

TO: All Faculty

FROM: Elizabeth Diffendal

SUBJECT: Background on TESC Summer Salaries and a Proposal for Summer, 1985

A little history of TESC summer schools.

Evergreen has been running a summer school since the summer of 1972 when Don Humphrey was the first Summer School Dean. That first summer school was self-supporting. Faculty were paid on a per capita basis for the number of students taught.

From 1973 - 1981, TESC's Summer School was state-funded, with the amount available for faculty salaries each year generated by the enrollment numbers the previous summer.

In 1973 or 1974, the summer salary schedule used for all subsequent state-supported summer schools was developed and implemented.

TESC Traditional Summer Salary Formula

Full-time	=	annual salary x 0.28
3/4 time	=	annual salary x 0.21
1/2 time	=	annual salary x 0.154
1/4 time	=	annual salary x .096
1/5 time	=	annual salary x .055

The amount paid for full-time summer teaching under that formula was 28% of annual salary, reflecting in part, the lack of faculty governance responsibilities in summer quarter. This figure -- 28% of annual salary -- was and still is 6% higher than the average national and Washington state college summer salary scales, which are set at 22% of annual faculty salary.

When we were operating as a state-supported summer school, faculty who taught were given summer contracts with guaranteed salaries, regardless of enrollment numbers. However, in fact, programs enrolling fewer than 10 students normally were cancelled. One year -- 1978 -- some faculty were paid full summer salaries and carried fewer than 10 students. This became the subject of much heated faculty debate.

In 1982, when Washington state colleges were in the process of making severe budget cuts, Evergreen requested to run the 1982 Summer School on a self-supporting basis and use allocated summer monies during the following academic year. We were permitted to operate in a self-supporting mode on a one-time basis. In fact, we have requested and been permitted to do this two more times, in 1983 and 1984. Apparently the state's willingness to let us do this is the fact that our summer school generates such a small amount of revenue for the state.

The requirement that the summer school be self-supporting meant that income from tuition and fees had to be as much or more than the expenses of faculty salaries, benefits and program support costs plus other costs such as student S & A expenses and selected annualized overhead costs.

The first time around, in the summer of 1982, we adopted a salary scale based on a flat-rate per quarter hours taught by faculty in order to be able to predict expenses relative to the tuition and fees paid by students. A consequence of the need to operate as a self-supporting summer school was that we could offer more programs so long as they each generated enough student quarter hours to reimburse the faculty teaching them. As a result of this first summer's experience, we discovered that if we offered the right mix of programs, we could attract up to 100 more student FTE. It would have been quite hard to grow to this number under the state-supported formula, since each year's allocation was based on the previous year's enrollment.

A less favorable consequence of our experience with self-supporting summer school was that faculty did not like to "recruit" students up to a particular threshold, e.g., 10 students, in order to receive a good proportion of their salary. In response to these concerns, Ron Woodbury worked with a faculty study group to refine the summer salary plan that paid faculty more for the first student quarter hours enrolled and gradually less for additional students. This new salary scale was based on a flat-rate per student quarter hour, and all faculty could take individual contracts in addition to program students to make their enrollment limits. Under this new plan, faculty who taught during the summer of 1984 were paid at the rate of 26% of the annual 1984 salary rate of a faculty member at Step 31 on the scale. This was the highest rate ever paid TESC faculty for summer teaching.

Unfortunately, the amount of revenue generated during the summer of 1984 was not great enough to cover the new, higher faculty salary plan in addition to the costs of student activities and annualized overhead costs. In addition, at the request of the faculty, a new Summer Salary Study Group was formed to recommend guidelines for future summer salaries. Faculty sentiment at a fall faculty meeting was that the College should request that future summer schools be state-supported so that faculty could have guaranteed summer salaries, rather than salaries dependent on numbers of student quarter hours enrolled with each faculty.

The 1985-87 budget request submitted by the College included this request for state-supported summer schools. To date, this request has been turned down, at least for the upcoming 1985 summer school. As a result, we will again operate in 1985 on a self-supporting basis.

A major recommendation of the Summer Salary Study Group was that summer salaries not be set on a flat rate, but rather, be set as closely as possible to the step system used as the basis for contracts during the regular academic year. Also, it was recommended that the summer salaries be set at as high a percentage of the full-year salary as possible.

A comparison of summer salary plans and my recommendation for the summer of 1985.

On the attached page, you will see a comparison of the costs of operating the 1985 summer school under three separate plans:

- Plan A: last year's flat-rate scale;
- Plan B: the "traditional" step scale applied to 1985 salaries;
- Plan C: my proposed three-step plan applied to 1985 salaries.

Under any of these plans, actual salary will have to be calculated on the tenth day of the quarter and must be based on actual student credit hours enrolled in each program. There is no way to guarantee salaries in a self-supporting program in which the only money available is that generated by student tuition and fees. My rationale for Plan C is explained below. If faculty agree with this plan, it will have to be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Plan C creates a summer salary scale which is based on an average rate of 24% of the faculty's salary during the academic year, 1984-85. The 24% rate is two percent higher than the average for other college summer programs.

In order to comply with the faculty desire to avoid the flat-rate concept and approach a stepped scale, proposed Plan C has three steps based on regular faculty experience years.

Step 1 = Faculty from experience years 2 - 18 will be paid at
 .24 x Step 15 annual salary or
 \$7200.00 = full time
 \$5400.00 = 3/4 time
 \$3600.00 = 1/2 time
 \$1800.00 = 1/4 time

Step 2 = Faculty from experience years 19 - 22 will be paid at
 .24 x Step 21 annual salary or
 \$8000.00 = full time
 \$6000.00 = 3/4 time
 \$4000.00 = 1/2 time
 \$2000.00 = 1/4 time

Step 3 = Faculty from experience years 23 - 32 will be paid at
 .24 x Step 26 annual salary or
 \$8600.00 = full time
 \$6450.00 = 3/4 time
 \$4300.00 = 1/2 time
 \$2150.00 = 1/4 time

These steps were created by dividing the actual pool of 60 applicants for the 1985 Summer School into three groups, based on experience year, then selecting the median salary for each group for payment purposes. By using a three stepped scale, we can reasonably calculate faculty salaries on the tenth day, rather than having to calculate a separate quarter-hour reimbursement formula for 23 different steps!

The 1984 Summer School generated about \$25,000 less than was needed to cover S & A expenses and minimum essential overhead expenses. The 1985 summer school must cover these expenses.

On the attached chart, the first column reflects the personnel costs of the 1984 plan when applied to 1985 requests. The middle column, based on the state-sponsored summer school formula, would generate even higher personnel expenses. The third column, proposed Plan C, reflects a total salary figure which should permit the summer school to cover necessary expenses and still provide faculty with higher than average summer salaries. I recommend the adoption of Plan C for 1985.

(The following table is a reconstruction of the content on this page, which is extremely faint and largely illegible. It appears to be a multi-column table with several rows of data.)

Category	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
Step 1 - Faculty from previous year 1 - 18 will be paid at
Step 2 - Faculty from previous year 19 - 22 will be paid at
Step 3 - Faculty from previous year 23 - 32 will be paid at

Revised: 1/14/1985

COMPARISON OF SUMMER FACULTY SALARY
EXPENSES UNDER THREE PLANS

Experience Year of Faculty Requesting Summer Teaching	Proportion of Summer Teaching	Plan A Flat Rate Scale 26% of Step 31 1984 Scale	Plan B Traditional "Steps" 28% of Annual 1985 Salary	Plan C Three Step Scale 24% of Annual 1985 Salary	
2	.50	4400	2482.76	3600	
12	.50	4400	3834.32	3600	
13	.50	4400	3953.32	3600	
13	.50	4400	3953.32	3600	
13	.50	4400	3953.32	3600	
14	.50	4400	4064.62	3600	
14	.50	4400	4064.62	3600	
15	.25	2200	2083.27	1800	
16	.50	4400	4259.22	3600	
16	.50	4400	4259.22	3600	
16	1.00	8800	8518.44	7200	
16	.25	2200	2129.61	1800	
17	1.00	8800	8691.76	7200	
17	.25	2200	2172.94	1800	
18	.50	4400	4426.94	3600	Plan A
19	.75	6600	6759.90	6000	
19	.50	4400	4506.60	4000	
20	.25	2200	2291.94	2000	
20	.25	2200	2291.94	2000	
20	.50	4400	4583.88	4000	
20	.50	4400	4583.88	4000	
20	.50	4400	4583.88	4000	
20	.50	4400	4583.88	4000	
20	.50	4400	4583.88	4000	
21	.50	4400	4655.70	4000	
21	.50	4400	4655.70	4000	
21	.50	4400	4655.70	4000	
21	.50	4400	4655.70	4000	
21	.50	4400	4655.70	4000	
21	1.00	8800	9311.40	8000	
22	.50	4400	4725.28	4000	
22	.25	2200	2362.64	2000	
22	.25	2200	2362.64	2000	
22	.25	2200	2362.64	2000	
22	.75	6600	7087.92	6000	
22	.50	4400	4725.28	4000	Plan B
23	.50	4400	4791.64	4300	
23	.50	4400	4791.64	4300	
24	.50	4400	4858.14	4300	
24	.25	2200	2429.07	2150	
24	.50	4400	4858.14	4300	

Revised: 1/14/1985

Experience Year of Faculty Requesting Summer Teaching	Proportion of Summer Teaching	Plan A Flat Rate Scale 26% of Step 31 1984 Scale	Plan B Traditional "Steps" 28% of Annual 1985 Salary	Plan C Three Step Scale 24% of Annual 1985 Salary	
25	.50	4400	4923.80	4300	
26	.50	4400	4988.76	4300	
26	.50	4400	4988.76	4300	
26	.50	4400	4988.76	4300	
26	.50	4400	4988.76	4300	
28	.50	4400	5117.00	4300	
29	.50	4400	5179.58	4300	
29	.25	2200	2589.79	2150	
30	.25	2200	2620.73	2150	
31	.75	6600	7954.80	6450	
31	.50	4400	5303.00	4300	
32	.75	6600	8044.05	6450	Plan C
		226,600	236,666.30	202,750	
+ 13.5 % Benefits		30,591	31,950.00	27,371	
TOTAL:		257,191	268,616.30	230,121	