

## **A RUNAWAY TRAIN: ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES STEAM AHEAD OF FACULTY BY 85 PERCENT**

**Nick Gier, President, [Idaho Federation of Teachers](#), AFL-CIO**

When I arrived at the University of Idaho in 1972, new assistant professors made \$10,000 and President Ernest Hartung made \$30,000. When President Richard Gibb was hired in 1977, his salary had risen to four times that of entry level faculty. Faculty complaints became more vocal when President Elizabeth Zinser's 1993 salary was five times entry level salaries. Zinser promised that her high tide wage would float all faculty boats, but instead, except for a few good years, our boats have been swamped, or back to my original metaphor, our rail cars have been abandoned on a side track.

The faculty union on campus has been publishing a salary survey since 1976, and we have data on administrative salaries that go back to 1982. In those 24 years higher administration salaries have increased 239 percent while salaries for full professors went up 154 percent. Current President Tim White's \$275,018 is a whopping 382 percent increase over President Gibb's 1982 salary of \$57,115. The consumer price index for that 24-year period was 193 percent, so that means that full professors have actually taken a 39 percent pay cut, while their bosses have had a net salary increase of 58 percent. The academic locomotive that should be pulling us along has left us at the station.

Those who justify these huge administrative salaries say: "This is what the market demands, and we are still paying less than peer institutions." If faculty salaries had been keeping up, this would have been persuasive. But, as the State Board of Education continues to approve these administrative increases each year, UI faculty went without raises for three years between 2001 and 2004.

The result is a staggering failure to meet salary levels at peer institutions, especially full professors in the following disciplines: marketing (-41.6%); philosophy (-39.9 %); teacher education (-35.5%); law (-34.5%); psychology (-34.4%); family and consumer science (-33.7%); foreign languages (-33%); civil engineering (-32.8%); accounting (-32.1%); political science (-31.5%); sociology-anthropology (-31.4%); health & PE (-29.3%); ag economics (-28.9%); history (-28.4%); statistics (-28.4%); art &

design (-26.1%); and physics (-25%). At the peak of his career Tim White receives a fine reward, but our faculty are underpaid, demoralized, and disgusted.

During the late 1960s there was a large expansion of our public higher education system. This was good for educational opportunity, but bad for the way in which this system developed according to a business model. University presidents became less like academic leaders and more like CEOs, and their salaries, as well as those of their management teams, have skyrocketed. A natural response to the industrialization of the university was the rise of faculty unions. They now represent a large majority of faculty in states where collective bargaining is allowed. (Idaho is not one of them.) A central feature of these contracts is a salary step system that guarantees cost of living increases as well as raises above that in good years. If UI faculty had gone for our salary step proposal in 1976, we would now be at the top of our peers rather than at the bottom. Furthermore, faculty without a market value@Bthose in the library, humanities, and social sciences--would be making a decent professional wage.

One year a Moscow resident responded to our salary complaints by saying: AThis is what you get for coming to Idaho, and besides you make a lot more money than I do.@ But even among Idaho=s professional workers, postsecondary teachers make \$10 less per hour than Idaho=s engineers, architects, computer system analysts, lawyers, optometrists, physicians, pharmacists, and chemists. Is it too much to ask that we are paid salaries equal to those that some of our many students will be earning? We don=t think so.