

## Robbing Peter to Pay Paul??<sup>1</sup>

<b>Name</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>2004-2005 Total SCH</b>	<b>2004 Merit Raise</b>	<b>\$ Raise/SCH</b>	<b>Peter-Paul Ranking</b>
Hsieh	MIS	273	\$8,421.00	\$30.85	1
ClarkJ	FIN	228	\$6,143.00	\$26.94	2
Henthorne	MKT	282	\$7,142.00	\$25.33	3
BabinB	MKT	312	\$7,440.00	\$23.85	4
Carr	MGT	237	\$5,548.00	\$23.41	5
BabinL	MKT	219	\$5,016.00	\$22.90	6
Vest	MGT	288	\$6,046.00	\$20.99	7
Chen	MIS	219	\$4,310.00	\$19.68	8
Pereyfitte	MGT	357	\$6,523.00	\$18.27	9
Jordan	ACC	435	\$7,733.00	\$17.78	10
Lai	MIS	174	\$2,717.00	\$15.61	11
Nissan	ECO	552	\$7,772.00	\$14.08	12
Crockett	ACC	240	\$3,372.00	\$14.05	13
Mixon	ECO	558	\$7,702.00	\$13.80	14
Yang	MGT	297	\$3,995.00	\$13.45	15
Lindley	FIN	438	\$4,711.00	\$10.76	16
Sharp	ECO	528	\$5,327.00	\$10.09	17
Pate	ACC	438	\$3,977.00	\$9.08	18
ClarkS	ACC	636	\$5,372.00	\$8.45	19
Carter	ECO	924	\$7,710.00	\$8.34	20
Green	ECO	729	\$5,756.00	\$7.90	21
Wong	ECO	612	\$4,191.00	\$6.85	22
Duhon	MGT	525	\$3,501.00	\$6.67	23
Cartee	FIN	390	\$2,596.00	\$6.66	24
Lo	ECO	741	\$4,381.00	\$5.91	25
Sawyer	ECO	810	\$4,412.00	\$5.45	26
Eisenberg	FIN	426	\$2,186.00	\$5.13	27
Zantow	MGT	393	\$1,978.00	\$5.03	28
Daniel	MGT	483	\$2,246.00	\$4.65	29
Bushart	MGT	438	\$1,914.00	\$4.37	30

## Robbing Peter to Pay Paul??, continued

<b>Name</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>2004-2005 Total SCH</b>	<b>2004 Merit Raise</b>	<b>\$ Raise/SCH</b>	<b>Peter-Paul Ranking</b>
Osmonbekov	MKT	552	\$2,297.00	\$4.16	31
Lopez	MKT	678	\$2,762.00	\$4.07	32
Magruder	MIS	390	\$1,583.00	\$4.06	33
Gunther	ECO	834	\$2,802.00	\$3.36	34
SmithBill	MKT	645	\$2,120.00	\$3.29	35
SmithBob	ACC	696	\$2,218.00	\$3.19	36
DePree	ACC	513	\$1,557.00	\$3.04	37
Whitesell	ECO	525	\$1,546.00	\$2.94	38
Davis	MIS	540	\$1,401.00	\$2.59	39
Henderson	ACC	732	\$1,820.00	\$2.49	40
Salter	FIN	1095	\$2,581.00	\$2.36	41
Lewis	MIS	930	\$1,899.00	\$2.04	42
KingE	FIN	1848	\$3,707.00	\$2.01	43
Rambo	ACC	255	\$400.00	\$1.57	44

---

<sup>1</sup> The old expression “Robbing Peter to pay Paul” is a familiar one. In the Spring/Summer of 2004, a raise was awarded to USM faculty by the IHL. Through the usual channels, raises were assigned to individual faculty members. Each raise included a \$400 COHIA. What if each faculty member’s raise were paid for by assessing his or her students a per-credit-hour fee during the subsequent academic year (fall & spring only)? Calculating such a Raise per SCH figure yields the cost per SCH of each individual’s raise and indicates the true burden of the raise. The Peter-Paul Ranking is constructed accordingly.

Consider this: Would (for instance) Chang-Tseh Hsieh’s students be willing to pay an extra \$30.85 per SCH (an extra \$92.55 per 3 hour course) for the privilege of being taught by him? Maybe and maybe not. In the minutes of the June 23, 2004, President’s Council meeting, Dr. Shelby F. Thames outlined the schedule of tuition increases approved by the Mississippi IHL (available online at [http://www.usm.edu/president/pc\\_mins/pcminutes623.pdf](http://www.usm.edu/president/pc_mins/pcminutes623.pdf)).

What this analysis also shows is that many of the “Big Raise” recipients are being carried (in SCH terms) by the “Middle Raise” and “Low Raise” recipients. It’s good to be a member of the club!