

DEAR USMNEWS.NET

Dear usmnews.net,

Thank you for this morning's report ([At the Root of it All: How Martha Saunders' Salary Compares To John Q Prof's Salary](#)). I'm sure many of your readers noticed that the \$345,500 salary in the report is/was Dr. Saunders' base pay. It does not include the presidential perks, including the use of the presidential mansion on Jamestown, the cost of maintenance and upkeep for the presidential mansion, travel for her husband and herself – including the presidential airplane, clothing allowance, cars, etc. Once those numbers are added in the disparity becomes even greater than suggested in your report.

Name withheld

Dear Name withheld,

While Dr. Saunders' salary and benefits appear out-of-line with a poor school which survives only by massive increases in tuition, the administrative bloat she has created and/or contributed to is even more troubling. Over the past few years, Southern Miss has seen explosive growth in the number of administrators. As of 2009, the [Chronicle of Higher Education](#), reported that USM had one of the “biggest increases” in the nation in “growth in managers and support personnel relative to enrollment.”: 84%. There is [no reason](#) to believe that over the [past few years](#) that the [rate of increase](#) has [changed](#).

Benjamin Ginsberg published an excellent book, [The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters](#) (Oxford University Press, 2011). In a [Chronicle of Higher Education](#) interview Mr. Ginsburg advanced the argument “...that universities have shifted their resources and attention away from teaching and research in order to feed a cadre of administrators who, he says, do little to advance the central mission of universities and serve chiefly to inflate their own sense of importance by increasing the number of people who report to them....”

Marc DePree, Editor
usmnews.net