

Report: Task Force on Faculty Salaries

Introduction

Committee Membership (See Appendix 1 for full text of memorandum)

- Members at Large Representatives
Ray Abhold (Biology/Academic Resources)
Daniel Bukofzer (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Réza Motameni (Marketing and Logistics)
Albert Valencia (Counseling, Special Education and Rehabilitation)
- Academic Senate Representatives
Virginia Rondero Hernandez (Social Work Education)
Frederick Zechman (Biology) – sabbatical, spring 2007
- Executive Committee Representatives
Mike Botwin (Psychology)
Harald Schweizer (Criminology)
- Budget Committee Representatives
Pedro Amaral (Philosophy) – resigned, spring 2007
Joe Parks (Curriculum and Instruction)
- Personnel Committee Representative
Debra Harris (Social Work Education)

Charge to Committee (See Appendix 2 for full text of charge)

The Task Force on Faculty Salaries was charged to:

- Examine faculty salaries on the CSUF campus and in relation to the other CSU campuses and peer institutions, including the CPEC group
- Examine salary practices on the CSUF campus and in relation to the other CSU campuses and peer institutions, including the CPEC group
- Examine compensation packages of the CSU and other professional groups employed by the State of California
- Examine the erosion of faculty salary buying power
- Conduct forums and/or roundtables on faculty salaries with the CSUF academic assembly
- Provide a report to the members of the CSUF Academic Senate by March 1st of 2007

Response to Charge

Due to its nature and complexity, all aspects of the charge assigned to the Task Force could not be reasonably accomplished in the time frame provided. In actuality, only the first charge was fully addressed and therefore forms a major portion of this report. While the second charge could not be addressed in its entirety, initial data on CSUF practices, as inferred from salary patterns, is also provided within this report.

The Data

External Source

The principal source of data for this report comes from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Salary Survey. Data from the survey provides average faculty salaries arranged by academic rank (full professor, associate professor, and assistant professor) at more than 1,300 colleges and universities.

The colleges and universities within the AAUP data are divided by Carnegie Classification into doctoral degree granting, masters degree granting, baccalaureate degree granting, and associate degree granting institutions. Salaries are reported in thousands of dollars and are rounded to the nearest hundred. To accommodate institutional variation (9 vs. 12 month faculty, academic year vs. year-round faculty), salaries were adjusted to represent earnings for an academic work year. The numbers cover full-time members of each institution's instructional staff, except those in medical and dental schools.

There are certain advantages and disadvantages in using a single source of external data.

Advantages:

- The institutions themselves have provided their data following the same self-reporting guidelines.
- The data are compiled for a single reason. Thus, all comparisons will be consistent, assuming errors are constrained within the data set.
- Emphasis can be placed on data analysis rather than the source of the data, the validity of the data, or the accuracy of the data (i.e. having to address the means by which data was collected, the reason it was collected, and what was included or excluded from the data).

Disadvantages

- It is assumed the data, even self-reported, are accurate. To infer that external validation or replication is unnecessary may be unwarranted.
- It is assumed the data are being used for its intended purpose.
- It is assumed the data are sufficient to answer the questions being posed.
- While comparisons between individual institutions are not influenced by the absence of weighted averaging, the grouping of institutions, as is done in parts of this study, would benefit from weighted averaging, which was not possible, given the data at hand. Without such averaging, salary practices at one institution are given equal weight with all others regardless of faculty numbers. The impact of such analysis is debatable.

Internal Sources

Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP)

Faculty salary data for academic year (AY) 2000-01 through AY 2005-06, maintained in a data warehouse by IRAP, was made available to the

committee. These data were used to confirm CSUF data obtained from external sources (see below).

Academic Personnel (AP)

Faculty salary data for AY 2005-06 was provided by Academic Personnel. These data were used to provide a more detailed breakdown of faculty salaries on the CSUF campus. This, in turn, was thought to provide a snapshot of recent salary decision making practices.

Data Collection and Manipulation

External data (AAUP)

All available data for AY 2000-01 through AY 2005-06 were downloaded from the website (<http://chronicle.com/stats/aaup/>) as text files. The text files were manipulated to comma delimited text and then converted to Excel files. Further data manipulation within Excel generated the data points expressed in the figures presented below. The Excel files can be made available upon request.

Internal data (Institutional Research and Academic Personnel)

All data was provided as Excel files. Further data manipulation within Excel generated the data points expressed in the figures presented below. The Excel files can be made available upon request.

Ph.D. Granting Institutions

All Ph.D. granting institutions within the AAUP data were collated by academic year. For the years used in this analysis, the number of Ph.D. granting institutions in the study ranged from a minimum of 203, in AY 2000-01, to a maximum of 221, in AY 2005-06.

Masters Granting Institutions

All Master's granting institutions within the AAUP data were collated by academic year. For the years used in this analysis, the number of Masters granting institutions in the study ranged from a minimum of 396, in AY 2000-01, to a maximum of 420 institutions, in AY 2005-06.

CPEC Institutions

The list of CPEC institutions has not changed since 1997. The list was obtained from CPEC and is provided (See Appendix 3). The CPEC institution data within the AAUP data were extracted and treated as a separate data set. The data in this study were found to be different than that used by CPEC in its analysis of faculty salaries. The reasons for this are twofold: (1) the data provided directly to CPEC by participating institutions is edited to exclude salaries of selected fields of study; (2) the data used by CPEC is weighted by the number of faculty within each rank at each participating institution. Faculty numbers are not provided in the AAUP data.

CSU System

Twenty two CSU campuses are represented within the AAUP data for AY 2000-01 and AY 2001-02. A twenty-third campus (CSU Channel Islands) was added to the AAUP data set in AY 2003-04. The CSU data was provided to AAUP by the Chancellor's Office. The data for CSU campuses were extracted and treated as a separate data set.

CSUF

The data for CSUF within the AAUP data were extracted and treated as a separate data set. This provided the means by which CSUF data could be compared to 'the rest' of the CSU. CSUF data provided by IRAP and AP at CSUF were each treated as separate data sets. It is noted that a single data point, identified as an anomaly, was removed from the data set provided by AP.

Findings for AY 2000-01 through AY 2005-06

General Comments

In order to demonstrate comparisons in the data examined, a series of figures have been developed (See Appendix 4). All but three CPEC institutions are doctoral granting, by Carnegie classification. The universities within the CSU are self-identified as Master's granting institutions. These differences are the reason that some have questioned the appropriateness of drawing conclusions from comparisons of the CSU and the CPEC group. This argument aside, it is not surprising faculty salaries for CPEC institutions closely mirror faculty salaries for doctoral granting institutions.

Verification of CSUF Data As Provided by AAUP

As indicated, one of the disadvantages of using any data, particularly that from a single data source, is the question of accuracy or verifiability. In this particular instance, CSUF data obtained from the AAUP could be compared with on-campus data. With the assistance of IRAP, on-campus CSUF data for AY 2000-01 through AY 2005-06 was collated and compared against the data provided AAUP by the CSU Chancellor's Office (CO). The figures representing these comparisons by academic rank are provided in Figures 1, 2, and 3. It can be seen from these figures that the CSUF data obtained by AAUP from the CO was essentially identical to the data provided by IRAP.

External Comparisons - CSUF Salaries and Other Institutions

Full Professor

Figure 4: The average CSUF full professor salary is on par with the average of salaries of their counterparts in the CSU system.

Figure 5: CSU and CSUF full professors earn significantly less than full professors at Ph.D. granting institutions and those at institutions within the CPEC group. On the other hand, CSU and CSUF full professors earn significantly more than those at MA granting institutions. Full professors at Ph.D. granting, CPEC, and MA granting institutions experienced a steady

climb in salaries over the 6 year period examined in this study. With the exception of AY 2003-04 and AY 2004-05, matching increases in salaries were seen in CSU institutions and CSUF. The salary stasis for the two identified academic years effectively increased the gap between CSU/CSUF salaries and Ph.D. granting/CPEC institutions – further driving CSU/CSUF salaries toward the salaries of full professors at MA granting institutions.

Associate Professor

Figure 6: For AY 2000-01 through AY 2002-03, the salaries of CSUF associate professors were much like their counterparts in the rest of the CSU. In the subsequent three academic years, AY 2004-05 through AY 2005-06, associate professor salaries at CSUF fell behind the CSU average and below salaries paid in AY 2002-03.

Figure 7: As was seen for full professors, the salaries at Ph.D. granting, CPEC, and MA granting institutions grew steadily over the 6 years examined in this study. For AY 2000-01 through AY 2002-03, similar increases were also seen in CSU and CSUF salaries. The salaries of associate professors within the CSU and at CSUF were closely aligned with Ph.D. and CPEC salaries in AY 2000-01 through AY 2001-02, becoming nearly equivalent in AY 2002-03. In subsequent years, however, as the salaries at Ph.D. granting and CPEC institutions continued to rise, the salaries in the CSU were either stagnant or showed modest gains while those at CSUF experienced a modest regression. Again, the salary stasis since AY 2002-03 effectively increased the gap between CSU/CSUF salaries and Ph.D. granting/CPEC institutions, further driving CSU/CSUF salaries toward those of associate professors at MA granting institutions.

Assistant Professor

Figure 8: For all academic years examined, assistant professors at CSUF were near the bottom of those paid to their counterparts within the rest of the CSU. Moreover, the salary gap has increased since AY 2001-02.

Figure 9: CSU and CSUF assistant professors earn significantly less than those at Ph.D. granting and CPEC institutions. On the other hand, CSU and CSUF assistant professors earn slightly more than those at MA granting institutions. As was seen for full and associate professors, the salaries at Ph.D. granting, CPEC, and MA granting institutions experienced a steady climb over the 6 year period examined in this study. With the exception of AY 2003-04 and AY 2004-05, matching increases in salaries were seen in CSU and CSUF institutions. The salary stasis for the two identified academic years effectively increased the gap between CSU/CSUF salaries and Ph.D. granting/CPEC institutions, further driving CSU/CSUF salaries toward the salaries of assistant professors at MA granting institutions.

Internal Comparisons – CSUF Salaries

CSUF Salaries by Rank (Figure 10)

On average, and as expected, assistant professors are paid less than associate professors and, in turn, associate professors are paid less than full professors. As viewed by minimums and maximums, it is also apparent that some assistant professors are paid more than some associate professors and full professors and some associate professors are paid more than some full professors.

CSUF Salaries by College/School (Figures 11 through 14)

There are notable differences in the overall average salaries paid by the schools and colleges (Figure 11). Two colleges, Craig School of Business (CSB) and Engineering (ENR), are specifically noted for being higher than the rest. On the other end of the spectrum, the averages of faculty salaries in three colleges fall below the university average and below those of all other schools and colleges. These include Arts and Humanities (AH), Science and Mathematics (CSM) and Social Sciences (SS).

On the high end, the observed differences are essentially sustained when salaries are broken down by rank (Figures 12, 13 and 14). That is, the average CSB and ENR salaries at all ranks are still substantially higher than salaries at equivalent ranks in the other schools and colleges. On the low end, the differences are also sustained to a degree. The average of assistant and associate professor salaries within AH, CSM, and SS are below the university average and below those of the other schools and colleges. In contrast, and with the exception of CSB and ENR, the average full professor salary in the remaining schools and colleges are below the university average and not substantially different from one another.

The variance in average college/school salaries is also reduced by rank. That is, the spread between average assistant professor's salaries (\$30.8K – AH vs. CSB) is greater than that of associate professor's salaries (\$25K – CSM vs. CSB) which, in turn, is greater than the spread of full professor salaries (\$10.6K – SS vs. CSB).

CSUF Salaries by Department (Figures 15 through 18)

The generalized differences and trends observed when comparing salaries by college and school (Figures 11 through 14) are also reflected in the data when they are further subdivided by departments (Figures 15 through 18 – see Appendix 5 for chart legend to department names). It is noted, however, that specific inter-departmental differences within some schools or colleges render the generalized statements made previously somewhat less appropriate.

CSUF Salaries by Years of Service at CSUF (Figures 19 through 23)

In some small part, the number of years at CSUF most certainly is correlated to experience within academia. Putting aside arguments as to the value of such experience, the fact remains that faculty search committees consider such experience, give weight to it, have their decisions influenced by it and consider offers of service-credit for it. Bearing this in mind, one would expect a correlation, at least in some small degree, between years of academic experience and salaries. It is not totally unexpected, therefore, for faculty salaries to rise with years of service (See Figure 19).

Figures 20 through 22 provide greater detail and allow further examination of the relationship between salaries and years of academic experience. The first 5 years in faculty salaries are largely defined by service at the assistant professor rank where salaries do not increase appreciably with years of service. The next 20 years are defined by transitions in rank from assistant professor, to associate professor, then finally to full professor, during which salary progression is measurable. The salary stagnation that follows is largely experienced by faculty at the rank of full professor.

A better visualization of this phenomenon is provided in Figure 23. This figure shows that full professor and assistant professor salaries are only very slightly correlated with years of service. In contrast to this, the salaries of associate professors show a significant correlation between salary and length of service.

CSUF Salaries by Years Post-Degree (Figures 24-28)

As with years of service, the number of years post-degree correlates to experience, whether it is in one's field of expertise or within the field of academia. Again, a correlation between years post-degree and salary is expected and is observed (Figures 24 through 27). Figure 28 also shows a pattern similar to that seen in figure 23. That is, full and assistant professor salaries show a small correlation with years post-degree whereas the salaries of associate professors show a significant correlation.

Conclusions

The data and analysis contained within this report do not address salary issues for any individual faculty member or group not specifically identified. With the data at hand, only generalized conclusions can be drawn at this time. That is, while overall trends and practices have been inferred, the reasons for such are speculative, at best. A better appreciation for current practices may be possible with knowledge of salary entry points for faculty members at each rank and progression of those salaries with time. In spite of this limitation, reviewing and comparing faculty salaries has unveiled inequities in the CSUF salary structure that require further attention, and in some instances, remediation.

It is not surprising to find that CSU faculty salaries, including those at CSUF, have fallen behind those of CPEC institutions. Such findings have been well published within CPEC reports over many years. On the other hand, it is particularly disturbing to not only find that assistant and associate professor salaries at CSUF are falling behind those paid to their counterparts at other CSU campuses, but that assistant professor salaries at CSUF are also among the lowest paid in the system altogether. More importantly, the low salaries are reflected across most departments in most schools and colleges. Said another way, the low salaries are not localized to specific departments or schools/colleges. This implies a commonality in decision making processes that are decentralized by their very nature. Such commonality, in turn, suggests there may be one or more external driving factors influencing those decisions made within the schools and colleges. It appears, though, that such external driving factors do not affect all schools and colleges equally, as evidenced by two notable exceptions, namely CSB and ENR.

The salary differences between the colleges and schools are particularly significant as disparities were found to exist even between departments within the same college or school. Market differential or market demand may be a primary driving factor in salary decisions and could help explain such disparities. On the other hand, even among schools/colleges where such disparities do not exist, differences in salary based on discipline still appear to be prevalent. This finding is fairly surprising given that the expected duties of all faculty members, regardless of discipline, consist of teaching, scholarship and service. Since the instructional and non-instructional workload for faculty have been fairly well defined, it is difficult to explain why the differences within and between the colleges/schools exists (other than market forces or the perception thereof). Most importantly, it is quite apparent some schools/colleges are more capable of maintaining higher salary scales than others. Regardless, the issue is not whether some faculty members are paid too much, or others are paid too little. Rather, the relevant issue is one of equity. The ability of some schools/colleges to maintain higher salary scales necessarily implies an inequity in budget as well as an inequity in pay for identical duties and expectations.

Deeper philosophical issues may be at the root of the salary differentials observed in this study. Those philosophical issues include: (1) salaries being held hostage to an avoidance of salary inversion and/or compression, (2) differences in perception within and between colleges and schools of market demand and the ability to respond to that demand with the resources provided (See Appendix 6), (3) differences in the perception of what salaries are buying – i.e. discipline expertise regardless of workload expectations or workload expectations regardless of discipline expertise.

What appears to be salary progression as a function of years of service most likely represents changes in rank with years of service with no other provision for monetary compensation (i.e. merit) in between ranks. Associated with the

change in rank are salary step increases (SSI's). While assistant and full professors can and do receive SSI's, the reduced frequency at which these have been granted has meant the majority of SSI recipients have been associate professors, thus explaining the observed differential in salary between the rank of assistant and full professor.

Recommendations

1. *Committee Continuation*

Consideration should be given to extending the activities of the committee for another year. Further study is needed to address those aspects of the committee's charge that could not be addressed within the time frame provided. The following are recommended for further study: (a) market forces and their contribution to salary inequity, (b) the effects of inflation and cost of living both regionally and within the state, (c) differences in pay by discipline within the CSU and at CSUF.

2. *Salary Adjustments*

Every effort should be made to bring the average salaries paid to Assistant and Associate Professors at CSUF to the average of those paid within the CSU. Since CSUF has positioned itself in the top tier of institutions within the CSU by expectation and performance, serious consideration should also be given to the idea that faculty should be paid accordingly.

3. *Objective and Transparent Processes*

The Academic Senate should work closely with Academic Affairs to develop processes and/or procedures for the evaluation and assessment of faculty salaries with the intention of achieving greater equity across disciplines. This process should be objective and transparent.

Appendix 1: Task Force Appointments



CALIFORNIA
STATE

UNIVERSITY, **September 26, 2006**
FRESNO

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members At Large Representatives
Ray Abhold (Biology/Academic Resources)
Daniel Bukofzer (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
Réza Motameni (Marketing & Logistics)
Albert Valencia (Counseling, Special Education & Rehabilitation)

Academic Senate Representatives
Virginia Rondero Hernandez (Social Work)
Frederick Zechman (Biology)

Executive Committee Representatives
Mike Botwin (Psychology)
Harald Schweizer (Criminology)

Budget Committee Representatives
Pedro Amaral (Philosophy)
Joe Parks (Curriculum & Instruction)

FROM: Kathie Reid, Vice Chair Academic Senate

RE: **Task Force on Faculty Salaries**

At its meeting of September 25, 2006, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approved your appointment to the Task Force on Faculty Salaries.

Michael Botwin, Chair, Academic Senate, will contact you regarding the first scheduled meeting that you should attend.

Office of the
Academic Senate SH
5240 N. Jackson Ave. M/S UC43
Fresno, CA 93740-8023
559.278.2743
Fax 559.278.5745

Appendix 2: Charge to Committee

Task Force on Faculty Salaries — Charge and Membership

At the May 8, 2006 meeting of the Academic Senate a motion was made by Senator Rick Zechman (Biology). As the minutes of that meeting show he stated that “his, colleagues had asked him to urge the Senate to visit the issue of faculty salaries. They indicated that morale is at an all-time low, and are also concerned about CSU Fresno’s ability to attract and retain high quality faculty.” The following motion was made, seconded, carried unanimously by the body of the senate:

to forward to the Executive Committee the issue of faculty salary and equity in order to enhance and meet CSU Fresno’s mission and this will include setting up round table discussions for faculty to share issues of concern.

Charge:

To that end the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of California State University, Fresno proposing a task force that will be charged with the following:

- Examine faculty salaries and salary practices both on this campus and In relation to the other twenty-two CSU campuses and peer institutions, especially in the CPEC group.
- Examine the compensation packages of other professional groups employed by the State of California and examine the erosion of the buying power of faculty salaries.
- Conduct a series of forums or roundtables on faculty salaries with the members of the Academic Assembly of California State University, Fresno.
- Provide a report to the Academic Senate by March 1, 2007.

Membership:

- Two members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
- Two members of the Academic Senate Committee
- ~ One Member from the University Budget Committee
- One Member from the Academic Personnel Committee
- Four members of the faculty at large

Motion:

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of California State University, Fresno respectfully requests that the Task Force on Faculty Salaries be given full access to university records and resources required to successfully fulfill their charge,

Appendix 3: CPEC Institutions

Institution	Classification	Type
Arizona State U, Tempe (AZ)	I	Ph.D.
Bucknell U (PA)	IIA	M.A.
Cleveland State U (OH)	I	Ph.D.
George Mason U (VA)	I	Ph.D.
Georgia State U (GA)	I	Ph.D.
Illinois State U (IL)	I	Ph.D.
Loyola U Chicago (IL)	I	Ph.D.
North Carolina State U (NC)	I	Ph.D.
Reed C (OR)	IIB	M.A.
Rutgers U, Newark (NJ)	I	Ph.D.
State U of New York, Albany (NY)	I	Ph.D.
Tufts U (MA)	I	Ph.D.
U of Colorado, Denver (CO)	IIA	M.A.
U of Connecticut (CT)	I	Ph.D.
U of Maryland, Baltimore (MD)	I	Ph.D.
U of Nevada, Reno (NV)	I	Ph.D.
U of Southern California (CA)	I	Ph.D.
U of Texas, Arlington (TX)	I	Ph.D.
U of Wisconsin, Milwaukee (WI)	I	Ph.D.
Wayne State U (MI)	I	Ph.D.

Appendix 4: Figures 1 through 28

- Figure 1: CSUF Full Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. Chancellor's Office (CO) Data
- Figure 2: CSUF Associate Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. CO Data
- Figure 3: CSUF Assistant Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. CO Data
- Figure 4: Full Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. CSU
- Figure 5: Full Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. Comparison Groups
- Figure 6: Associate Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. CSU
- Figure 7: Associate Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. Comparison Groups
- Figure 8: Assistant Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. CSU
- Figure 9: Assistant Professor Salaries, CSUF vs. Comparison Groups
- Figure 10: CSUF Salaries by Rank
- Figure 11: CSUF Salaries by College or School
- Figure 12: CSUF Full Professor Salaries by College or School
- Figure 13: CSUF Associate Professor Salaries by College or School
- Figure 14: CSUF Assistant Professor Salaries by College or School
- Figure 15: CSUF Salaries by Department
- Figure 16: CSUF Full Professor Salaries by Department
- Figure 17: CSUF Associate Professor Salaries by Department
- Figure 18: CSUF Assistant Professor Salaries by Department
- Figure 19: CSUF Salaries by Years of Service
- Figure 20: CSUF Full Professor Salaries by Years of Service
- Figure 21: CSUF Associate Professor Salaries by Years of Service
- Figure 22: CSUF Assistant Professor Salaries by Years of Service
- Figure 23: CSUF Salaries by Rank and Years of Service
- Figure 24: CSUF Salaries by Years Post-Degree
- Figure 25: CSUF Full Professor Salaries by Years Post-Degree
- Figure 26: CSUF Associate Professor Salaries by Years Post-Degree
- Figure 27: CSUF Assistant Professor Salaries by Years Post-Degree
- Figure 28: CSUF Salaries by Rank and Years Post-Degree

Appendix 5: Key to Departments by College/School

Sch	Department	Code	Sch	Department	Code	
AG	Agricultural Economics	AG 1	ENR	Civil and Geomat Eng and Const	EN 1	
	Animal Sciences and Ag Educ	AG 2		Electrical and Comp. Engr.	EN 2	
	Child Family and Consumer Sci	AG 3		Mech And Industrl Engineering	EN 3	
	Food Science and Nutrition	AG 4		Total	EN T	
	AH	Industrial Technology	AG 5	HHS	Comm Sciences and Disorders	HS 1
		Plant Science	AG 6		Health Science	HS 2
		Viticulture and Enology	AG 7		Kinesiology	HS 3
		Total	AG T		Nursing	HS 4
Art and Design		AH 1	Physical Therapy		HS 5	
Communication		AH 2	Rec Adm and Leisure Studies		HS 6	
English		AH 3	Social Work Education		HS 7	
Linguistics		AH 4	Total		HS T	
CSB	Mass Comm and Journalism	AH 5	SM		Biology	SM 1
	Modern and Classical Languages	AH 6		Chemistry	SM 2	
	Music	AH 7		Computer Science	SM 3	
	Philosophy	AH 8		Earth and Environmental Sciences	SM 4	
	Theatre Arts	AH 9		Mathematics	SM 5	
	Total	AH T		Physics	SM 6	
	Accountancy	CS 1		Psychology	SM 7	
	Finance and Business Law	CS 2		Total	SM T	
	Info Sys and Decision Sciences	CS 3		SS	Africana and Amer Indian Studies	SS 1
Management	CS 4	Anthropology			SS 2	
Marketing and Logistics	CS 5	Chicano and Latin Amer Studies	SS 3			
Total	CS T	Criminology	SS 4			
EHD	Counseling and Special Education	ED 1	Economics		SS 5	
	Curriculum Teaching and Ed Tech	ED 2	Geography		SS 6	
	Educational Research and Admin	ED 3	History		SS 7	
	Literacy and Early Education	ED 4	Political Science		SS 8	
	Total	ED T	Sociology		SS 9	
			Womens Studies		SS 10	
			Total	SS T		
			ALL	Total	U	

Appendix 6: Initial Examination of Market Demand

It may be of value to examine further the concept of market demand as a factor driving salary differences across disciplines. Two factors have been identified as potential contributors. First, market demand may result from competition with non-academic institutions. That is, higher salaries are necessary to compete effectively with industry for qualified individuals. Second, market demand may result from a smaller application pool in specific disciplines. That is, higher salaries are necessary to compete in a seller's market.

To examine these points, data was extracted from the Faculty Recruitment Reports on the CSU website (www.calstate.edu/HR/FacRecruitment.shtml) and is presented in Table 1 and Table 2. It is noted that further breakdown of the data presented here into sub-disciplinary fields is available in the reports themselves.

Table 1 shows the percentage of faculty hired by the CSU from sources outside of academia for AY 2000-01 through AY 2005-06. As can be seen, the CSU hires a majority of its new faculty directly from academic institutions – i.e. less than 15% in any academic year are hired from outside of academia. In this particular measure, Business and Engineering are not appreciably different than the CSU average for all fields. Moreover, the Natural Sciences (at the low end of the CSUF salary scale) consistently hire more individuals from outside academia than does Business (at the high end of the CSUF salary scale).

Table 2 shows the average number of applications per tenure-track positions searched by the CSU for AY 2000-01 through AY 2005-06. As can be seen, the number of applicants per search has remained fairly constant by discipline over the years examined. Again, Business and Engineering have not been appreciably different than the CSU average for any year examined. Indeed, there are some fields with apparently more demand (in terms of applications per tenure track position searched) than either Business or Engineering, fields that do not exhibit the tendency toward the higher salaries observed in Business and Engineering.

These data suggest that market forces may not be what they are thought to be or may not be working in the manner to which they have been interpreted. Instead, there is every possibility that market forces may be but a perception within academia, rather than a reality.

Table 1
Sources of New Tenure Track Faculty in the CSU
Percentage of New Hires Not from Higher Education

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Agriculture	33	29	14.3	14.3	57.1	26.7
Architecture	67	20	20	12.5	0	14.3
Business/Management	9	6	7.7	7.5	5	13.6
Communications	4	4	21.6	11.4	11.1	3.7
Education	11	10	10.8	15	5	15.6
Engineering	3	11	35	35.7	21.7	17.6
Fine Arts	12	12	11.8	10.3	4.3	10.8
Health Sciences	13	15	10.7	14.3	7.4	18
Home Economics	10	0	10.5	4.8	16.7	0
Letters	0	1	3.8	3.7	2.8	4.1
Mathematics/Computer Science	3	5	11.8	9.1	5	7.7
Natural Sciences	13	4	13	4.5	15.9	14.1
Public Affairs	12	10	8.3	10.5	0	17.5
Social Sciences	4	9	2.9	6.3	1.6	9
Miscellaneous/Other	0	0	4.2	6.7	0	27.3
All Fields	8	8	9.8	10.3	7.6	12.6

Table 2
Tenure Track Faculty Searches in the CSU
Average Applications per Search

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Agriculture	7	15	32	20	18	17
Architecture	12	14	27	24	18	19
Business/Management	24	27	26	28	28	37
Communications	21	18	25	17	27	25
Education	11	14	14	13	14	16
Engineering	22	19	29	41	43	47
Fine Arts	31	38	41	39	40	8
Health Sciences	4	5	7	5	6	40
Home Economics	10	13	23	18	20	8
Letters	53	55	50	38	48	53
Mathematics/Computer Science	32	32	45	49	103	97
Natural Sciences	38	30	36	34	32	42
Public Affairs	14	18	17	11	21	15
Social Sciences	37	35	43	39	35	45
Miscellaneous/Other	29	20	30	27	28	25
All Fields	27	27	31	28	32	36