

Preliminary Report of the Compensation Committee for the College of Arts and Letters Strategic Plan, November 16, 2006

Committee Members: W.D. Blackmon (Convener), Marcus Cafagña (English), Barb Gressel (English), Nancy Harris (Music), Marianthe Karanikas (English). Grant Peters (Music), Art Spisak (Modern and Classical Languages), Wade Thompson (Theatre and Dance), and Matt Wilson (English)

1. **Basic Recommendations:** The Committee strongly feels that the need for substantially higher faculty and staff salaries is easily the top priority on campus. Faculty Senate surveys have shown this year after year in recent years. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the College of Arts and Letters make this its top priority. The Provost has indicated that she expects a certain “match” from colleges concerning their top priority areas, so the Committee recommends that COAL show its support of faculty and staff salaries by being willing to make such a match.

The Committee realizes that these are extremely trying times, in terms of budget, for COAL; therefore, it has not stopped at simply pointing out inequities in faculty salaries and staff workloads and resources returned to the college in comparison to productivity. The Committee has identified over \$4,000,000, produced last academic year (but typical of an annual, ongoing effort) in profit areas of the college (through graduate teaching assistants, per course teachers, and high school dual credit programs), profit areas that are typically “above and beyond” the work typically done at this university by other colleges. These identified additional “profits” equal over 30% of the money paid for faculty and staff salaries during this same period. We recommend that the COAL Dean advocate for a fair return from the University for such “profits,” and that this money be applied to raising faculty and staff salaries to a reasonable and fair level at Missouri State University, in comparison to national averages by rank and discipline.

2. **Inequities Among Colleges on Campus in Terms of Faculty Salaries:** In October of 2005, a report from the Faculty Senate (the table is in Attachment A) compared the colleges at MSU to national CUPA (College and University Personnel Association) averages, by rank and discipline (that is, Arts and Letters departments on campus were compared to the same type of departments nationally, just as Business departments campus were compared to Business departments nationally). COBA ranked first at MSU, reaching 94.1% of the national average. CHHS ranked second at 93.3% of the national average. COAL easily ranked dead last, at 86.3% of the national average, 7.8 % below COBA and 7.0% below CHHS. But the worst aspect is that, under the current “cost center” system (in which the faculty salary pool comes from current faculty salaries in the “cost center”), these gaps will get worse and worse every year (in a sense, making a mockery of the merit system in COAL). The relative loss from last fall to this

fall (Comparing COBA to COAL) is nearly 1/3% (.312%), given the 4% salary pool last year.

Inequities Among Lecturer Salaries, Campus-Wide and State Wide: For FY 07 Lecturer salaries in COAL are significantly below those campus wide (the average in COAL is \$29,650.88; the average campus-wide is \$33,983.77—see Attachment B). Ironically, this gap is not bad enough to equal the national gap of tenured and tenure-track faculty in COAL. A Missouri Department of Higher Education Report chart has been attached (see attachment C) noting Lecturer salaries for 2005. Whichever comparison group we decide will make for a more fair comparison, that comparison group will be much more reasonable for Lecturers in COAL than national averages or comparisons within MSU. For example, if we average Lecturer salaries at UMSL and UMKC, that average is \$40,236.50, compared to \$31,471 for MSU (even lower, of course, for COAL Lecturers)

3. **Workload Comparison for COAL/All Other MSU Colleges Secretarial Staff:** Many issues could possibly be raised in this area, but one is so overwhelming, that is the one we feel we should lead with. COAL secretarial staff, on an average support 34 faculty members, per course faculty members, graduate assistants, and other staff (see Attachment D). This 34:1 ratio compares to an average for the other academic departments of 17.6:1. As it turns out, if, instead of counting individuals supported, we use FTE (full-time equivalent faculty) the ratio is even worse, more than 2:1. Currently our secretarial staff members are quantifying the complexity of the tasks they do in an eight-hour day. Of course, the fact that they have roughly double the workload of secretarial staffs across campus is being ignored.
4. **“Profit” for Overload Work Done by Graduate Teaching Assistants, Per Course Teachers, and High School Dual Credit Programs:** According to the University Departmental Profiles for the 2005-2006 Academic Year, almost 70% of graduate teaching assistants outside of COAL were used in support role, whereas GTAs in COAL predominantly taught two sections a semester, two semesters a year (many GTAs on campus who do teach, teach only one section per semester). Despite this, our GTAs are paid at the lower of two rates on campus. The system campus-wide is clearly unfair, and yet it generates a huge amount of “profit” not shared with COAL or departments in COAL responsible for overseeing the work of these GTAs. Our college, according to the same source, also has a disproportionate share of per course teachers, over 1/3 of those on campus last year, and the results are fairly spectacular “profits.” We don’t have access to campus-wide High School Dual Credit information, but estimate a similar disproportionate share (there actually is some profit sharing here, to show that this can, indeed be done, at a rate of \$5 per credit hour returned as a reward to the home department).

The calculations below follow predictable paths. For example, the expenses for GTAs are the annual stipend, plus free tuition. This came to an average of

\$10,487.25 of expenses per year for each GTA. Then we found the number of students in their classes (or a very close estimate) and multiplied by the cost of tuition. We did this with per course teachers, too (with figures graciously provided by Continuing Education and the College of Arts and Letters), and did it with the English Department's High School Dual Credit program (although there are other such classes in COAL, as well).

Here are the profits we found (even if these calculations are slightly off, or if certain factors weren't considered [utilities are usually on in classroom buildings, anyway], etc., etc.) we believe the significance of these numbers could be huge, if even a small portion of this profit is returned and funneled into faculty and staff salaries:

COAL "Overload" Profits for Academic Year 2005-2006:

\$1,525,830.00	Graduate Teaching Assistants (the cost of the support GTAs considered and subtracted, along with costs discussed earlier)
\$1,539,084.16	COAL Per Course Teachers
\$1,097,658.85	COAL Per Course Teachers paid through Continuing Ed.
\$ 267,898.82	English High School Dual Credit
\$4,413,526.83	Total (30+ % of money budgeted for COAL faculty and staff salaries, AY 2005-2006 (FY 06))

5. **Merit/Equity Ratio in the College Compensation Matrix:** This is new territory for all of us. Since those who are at the low pay quartile by national comparisons receive proportionately larger shares, college-wide, for their merit rankings, we hope this will all work out reasonably given the severe equity problems that exist in terms of faculty salaries in the college. We do recommend a fair and equal balance of merit and equity pay, and hope the new system will provide this. When discretion at the college level exists, we ask that this ideal balance of merit and equity be kept in mind.
6. **Faculty and Staff Salary Equity Issues Within the College:** Faculty salary equity issues may exist within the college, but we wish to delay considering these until external equity issues within the University in relation to our college are resolved. Also, we want to calculate a reasonable way of pro-rating years of service at the professor rank (although CUPA averages treat a professor as a professor, twenty years of service at that rank should be treated, we feel, differently than one year of service).
7. **Departmental/College Compensation Plans:** Since departmental plans have just been submitted, we will address this aspect of the strategic plan later.