Warning! The simulator may not work on versions of Microsoft Office older than 2013.

This file, like most readme files, will be a bunch of scattered notations about the simulator, poorly organized; the last minute things that an author remembers to write; l'esprit d'escalier – that, and more technical detail than sane people would want to read.

• Sheet5 and the Faculty Salary sheet provide the results of any scenario one wants to simulate. Sheet5 is mostly summary statistics, correlations, departmental level data and calculated results and a few yellow highlighted control cells. The Faculty Salary sheet in the simulator calculates the amount of merit raise for each faculty member given the assumptions of the scenario chosen on Sheet5, their old salary, their new salary and miscellaneous other faculty level variables.

• To switch between the interim Provost’s pay plan and Committee Plan A: enter a 1 in cell I24 of Sheet5 in the simulator, for Brad’s plan -- or a 2 in the same cell, for Committee Plan A. Then press the Refresh All button on the Data ribbon.

• When testing the Provost’s plan, but only when testing the Provost’s plan, one must take care about the numbers in cells I2 and I3 on Sheet5. Entering any value in cell I2 causes I3 to recalculate. Clicking Refresh All in the Data ribbon will cause everything else to update to the new proportions. By this method one can do the mixing and matching that the Provost has designed into his plan.

• One can alter the total amount available for raises of any kind, University wide, by entering a different value in cell A1, Sheet5. One can also alter the apportionment of the money for all raises, into the four categories of raises by changing the percentages in cells B2, B3, B4 and B5.

• Cell I25 controls the method by which the departmental pot is calculated. Which is to say that putting a 1 in cell I25 calculates the departmental pot the Provost’s way and a 2 in cell I25 calculates the departmental pot as the committee suggests in Plan A.

• Cell I25 is now rigged to equal cell I24. If one types a value in cell I25, the connection between I24 and I25 is broken thereby. This would potentially result in a situation where the Provost’s way of dealing with rubric scores is paired with the committee’s way of computing the departmental pot or vice versa, which is fine if that is what the user intends. Just watch out to make sure that the values in cells I24 and I25 are both set to whatever scenario one actually wants to review, even if it is a hybrid scenario.

• In general, most users will want to restrict their modifications of the simulator to the yellow highlighted cells on Sheet5, so as not to screw up the simulator.

• There are miscellaneous sheets on the right side of Sheet8. They are just miscellaneous other data, calculations and experiments we were trying that are ongoing. Feel free to view them or even change them. None of them are required for the working of the simulator itself.
For our tests, the hypothetical rubric scores in the simulator were centered upon the average of actual merit scores from previous years, for each faculty member, reverse coded so as to translate from the old system to the new rubric score system. We were somewhat confused about this procedure because the merit scores we were given range from one through six. We did the best we could and can change it if it is incorrect. We doubt that this matter would substantially change our findings, however. For some of our tests we also calculated the standard deviation of those past scores for each faculty member and used the result to introduce a little random variation into the hypothetical rubric scores.

We have no current CUPA or OSU figures to establish the current market. Therefore, the committee has assumed that both market measures have probably increased over the last five or six years by about 15%. Accordingly, we multiplied the market figures from five or six years ago by 115% to arrive at our (pretend) market figures. That modification is used in all calculations that involve a market measure. If the 15% figure is too high or too low, that fact should not substantially change most of our results. Changing the 15% assumption is not terribly difficult, but should be requested of the committee, rather than undertaken by most users.

The salaries we use in our simulator are the salaries that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women was given, five or six years ago, with much modification. Few, if any, pay raises have occurred since that time.

Indeed, the data given to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women has provided the basis for all calculations in the simulator and can be found along with many modifications and additions and deletions, on the Faculty Level Data sheet.

Editing the Faculty Level Data sheet or the Faculty Salary sheet or Sheet4 or Sheet8 is not advisable for the casual user.

Also, it should be noted that the data provided to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women were not entirely accurate at the time. And, those inaccuracies remain. No one knows how common or how serious those inaccuracies are, though we do believe that the salary numbers were probably accurate at the time, even if other variables in the data contained errors.

Because we do not know how to treat people with complex titles, such as “Associate Professor and Department Head,” who have special modifications to their salaries, which have not been accounted for in the interim Provost’s plan, as presented to the faculty Senate, for purposes of constructing the simulator, we simply deleted all those faculty from the data., leaving only those faculty with simple titles. Those titles are Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor.