

Acknowledgements

Members of the Joint Committee for the Study of Salaries would like to express their appreciation to Mr. Peter Martel and Professor C. J. O'Donnell for their statistical expertise and production of the numerous analyses that formed the basis for the Committee's work.

Special recognition goes to Professor O'Donnell, who prepared the Appendices attached to this Report in their entirety.

I. Introduction/Background

The 2004 COP Salary Study compared full-time state college faculty salaries to those of faculty at public, unionized Masters I institutions nationwide. This external comparative study showed that state college faculty at the senior ranks and with extensive service suffered the most in comparison to the salaries earned by peers at the same rank and, it is assumed, comparable service and credentials. A separate external comparative study conducted on behalf of the Association by JBL Associates of Bethesda, Maryland, found the same results when comparing state college faculty salaries to those of faculty at peer institutions as defined by the Board of Higher Education.

The parties were unable to formulate a mechanism to address these issues at the bargaining table during the winter of 2005. The parties, therefore, agreed to study the problems of salary inversion and salary compression internal to the bargaining unit further in a joint labor-management committee (Article XIII, Section M of the 2004-2007 collective bargaining agreement). The Committee was charged with producing a report concerning those salary issues for both the Council of Presidents and the Association.

The coordinated effort of the parties has parallels in the bargaining history of the state college faculty and librarians. As a major part of the 1986-89 agreement (the "salary equity" contract) and again in a memorandum of agreement attached to the 1995-98 agreement, the parties worked together to address significant problems in the salary structure of the full-time faculty and librarians.

Once the 2004-2007 agreement was funded in December 2005 and pay increases were implemented in February 2006, the Committee further agreed to update the 2004 COP Faculty Salary Study to determine what progress had been made towards increasing state college faculty salaries when compared externally to those at peer institutions nationwide. The updated report is in progress and should be completed by the fall semester. The Committee also studied salaries of full-time faculty and librarians within the bargaining unit.

It is hoped that the work undertaken here will enable the parties to find suitable ways in which to rectify the problems that exist within the faculty and librarian salary structure and to minimize their recurrence in the future.

II. Definitions and Limitations

A. Salary Inversion

Salary inversion is defined as the condition in which a faculty member who has less relevant service or who holds a lower academic rank is earning a higher salary than a faculty member who has more relevant service and/or who holds a higher academic rank. Management takes the view that salary inversion is principally consequential within the confines of each academic discipline.

The Association is concerned with salary inversion across the entire full-time bargaining unit.

B. Salary Compression

Salary compression is defined as the condition in which the range of salaries among full-time faculty or librarians at the same academic rank does not vary appropriately in relation to years of relevant service and/or possession of a terminal degree.

C. Limitations

The Committee's study (internal analysis) compared salaries of full-time faculty members within the state college system by academic rank. Salaries were projected to the end of the current agreement, which will expire on June 30, 2007. These projections did not include salary adjustments associated with the new post-tenure review process (Alternative One), nor did they take into account promotion or terminal degree salary adjustments that may take effect on September 1, 2006.

In the updated COP Faculty Salary Study (external comparison), when comparing state college faculty salaries to those of faculty at peer institutions nationwide, state college faculty salaries will not be projected to the end of the current agreement. Instead, this analysis will include those salary increases implemented in February 2006 as well as the salary adjustments associated with the first round of the new post-tenure review process (Alternative One). As was the case in the 2004 study, only the six largest state colleges will be included in the updated COP Faculty Salary Study.

When assessing the impact of changes in the minimum salary formula on faculty salaries, the Committee used full-time faculty salaries at Bridgewater, Salem and Worcester State Colleges to represent faculty salaries statewide. These three institutions employ approximately 50% of the full-time faculty in the bargaining unit.

The Committee has made no attempt to project the cost or value over time of any set of adjustments or corrections for salary inversions or salary compression.

III. Scope of the Problem

A review of salaries done by the Association as part of the Committee's work

indicated that the most serious salary inversion problems exist at Salem, Bridgewater and Worcester State Colleges. At these institutions, as the number of years of relevant service increases, faculty salaries fall closer to the minimum salary formula, demonstrating salary inversion among faculty.

At the remaining six institutions (Fitchburg, Framingham, Mass Art, the Maritime Academy, MCLA and Westfield), the number of years of relevant service has no effect on faculty salaries when compared to the minimum salary formula, demonstrating salary compression among faculty.

IV. General Principles

The Committee initially considered addressing salary inversion on a department by department basis giving regard to the credentials and qualifications of individuals and, as judged appropriate, increasing the salaries of more senior members of the department relative to the salary of any junior member of the department hired at or earning a higher salary. This approach was judged unworkable because it proved to be subject to the anomalies of the timing of hiring faculty and did not provide a systematic method to address salary inversion.

Consequently, the Committee agreed to assess whether an adequate and practical solution to the problems of both inversion and compression internal to the bargaining unit would be to recommend significant changes to the minimum salary formula (Article XIII-A). Particular attention was given to the weighting of certain factors for members of the bargaining unit at the upper academic ranks.

Furthermore, the Committee agreed that one goal should be to increase the median salaries for state college faculty at the upper academic ranks in order to bring them as close as possible to the median faculty salaries at external peer institutions as those appear in the 2004 COP Faculty Salary Study.

V. Recommendations

- A. Since its inception in the contract, the minimum salary formula has assigned a lower value to relevant professional experience than to full-time teaching experience; this has had a disproportionately negative effect on salaries in the professional disciplines, particularly Business, Nursing, and Social Work.

RECOMMENDATION: That the minimum salary formula be adjusted to value all full-time teaching and relevant professional experience equally for a given academic rank.

- B. Salary inversion and compression exist, to varying degrees, at all of the Colleges.

RECOMMENDATION: That the minimum salary formula be adjusted to give greater value to full-time teaching and relevant professional experience.

- C. Salary inversion has gone unaddressed for an extended period of time, compounding the problem. The problem of inversion must be addressed when it occurs, rather than allowing it to reach crisis proportions before being addressed.

RECOMMENDATION: That the parties negotiate an equitable method to address salary inversion when it occurs within disciplines or departments.

- D. Salary compression internal to the state college faculty is most serious at the upper two academic ranks. Salaries at these ranks also suffer most in external comparison to salaries of faculty at nationwide peer institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the minimum salary formula not increase the base salary or the value given to academic rank for Assistant Professors. Only the value given to Associate and (full) Professors should increase.
2. That years of teaching and professional experience be given different values based on academic rank, with the highest value for experience given to (full) Professors and the lowest value for experience given to Instructors. As faculty progress through the academic ranks, the increased value for each year of relevant professional experience or teaching will, it is believed, ameliorate both salary inversion and compression within the bargaining unit.
3. That there be a substantial increase in the value given to the terminal degree.

- E. Salary increases as a result of post-tenure review (Alternative One) may decrease, increase or have no effect on salary inversion within the bargaining unit. These salary increases will be

implemented over a four-year period and thus their effects cannot be assessed or considered in the short term.

RECOMMENDATION: That salary adjustments associated with post-tenure review (Alternative One) be set aside when salary adjustments to address salary inversion and compression are calculated and implemented.

- F. After post-tenure review (Alternative One) has been fully implemented in AY 2008-2009, the resulting salary increases may have a significant impact on aggregate salaries among full-time faculty and librarians, particularly at the upper academic ranks.

RECOMMENDATION: That the parties conduct a thorough analysis of salaries internal to the full-time bargaining unit after AY 2008-2009 and that they conduct another external comparative salary study with reference to salaries of faculty at peer institutions.

- G. Anecdotal evidence reported by the Association suggests that salary inversion and compression exist among the salaries of the state college librarians.

RECOMMENDATION: That the minimum salary formula for librarians incorporate all of the recommended changes for faculty members (*i. e.*, valuing of relevant professional experience, academic rank, terminal degree, etc.).

VI. Specific Models to Address Salary Problems

The Committee examined over two dozen specific models of changes in the minimum salary formula (Article XIII-A of the 2004-07 collective bargaining agreement). Subject to the limitations noted above, each model's impact on salary inversion and compression, its estimated cost, the percentage of faculty at each academic rank whose salaries would be adjusted, the average salary adjustment at each academic rank, and the resulting average and median salary by academic rank were evaluated.

The Committee recommends three of these models as most effective in addressing internal salary inversion and compression, resulting in median state college faculty salaries by academic rank that are closest to the external faculty median salaries by academic rank documented in the 2004 COP Faculty Salary Study.

In all three models, the values assigned to the upper two academic ranks are increased, the value assigned to the Assistant Professor rank is decreased, the value assigned to the terminal degree is increased, and the values assigned to full-time teaching and relevant professional experience are equalized and graduated by academic rank. These models, as well as the minimum salary formula as of July 1, 2006 (Article XIII-A), are described in Appendix A.

The impact of each of the three models on the frequency distribution of state college faculty salaries by academic rank, as well as the frequency distribution of state college faculty salaries as of July 1, 2006 (subject to the limitations noted above), are presented in Appendix B.

The estimated cost of each of the three models, the resulting median and average faculty salaries by academic rank, and the percentage of faculty at each rank whose salaries would be adjusted under the model are presented in Appendix C.

The impact of each of the three models on the structure of librarian salaries is presented in Appendix D.

The Committee makes no recommendation concerning the occasions on which or the frequency with which any such model might be used in adjusting the salaries of members of the bargaining unit.

VII. Conclusion

The Committee recommends that the parties address the issues of salary inversion and compression during the negotiation of the 2007-2010 agreement and apply for the funding necessary to implement the negotiated salary adjustments under the provisions of Chapter 150E.