Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy

Volume 0 *NCSCBHEP Proceedings 2009* Article 19

April 2009

An Assessment of the Impact of Collective Bargaining on Faculty Compensation at Community Colleges

Stephen C. Katsinas
University of Alabama

David E. Hardy
University of Alabama

An Assessment of the Impact of Collective Bargaining on Faculty Compensation at Community Colleges

by Stephen G. Katsinas and David E. Hardy, University of Alabama
Jose F. Maldanado, Alamo Community College District (Texas)
V. Barbara Bush, University of North Texas

Shortly after his appointment as President of Columbia University, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower reportedly met with a group of senior faculty. As the meeting was concluded, the General thanked them, and told them how much he appreciated their coming to the university to share their concerns. As he flashed his world-famous wide smile, a senior professor reportedly responded, "General, you don't understand; we *are* the University."

This same sense of pride and satisfaction with their role is evident in full-time faculty at community colleges. In fact, a 1989 national survey conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching of 5,000 faculty across all types of institutions of higher education found that faculty at community colleges were more satisfied with their career choice than faculty teaching in any other institutional type. More specifically, a qualitative study of full-time faculty at 16 rural community colleges conducted by Katsinas and his research teams between 1993 and 1995 revealed a high commitment of faculty to rural regions and rural people. A strong majority indicated that, if they had to do their careers over again, they would choose teaching at a rural community college (Ning, 1999).

Despite this show of job satisfaction and commitment, America's community colleges are on the verge of a major shortage of full-time faculty. This is due to two simultaneous trends: First, the record enrollments at community colleges are resulting in demands for additional faculty. In just five academic years, from 2000-2001 to 2005-2006, unduplicated headcount enrollments rose by 2.3 million students (Hardy, Katsinas, & Bush, 2007). Second, the

retirement of faculty hired during or in the years shortly after the "Baby Boom" of 1965-1973 is now occurring (Twombly & Townsend, 2007). Many community colleges already report challenges in attracting qualified faculty in high demand areas that include, but are not limited to nursing (Reid, 2005), information technology, engineering technology, science, and mathematics (Burnett, 2004; Starobin, 2004). While hiring freezes and cuts associated with the current national economic downturn may dampen labor market pressures in the immediate short term, in the longer term there is little question that "Baby Boom" era faculty are on the verge of retirement in great numbers. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to predict substantial shortages of full-time faculty for community college in the near future. Such shortages will necessarily call for active recruitment of new faculty and a renewed focus on such faculty issues as compensation.

In their analysis of research on community college faculty, Twombly & Townsend observe:

> "Much of what we know about community college faculty results from small-scale quantitative and qualitative studies conducted and the institutional or state level. Given the tremendous variation among institutions in terms of size, population served, and geographic location, this approach makes sense. On the other hand, the localized nature of the research makes it difficult to generalize findings across institutions and sates or to assume the transferability of findings in the case of qualitative research." (2008, p7).

This paper addresses the issue of faculty compensation by examining salary and benefits data for full-time faculty at US public community colleges in the 2003-2004 academic year. The last major empirical studies on this subject were conducted a generation ago by Francis King

(1971), funded by Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association (TIAA), with a follow-up study by King and Cook (1980). To address this weakness, in early 2006 a doctoral study was completed by Jose F. Maldanado at the University of North Texas. This study compared two-year colleges with and without collective bargaining agreements according to the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions in 1996, with and without local funding, and across institutional type using the 2005 Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to assess how three dimensions of the community college world well known by policymakers, practitioners, and scholars alike – the existence of collective bargaining, local appropriations, and the influence of geographical "place" – impact salaries and fringe benefits for full-time faculty at U.S. community colleges.

Literature Review

The number of quantitative studies of faculty salaries and fringe benefits for full-time faculty at community colleges is limited. Grubb and his associates argue that community college teaching has received little systematic attention (1999). The National Education Association (2005), the American Federation of Teachers (2006), and the American Association of University Professors (2005) regularly conduct salary studies for full-time faculty. Analyzing data presented in the NEA Almanac of Higher Education for 2005, Susan B. Twombly and Barbara K. Townsend, two of the leading authors on community college faculty issues, found community college faculty teach about 37% of all undergraduates, including about half of all freshmen and sophomores, and about 40% of all African-American and Asian-American students (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). In their NEA Almanac of Higher Education 2009 analysis,

Clery & Christopher (2009) found faculty salaries at community colleges with collective bargaining agreements averaged $70,051, or $2,518 more than those teaching at institutions with no collective bargaining agreement. Additionally, Townsend & Twombly found salaries do not appear to improve over the long run because of unionization, and unionized faculty do not appear to be more satisfied than those in nonunionized settings (2007). To date, however, none of these organizations has employed the new Carnegie Basic classifications for Associate's Colleges to assess differences in salaries and fringe benefits by types of community colleges, nor have they released studies assessing salary differentials for full-time faculty working under collective bargaining agreements or in states with or without revenues from local tax appropriations. Likewise, there are few studies of the fringe benefits attached to faculty employment in community colleges. In their analysis "Community College Faculty: What We Know and What We Need to Know," Twombly & Townsend (2009) urge more research on possible differences by unionization status.

There also very few studies of the impact of local funding as a revenue source for community colleges generally, and specifically if its existence makes a difference on salaries and fringe benefits for community college faculty. Kent Phillippe and George A. Boggs (2003), respectively the Director of Research and President of the American Association of Community Colleges, note the importance of measuring local funding as a revenue source:

> For policy purposes, this is a critical factor that can drive many state and local decisions. Colleges with significant local revenues can be somewhat sheltered from the impact of state financial crises. For example, a 5 percent cut in state revenues has a bigger impact for a college that receives half of its funds from state sources than it has for a college that receives only one-third of its revenue from the state. (Phillippe & Boggs, 2003, p.81).

By far the two most comprehensive studies conducted on this subject were authored by Francis King. Her first, *Benefit Plans in Junior Colleges, 1971,* supported by Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association and endorsed by the American Association of Junior Colleges, studied salaries and six categories of fringe benefits. This work was replicated in King and Cook's *Benefits in Higher Education, 1980* (King & Cook, 1980; see also King, 1971). These studies served as a guidepost for the data analysis that follows.

It is important to acknowledge that quantitative studies of certain aspects of retirement and the general labor market do exist. Through use of the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:93), Gahn and Twombly (2001) investigated community college faculty members' propensity to retire or change jobs and the general faculty labor market. They argued that this labor market faces major challenges, reinforcing earlier work by Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster (1998) which indicated that an aging faculty is one of the most important issues facing community colleges. Additionally, Gahn and Twombly (2001) found high concentrations of faculty in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities at community colleges who previously had been employed in four-year universities and, thus, had different perspectives and expectations regarding their careers in the two-year sector. In another study utilizing NSOPF:93 data, Palmer and Zimbler (2000) investigated differences among community college faculty based upon teaching field, age group, and years of experience in their current positions, and found significant differences. In particular, differences by age and years of experience highlighting the effects of being at different stages in the faculty careers were observed. Finally, in their descriptive analysis of full-time community college faculty respondents to the 1999 NSOPF dataset, Hardy and Laanan (2006) predicted challenges brought on by an aging faculty,

with 14% of faculty surveyed indicating plans to retire within five years of the 1998-1999 data collection period, and another 20% indicating plans to retire in six to ten years, and 21% indicating plans to retire within 11 to 15 years. Interestingly, 57% indicated that, if offered, they would consider the possibility of taking an *early* retirement.

The analysis by Hardy and Laanan confirmed prior studies of faculty retirement issues (Rifkin, 2000; Berry, Hammons & Denny, 2001; Outcalt, 2002). Hardy and Laanan found 34% indicating either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with their current salary, and 18% were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with their fringe benefits; furthermore, younger faculty were not as pleased with what their institutions provided as were those older and further along in their careers, which would indicate that if a tightening of the faculty labor market occurs, community colleges may face a major challenge. Taken together, these quantitative studies indicate that a major challenge for community colleges due to an impending wave of full-time community college faculty retirements could occur in the near future.

An important limitation of our current study is that we did not examine the use of part-time faculty, upon which community colleges increasingly rely. Experts have observed that, to maintain the open door in a period of increasingly restrained budgets, there has been a rise in the use of part-time faculty (Palmer, 1999; Katsinas & Palmer, 2005; Katsinas, 2005; and Roessler, 2006). It is also well-known that patterns of use of part-time faculty are very different by type of community college, particularly in the rural setting, where they are not as widely available (Banachowski, 1999). This may, in fact, be the other side of the coin that explains why internal "venture capital" is much smaller, and internal budgeting practices much more conservative at rural and small community colleges (Katsinas, Alexander & Opp, 2003). Katsinas and Miller

(1988) have discussed how community colleges in high poverty rural areas with low levels of assessed local property taxes were challenged to deliver expensive "high tech" programs.

Today, the studies by King (1971) and King & Cook (1980) are more than a quarter-century old. Much has changed in the community college world, in terms of dramatically increased enrollments (Hardy, Katsinas, & Bush, 2007) and a long-term decline in state appropriations. Roessler (2006) found that in fiscal year 1980-1981, there were 16 states in which state appropriations accounted for 60% or more of total revenues; by FY2000-2001, no state did so. In FY1980-1981, 55% of all US community college students attended in one of the 22 states in which state appropriations accounted for 50% or more of total funding; by FY2000-2001, it was only 8% in seven rural states. Further, the long-term decline in state funding described by Roessler predates the deep budget cuts experienced by US community colleges in FY2003, when 34 of 46 states reported mid-year cuts in state appropriations (Katsinas, Tollefson, & Palmer, 2003). Thus, rigorous quantitative analysis of full-time faculty salaries and fringe benefits is all the more important and timely.

Research Design

In his study, Maldanado included data reported by all public Associate's Colleges to the U.S. Department of Education/National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Salary (SA) survey during the 2003-2004 academic year. The IPEDS Dataset Cutting Tool (DCT) was used to extract data which was then imported into Excel® and Access®. In Access®, the data was linked via the IPEDS institutional UnitIDs to a master list of Associate's Colleges, which then could be separated into the Rural, Suburban, Urban, or Two-Year Under-Four Associate's College classification using the *2005 Basic*

Classification guidelines released by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in February 2006 (2006). A total of 1,053 institutions (98%) of community colleges reporting salary expenditures in the 2003-2004 academic year for 224,260 total full-time faculty were included in Maldanado's analysis. Salaries comprised a total of $11,795,784,344 of institutional expenditures in 2003-2004. A total of 1,093 (99%) of community colleges nationwide reporting fringe benefit expenditure data for their full-time faculty were included in Maldanado's analysis, with total benefits expenditures of $2,582,106. The very high rates of reporting by institutions for the salaries and fringe benefits portion of the IPEDS SA gives us high confidence in the accuracy of the data presented in the tables below.

We agree with Twombly & Townsend (2008), and assert that to understand what is happening out in the field, and the challenges related to adequately staffing community colleges in the near future, it is important to examine full-time faculty compensation data in key dimensions well known by state policymakers, institution practitioners, and scholars including Associate's College type, and the existence (or lack thereof) of faculty rank, collective bargaining agreements, and local appropriations. The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions (NCSCBHEP) has tracked collective bargaining agreements since 1972. Its listing of community colleges with collective bargaining, *The 1996 Directory of Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education,* is the most comprehensive available.[1] Similarly, Grapevine, housed at Illinois State University, has since 1960 has annually tracked state tax appropriations for public higher education institutional operating budgets. Grapevine's definitions of the 25 states with local tax

[1] In early 2006, after Maldanado's study had been completed, NCSCBHEP released its 2006 version, too late for analysis here.

appropriations above 10% of total revenues, and those 25 states below provides further opportunities for analysis (Grapevine, as cited in Roessler, 2006). These existing data sets, when combined with the new 2005 Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, provide a powerful new tool for a more comprehensive analysis: one that "peels back the layers of the onion" to provide greater understanding and insight.

Results

Salaries of Full-Time Faculty at Community Colleges with and without Faculty Rank

Table 1 shows that a total of $11.8 billion of reported expenditures for compensation was paid to the 224,460 full-time faculty at U.S. community colleges. According to IPEDS, of these 224,460 full-time faculty, 168,555 (75%) have faculty "rank" (i.e., "professor," "associate professor," or "assistant professor") and 555,705 (25%) do not, although it is not clear what is meant by the term "instructor" at many institutions (i.e., without a title of full or associate professor, institutions can have "step" programs to compensate at increasing levels those with greater seniority or years of service). The mean salary of all full-time faculty in FY2003 was $52,595; faculty in three out of the five academic ranks (professor, associate professor, and instructor) were paid more than faculty with no academic rank. The mean salary for the 29,138 full professors ($63,012) was roughly $10,000 per year above that of the national mean for all faculty. Extrapolating from this data, it becomes clear that academic rank matters, as faculty with no academic rank at every type of Associate's Colleges are compensated at levels below the national mean.

Table 1 also shows significant variance in mean compensation of full-time faculty by type of Associate's College. In general, the smaller the college, the lower the mean salaries for full-time faculty. At $59,960, mean salaries for full-time faculty at surburban Associate's Colleges were highest, followed by $55,942 at urban and $46,535 at rural colleges, with a range of about $13,400 annually For every academic rank except the numerically smallest category of "lecturer," faculty at suburban institutions are paid the most, followed by urban institutions, with rural faculty paid the least. The ranges are substantial. The 8,286 full professors at suburban community colleges are paid $70,286 per year, compared to just $55,139 for the 9,997 faculty at rural community—an annual range of more than $15,000 each year. The significance of this particular compensation range is heightened when one considers that $13,000 to $15,000 per year can translate into just under a half a million in absolute dollars over a 30- to 35-year faculty career, and may exceed a million dollars in compensation when adjusted for inflation.

Collective Bargaining

Tables 2 and 3 present data related to collective bargaining at Associate's Colleges in the United States. In Table 2, a state is counted as having collective bargaining if the majority of the publicly controlled two-year institutions within its borders have collective bargaining agreements as reported in the 1996 NCSCBHEP report. Among the top 25 states in mean faculty compensation in FY2003, Arizona is the only non-collective bargaining state ranking among the top 20; mean salaries for three other non-collective bargaining states rank at the bottom of the top 25 listed. It is clear that faculty operating under collective bargaining agreements in the fifty states are paid more than those who do not.

The first chart in Table 3 compares the mean salaries of full-time faculty operating under collective bargaining agreements with those who do not; this reveals a substantial gap, with a mean average salary of $57,377 for those at institutions with collective bargaining, and $43,884 for those at institutions without. Within each type of Associate's College, the mean salaries of full-time faculty at community colleges are higher at those institutions with collective bargaining. The annual spread or difference in mean annual salaries (indicated in the two columns on the far right of the table) ranges from $4,339 at Rural Small colleges to $17,249 at Suburban Multi-Campus districts. Again, the smaller the institution, the lower the average salaries; yet for each type of Associate's College, higher pay is found at institutions with collective bargaining agreements. When it comes to faculty compensation, collective bargaining and geography clearly matter.

Local Appropriations and Faculty Compensation

The second chart in Table 3 compares the mean salaries of full-time faculty at community colleges at institutions in the 25 states where local appropriations exceed 10% of total revenues with those of the 25 states where local appropriations do not exceed 10% (most of which are below 2% of total revenues). The substantial difference identified by Phillippe and Boggs (2003) resulting from access to local tax appropriations is readily apparent here. The average salary for all full-time faculty in the 25 states with local appropriations was $54,663, compared to $46,963 for full-time faculty in the 25 states without—a difference, in just one year, of $7,700 (16%). By major college type, full-time faculty at Suburban colleges in states with local funding were paid significantly more ($61,822) than faculty who worked in Urban ($58,490) and Rural ($46,905) colleges that also had local funding.

Mean salaries for full-time faculty at Associate's Colleges without local funding show similar trends. Full-time faculty at Rural Colleges without local funding were paid on average $45,786, or about $1,200 per year less than the average of $46,963 across all types of faculty working at institutions without local funding. The average salaries paid full-time faculty at all Rural, Suburban, and Urban Associate's Colleges were higher at institutions with local than those without local funding. However, an interesting difference emerges when the data are disaggregated by the three types of Rural Colleges (Small, Medium, and Large). Full-time faculty at Rural Small and Rural Medium Colleges without local funding were paid *more* than full-time faculty teaching at Rural Small and Rural Medium Associate's Colleges with local funding. For none of the other Carnegie types of Associate's Colleges was this difference found.

The final two columns of the lower chart on Table 3 show the significance of the differences in terms of annual salaries paid to full-time faculty, expressed in numbers and percentages. Clearly, full-time faculty at Urban and Suburban Associate's Colleges with local support are paid significantly more – more than $10,000 *or 22 to 23% per year* – than their counterparts working at Urban and Suburban Associate's Colleges in states without local support. Full-time faculty working at Rural Large institutions in states with local support were paid $3,278 or 7% more per year than their counterparts working at Rural Large Associate's Colleges in states without local support.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of local funding suggested by Phillippe and Boggs (2003) when analyzing average salaries for full-time faculty across the country. For each major category, full-time faculty in states with local funding were paid more; by major sub-classification, Suburban faculty were paid nearly $12,000 more per year, Urban faculty nearly $10,000 per year, and Rural faculty just $1,200 per year. This strongly supports Phillippe and

Boggs in their argument regarding the critical difference between those states with and without local funding.

Fringe Benefits at Associate's Colleges

Not surprisingly, the variation that exists in the salaries provided to full-time faculty at Associate's Colleges is also reflected in the major fringe benefits offered. Space limitations do not allow a full presentation of Maldanado's work here, but Table 4 summarizes the national data: 19 of 20 community colleges offer medical and dental plans; four out of five offer Social Security; two out of three offer retirement plans; seven out of ten offer worker's compensation, and six out of ten offer unemployment compensation. More specialized fringe benefits, including group disability insurance, tuition plans, and guaranteed insurance plans, however, are not as common at rural-serving Associate's Colleges. In light of the obvious relationship between fringe benefits and faculty salaries, it is not surprising to again find the trend that the smaller and more rural the college, the less likely specialized benefits are offered (Maldanado, 2006).

The significant salary variation documented by Carnegie type for those states with and without collective bargaining agreements above is also reflected in the analysis of fringe benefits by Associate's College type. Again, the average full-time faculty salary is $13,853 (32%) higher at institutions with collective bargaining agreements ($57,737 vs. $43,884). The 627 colleges in collective bargaining states spent an average of $13,121 per full-time faculty member on fringe benefits, while the 466 colleges in non-collective bargaining states spent an average of $8,793 per full-time faculty member on fringe benefits, a difference of $4,328 per year (nearly 50%). Over a 35-year career, each full-time faculty member who is not represented via collective bargaining receives $352,717 less in fringe benefits (Maldanado, 2006). Significant salary

variation also exists by Carnegie type for those states with and without local appropriations; again, however, that variation is not as pronounced as the variation in states with and without collective bargaining. Overall, a higher number of colleges with local appropriations offer better fringe benefits packages than colleges without local appropriations, and full-time faculty in states with local appropriations earned 16% more than faculty in states without local appropriations.

Discussion

This study found a significant range in the mean salaries and fringe benefits offered to full-time faculty at community colleges in the United States. It is clear that major differences exist at those institutions with academic rank, as well as by the type of geographic setting served (i.e., rural, suburban or urban). Further, the existence of collective bargaining and local appropriations has a substantial effect producing higher mean levels of annual compensation. But do these findings matter, and do they tell us anything we did not already know?

The answer is that these findings do matter. Due to the much higher gas prices rural America has seen and those areas' lack of publicly subsidized mass transit, the long-term trend of lower costs of living in areas of rural America may be coming to an end. It is still too early to assess the long-term effects of the burst of the housing bubble in suburban and urban America on faculty salaries. However, we can theorize that over the past five years, with much higher gasoline costs, the differential in living costs has likely narrowed. For this reason, the significant lag of average full-time faculty salaries at rural community colleges is troubling. This lag comes at a time when the nation's community college administrative leadership is turning over, and a turnover of full-time faculty also hired during the baby boom can also be expected to occur. The significantly lower salaries and lower levels of specialized fringe benefits paid to full-time

faculty at rural community colleges strongly suggests that this particular set of institutions will be challenged greatly as the higher education industry moves into a period of rapid faculty turnover.

What incentives will the institutions provide to attract diverse and highly-qualified faculty? How will appropriate faculty development, including more expensive specialized programming and access to doctoral education, be provided? Will existing salary structures allow these colleges to pay for full-time faculty in high-demand areas? Finally, in light of the 15% metropolitan/non-metropolitan wage differential identified by Charles W. Fluharty at the Rural Policy Research Institute (2007), at what point does the much higher loan indebtedness taken by today's undergraduate and graduate students serve to lower the odds of making the career decision to teach at a rural community college possible?

We believe that the future will pose many challenges for all types of community colleges to recruit and retain qualified and committed full-time faculty. We specifically recommend that federal and state policymakers seriously consider renewing the teacher recruitment incentives of loan forgiveness formerly offered through the federal program that bore the name of the late Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, providing student loan forgiveness for graduates in teacher education who chose to teach in high-poverty urban and rural areas. The time has come for the National Science Foundation and other interested entities to fund studies that address this specific area of policy concern.

Townsend and Twombly (2001) have noted that the globalization of the economy and workforce are impacting community colleges throughout the United States. They further state that, although community colleges are primarily local institutions, individual colleges will vary in terms of the extent to which they are protected from or are affected by changes in global

markets and the world economy. Certainly, one area in which these institutions are but one point on a world-wide continuum is their existence as a set of employers. Colleges, state policy makers, and federal policy makers would be well cautioned to remember this as they analyze and alter such fundamental workforce factors as employee salaries and fringe benefits. Indeed, while our analysis of the differences *within* the various comparison groups by Carnegie institutional type, collective bargaining coverage and local appropriations opens the door to a discussion of "leveling the playing field" in terms of faculty salaries and benefits, future research should also look at these variables in comparison to other industry sectors in the institutions' local regions, across the country and, indeed, globally. In today's technology-rich world, it is as possible for a faculty member to be employed by a foreign institution via the Internet as it is for him or her to work for the local community college in a rural region of one of our fifty states – and the former option sometimes comes at a salary premium. Additionally, the relationship between qualified faculty in high-demand areas (including, but not limited to, allied health, nursing, engineering technology) and high-wage jobs strongly suggests the need for further examination of the relationship between geography and faculty compensation to bolster regional economic advantage, particularly in high-poverty rural and urban areas. Such possibilities must be taken into account if we are to continue to attract and employ high-quality faculty members at what this study has shown to be the most economically unappealing institutions to such professionals.

It is evident from our research that further study of the impact of salaries and benefits at U.S. community colleges is needed. Such studies should investigate and assess: a) how the presence of *both* local support and collective bargaining impacts full-time faculty salaries; b) the impact of access or lack of access to part-time faculty, particularly in high demand fields; and c) how lower levels of access to additional graduate study impacts the migration patterns of faculty

in areas such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), disciplines that are critical to the future high-wage job base of rural areas of our nation.

References

American Association of University Professors (2005). *The annual report of the economic status of the profession: 2003-2004.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Federation of Teachers. (2006). *About AFT higher education*. Retrieved February 18, 2006, from http://www.aft.org/higher_ed/about.htm

American Federation of Teachers. (2006). *Hot topics*. Retrieved February 18, 2006, from http://www.aft.org/higher_ed/topics/index.htm

American Federation of Teachers. (2006). *Who we are.* Retrieved February 18, 2006, from http://www.aft.org/about/index.htm

Banachowski, G. (1996). Perspectives and perceptions: The use of part-time faculty at community colleges. *Community College Review 24* (2),1-14.

Berry, L. H., Hammons, J. O., & Denny, G. S. (2001). Faculty retirement turnover in community colleges: A real or imagined problem? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(2), 123-136.

Burnett, S. (2004). Using our imagination. *Community College Week, 17*(4),6-8.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006). *2005 Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.* Released February 2006. Retrieved August 31, 2007, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Clery, S.B., & Christopher, B.L. (2009). Faculty salaries: 2007-2008. *National Education Association Almanac of Higher Education 2009*, 7-28.

Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American community college*, (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Coulter, M. W. (1993). Modern teachers and postmodern students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,17* (1), 51.

Eddy, P. L. (2007). Faculty development in rural community colleges, *New directions for community colleges, Rural community colleges: Teaching, learning, and leading in the Heartland, 137* (Spring), 565-76.

Finkelstein, M., Seal, R., & Schuster, J. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fluharty, C. W. (2007). Written statement for the record. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Specialty Crops, Committee on Agriculture, United States House of Representatives, March 21, 2007, Retrieved on September 19, 2007, from http://www.rupri.org/Forms/testimony032107.pdf

Gahn, S., & Twombly, S. B. (2001). Dimensions of the community college faculty labor market. *Review of Higher Education, 24*(3), 259-282.

Grubb, W. N., & associates (1999). Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges. New York: Routledge.

Hardy, D.E., & Katsinas. S.G. (2006). Using community college classifications in research: From conceptual model to useful tool. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30,* 339-358.

Hardy, D.E., Katsinas. S.G., and Bush, V.B. (2007). Tidal Wave II, Community Colleges, and Financial Aid. *Enrollment Management Journal. 1*(1), 23-48.

Hardy, D. E. & Laanan, F. S. (2006). Characteristics and perspectives of faculty at public 2-year

colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*(10), 787-811.

Katsinas, S.G., & Miller, M.T. (1998). Vocational education in rural community colleges: Strategic issues and problems, *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 23, 2.

Katsinas, S. G. (2005). Increased competition for scarce state dollars. *New directions for community college*,132, (pp.19-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Katsinas, S. G., Alexander, K. F., & Opp, R. D. (2003). *Preserving access with excellence: Financing for rural community colleges*. Rural Community College Initiative Policy Paper. Chapel Hill, NC: MDC Inc.

Katsinas, S. G., & Palmer, J. C. (Eds.). (2005). Editor's notes. *New directions for community colleges: Sustaining financial support for community colleges*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Katsinas, S.G., Tollefson, T.A., and Palmer, J.C. 2003 state directors study.

King, F. P., (1971). *Benefit plans in junior colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

King, F. P., & Cook, T.J. (1980). Benefit plans in higher education. New York: Columbia University Press.

Maldanado, J.F. (2006). A national analysis of faculty salary and benefit in public community colleges, academic year 2003-2004. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.

Murray, J. P. (2007). Recruiting and retaining rural community college faculty. *New directions for community colleges, Rural community colleges: Teaching, learning, and leading in the Heartland,* 137, p.57-64.

National Education Association. (2005). *Almanac of higher education*. Washington, D.C.:

Author.

National Center for Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions. (1996). *The 1996 directory of faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education.* New York: Author.

Ning, B. (1999). An analysis of issues related to faculty and professional development in rural community colleges. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toledo.

Outcalt, C. L. (ed.). (2002). *New directions for community colleges: Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (Vol. 114). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, J.C. (1999**).** Part-time faculty at community colleges: A national profile. In *The 1999 National Education Association almanac of higher education.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Palmer, J. C., & Zimbler, L. J. (2000). Instructional faculty and staff in public 2-year colleges. Statistical analysis report. 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93) (NCES No. 2000192). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ED 442 518).

Phillippe, K.A., & Boggs, G.R. (2003). The perspective of the American Association of Community Colleges. In McCormick and Cox (Eds.). (2003). *New directions for community colleges, Classification systems for two-year colleges, 122 (79-85).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reid, M. B. (2005). *A survey of community college healthcare program deans/directors on issues related to the shortage of nurses and other healthcare providers*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Texas.

Rifkin, T. (2000). Public community college faculty. New Expeditions: Charting the second

century of community colleges. Issues Paper No. 4. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ED 439 739).

Roessler, B. C. (2006). A quantitative study of revenue and expenditures at U.S. public community colleges, 1980-2001. Published Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Texas.

Starobin, S. S. (3004). *Gender differences in college choice, aspirations, and self-concept among community college students in science, mathematics, and engineering.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Texas.

Townsend, B.K., & Twombly, S.B. (2007). Community college faculty: Overlooked and undervalued. *ASHE Higher Education Report Series, 32*(6). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Twombly, S. B., & Townsend, B. K. (2001). Conclusion: The future of community college policy in the 21st century. In B. K. Townsend & Susan Twombly (Eds.) *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 283-298). Ablex Publishing: Westport, CT.

Twombly, S.B., & Townsend, B.K. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and what we need to know. *Community College Review, 36* (1), 5-24.

Wolfe, J. R. & Strange, C. C. (2003). Academic life at the franchise: Faculty culture in a rural two-year branch campus. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(3), 343-362.

Table 1
Mean Salaries, Numbers, and Percentages of Full-Time Faculty With and Without Faculty Rank at Public Associate's Colleges in the United States, and Total Expenditures for Full-Time Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits, Fiscal Year 2003

		Rural (575)	Suburban (208)	Urban (182)	2-Year Under 4-Year (88)	ALL Colleges (1,053)	Total Expend-itures
WITH FACULTY RANK							
Professor	Mean Salary	$55,139	$70,286	$65,037	$61,245	$63,012	$1.84 bil
	Number	9,997	8,873	8,566	1,802	29,138	
	Percent	*(10.6)*	*(15.7)*	*(13.8)*	*(15.9)*	*(13.0)*	
Associate	Mean Salary	$48,041	57,637	54,607	54,171	53,009	$1.15 bil
Professor	Number	7,744	5,712	5,598	2,664	21,718	
	Percent	*(8.2)*	*(10.1)*	*(9.0)*	*(23.6)*	*(9.7)*	
Assistant	Mean Salary	$42,565	49,745	48,891	45,776	46,598	$1.14 bil
Professor	Number	8,014	5,896	7,180	3,286	24,376	
	Percent	*(8.5)*	*(10.5)*	*(11.5)*	*(29.1)*	*(10.9)*	
Instructor	Mean Salary	$45,850	62,570	58,146	39,552	53,870	$4.90 bil
	Number	36,477	26,155	25,323	3,022	90,977	
	Percent	*(38,6)*	*(46.4)*	*(40.7)*	*(26.7)*	*(40,6)*	
Lecturer	Mean Salary	$36,506	35,996	43,653	39,879	40,162	$0.09 bil
	Number	656	215	976	399	2,246	
	Percent	*(0.7)*	-	*(0.2)*	*(0.4)*	*(0.1)*	
All WITH	Mean Salary	$47,080	61,694	57,277	48,378	54,111	$9.12 bil
Faculty	Number	62,888	46,851	47,643	11,173	168,555	
Rank	*Percent*	*67%*	*83%*	*77%*	*99%*	*75%*	
WITH NO FACULTY RANK:							
	Mean Salary	$45,451	$51,443	$51,523	$35,274	$48,024	$2.68 bil
	Number	31,636	9,540	14,402	127	55,705	
	Percent	*33%*	*17%*	*23%*	*1%*	*25%*	
GRAND TOTAL, ALL:							
	Mean Salary	**$46,535**	**$59,960**	**$55,942**	**$48,231**	**$52,598**	**$11.8 bil**
	Number	**94,524**	**56,391**	**62,205**	**11,300**	**224,260**	
	Percent	***100%***	***100%***	***100%***	***100%***	***100%***	

Source: Maldanado, 2006.

Table 2
Mean Full-Time Faculty Salaries at Public Associate's Colleges in States with and without Collective Bargaining Agreements, Fiscal Year 2003

State	Mean Salary	State	Mean Salary
1. California	$69,369	26. Georgia	$45,061
2. Michigan	64,608	27. Utah	44,919
3. New Jersey	62,050	28. Alabama	44,537
4. Wisconsin	61,038	29. Wyoming	44,396
5. Alaska	60,565	***30. Iowa***	***43,061***
6. Connecticut	59,729	***31. New Hampshire***	***42,950***
7. New York	58,907	32. Kentucky	42,909
8. Arizona	58,429	33. Indiana	42,639
9. Illinois	56,734	34. Tennessee	42,560
10. Maryland	55,658	***35. Nebraska***	***42,***493
11. Massachusetts	55,577	36. Mississippi	42,435
12. Delaware	55,513	***37. Kansas***	***42,276***
13. Pennsylvania	54,532	38. ***Idaho***	***42,253***
14. Minnesota	54,400	39. Colorado	41,804
15. Hawaii	52,630	40. New Mexico	41,400
16. Nevada	51,827	41. Louisiana	40,860
17. Oregon	51,472	42. West Virginia	40,795
18. Rhode Island	51,236	***43. Oklahoma***	***40,766***
19. Ohio	50,704	44. South Carolina	40,672
20. Florida	49,001	***45. South Dakota***	40,075
21. Washington	48,394	***46. Montana***	39,768
22. Missouri	46,589	47. Arkansas	39,046
23. Texas	46,484	***48. North Dakota***	38,060
24. Maine	46,358	49. North Carolina	37,943
25. Virginia	46,062	50. Vermont	N/A

Notes:
1. If the majority of the Associate's Colleges in a given state reported having collective bargaining agreements, the state was classified as "collective bargaining."
2. States in which a majority of Associate's Colleges have collective bargaining agreements for their two-year colleges are in bold and italicized.

Source: Maldanado, 2006.

Table 3
The Impact of Collective Bargaining and Local Appropriations on Full-Time Faculty Salaries at Public Associate's Colleges in the United States, by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification Type, Fiscal Year 2003

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	Salaries of Full-Time Faculty at Associate's Colleges.....			
Carnegie 2005 Basic Classification	*WITH Collective Bargaining*	*WITHOUT Collective Bargaining*	*DIFFERENCE . Dollars*	*% .*
Rural Small	$44,165	$39,826	+$ 4,339	+11%
Rural Medium	48,304	41,365	+$ 6,939	+17%
Rural Large	55,209	43,403	+$ 11,806	+27%
All Rural	$51,340	$41,596	+$ 9,744	+23%
Suburban Single Campus	$62,393	42,151	+$ 20,242	+48%
Suburban Multi-Campus	64,659	47,410	+$ 17,249	+36%
All Suburban	$63,402	$45,619	+$ 17,783	+39%
Urban Single Campus	55,502	40,708	+$ 14,794	+36%
Urban Multi-Campus	61,005	50,853	+$ 10,152	+20%
All Urban	$59,865	$48,100	+$ 11,765	+24%
2-Year Under 4-Year	$51,109	$44,150	+$ 6,959	+16%
ALL COLLEGES	$57,737	$43,884	+$ 13,853	+32%

LOCAL APPROPRATIONS	Salaries of Full-Time Faculty at Associate's Colleges.....			
Carnegie 2005 Basic Classification	*WITH* **Local** *Appropriations*	*WITHOUT* **Local** *Appropriations*	*DIFFERENCE .* **Dollars**	*%..*
Rural Small	$42,899	$40,081	-$2,818	-7%
Rural Medium	45,097	43,655	-$1,442	-3%
Rural Large	49,037	52,315	+$3,278	+7%
All Rural	**$45,786**	**$46,905**	**+$1,119**	**+2%**
Suburban Single Campus	51,092	61,107	+$10,015	+20%
Suburban Multi-Campus	49,772	62,633	+$12,861	+26%
All Suburban	**$50,321**	**$61,822**	**+$11,501**	**+23%**
Urban Single Campus	48,449	50,148	+$1,699	+4%
Urban Multi-Campus	47,893	60,754	+$12,861	+27%
All Urban	**$48,046**	**$58,490**	**+$10,444**	**+22%**
2-Year Under 4-Year	$44,457	$49,668	+$5,211	+12%
ALL COLLEGES	**$46,963**	**$54,663**	**+$7,700**	**+16%**

Notes: (1) The 1996 NCSCBHEP study was used to designate colleges with collective bargaining. (2) The 2005 Grapevine (Illinois State University) rankings were used to designate colleges located in the 25 states where local appropriations exceeded 10% of total expenditures. Source: Maldanado, 2006.

Table 4
Fringe Benefits for Full-Time Faculty at Associate's College in the United States by 2005 Carnegie Basic Classification Type, Fiscal Year 2003

	Rural	Suburban	Urban	2Under4	TOTAL
Medical/Dental Plans	**573**	**204**	**179**	**87**	**1,043**
Percent Reporting	*95%*	*95%*	*96%*	*96%*	*95%*
Social Security	**508**	**162**	**146**	**84**	**900**
Percent Reporting	*85%*	*75%*	*78%*	*92%*	*82%*
Retirement Plan	**399**	**152**	**102**	**48**	**701**
Percent Reporting	*66%*	*71%*	*55%*	*53%*	*64%*
Worker's Compensation	**378**	**166**	**140**	**83**	**767**
Percent Reporting	*63%*	*77%*	*75%*	*91%*	*70%*
Unemployment Compensation	**304**	**142**	**127**	**65**	**638**
Percent Reporting	*51%*	*66%*	*68%*	*71%*	*58%*
Other Insurance Benefits	**59**	**43**	**34**	**4**	**140**
Percent Reporting	*10%*	*20%*	*18%*	*4%*	*13%*
Guaranteed Disability	**88**	**103**	**204**	**37**	**433**
Percent Reporting	*34%*	*41%*	*55%*	*41%*	*40%*
Other Benefits	**26**	**8**	**8**	**5**	**57**
Percent Reporting	*5%*	*6%*	*4%*	*5%*	*5%*
Tuition Plan	**238**	**73**	**74**	**50**	**435**
Percent Reporting	*40%*	*34%*	*40%*	*55%*	*40%*
Group Life Insurance	**409**	**154**	**154**	**84**	**801**
Percent Reporting	*68%*	*72%*	*83%*	*92%*	*73%*

Source: Maldanado, 2006.