

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

| For the 2009–10 |
| Academic Year |



The Definitive Source for
Higher Education Salaries Since 1967

2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The *2009–10 Two-Year Faculty Salary Survey* collects salary and rate structure data for full-time teaching faculty at two-year institutions. In addition, it also collects pay practices data for both full-time and part-time/adjunct teaching faculty. This is the survey's sixth year.

We wish to thank our members for their support relative to survey design and content. CUPA-HR would not be able to offer a tool so central to the needs of higher education administrators without their continuing insight and advice.

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.

Andy Brantley
President and Chief Executive Officer

CUPA-HR RESEARCH STAFF

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

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

Suzi Bowen, M.A.
Research Associate



2009–10 TWO-YEAR FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

©2010 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.
Centerpoint Commons, 1811 Commons Point Drive, Knoxville, TN 37932

Data Reflect Salaries as of: October 15, 2009
Publication Date: March 2010

Note: This Executive Summary includes overall average salaries by pay method. To order the full report go to: http://portal.cupahr.org/iMI_Spublic/surveys/surveyrules.aspx

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	1
I. Introduction	3
II. Survey Methodology and Content	5
III. Profile of 2009–10 Participating Two-Year Colleges	8
- Geographic Distribution	8
- Budget Distribution	8
- Faculty Unionization	9
IV. Full-Time Faculty Pay Practices	10
- Use of Academic Ranks	10
- Use of Differential Pay	10
- Determining the Amount of the Pay Differential for Hard-to-Hire Disciplines	11
- Contract Types	12
- Methods Used to Define Teaching Load	12
- Number of Credits/Course Hours Considered a Full Teaching Load	12
- Compensation Methods for Overload and Summer Term Teaching	13
- Compensation Rates for Overload and Summer Term Teaching	14
- Factors Influencing Overload and Summer Term Teaching Compensation	15
V. Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty Pay Practices	16
- Limitations on Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty Teaching Load	16
- Maximum Number of Credits/Course Hours Allowed to Teach Per Term	16
- Compensation Methods for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	17
- Compensation Rates for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	17
- Factors Influencing Compensation Rates for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty	18
VI. Salaries at 2009–10 Participating Two-Year Colleges	19
- Use of Selected Pay Methods	19
- Overall Average Salaries by Pay Method Used	20

Appendices

Appendix A: Detailed Salary and Rate Structure Tables	A-1
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 *2009–10 Two-Year Faculty Salary Survey* (TYFSS) provides up-to-date faculty salary data for administrators at two-year colleges.

Data collected by this survey are designed to help administrators effectively manage their human resource costs by providing a broad range of salary data with which to evaluate current faculty pay levels and plan compensation budgets.

This year's survey provides salary data from 174 two-year colleges and reflects the salaries of 30,425 full-time faculty members. Fifteen of this year's participants were systems providing data in the aggregate for 96 campuses. As such, the survey actually represents salary data for 255 institutions. The survey 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, and specify "TYFS Survey Suggestion" in the subject line.

DataOnDemand and Special Studies Available

DOD is a hands-on application that gives institutions and specified users direct access to survey data—from the date of purchase until the end of January of the following year. Users also have access to results for the survey from the prior four years. DOD is a great value as you can conduct your own analyses any time you want and as often as you want, using peer comparison groups that you create. Use of DOD is limited only by the five restrictions in place to protect confidentiality and ensure compliance with Department of Justice Safe Harbor Guidelines:

- No salary data are linked to a given institution (other than where a user has permission to see his or her institution's data).
- No salary data are reported for positions with fewer than five responding institutions.
- A comparison group must include a minimum of eight institutions that participated in the survey.
- Each comparison group **created and used** must differ by at least three institutions from all other existing and deleted comparison groups.
- The weighted data report option provides salary data only for positions with 5 or more responding institutions **and** in which no institution comprises more than 25% of position incumbents. If a position has at least 5 responding institutions but one institution represents more than 25% of the incumbents, salary data is not reported.

Using DOD is easy. All you have to do is create your comparison group and run one of the four standard reports. Both un-weighted and weighted salary data are provided, as well as rate-structure information. For institutions that pay-by-level of education or pay-by-rank, salaries are also reported separately for union and non-union faculty.

- **Salary by Education Level:** Provides un-weighted and weighted salary data by level of education. For each level, mean (average), median, minimum and maximum, 25th, 50th and 75th percentile salary information are provided. Pay scale structure data are also provided as well as salary data for union and non-union faculty. Output format: HTML or PDF.

- **Salary by Faculty Rank:** Provides un-weighted and weighted salary data by rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor and lecturer). For each rank, mean (average), median, minimum and maximum, 25th, 50th and 75th percentile salary information are provided. Pay scale structure data are also provided as well as salary data for union and non-union faculty. Output format: HTML or PDF.
- **Salary by Discipline – Unranked Option:** Provides un-weighted and weighted salary data by academic discipline. For each discipline, mean (average), median, minimum and maximum salary information are provided. Output format: HTML or PDF.
- **Salary by Discipline – Ranked Option:** Provides un-weighted and weighted salary data by academic discipline and rank. For each discipline rank, mean (average), median, minimum and maximum salary information are provided. Output format: HTML or PDF.

Special Studies are custom reports produced by the CUPA-HR research staff, based upon selection criteria specified by you but subject to the same restrictions noted above. We conduct special studies upon request, but DOD is a far greater value for the money. The format for special studies is the same as DOD standard reports.

Go to www.cupahr.org to order DataOnDemand and Special Studies.

II. SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND CONTENT

Survey Methodology

The TYFS Survey was conducted entirely on the Web. Data were collected through Surveys Online, CUPA-HR's Web-based data collection and reporting system. The survey opened for data collection on September 15, 2009, and closed in January 2010.

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

The survey collected three types of data: salary, pay practices and institutional. Appendix B contains a document 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 two-year 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 TYFS Survey provides four options for reporting faculty salaries:

- Level of Education/Degree
- Academic Rank (professor, associate, assistant, instructor, and lecturer)
- Discipline with Faculty Unranked
- Discipline with Faculty Ranked across 43 disciplines

The following data were collected for each reporting option:

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

Disciplines

The 43 disciplines included in the TYFS 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 the 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.

01.02 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 survey 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 TYFS Survey. 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
- 2005 Carnegie classification
- Affiliation
 - Public
 - Private-independent
 - Private-religious
 - Private-for-profit
- Level of instruction
 - Undergraduate only
- 2009–10 total operating budget
- Student enrollment for Fall 2009–10
 - 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 2009–10
 - 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

Note: The information on the following pages is taken from the survey report. The full report contains 31 tables, including 10 tables of detailed salary data.

III. PROFILE OF 2009–10 PARTICIPATING TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

A total of 174 two-year colleges, representing 30,425 full-time faculty members, responded to this year's survey. Fifteen of the respondents were systems reporting in the aggregate for 96 campuses, raising the total number of institutions reflected in the survey to 255. Appendix D lists this year's respondents in alphabetical order.

Geographic Distribution

Table 1 shows the geographic distribution of participating two-year colleges in terms of U.S. Census regions. The largest numbers of participants are from the Midwest and South (36.8% and 31.6% respectively). The smallest numbers are from the Northeast Region (13.2%).

TABLE 1
Geographic Distribution of Responding Two-Year Colleges
CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

Census Region	N	% of Total
Northeast	23	13.2%
South	55	31.6%
Midwest	64	36.8%
West	32	18.4%
Total	174	100%

Budget Distribution

The budget size of participating institutions ranges from a low of about \$2.1M to a high of \$713M. Budget quartiles are shown below.

TABLE 2
Budget Distribution of Responding Two-Year Colleges
CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

Quartile	Budget Size (N = 174)
1	<\$20,852,454
2	\$20,852,454 - \$41,954,561
3	\$41,954,562 - \$97,353,407
4	>\$97,353,407
Mean	\$73,483,305
Median	\$41,954,561
Minimum	\$2,150,000
Maximum	\$713,019,800

Faculty Unionization

Unions represent faculty at 91 or 52.3% of this year's responding institutions. Salaries at institutions with union and non-union faculty are reported in the detailed salary tables found in Appendix A.

TABLE 3
% of Responding Two-Year Colleges with
Union versus Non-Union Faculty
CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

Faculty	N	%
Non-Union	83	47.7%
Union	91	52.3%
Total	174	100%

IV. FULL-TIME FACULTY PAY PRACTICES

- **Use of Academic Ranks:** Approximately fifty-three percent of the institutions responding to the survey this year have ranked faculty; this lower than the percentage reported last year.
- **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. The vast majority (90.1%) are on 9–10 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, per contact hour or per course. 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 that limit the teaching load of their part-time/adjunct faculty. Table 16 shows the maximum number of credits/course hours that 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, per contact hour and per course 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 2009–10 PARTICIPATING TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Salaries for full-time faculty at participating two-year 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 un-weighted and weighted salaries are provided. Un-weighted data more precisely reflects what institutions are paying in that the average or median salary for a position is included only once for each participant school. Weighted data, in contrast, is more an indicator of what incumbents are earning in that the average or median salary for a position is included once for each incumbent, thereby giving more weight to salaries paid by institutions with large numbers of incumbents.

Important Changes in Reporting of Data Starting in 2006–07

To comply with Department of Justice (DOJ) Safe Harbor Guidelines salary data are reported only for positions having at least **five responding institutions**; in the past the minimum number was less than this. Similarly, weighted salary data are reported only for positions with 5 or more responding institutions **and** in which all responding institutions comprise 25.0% or less of the incumbents. If a position has at least 5 responding institutions but one institution represents more than 25% of the incumbents, salary data is not reported. To read a summary of the Safe Harbor Guidelines go to <http://www.ftc.gov/reports/hlth3s.htm#6> and select Statement 6.

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 a majority (59.7%) of the responding two-year institutions provided salary data for full-time faculty based on level of education, while 25.6% reported salaries based on academic rank, independent of discipline. Salaries based on discipline-unranked and discipline-ranked were reported by the fewest number of respondents, at 10% and 12% respectively.

TABLE 20
% of Responding Two-Year Colleges Reporting Salary Data
for Each of the Following Methods *
CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

	N	%
Level of Education/Degree	105	59.7%
Academic Rank	45	25.6%
Academic Discipline	11	6.2%
Academic Discipline and Rank	15	8.5%
Total *	176	100%

* Several schools reported salary data in more than one category.

Overall Average Salaries by Pay Method Used

The overall average un-weighted salary of full-time faculty at this year's responding institutions was \$55,859; the comparable weighted salary was \$59,065. As Table 21-B shows, the median salary increase for institutions completing both the 2010 and 2009 surveys was 0.69%. At 2.63%, increases were largest at institutions paying on the basis of rank within discipline, but it is important to keep in mind that only 16 institutions reported salary data in this category.

TABLE 21-A:
Average 9-10 Month Salaries of Full-time Faculty at
Responding Two-Year Colleges by Pay Method –
Un-weighted and Weighted *

CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

	Un-weighted Salary	Weighted Salary	Number of Institutions	Number of Incumbents
Education	\$58,095	\$60,013	105	16,778
Academic Rank	\$55,080	\$57,964	45	10,486
Discipline Unranked	\$55,012	\$60,430	11	886
Discipline Ranked	\$54,358	\$56,624	15	2,275
Overall	\$55,859	\$59,065	174	30,425

* Several schools reported salary data in more than one category.

TABLE 21-B:
Median Increase in Average 9-10 Month Salaries of
Full-time Faculty at Responding Two-Year
Colleges by Pay Method ¹

CUPA-HR 2009–10 TYFS Survey

	Median Salary Increase	Number of Salary Pairs
Education	0.69%	12,568
Rank	0.52%	9,566
Discipline Ranked	2.63%	1,916
Discipline Unranked	0.59%	636
Overall	0.69%	24,686

Appendix A contains detailed salary and rate structure tables.

¹ **Method of Calculating Median Salary Increase:** Percent change is determined for each pair of salaries reported by institutions for the current and prior years (2010 vs. 2009) and the median of the percent changes calculated.

Appendix A

Detailed Salary and Rate Structure Tables

Note: Available in the full version of the report

- Salary and Rate Structure Tables by Level of Education, including breakout for institutions with and without faculty bargaining
 - Table 1: Salary by Education Level – Not Weighted
 - Table 2: Salary by Education Level – Weighted
 - Table 3: Salary by Education Level – Pay Scale Structures
 - Table 4: Salary by Education Level – Unionized Vs. Non-Unionized Faculty
- Salary and Rate Structure Tables by Rank, including breakout for institutions with and without faculty bargaining
 - Table 1: Salary by Faculty Rank – Not Weighted
 - Table 2: Salary by Faculty Rank – Weighted
 - Table 3: Salary by Faculty Rank – Pay Scale Structures
 - Table 4: Salary by Faculty Rank – Unionized Vs. Non-Unionized Faculty
- Salary and Rate Structure by Discipline
- Salary and Rate Structure Tables by Discipline and Rank

HOW TO ORDER THE FULL REPORT AND SPECIAL STUDIES

Go to http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/order_salary_0910.asp. This page contains order forms and pricing for the 2009-10 surveys.