

# Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy

---

Volume 0 *National Center Proceedings 2016*

Article 2

---

September 2016

## Research Panel: Monetary Compensation of Full-Time Faculty at American Public Regional Universities: The Impact of Geography and the Existence of Collective Bargaining

Stephen Katsinas  
*University of Alabama*

Johnson Ogun  
*University of Alabama*

Nathaniel Bray  
*University of Alabama*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba>

 Part of the [Collective Bargaining Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Katsinas, Stephen; Ogun, Johnson; and Bray, Nathaniel (2016) "Research Panel: Monetary Compensation of Full-Time Faculty at American Public Regional Universities: The Impact of Geography and the Existence of Collective Bargaining," *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*: Vol. 0 , Article 2.

Available at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol0/iss11/2>

This Proceedings Material is brought to you for free and open access by The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

## **Monetary Compensation of Full-Time Faculty at American Public Regional Universities: The Impact of Geography and the Existence of Collective Bargaining**

Research Paper Presented at the 43rd Annual National Conference of the  
National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions  
Hunter College, The City University of New York

By Stephen Katsinas, Johnson Ogun, and Nathaniel Bray, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama,  
<http://uaedpolicy.ua.edu/> Questions may be addressed to Stephen G. Katsinas, [katsinas@ua.edu](mailto:katsinas@ua.edu)  
April 3, 2016

### **Executive Summary**

This work builds upon an analysis of regional universities that began in 2009, to build a geographically-based, quantifiable definition of the nation's regional universities. It builds on efforts begun by Katsinas (1993) to geographically map access oriented community colleges, which resulted in the geographic coding of Associate's Colleges as part of the 2005 and 2010 Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Katsinas, Lacey, & Hardy, 2005).

### **Key findings**

- 1. Wide variation in salaries and fringe benefits based upon geographic region served.**
- 2. Wide variation in salaries and fringe benefits based if collective bargaining exists.**
- 3. Access institutions need a 21st century classification scheme to reflect mission, workload**

### **Implications for Practice**

- 1. Disaggregate data:** Very clear faculty workload differences exist between flagship and regional universities, justifying disaggregation of RUs within the national data bases. But USED and Carnegie don't do this—USED combines all "4-year" together, and Carnegie's "highest degree awarded" scheme (Doctoral, Master's, Baccalaureate, Associate) contains so much noise that users (Delta Cost Project, AAUP, etc.) are likely unintentionally reinforcing "pecking order" biases Astin found 25 years ago.
- 2. Regional universities deserve to stand on their own as an institutional type.** *Carnegie's public Master's category leaves out 120 RUs that serve 1.4 million students.*
- 3. Geography matters:** Picking peer institutions requires recognizing place-based differences that get masked in data averages. Like community colleges, regional universities are committed to providing access and opportunity to their regions (e.g., AASCU's "Stewardship of Place" program). This justifies a place-based classification scheme for access institutions.
- 4. Collective bargaining matters:** Inflation-adjusted career earnings can exceed \$1 million.

### **Implications for Policy & Research**

1. We are on our own. USED discontinued collecting Fringe Benefit data in IPEDS surveys
2. But good data are still needed by boards, business & human resource officers, and faculty to build compensation plans. We have to find our own way.
3. Differences may be greater than reported here, as cost savings may be obtained by spreading purchasing of fringe benefits (med, group life ins., etc.) across larger pools and groups.
4. Funding is needed for a large national study similar to King & Cook (1980), involving NACUBO, CUPA, and other interested organizations (perhaps TIAA and Ford Foundation).
5. NSF and NIH should study faculty compensation in high wage/high demand STEM and IT fields.
6. Secondary analysis/focus on high poverty regions.
7. Secondary analysis/focus on sparsely populated areas.
8. Study compensation across 2- & 4-year access sectors.
9. A classification scheme appropriate for access institutions can help document the connection between full-time faculty and higher degree completion rates. Does presence of more full-time faculty lead to faster/higher Associate Degree completion rates? If so, this finding would be of great importance.

**To tell access story requires new frames to localize data!**

State	Collective Bargaining	State	No Collective Bargaining
Alaska	X	Alabama	X
California	X	Arizona	X
Connecticut	X	Arkansas	X
Delaware	X	Colorado	X
Florida	X	Georgia	X
Illinois	X	Hawaii	X
Iowa	X	Idaho	X
Kansas	X	Indiana	X
Maine	X	Kentucky	X
Maryland	X	Louisiana	X
Massachusetts	X	Mississippi	X
Michigan	X	North Carolina	X
Minnesota	X	North Dakota	X
Missouri	X	Oklahoma	X
Montana	X	South Carolina	X
Nebraska	X	Tennessee	X
Nevada	X	Texas	X
New Hampshire	X	Utah	X
New Jersey	X	Virginia	X
New Mexico	X	West Virginia	X
New York	X	Wyoming	X
Ohio	X		
Oregon	X		
Pennsylvania	X		
Rhode Island	X		
South Dakota	X		
Vermont	X		
Washington	X		
Wisconsin	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>

Source: Barry, J. & Savarese, M. (2012). *Directory of U.S. faculty contracts and bargaining agents in institutions of higher education*. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

Table 2  
*Public Regional Universities with & without Collective Bargaining by Type, 2010-11*

<b>Institutions (in NUMBERS)</b>			
	<b>All Public Regional Universities</b>	<b>With Collective Bargaining</b>	<b>Without Collective Bargaining</b>
Rural Small	49	32	17
Rural Medium	90	40	50
Rural Large	122	62	60
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>127</b>
Suburban Smaller	13	9	4
Suburban Larger	42	32	10
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>14</b>
Urban Smaller	21	13	8
Urban Large	53	31	22
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Average, All</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>171</b>
<b><u>Within each geographic type</u></b> (in PERCENTAGES)			
Rural Small	100	65	35
Rural Medium	100	44	56
Rural Large	100	51	49
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>49</b>
Suburban Smaller	100	69	31
Suburban Larger	100	76	24
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>25</b>
Urban Smaller	100	62	38
Urban Large	100	58	42
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Average, All</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>44</b>
<b><u>Across each geographic type</u></b> (in PERCENTAGES)			
Rural Small	13	15	10
Rural Medium	23	18	29
Rural Large	31	28	35
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>74</b>
Suburban Smaller	3	4	2
Suburban Larger	11	15	6
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>
Urban Smaller	5	6	5
Urban Large	14	14	13
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes: (1) Regional universities are defined to be members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities with identifiable institutional UnitIDs in the federal NCES/IPEDS data base. (2) definitions of public Regional University subtypes were developed by Katsinas (2016, forthcoming). (3) list of institutions with collective bargaining was obtained from Berry & Saravese, 2012; (4) if the majority of regional universities within a given state had collective bargaining, the state was counted as a collective bargaining state.

Table 3

Full-time Faculty at Regional Universities with &amp; without Collective Bargaining, 2010-11

	<b>Full-time Faculty ....</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b><u>With</u> Collective Bargaining</b>	<b><u>Without</u> Collective Bargaining</b>
Rural Small	5,386	3,372	2,014
Rural Medium	15,872	8,066	7,806
Rural Large	50,605	25,764	24,841
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>71,863</b>	<b>37,202</b>	<b>34,661</b>
Suburban Smaller	2,441	1,767	674
Suburban Larger	18,884	13,635	5,249
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>21,325</b>	<b>15,402</b>	<b>5,923</b>
Urban Smaller	4,957	2,837	2,120
Urban Large	29,077	19,027	10,050
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>34,034</b>	<b>21,864</b>	<b>12,170</b>
<b>Total, All</b>	<b>127,222</b>	<b>74,468</b>	<b>52,754</b>
<b><u>Within each geographic type</u></b> <i>(in PERCENTAGES)</i>			
Rural Small	100	63	37
Rural Medium	100	51	49
Rural Large	100	51	49
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>
Suburban Smaller	100	72	28
Suburban Larger	100	72	28
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>28</b>
Urban Smaller	100	57	43
Urban Large	100	65	35
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Average, All</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>37</b>
<b><u>Across each geographic type</u></b> <i>(in PERCENTAGES)</i>			
Rural Small	4	5	4
Rural Medium	12	11	11
Rural Large	40	35	47
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>66</b>
Suburban Smaller	2	2	1
Suburban Larger	15	18	10
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>
Urban Smaller	4	4	4
Urban Large	23	26	19
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Average, Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes: (1) Regional universities are defined to be members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities with identifiable institutional UnitIDs in the federal NCES/IPEDS data base. (2) definitions of public Regional University subtypes were developed by Katsinas (2016, forthcoming). (3) source of institutions with collective bargaining was Berry & Saravese, 2012; (4) if the majority of Regional Universities within a given state had collective bargaining, the state was counted as a collective bargaining state.

	Colleges	Full-Time Faculty				Average Salaries of Full-Time Faculty...				
		Number	Total	with collective bargaining	without collective bargaining	All	with collective bargaining	without collective bargaining	difference, expressed in...	
									Dollars	%
Rural Small	49	5,386	100	63	37	\$62,622	\$64,737	\$59,079	\$5,658	9
Rural Medium	90	15,872	100	51	49	\$60,824	\$61,900	\$59,711	\$2,189	4
Rural Large	122	50,605	100	51	49	\$69,074	\$70,383	\$67,482	\$2,901	4
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>71,863</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>\$64,173</b>	<b>\$65,673</b>	<b>\$62,091</b>	<b>\$3,583</b>	<b>5</b>
Suburban Smaller	13	2,441	100	72	28	\$74,944	\$79,018	\$64,314	\$14,704	19
Suburban Larger	42	18,884	100	72	28	\$74,687	\$79,836	\$61,339	\$18,497	23
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>21,325</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>\$74,816</b>	<b>\$79,427</b>	<b>\$62,827</b>	<b>\$16,601</b>	<b>21</b>
Urban Smaller	21	4,957	100	57	43	\$72,162	\$70,704	\$53,116	\$17,588	25
Urban Large	53	29,077	100	65	35	\$77,940	\$83,308	\$75,105	\$8,203	10
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>34,034</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>\$75,051</b>	<b>\$77,006</b>	<b>\$64,111</b>	<b>\$12,896</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Totals/Averages</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>127,221</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>\$71,347</b>	<b>\$74,035</b>	<b>\$63,009</b>	<b>\$11,026</b>	<b>15</b>

Notes: (1) 390 Regional universities were listed as American Association of State Colleges and Universities members as of August 2014 with identifiable institutional UnitIDs in the federal NCES/IPEDS data base; (2) data on full-time faculty is from the IPEDS Human Resources Survey for 2010-11; (3) definitions of public Regional University subtypes were developed by Katsinas (2016, forthcoming), consistent with the geographic codes (rural, suburban, urban, etc.) that were part of the 2005 and 2010 Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and included in all published federal higher education data sets; (4) the source of institutions with collective bargaining was Berry & Saravese, 2012; (5) if the majority of Regional Universities within a given state had collective bargaining, the state was counted as a collective bargaining state.

Table 5  
*Average Fringe Benefits of Full-time at Public Regional Universities, 2010-2011: The impact of Collective Bargaining*

	Colleges	Full-Time Faculty	ALL	with Collective Bargaining	without Collective Bargaining	difference expressed in	
						Dollars	%
Rural Small	49	5,386	\$25,209	\$26,828	\$18,011	\$8,817	33
Rural Medium	90	15,872	\$23,896	\$27,321	\$19,816	\$7,505	27
Rural Large	122	50,605	\$25,159	\$26,052	\$24,066	\$1,986	8
<b>Rural Average</b>	261	71,863	<b>\$24,755</b>	\$26,734	\$20,631	<b>\$6,103</b>	<b>23</b>
Suburban Smaller	13	2,438	\$26,271	\$34,172	\$20,382	\$13,790	40
Suburban Larger	42	18,886	\$26,679	\$39,679	\$23,590	\$16,089	41
<b>Suburban Average</b>	55	21,324	<b>\$26,475</b>	\$36,926	\$21,986	<b>\$14,940</b>	<b>40</b>
Urban Smaller	21	4,957	\$25,832	\$28,601	\$23,622	\$4,979	17
Urban Large	53	29,077	\$26,684	\$34,185	\$21,345	\$12,840	38
<b>Urban Average</b>	74	34,034	<b>\$26,258</b>	\$31,393	\$22,484	<b>\$8,910</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Total Average</b>	390	127,221	<b>\$25,829</b>	\$31,684	\$21,700	<b>\$9,984</b>	<b>32</b>

Notes: (1) 390 Regional universities were listed as American Association of State Colleges and Universities members as of August 2014 with identifiable institutional UnitIDs in the federal NCES/IPEDS data base; (2) data on full-time faculty is from the IPEDS Human Resources Survey for 2010-11; (3) definitions of public Regional University subtypes were developed by Katsinas (2016, forthcoming), consistent with the geographic codes (rural, suburban, urban, etc.) that were part of the 2005 and 2010 Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and included in all published federal higher education data sets; (4) the source of institutions with collective bargaining was Berry & Saravese, 2012; (5) if the majority of Regional Universities within a given state had collective bargaining, the state was counted as a collective bargaining state.

Table 6

*The Impact of Collective Bargaining: Total Monetary Compensation for Full-Time Faculty at U.S. Public Regional Universities, 2010-11*

	ALL	with	without	annual average		Annual average x 30 years  (in dollars)
		Collective Bargaining	Collective Bargaining	difference expressed in Dollars	%	
Rural Small	\$87,831	\$91,565	\$77,090	\$14,475	16	\$434,250
Rural Medium	\$84,720	\$89,221	\$79,527	\$9,694	11	\$290,820
Rural Large	\$94,233	\$96,435	\$91,548	\$4,887	5	\$146,610
<b>Rural Average</b>	<b>\$88,931</b>	<b>\$92,407</b>	<b>\$82,722</b>	<b>\$9,685</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$290,550</b>
Suburban Smaller	\$101,215	\$113,190	\$84,696	\$28,494	25	\$854,820
Suburban Larger	\$101,366	\$119,515	\$84,929	\$34,586	29	\$1,037,580
<b>Suburban Average</b>	<b>\$101,291</b>	<b>\$116,353</b>	<b>\$84,813</b>	<b>\$31,540</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>\$946,200</b>
Urban Smaller	\$97,994	\$99,305	\$76,738	\$22,567	23	\$677,010
Urban Large	\$104,624	\$117,493	\$96,450	\$21,043	18	\$631,290
<b>Urban Average</b>	<b>\$101,309</b>	<b>\$108,399</b>	<b>\$86,594</b>	<b>\$21,805</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$654,150</b>
<b>All</b>	<b>\$97,176</b>	<b>\$105,720</b>	<b>\$84,709</b>	<b>\$21,010</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$630,300</b>
Notes: (1) 390 Regional universities were listed as American Association of State Colleges and Universities members as of August 2014 with identifiable institutional UnitIDs in the federal NCES/IPEDS data base; (2) data on full-time faculty is from the IPEDS Human Resources Survey for 2010-11; (3) definitions of public Regional University subtypes were developed by Katsinas (2016, forthcoming), consistent with the geographic codes (rural, suburban, urban, etc.) that were part of the 2005 and 2010 Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and included in all published federal higher education data sets; (4) the source of institutions with collective bargaining was Berry & Saravese, 2012; (5) if the majority of Regional Universities within a given state had collective bargaining, the state was counted as a collective bargaining state.						