



**2003-04**

# Community College Faculty Salary Survey



**College and University Professional  
Association for Human Resources**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The *2003–04 Community College Faculty Salary Survey* collects salary and rate structure data for full-time teaching faculty at two-year institutions and also collects pay practices data for both full-time and part-time/adjunct teaching faculty. This is the survey's second year. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) supported our efforts by publicizing the survey to their membership.

The content of this year's survey is basically the same as last year. We made some modifications, however, based on our experiences with the data and on user feedback. While most questions in the survey worked well, some did not, and we used the lessons learned to create what we hope is a more effective survey for 2003-04.

In the CUPA-HR National Office, our research department staff coordinated and reviewed all aspects of survey analysis and report production. To ensure the accuracy of data, the research staff worked closely with the many human resource and institutional research professionals responsible for completing the survey. The efforts of these individuals are greatly appreciated. We also want to thank Peerfocus, Inc., our partner and collaborator in Surveys Online.

Stephen J. Otzenberger  
Executive Director

### CUPA-HR RESEARCH STAFF

Ray "Chip" Sizemore, Ph.D.  
Director of Research

Maria Rodriguez-Calcagno, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate

Trisha Wright, M.S.  
Research Associate



### 2003–04 COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

©2004 by the College and University Professional  
Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR)

All rights reserved. No information in this book may be reproduced in any form for any purpose without written consent of the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources. Inquiries may be directed to CUPA-HR Research. The CUPA-HR logo is a registered trademark of the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.

Tyson Place, 2607 Kingston Pike, Suite 250, Knoxville, TN 37919  
International Standard Book No. 0-9725802-7-1

Data Reflect Salaries as of: October 1, 2003  
Publication Date: March 2004

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Survey Methodology and Content	2
III. Profile of 2002–03 Participating Community Colleges	5
- Geographic Distribution	5
- Budget Distribution	5
- Faculty Unionization	6
IV. Full-Time Faculty Pay Practices	7
- Use of Academic Ranks	7
- Use of Differential Pay	7
- Determining the Amount of the Pay Differential	8
- Contract Types	9
- Methods Used to Define Teaching Load	9
- Number of Credits/Course Hours Considered a Full Teaching Load	9
- Compensation Methods for Overload and Summer Term Teaching	10
- Compensation Rates for Overload and Summer Term Teaching	10
- Factors Influencing Overload and Summer Term Teaching Compensation	11
V. Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty Pay Practices	12
- Limitations on Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty Teaching Load	12
- Maximum Number of Credits/Course Hours Allowed to Teach Per Term	12
- Compensation Methods for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	12
- Compensation Rates for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	13
- Factors Influencing Compensation Rates for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	13
VI. Salaries at 2002–03 Participating Community Colleges	14
- Use of Selected Pay Methods	14
- Overall Average Salaries by Pay Method Used	15
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Detailed Salary and Rate Structure Tables	A-1
- Table 22: Unweighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Level of Education/Degree	A-2
- Table 23: Weighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Level of Education/Degree	A-3
- Table 24: Rate Structure for 9–10 Month Contracts by Level of Education/ Degree	A-4
- Table 25: Unweighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Academic Rank	A-5
- Table 26: Weighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Academic Rank	A-6
- Table 27: Rate Structure for 9–10 Month Contracts by Academic Rank	A-7
- Table 28: Unweighted/Weighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Discipline – Unranked Faculty	A-8

- Table 29: Unweighted/Weighted 9–10 Month Salaries by Discipline – Ranked Faculty	A-9
- Table 30: Unweighted 9–10 Month Salaries of Union and Non-Union Faculty by Level of Education/Degree	A-13
- Table 31: Unweighted 9–10 Month Salaries of Union and Non-Union Faculty by Rank	A-14
Appendix B: Survey Questionnaire Sample	B-1
Appendix C: Survey Discipline Descriptions	C-1
Appendix D: Responding Institutions	D-1

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

---

CUPA-HR's *2003–04 Community College Faculty Salary Survey* (CCFSS) provides up-to-date faculty salary data for administrators at two-year colleges.

Human resource costs range from 65 to 85 percent of an institution's overall operating expenses. Data collected by the CCFSS are designed to help administrators effectively manage these costs by providing a broad range of salary data with which to evaluate current pay levels and plan compensation budgets.

This year's survey provides salary data from 250 community colleges representing 35,023 full-time faculty members. It also reports data on pay practices for both full-time and part-time/adjunct teaching faculty. Appendix D contains a list of survey respondents in alphabetical order.

If you believe we should collect additional data or make other improvements in our survey process, we welcome your suggestions. Our objective is to meet the informational needs of CUPA-HR members in particular and of higher education organizations in general. Please send your suggestions to [rsizemore@cupahr.org](mailto:rsizemore@cupahr.org), and specify "CCFS Survey Suggestion" in the subject line.

### **Special Studies Available**

Special Studies of CCFSS results also may be purchased. Special Studies are custom reports produced by the CUPA-HR research staff, based upon selection criteria or peer groups specified by you. While the survey report enables you to compare your salaries and practices to all community colleges that participated in the survey, Special Studies enable you to make these comparisons to one or more specific groups.

**Go to [www.cupahr.org](http://www.cupahr.org) to order Special Studies.**

---

## II. SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND CONTENT

---

### Survey Methodology

The CCFSS was conducted entirely on the Web. Data were collected through Surveys Online, CUPA-HR's Web-based data collection and reporting system. The survey was opened for data collection on September 15, 2003 and closed on January 21, 2004 for the purposes of this report.

Thousands of real-time and server-side validation checks were built into the questionnaire. These checks flagged data that were extremely low or high, or significantly different from last year's submissions when available. A final validation check flagged computational and other potential errors. In order to submit a completed survey, an institution had to correct all "fatal" errors and correct or annotate all "serious" errors.

Data submitted by institutions for the CCFSS will be accessible online for the next three years. After that, the data will be archived, but still accessible upon request.

The CCFSS collected three types of data: salary, pay practices, and institutional. Appendix B contains a Word version of the Web-based questionnaire.

### Salary Data

Faculty salaries in most four-year institutions are based on the traditional structure of discipline and rank. This is not the case with community colleges. While some use discipline and rank, others use discipline alone, with faculty unranked. Still others base their pay structure on level of education/degree or on rank, independent of discipline. In order to capture the diversity of pay structures, the CCFSS provided four options for reporting faculty salaries:

- Level of Education/Degree
- Academic Rank
- Discipline with Faculty Unranked
- Discipline with Faculty Ranked

The following data were collected for each reporting option:

- Number of faculty
- Average salary
- Lowest salary
- Highest salary

For community colleges using disciplines, ranks, or both, salary data was collected across 43 disciplines for the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and Lecturer.

### Disciplines

The 43 disciplines included in the CCFS Survey are from the *Classification of Instructional Programs: 2000 Edition* published by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Appendix C describes the disciplines covered in this year's survey.

The CIP taxonomy is a hierarchy organized on three levels:

- 2-digit codes define the most general groupings of related programs (XX)
- 4-digit codes define intermediate groupings of programs that have comparable content and objectives (XX.XX)
- 6-digit codes define specific instructional programs (XX.XXXX)

For example:

**01. AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURE OPERATIONS, AND RELATED SCIENCES.**

Instructional programs that focus on agriculture and related sciences and that prepare individuals to apply specific knowledge, methods, and techniques to the management and performance of agricultural operations.

**01.01 Agricultural Business and Management.** Instructional content for this group of programs is defined in codes 01.0101 - 01.0199

**01.0102 Agribusiness/Agricultural Business Operations.** A program that prepares individuals to manage agricultural businesses and agriculturally related operations within diversified corporations. Includes instruction in agriculture, agricultural specialization, business management, accounting, finance, marketing, planning, human resources management, and other managerial responsibilities.

Go to <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002165.pdf> for more information on CIP–2000.

### **Pay Practices Data**

The CCFSS collected the following types of data about pay practices for full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty. Both structured and open-ended questions were used.

- Full-time teaching faculty
  - Use of ranks
  - Pay structure
  - Use of differential pay for hard-to-hire disciplines
  - Use of differential pay for academic versus technical disciplines
  - Use of academic versus calendar year contracts
  - Definition of full-time teaching load
  - Compensation methods for overload and summer term teaching
  - Compensation rates for overload and summer term teaching
  - Factors affecting compensation rates for overload and summer term teaching
- Part-time/adjunct teaching faculty
  - Limits on part-time/adjunct faculty teaching load
  - Compensation methods for part-time/adjunct faculty
  - Compensation rates for part-time/adjunct faculty
  - Factors affecting compensation rates for part-time/adjunct faculty

### **Institutional Data**

The following institutional data are available for each college participating in the CCFSS. These data are used primarily to create comparison groups. The first five items were pre-loaded while the last four, starting with operating budget, were collected through the survey.

- Institution name
- 2000 Carnegie classification
- Affiliation
  - Public
  - Private-independent
  - Private-religious
  - Private-for-profit

- Level of instruction
  - Undergraduate only
- 2003–04 total operating budget
- Student enrollment for Fall 2003–04
  - Number of full-time students
  - Number of part-time students
  - Fall credit hours taken by part-time students
  - Full-time equivalent (FTE) student total
- Faculty size for Fall 2003–04
  - Number of full-time faculty
  - Number of part-time faculty
  - Fall course hours taught by part-time faculty
  - Full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty total
- Faculty union or non-union

The following is an extract from the survey report. The full report contains 31 tables, including 10 tables of detailed salary data.

---

### III. PROFILE OF 2003–04 PARTICIPATING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

---

A total of 250 community colleges, representing 35,023 full-time faculty members, responded to this year’s survey. Appendix D lists this year’s respondents in alphabetical order.

#### Geographic Distribution

Table 1 shows the geographic distribution of participating community colleges in terms of CUPA-HR’s membership regions. The largest number of participants is from the Midwestern Region (31.2%), followed by the SouthWestern Region (22.8%). The smallest number is from the Northwestern Region (8.4%).

**TABLE 1**  
**Geographic Distribution of Responding Community Colleges**  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 CCFS Survey*

CUPA-HR Region	N	% of Total
Eastern	52	20.8%
Midwestern	78	31.2%
Northwestern	21	8.4%
Southern	42	16.8%
SouthWestern	57	22.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### Budget Distribution

The budget size of participating institutions ranges from a low of \$2.5M to a high of \$481M. Budget quartiles are shown below.

**TABLE 2**  
**Budget Distribution of Responding Community Colleges (Total N = 237)**  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 CCFS Survey*

Quartile	Budget Size
1	< \$15,407,035
2	\$15,407,035 to \$27,361,167
3	\$27,361,168 to \$49,035,118
4	> \$49,035,118

#### Faculty Unionization

Unions represent faculty at 133 of the responding institutions, or slightly more than half (52.2%). Unions represent “all faculty” at 82 of the 133 colleges (61.6%), “full-time” faculty at 50 (37.6%), and only part-time/adjunct faculty at one institution (Table 3). Detailed salaries at institutions with union and non-union faculty are reported in Tables 30 and 31 of Appendix A.

---

#### IV. FULL-TIME FACULTY PAY PRACTICES

---

- **Use of Academic Ranks:** Slightly more than half of the responding community colleges report using ranks, 53.4% (Table 4).
- **Use of Differential Pay:** Respondents were asked whether their institution pays more for either academic or technical disciplines or for hard-to-hire disciplines. Tables 5 and 6 quantify the responses. The most frequently reported hard-to-hire disciplines are described in Table 7, while Table 8 describes the methods most frequently used to determine the amount of the pay differential.
- **Contract Types:** Table 9 describes the distribution of faculty on academic year/9–10 month contracts versus calendar year/11–12 month contracts.
- **Full Teaching Load for Full-Time Faculty:** Survey participants were asked which method does their institution primarily use to define teaching load and then the number of credits/course hours considered to be a full teaching load (regardless of the method actually used by their institution. Tables 10 and 11 summarize the results.
- **Methods Used to Compensate Full-Time Faculty for Overload and Summer Term Teaching:** Table 12 shows the different methods used by responding institutions to pay full-time faculty for overload and summer term teaching.
- **Minimum and Maximum Dollar Amounts Paid to Full-Time Faculty for Overload and Summer Term Teaching:** Survey participants were asked to report the minimum and maximum dollar amounts paid per credit/course hour. Results are reported in Table 13.
- **Factors Influencing Actual Amounts Paid to Full-Time Faculty for Overload and Summer Term Teaching:** Table 14 shows the factors most frequently influencing the actual amount paid to full-time faculty for both overload and summer term teaching.

---

#### V. PART-TIME/ADJUNCT FACULTY PAY PRACTICES

---

- **Limitations on the Teaching Load of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty:** Table 15 shows the percentage of responding community colleges limiting the teaching load of their part-time/adjunct faculty during a regular term, summer term, and academic year. Table 16 shows the maximum number of credits/course hours part-time/adjunct faculty may teach per regular and summer term.
- **Methods Used to Compensate Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty:** Table 17 shows the different methods used by responding institutions to pay part-time/adjunct faculty.
- **Minimum and Maximum Dollar Amounts Paid to Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty:** Survey participants were asked to report the minimum and maximum dollar amounts paid per credit/course hour to part-time/adjunct faculty. Results are reported in Table 18.
- **Factors Influencing Actual Amounts Paid to Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty:** Table 19 shows the factors most frequently influencing the actual amount paid to part-time/adjunct faculty.

---

## VI. SALARIES AT 2003-04 PARTICIPATING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

---

Salaries for full-time faculty at participating community colleges are summarized below by the different pay methods.

All salaries are reported in terms of academic year (9–10 month) contracts. Respondents were asked to multiply salaries for calendar year (11–12 month) contracts by 9/11 or .818. Both unweighted and weighted salaries are provided. Unweighted salaries can be thought of as “what institutions pay” while weighted salaries can be viewed as “what incumbents earn.” Weighted salaries favor (i.e., give more weight to) to institutions with large numbers of incumbents.

### Use of Selected Pay Methods

Survey participants were asked, “Which of the following do you use as the primary basis for determining compensation for full-time teaching faculty?” and given the following options:

- Level of Education/Degree
- Academic Rank
- Discipline – Faculty Unranked
- Discipline – Faculty Ranked

Table 20 shows that, unlike four-year institutions, only 5.1% (12) of the responding community colleges report using both discipline and rank as the basis for compensating full-time faculty. Instead, a majority (54.6%) use level of education/degree, while 19.1% use academic rank, independent of discipline. Only 3.4% report using discipline alone.

**TABLE 20**  
**% of Responding Community Colleges Paying Full-Time Teaching Faculty by Each of the Following Methods**  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 CCFS Survey*

	N	%
Level of Education/Degree	129	54.6%
Academic Rank	45	19.1%
Academic Discipline	8	3.4%
Academic Discipline and Rank	12	5.1%
Other	42	17.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Overall Average Salaries by Pay Method Used

The overall, average unweighted salary of full-time faculty at responding community colleges is \$49,098; the comparable weighted salary is \$50,998. These numbers represent 35,023 faculty members. Institutions using an education-based pay structure have a higher average salary (unweighted) than institutions using a pay structure based on rank or discipline.

**TABLE 21**  
Average 9-10 Month Salaries of Full-time Faculty at  
Responding Community Colleges by Pay Method –  
Unweighted and Weighted  
*CUPA-HR 2003-04 CCFS Survey*

	<b>Unweighted Salary</b>	<b>Weighted Salary</b>	<b>Number of Incumbents</b>
Education	\$50,098	\$50,414	18,216
Rank	\$48,138	\$52,345	11,787
Discipline – Ranked	\$47,891	\$51,026	3,810
Discipline - Unranked	\$47,222	\$46,576	1,210
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>\$49,098</b>	<b>\$50,998</b>	<b>35,023</b>

Appendix A contains detailed salary and rate structure tables.

#### **How to Order the Full Report and Special Studies**

Go to CUPA-HR's home page at [www.cupahr.org](http://www.cupahr.org). Highlight "Surveys" in the menu on the left side of the page, and then select "Salary Surveys 2004."