	 47.6	

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

College of Business, Economics and Government

MEMORANDUM

March 22, 1975

TO: Robert W. Hiatt, President

FROM: Richard J. Solie, Associate Dean *Richard*

SUBJECT: Revised Analysis of FY75 and FY76 Salary Increases Requested.

I did not include the cost of merit increases for FY76 since I did not know what method Bill Case had used to calculate them. I also did not include the increase in staff benefits since I thought this might be dealt with separately.

You will also note that my summary of increases requested for FY76 includes only the additional increases requested for FY76 above those requested for FY75. Thus, to get the total added cost for FY76 above the present base, you would need to add in the FY75 increases as Bill Case apparently did.

I hope these are satisfactory, but if you have any questions or see the need for changes, feel free to call me at home (479-2719). I will be there until 6:45 this evening and most of tomorrow afternoon.

RJS:jr

PS: Our xerox machine did a poor job of reproducing the copies, but I am enclosing the original so you can have other copies made on a better machine.