

The CoB's 2006 Summer Teaching Deals Explained

A previous report at usmpride.com indicated that a few CoB faculty received teaching releases for the summer 2006 semester (see heading below).

Updates Below

Special Report

Pay for Play: 2006 Summer Salary Shenanigans

An Investigation into Salaries in the CoB

A table in that report showed that Ed Nissan (EFIB) and Charles Sawyer (EFIB) received summer 2006 teaching deals that consisted of various amounts of release-time. That table is presented below, along with responses from readers to that original report:

Table 1
Pay for Play: The Summer of 2006 in the CoB

Name	Teaching Ratio	Salary Ratio	Summer Pay	FT Summer Rate
Babin, L. [MKT, full]	1/3 [3 hrs]	1/3	\$ 3,795	\$11,500
Clark, S. [ACC, full]	2/3 [6 hrs]	2/3	\$ 7,590	\$11,500
Green, T. [ECO, associate]	3/3 [9 hrs]	3/3	\$10,250	\$10,250
King, E. [FIN, associate]	3/3 [9 hrs]	3/3	\$10,250	\$10,250
Nissan, E. [ECO, full]	2/3 [6 hrs]	3/3	\$11,500	\$11,500
Peyrefitte, J. [MGT, assistant]	2/3 [6 hrs]	3/3	\$ 9,250	\$ 9,250
Sawyer, C. [ECO, full]	1/3 [3 hrs]	1/2	\$ 5,693	\$11,500
Smith, W. [MKT, assistant]	3/3 [9 hrs]	3/3	\$ 9,250	\$ 9,250
Vest, M. [MGT, full]	2/3 [6 hrs]	2/3	\$ 7,590	\$11,500
Wittmann, C.	2/3 [6 hrs, online]	?	?	?

Notes: 2006 summer salary data taken from USM Budget. Teaching information comes from SOAR. Some of the partial payment amounts are approximate, but are presented above just as reported in the budget. Wittmann is a new assistant professor of marketing assigned to the Alternative Delivery of Instruction Department in the CoB (see usm.edu). His name does not appear in the USM budget at this time, however SOAR indicates that he taught 2 classes during Summer of 2006.

Key: Departmental unit and rank reported just below each person's name. "FT" above stands for Full Time.

Readers Respond (8/26/06)

A number of USMPRIDE.COM readers have responded to this document. It is being reported that Joseph Peyrefitte (Management) received a one-course credit during Summer semester of 2006 for participating in a training course. That credit allowed him to receive a 3/3 salary ratio for a 2/3 teaching ratio. We have also heard that both Nissan and Sawyer were given the historical 3/3 (1/2) for 2/3 (1/3) arrangement without having to participate in any additional activity, such as a training course.

A reader also informs USMPRIDE.COM that Sawyer was originally given a 2-course teaching load for Fall of 2006, but that an additional course was given to him due to constraints arising from faculty losses. However, the interesting detail is that the third course is being considered an "overload" and that Sawyer is being paid additional monies for covering that third course (3 hrs.) in his Fall 2006 teaching load (9 hrs.)

Investigators at usmpride.com have now received additional proof of the summer deals via a series of e-mails that were circulated to the EFIB faculty by the EFIB Chair, George Carter. That series of e-mails began with an e-mail from Carter on 13 March 2006, informing EFIB faculty of the summer 2006 teaching schedules. That e-mail series is presented below, from bottom to top:

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006
To: ECO;FIN; IB
Cc: Doty; Niroomand
Subject: RE: Summer 2006 Schedule

To EFIB Faculty:

Ernie raised some good points about the Summer 2006 Schedule. He gave me permission to send his comments and my reply to the Department since many of you probably have had the same thoughts.

George

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 8:50 AM
To: KingE
Subject: RE: Summer 2006 Schedule

Ernie,

I understand your frustration; it is a frustrating situation.

Long story short; only you, Trellis, and Sunny wanted to teach in the summer. The 9-hour load had its predictable consequences. We could not even get core classes offered, much less major courses offered. I was, therefore, authorized to offer a course release in selected cases where an individual has high research productivity, and course releases were not to be across the board. Ed and Charles agreed, Frank declined. I did not even approach some of our faculty members because they had made such strong statements when initially asked.

For future planning purposes, my recommendation is publications. They are the coin of the realm. Good teaching is an expectation and is rewarded as best as the annual evaluation process can reward it. It can hardly be considered a reward to good teaching to reduce a teaching load because of it. The reduced teaching load is made because of non-teaching considerations (such as, good research, large sections, excessive service, etc.) Our department is very proud of its "research culture." We promote that culture in recruiting, we brag about it at conventions, we judge each other in that context (witness the Third-Year Review expectations, Promotion expectations, and Tenure expectations). Even the concession to allow selective course release this summer was couched in that context (individuals with high research productivity). For future planning purposes, that message has been consistent and clear.

I am well aware that my role in putting the summer schedule together damns me. That is just part of the job. As they say, "It is a dirty job, but someone has to do it." The buck stops in my office, as it should. The bottom line, though, is that we expect good teaching, and have terminated those who do not teach well. AND, we expect high research productivity; so much so that the perceived rewards of the system go to those who publish well and often.

I regret that you are frustrated and hope that a few days will put a callus on it. In fact, our work has such relative benefits when compared to other occupations, we need to keep a perspective of appreciation for the job. Let us not let the relatively few adverse events color our appreciation for our sheer fortune in being a USM faculty member. The irritants will pass, but our day-to-day freedom, job security, respect, influence on young learners, colleagues, personal learning, and professional accomplishment are unsurpassed amongst the professions and trades.

Best,
George

-----Original Message-----

From:	KingE
Sent:	Tuesday, March 14, 2006 7:04 AM
To:	Carter
Cc:	KingE
Subject:	RE: Summer 2006 Schedule
Importance:	High

George:

I am e-mailing you rather than everyone (unless you want this as an EFIB-L discussion). I appreciate this information, but am unable to draw a conclusion on what criteria you used to decide you received a reduced teaching load. Many conclusions are possible (for example: only Econ, no FIN side will be rewarded; historical publishers are rewarded; smokers are rewarded; friends of George are rewarded; or faculty in their last 4 years [I am sure I missed several possible interpretations]), so I want to be sure I get the right one for future planning purposes. Are you saying by this schedule that the best research record in the department for the year for a person wanting to teach in the summer will be given a reduced load? So if Frank Mixon had desired to teach, either Ed or Sunny and Charles would be bumped, correct? I also assume your authority was for 2 courses total (6 hours total). Was each department treated the same? This information, given our desired departmental structure, should be public. How does a faculty member plan? Why is "research" rewarded with teaching? Why shouldn't, for example, good teaching be rewarded with a teaching reduction reward? By this schedule I here you saying my large classes and good teaching evaluations are meaningless to you. Teaching is never rewarded appropriately in our system, and this potential method is eliminated as well. It also sends a bad signal to the faculty who has regularly taught in the summer; it may be dangerous to lose your regular teaching base.

As I told you, this is especially frustrating when the last any of us knew the unchangeable announced rule was 9 hours for full pay. Once again we have slipped into the CoB quagmire of selective administration rules. I appreciate you trying to do the best for as many in the department as you can. I have no problem with merit systems (should we ever have one). I have great difficulty with *ex post* rule making. We should make rules prospectively – these rules should be for next summer, not this summer when nothing can be done about it. Do you see how this adds to the stereotype of favoritism and detracts from any legitimacy of a merit system? The only clear signal I can see is that the administration in the College wants only a few classes taught in the summer, preferably taught by adjuncts, with a few classes taught by cronies.

Thanks for the information. I look forward to your reply.

Ernie

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 6:17 PM

To: ECO; FIN; IB

Cc: Doty; Niroomand; DanielFrancis; McPhearson; Carr; Cawthon; Pate

Subject: Summer 2006 Schedule

To EFIB Faculty:

Thanks to Ernie for pointing out that my Summer 2006 Schedule did not account for the full 9 hours. The proper Summer 2006 Schedule is in the attachment. As you can see, I was authorized selective course release but not across the board course release.

George

King's e-mail speaks for itself. He lays out the situation in the CoB - the favoritism, the *ex post* rule-making, etc., as good as can be done. What's interesting is the response from Carter, the CoB's Ethicist-in-Residence. Below, we reproduce Carter's e-mail response, with our own comments and questions inserted (red font) in various spots.

-----Original Message-----

From: Carter

Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2006 8:50 AM

To: KingE

Subject: RE: Summer 2006 Schedule

Ernie,

I understand your frustration; it is a frustrating situation.

Long story short; only you, Trellis, and Sunny wanted to teach in the summer. **Who believes this statement? According to our sources, we should ask: When was the last time Edward Nissan did not teach in the summer? How many times, over the past decade, has Ed Nissan not taught in the summer?** The 9-hour load had its predictable consequences. We could not even get core classes offered, much less major courses offered. I was, therefore, authorized to offer a course release in selected cases where an individual has high research productivity, and course releases

were not to be across the board. Ed and Charles agreed, Frank declined. Again, sources indicate to us that we should challenge anyone to show that Ed Nissan often fails to teach courses in the summer. It doesn't happen – he always teaches courses in the June session. And, according to sources, Charles Sawyer was so unwilling to teach in the summer of 2006 that he taught courses at two separate universities: USM in June of 2006 and the University of Arkansas in July of 2006. I did not even approach some of our faculty members because they had made such strong statements when initially asked.

For future planning purposes, my recommendation is publications. They are the coin of the realm. Good teaching is an expectation and is rewarded as best as the annual evaluation process can reward it. It can hardly be considered a reward to good teaching to reduce a teaching load because of it. The reduced teaching load is made because of non-teaching considerations (such as, good research, large sections, excessive service, etc.) EFIB Chairman Carter has an ongoing Grievance regarding his assignment of a 5-day, 3-course, 3-preparation, 2 new preparation, etc. teaching load to Frank Mixon for spring of 2007. This follows Mixon's 4-day, 3-preparation, 1 new preparation load from fall of 2006. So much for this statement. Our department is very proud of its "research culture." We promote that culture in recruiting, we brag about it at conventions, we judge each other in that context (witness the Third-Year Review expectations, Promotion expectations, and Tenure expectations). According to reports available at usmpride.com, the EFIB research "culture" is a sham. Even the concession to allow selective course release this summer was couched in that context (individuals with high research productivity). Various reports available at usmpride.com show that neither Nissan nor Sawyer produced any A-level publications during the 2003-2005 evaluation period. For future planning purposes, that message has been consistent and clear.

I am well aware that my role in putting the summer schedule together damns me. That is just part of the job. As they say, "It is a dirty job, but someone has to do it." Isn't everything Carter does dirty? It seems that way. This whole episode is nothing less. The buck stops in my office, as it should. The bottom line, though, is that we expect good teaching, and have terminated those who do not teach well. Would that be Larry Eisenberg, for former assistant professor of finance that Carter lobbied the EFIB faculty for a "no" vote that would strengthen his (Carter's) written recommendation for a terminal contract. AND, we expect high research productivity; so much so that the perceived rewards of the system go to those who publish well and often. Anyone who still believes this, after 4 months of usmpride.com investigations, is living on Fantasy Island.

I regret that you are frustrated and hope that a few days will put a callus on it. In fact, our work has such relative benefits when compared to other occupations, we need to keep a perspective of appreciation for the job. Famous Carter tactic – we get the money, you get the warm and fuzzies. Let us not let the relatively few adverse events color our appreciation for our sheer fortune in being a USM faculty member. Is this a George Carter, or a Barbara Carter, e-mail to Professor King. The irritants will pass With that callus Carter spoke of earlier?, but our day-to-day freedom King now has a five-day per week schedule for spring 2007!, job security Are we supposed to have forgotten that Carter referenced "canning" someone in the previous paragraph, respect Does anyone still respect Carter, Doty, or Niroomand?, influence on young learners Through online classes?, colleagues, personal learning, and professional accomplishment are unsurpassed amongst the professions and trades.

Best Worst,
George