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Abstract
Although ambiguity exists regarding how states must respond to the mandates of Fordice to dismantle dual systems of education in previously segregated states, several scholars note Fordice should manifest itself in the enhancement of public Black colleges. Responding to Fordice, the state of Maryland entered into an agreement with the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) to make its Black colleges comparable with their White counterparts. While Maryland claims that it has satisfied its agreement with OCR, findings of this study challenge this assertion. Data from AAUP, University System of Maryland [USM], and the Morgan State Office of Institutional research show significant disparities in faculty salaries and workload between historically Black and predominately White colleges in the state.

Introduction
In the case of United States v. Fordice (1992), the Supreme Court ruled that states with segregated educational systems were obligated to actively dismantle their dual system of education by rectifying discriminatory policies and offering historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) adequate support to enhance their campuses. It was thought that this decision would result in the enhancement of public HBCUs, making them comparable and competitive with their predominantly White institutional (PWI) counterparts and enabling HBCUs to attract non-Black students (Gasman, Baez, Drezner, Sedgwick, Tudico, & Schmid, 2007).

The Fordice case stemmed from Mississippi’s efforts to continue de jure segregation in its public university system by maintaining a public university system segregated along racial lines (Stefkovih & Leas, 1994). In 1975, James Ayers, along with other plaintiffs, filed a lawsuit against Kirk Fordice, the Governor of Mississippi, for racial discrimination in the state’s university system (Gasman, et al., 2007). During the time that Ayers filed the litigation, there were vast differences in institutional mission statements, admission standards, and financial allocations which disadvantaged the state’s three HBCUs (Alcorn State University, Jackson State University, and Mississippi Valley State University) when compared to its five PWIs (University
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of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University for Women, University of Southern Mississippi, and Delta State University).

In 1992, Fordice reached the United States Supreme Court, where in a decision rendered by Justice White, the state of Mississippi was found in violation of their obligation to eradicate policies and practices which foster and maintain institutional segregation. The Court identified four policies in practice which were traceable to the vestiges of de jure segregation. The first of these involved the use of the American College Testing program (ACT) in college admissions. The minimum ACT score needed for acceptance was higher at PWIs than at HBCUs and many Blacks with lower scores attended HBCUs.

Another policy weighed by the Supreme Court was “Mississippi’s classification scheme for institutional mission” (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994, p. 413). Three of the PWIs were designated as “flagship” universities, providing these institutions with more financial resources. HBCUs, however, had more limited missions and funding, hurting their abilities to maintain their physical plant and recruit students. The third policy that the Court questioned was the unnecessary duplication of programs at PWIs and at HBCUs. The Court emphasized that such duplication was linked to de jure segregation (Brown, 1999; Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). With less duplication and placement of key programs of interest (but not duplicated) at both PWIs and HBCUs, students would have somewhat constrained choices of which institutions to attend. Theoretically, students would be drawn to an institution based on its unique curricular offerings rather than designation as an HBCU or PWI.

Despite common misconceptions and interpretations, Fordice does not propose merging or closing HBCUs (Brown, 2001; Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). Rather, the fourth policy outlined in Justice White’s decision focuses attention on the need to maintain all state institutions in Mississippi. Having institutions designated as predominantly White or historically Black institution is not, in and of itself, a constitutional violation. Rather, states were urged to eliminate policies which maintained the racial identifiability of these campuses.

The Supreme Court returned Fordice to a federal district court in Mississippi and charged it with developing a new desegregation plan which did not dismantle the state’s HBCUs (Hebel, 2004). The federal court mandated that Mississippi pay for new academic programs, construction, and start an endowment for the state’s HBCUs. Mississippi agreed to provide $503 million over a 17-year period, to the state’s HBCUs, to enhance programs and facilities (Gasman et al., 2007). Mississippi also required the HBCUs to recruit and retain at least 10% of non-Black students for three consecutive years. Until such time, the HBCUs would not be allowed to control their share of financial resources earmarked for the recruitment of non-Black students (Brown, 2002; Gasman, et al., 2007; Hebel, 2004).

Sixteen years after the Supreme Court rendered its decision, many leaders and administrators at HBCUs argue there has been limited institutional change stemming from this decision (Gasman et al., 2007; Minor, 2008). Disparities between HBCUs and PWIs persist and were clearly articulated in a recent Washington Post article by four presidents of public HBCUs in the state of Maryland (Avery, Burnim, Richardson, & Thompson, 2008). The presidents noted that their institutions continue to lack comparability with state PWIs. They explain that “efforts to enhance Maryland’s Black institutions have been slow and exceedingly limited” (Avery et al., 2008, para. 4), with the state failing in its efforts to “ensure that the [HBCUs] are comparable and competitive with the state’s traditionally White institutions in all facets of their operations and programs” (para. 7).
While research suggests some states have been uncertain of how to proceed with Fordice, hindering them from acting upon the intent of the decision (Brown, 2001), Maryland entered into an agreement with the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) to enhance the state’s public HBCUs. Although Maryland has yet to be officially cleared by the OCR, state leaders and policymakers contend that Maryland has fulfilled its commitment to strengthen its state’s public HBCUs (Perna, Milem, Gerald, Baum, Rowan, & Hutchens, 2006).

**Maryland and OCR**

Since the 1992 decision, the OCR has applied the Fordice ruling to states whose collegiate desegregation plans expired or continue to be monitored for compliance for laws which preclude discriminatory policies in public higher education. As a state which maintained a dual system of higher education through the 1960s, Maryland was subject to supervision by OCR and the new *Fordice* ruling. Maryland’s public postsecondary system includes 16 community colleges, 13 public four-year institutions, and two public research centers. The state also has 24 independent four-year institutions, three independent two-year colleges, and 128 private career schools (Maryland Higher Education Commission [MHEC], n.d.). The historically Black institutions in Maryland consist of Bowie State University, Coppin State University, the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, and Morgan State University. The initial three HBCUs and public predominantly White universities (e.g. Towson University, Salisbury University, and Frostburg University) are all under the University System of Maryland (USM), governed by a Board of Regents with a Chancellor as the chief executive officer. Morgan State University and St. Mary’s College of Maryland are not governed by USM and have their own governing boards (MHEC, n.d.).

The State of Maryland has four public research doctoral universities: (a) University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP); (b) University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC); (c) University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB); and (d) Morgan State University (MSU). UMCP is recognized as the flagship institution of the state and premier center of research and graduate education. UMBC is designated as the honors college. The third public university, UMB, specializes primarily in training students in health care, human services, and law professions. Finally, while Morgan State University is autonomous in terms of its governing structure, it is recognized as a public University in Maryland. MSU earned its distinction as the state’s public, urban doctoral intensive university in 2005, after Maryland approved a significant number of doctoral programs at the University.

In 1969, OCR informed Maryland that it was one of the states in violation of Title VI; it was operating a racially segregated system of higher education. As such, Maryland worked to develop a plan to dismantle its *de jure* system of higher education. In 1976, Maryland was informed that its plan submitted to OCR was unsatisfactory (MHEC, n.d.). Six years later, OCR resumed negotiations with Maryland regarding the development of a new desegregation plan. Subsequently, Maryland developed and submitted a statewide desegregation plan, entitled *A Plan to Assure Equal Postsecondary Educational Opportunity* (Maryland State Board, 1985). This plan, which OCR accepted, as demonstrating compliance with Title VI, focused on diversifying the state’s PWIs through enrollment and recruitment initiatives. It also aimed to enhance the state’s HBCUs, making them comparable and competitive with their White counterparts by investing in these universities’ capital funds, operating budgets, and the creation of new academic programs. During the plan’s implementation, Maryland reportedly submitted yearly progress reports to OCR, highlighting their accomplishments. According to the MHEC, the higher education coordinating board in Maryland, when the plan expired, without further intervention from OCR, the state
purportedly continued to improve educational opportunities across the state’s institutional types, in accord with State and federal law (MHEC, n.d.).

**Maryland’s Commitment to HBCU Development**

When the Supreme Court issued its decision in 1992 regarding *Fordice*, OCR applied the *Fordice* standards not only to states being monitored for compliance with federal law prohibiting discrimination in public higher education, but also to states, such as Maryland, whose OCR collegiate desegregation plan had expired. Based on the *Fordice* decision, Maryland entered into a new agreement with OCR to enhance Maryland’s public Black colleges by making them comparable and competitive with their PWI peers.

Despite the mandate by the OCR to all previously segregated states to abide by the *Fordice* ruling, ambiguity regarding what constitutes compliance remains. States are asked “to take all reasonable and educationally sound steps to eliminate policies and practices that are traceable to prior dual system and perpetuate segregation by race” (Brown, 2001, p. 53); however, there are no specific benchmarks or indication of how to reach these goals. This ambiguity has hindered many states from attempting or achieving the goals intended by the policy (Brown, 2001). Maryland, however, attempted to take action and work towards bringing its state institutions into compliance with OCR. Maryland proposed a desegregation plan focusing on improving PWI campus climates by hiring and recruiting Blacks at all levels. Also, recruitment, retention, and need-based financial assistance programs were established to help Blacks gain access to and complete graduate or professional school.

Maryland’s plan also included efforts to foster parity between its predominantly White and historically Black institutions. Specifically, the state agreed to prevent unnecessary program duplication between HBCUs and PWIs and to enhance the educational opportunities and infrastructures of the HBCUs by increasing their funding level according to their mission statements (MHEC, n.d.). The goal of these initiatives was to enhance the ability of HBCUs to provide a quality education for Black students as well as to increase the attractiveness of these campuses.

Maryland’s agreement with OCR originated in early 2000 and expired in 2005 (MHEC, n.d.). According to Kevin O’Keeffe and Calvin W. Burnett, former chairman of MHEC and former Maryland Secretary of Education respectively, Maryland has satisfied its agreement with OCR, making the state’s HBCUs competitive with their White counterparts (Avery, Burnim, Richardson, & Thompson, 2008; O’Keeffe & Burnett, 2006). Further, O’Keeffe and Burnett noted that the state promulgated a number of policies and programs to achieve its goal of increasing the comparability and competitiveness of HBCUs. For example, they reported that between 1999 and 2004, Maryland increased its need-based financial aid from 40.2 to 66.7 million dollars and increased the number of Black students attending both HBCU and PWI institutions. Additional faculty, administrators, and staff were hired. Maryland also required its public institutions to develop diversity statements and strategic goals (O’Keeffe & Burnett, 2006).

According to O’Keeffe and Burnett, serious efforts were made to avoid unnecessary program duplication by developing coherent, consistent, and unbiased policies of program review and approval. They argue that by denying programs, particularly at the doctoral level to PWIs and granting approval to HBCUs, Maryland greatly enhanced the competitiveness of Black schools. Further, they suggest that Maryland has engaged in a concerted effort to making the state’s HBCUs comparable to the State’s public PWIs by providing them with resources (funding for operational
enhancement and grant initiatives) for the enhancement of physical facilities and for institutional missions and programs support. They also point out that Maryland has provided $330 million to the state’s four HBCUs to support capital development (O’Keefe & Burnett, 2006).

**Maryland’s Claim**

Given the support to HBCUs, Maryland administrators and policymakers suggest they have not only fulfilled, but also exceeded, their agreement with OCR to create parity between the state’s HBCUs and their public White counterparts. While the interpretations of *Fordice* by Maryland and others have pushed on the implementation of policies addressing such issues as program duplication and the state of campus facilities, additional efforts are needed to truly make these institutions comparable. In particular, attention to increasing parity amongst faculty is central to competition with other institutions on “academic and research quality, status, and prestige” (Alexander, 2001, p. 113). Indicators of institutional quality often include statistics highlighting the proportion of faculty with doctorates, number of Nobel Prize winners, and total dollars professors obtain through grants and contracts. In addition to institutional quality, faculty members that an institution is able to recruit and retain governs what can and will be taught, determines which undergraduate and graduate programs can be offered, and speaks to the perceived quality of education students will receive. Thus, who a campus employs holds great importance.

Similarly, faculty salary is important in institutional efforts to recruit and retain a high quality faculty (Alexander, 2001; Hearn, 1999; Weiler, 1985) as it is often the largest item in college and university budgets. Institutions with fewer financial resources often have fewer funds to devote to this line item. In the course of analyzing faculty salary differentials at public and private institutions, Alexander (2001) notes that hiring top quality faculty can be challenging for institutions with fewer resources. Additionally, decisions to leave one institution for another are often based on salary differentials. Weiler’s (1985) study of faculty departure from the University of Minnesota reveals that salary was very important in 46.2% and moderately important in 30.8% of professors changing institutions. Salary is also important in that it represents more than an individual’s financial stability; it can be a sign of how much an individual is perceived as being worth and a way to demonstrate institutional commitment to a professor’s development and well-being (Hearn, 1999).

In addition to addressing salary concerns, other issues such as workload, teaching responsibilities, and faculty recruitment and retention are necessary to foster institutional quality (Alexander, 2001; Jackson, 2002; Weiler, 1985). While a professor may be drawn to an institution by its mission or student communities, a challenging workload perceived as exceeding what is required at other institutions can be problematic. For example, Jackson (2002) notes that “if a person has a job offer that requires him to teach four classes each semester at Southern University [an HBCU] . . . but can go a few blocks away and teach two or three classes a semester at Louisiana State University (a PWI), what incentive will that person have to work at Southern University” (p. 183)?

The importance of faculty workload is also linked to faculty retention. Over time, engagement in teaching and service have taken a backseat to excellence in research when tenure and career advancement are sought (Blackwell, 1988; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Zusman, 1999). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) describe the tenure process at research universities as being driven primarily by research productivity, with limited attention given to teaching. In fact, time spent teaching is time not spent engaging in research, and teaching can be seen as a distraction from tenure-related
activities. Heavy teaching loads then can distract faculty from scholarly productivity and pose undue challenges for professors, particularly at doctoral universities with strong research missions (Boyer, 1990; Jackson, 2002; Menges & Exum, 1983; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Although Maryland formally declared that parity has been reached between its state HBCUs and PWIs (O’Keefe & Burnett, 2006), in light of prior discussions about faculties, workload, and salary, we remain skeptical. It is in that vein which we explore whether Maryland’s goal has been reached.

Method

Data Sources

To examine faculty equality between MSU and its White institutional peers in Maryland, data were collected from three datasets. First, using AAUP’s Web database, we consulted the Annual Economic Status Reports on faculty compensation. The annual reports have been produced for nearly five decades, with each annual report presenting an overview of the survey results, detailed aggregate data, and institutional specific data. We examined the reports containing faculty salary data for years 2001 to 2007 for MSU’s institutional peers in Maryland. The data in these reports are based on institutional responses, from across the country, to the AAUP Full-Time Faculty Compensation Survey; all data were compiled and analyzed by AAUP. Secondly, faculty workload data were obtained from the Fourteenth Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the University System of Maryland (2007) found on the University System of Maryland’s website. This report contained faculty workload data from all public universities in Maryland for the years 2002 to 2007.

It is important to note institutional data from MSU were not included in these reports. Morgan State was specifically not included in the Fourteenth Annual Report on the Instructional Workload of the University System of Maryland because, as noted above, MSU is not affiliated with the University System of Maryland. Thus, data regarding MSU’s faculty salary and workload were obtained through the University’s Office of Institutional Research. We were given access to information about full-time faculty salary by rank, from 2001 to 2007, and workload from academic years 2002 to 2007.

MSU, UMBC, UMCP, and UMB

As compared to the other research universities in the state of Maryland, UMBC is the institution MSU most closely resembles in terms of size and availability of resources. For example, MSU’s current total student population is 7,005 (6,114 undergraduate students and 891 graduate students), and its 2007-2008 general funds appropriated by Maryland was $62,914,721 and its current general funds appropriated for the 2008-2009 academic year is $67,634,160 (Maryland Higher Education General Fund Appropriations: FY 2007 - 2009). MSU’s present faculty count for the 2008-2009 academic year is 558 (436 full-time and 122 part-time) and its undergraduate faculty to student ratio is 18:1 (Morgan State University, 2009). Furthermore, MSU offers 41 academic programs at the undergraduate level, 30 master’s degrees and 15 doctoral degrees. Similarly, UMBC’s total student population is 12,268 (9,612 undergraduate students and 2,656 graduate students) (University System of Maryland [USM] Institutions, 2009), and its 2007-2008 general funds appropriated by Maryland was $79,269,769 and its current general funds appropriated for the 2008-2009 academic year is $84,488,263 (Maryland Higher Education General Fund Appropriations: FY 2007 - 2009). UMBC’s present faculty count for the 2008-2009 academic year is 1,018 (714 full-time and 304 part-time) and the university’s faculty to student
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ratio is 16:1 (USM Institutions, 2009). UMBC offers 54 academic programs at the undergraduate level, 33 master’s degrees, and 24 doctoral degrees.

UMCP is the state’s flagship institution and, as such, tends to receive a disproportionate amount of state funding (Minor, 2008). UMCP’s distinction as Maryland’s flagship campus suggests it would have more financial resources to allocate to faculty recruitment, salary, and development, making it an inappropriate institution for comparison. UMCP’s student population is 36,014 (25,857 undergraduate students and 10,157 graduate students) (USM Institutions, 2009), and its 2007-2008 general funds appropriated by Maryland was $370,688,761; its current general funds appropriated for the 2008-2009 academic year is $396,173,691 (Maryland Higher Education General Fund Appropriations: FY 2007 - 2009). UMCP’s present faculty count for the 2008-2009 academic year is 19:1 (USM Institutions, 2009). UMCP offers 127 academic programs at the undergraduate level and 112 at the graduate level.

UMB is not completely appropriate as a primary institution of comparison as it specializes primarily in training students in the human service profession and operates a hospital. This also means UMB has more financial resources available for faculty development. For example, while UMB has a student population of 5,884 (810 undergraduate students and 5,074 graduate students) (USM Institutions, 2009), and its 2007-2008 general funds appropriated by Maryland was $157,678,766; its current general funds appropriated for the 2008-2009 academic year is $170,642,031 (Maryland Higher Education General Fund Appropriations: FY 2007 - 2009). Moreover, UMB offers three academic programs at the undergraduate level, 13 master’s degrees, 17 doctoral degrees, and four professional degrees. This leaves UMBC as the most appropriate institution for comparison.

Procedure

We conducted a series of trend analyses examining similarities and distinctions between faculty salaries and workload at MSU and its predominantly White doctoral institutional counterparts (UMCP, UMBC, and UMB). While largely descriptive in nature, utilizing trend analysis as the primary method of inquiry allowed us to simultaneously provide a broad descriptive overview of changes at one institution and compare and contrast across similar contexts. Our analyses make comparisons in faculty salary and workload between MSU and the three similar Maryland institutions as well as national averages in a given year. Specifically, we focus attention on distinctions between data from MSU and UMBC.

Results

Faculty Salary

Our first set of analyses reveals significant disparities between faculty salary at MSU and predominantly White research universities in the state. Table 1 shows a faculty salary trend report from 2001 to 2007, displaying average salaries of full-time instructional faculty, adjusted to a standard nine-month contract. Specifically, we compare the salaries of professors by rank (Professor, Associate, and Assistant) at the public doctoral institutions in Maryland with trends in the national average of faculty salaries.

When compared with the national average of faculty salaries, MSU’s competitive position with respect to faculty salaries has eroded somewhat since 2001. While it could be argued that the salaries for MSU faculty of all ranks have increased over the decade, our analyses show salaries, particularly of assistant and full professors, were increasingly below national averages.
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From 2001 to 2004, assistant and associate professors at MSU had salaries extremely similar to, and in some years slightly exceeding, the national average for faculty of similar rank. This trend shifted somewhat as the decade continued, particularly for assistant professors. In 2005 and 2007, MSU professors made 11% and 17% less than their peers of similar rank nationally. Interestingly, the largest disparities were observed between the salaries of the full professors employed at MSU and their colleagues across the country. Faculty salaries at MSU were lower than the national average every year, between 2001 and 2007, and were as much as 20% lower than the average salary for full professors nationally ($85,037 vs. $101,620 in 2005).

Similar trends can be observed when MSU’s faculty salaries are examined in the context of its institutional peers in Maryland. At all time periods, the average salaries for faculty at UMCP and UMB exceeded both the salaries of their peers at MSU and national averages. Particularly interesting trends emerge when examining differences between the salaries of professors at UMBC.

Table 1
Faculty Salary Trend Report by Academic Rank (fall 2001 to fall 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>82,822.00</td>
<td>88,460.00</td>
<td>90,254.00</td>
<td>89,254.00</td>
<td>85,037.00</td>
<td>90,543.00</td>
<td>93,301.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMBC</td>
<td>91,648.00</td>
<td>93,039.00</td>
<td>93,715.00</td>
<td>97,782.00</td>
<td>99,084.00</td>
<td>104,260.00</td>
<td>110,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMB</td>
<td>108,125.00</td>
<td>105,811.00</td>
<td>120,349.00</td>
<td>121,374.00</td>
<td>125,925.00</td>
<td>132,847.00</td>
<td>120,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>105,581.00</td>
<td>106,473.00</td>
<td>107,018.00</td>
<td>111,048.00</td>
<td>115,695.00</td>
<td>121,060.00</td>
<td>109,569.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>89,631.00</td>
<td>92,387.00</td>
<td>94,606.00</td>
<td>97,948.00</td>
<td>101,620.00</td>
<td>106,495.00</td>
<td>109,569.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>63,960.00</td>
<td>66,241.00</td>
<td>67,621.00</td>
<td>69,380.00</td>
<td>68,045.00</td>
<td>73,880.00</td>
<td>77,056.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMBC</td>
<td>64,323.00</td>
<td>64,944.00</td>
<td>64,670.00</td>
<td>67,769.00</td>
<td>70,082.00</td>
<td>73,592.00</td>
<td>76,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMB</td>
<td>76,074.00</td>
<td>77,278.00</td>
<td>81,137.00</td>
<td>83,754.00</td>
<td>87,993.00</td>
<td>91,376.00</td>
<td>83,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>74,389.00</td>
<td>74,502.00</td>
<td>74,937.00</td>
<td>75,301.00</td>
<td>80,286.00</td>
<td>84,234.00</td>
<td>89,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>63,049.00</td>
<td>64,938.00</td>
<td>66,275.00</td>
<td>68,576.00</td>
<td>70,952.00</td>
<td>74,075.00</td>
<td>77,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>54,689.00</td>
<td>55,855.00</td>
<td>56,127.00</td>
<td>57,888.00</td>
<td>54,462.00</td>
<td>62,213.00</td>
<td>55,803.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMBC</td>
<td>55,271.00</td>
<td>55,613.00</td>
<td>54,614.00</td>
<td>57,397.00</td>
<td>58,714.00</td>
<td>61,931.00</td>
<td>65,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMB</td>
<td>61,376.00</td>
<td>62,587.00</td>
<td>61,114.00</td>
<td>66,012.00</td>
<td>71,192.00</td>
<td>76,181.00</td>
<td>64,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>69,176.00</td>
<td>69,202.00</td>
<td>69,989.00</td>
<td>75,189.00</td>
<td>75,856.00</td>
<td>77,395.00</td>
<td>78,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>53,392.00</td>
<td>54,986.00</td>
<td>56,277.00</td>
<td>58,310.00</td>
<td>60,440.00</td>
<td>63,131.00</td>
<td>65,416.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Association of University Professors (2001 to 2007)
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and MSU. At the associate professor level, there were few differences between the salaries of MSU faculty salaries in relation to the salaries of professors at UMBC. However, between 2001 and 2007, UMBC full professors had increased their salary advantage over MSU full professors. For example, in 2001 UMBC paid its full professors an average salary that was 11% more than what was paid to MSU faculty ($91,648 vs. $82,822). These disparities narrowed somewhat in 2002 and 2003, but by 2007, UMBC’s salary advantage had increased to its widest point. In 2007, the average UMBC full professor ($110,600) made 19% more than the average MSU full professor ($93,301).

Disparities between the salaries of assistant professors at UMBC and MSU also emerged and widened over time. Between 2001 and 2007, UMBC assistant professors moved from a very slight salary advantage to a very significant advantage. In 2001, assistant professors at UMBC and MSU had comparable salaries ($55,271 vs. $54,689). The average salaries of MSU assistant professors even exceeded those of faculty at UMBC in 2003 and 2004. This trend changed in 2005, with the average salary of UMBC assistant professors exceeding the salary of MSU assistant professors by 8%. By 2007, UMBC’s salary advantage for assistant professors had increased to 17% or almost $10,000 ($65,200 vs. $55,803).

Faculty Workload

In addition to observable and increasing differences between what MSU is able to pay its faculty compared to other public doctoral institutions in Maryland, there are noticeable disparities in the faculty workload between MSU and similar Maryland public research institutions. Table 2 examines faculty teaching workload at two predominantly White public doctoral research universities in Maryland (UMCP and UMBC) from 2000 to 2007. Data in the Table are reflective of the average number of course units taught for full-time tenure-track faculty. One course unit is equivalent to a standard three-credit lecture course. Individual instructional activities (e.g., undergraduate research and dissertation research) that may not necessarily constitute a three-credit course are also incorporated in this faculty workload table. For example, if a faculty member’s workload is 4.2, this means teaching two courses per semester, and may either supervise the research of one student (graduate or undergraduate) or engage in another form of instructional activity per semester.

Table 2
Trends in Faculty Workload at Two Public Research Universities in Maryland by Academic Year (2002-2003 to 2006-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMBC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.umsa.umd.edu/ and Morgan State University’s Office of Institutional Research

Data reveals that while the teaching workload is fairly similar at UMBC and UMCP, faculty at MSU generally teach more courses than their faculty counterparts at other state research universities. For example, while faculty at MSU on average teach seven courses a year (e.g. three courses in one semester and four courses the other semester), faculty at UMBC on average teach
five courses a year (three courses one semester, two courses the following semester) and supervise approximately four undergraduate or graduate students each semester. Interestingly, while data in Table 2 reflects information on individual instruction for UMBC, those data do not for MSU. Consequently, while faculty at MSU are devoting a significant amount of their time teaching, they may also be devoting a large portion of their time working with undergraduate and graduate students on research projects (e.g., undergraduate research projects, theses, dissertations) which goes undocumented. As such, it is possible that these disparities in faculty workload between MSU and UMBC are even greater than what we observe, because the MSU numbers do not account for the number of graduate and/or undergraduate students MSU faculty are supervising in research. It is interesting to note that the gap between the course load of MSU and UMBC faculty has narrowed between 2002 and 2007; however, this gap has closed not because MSU faculty are teaching less, but because UMBC faculty are devoting more time to teaching and supervising students’ research (The Fourteenth Annual Report, 2007).

Table 3 compares the scholarly production of faculty at MSU with faculty at UMBC. It is important to note that UMBC includes only full-time faculty in their report on scholarly productivity whereas MSU includes all faculty (full and part-time). At a doctoral degree granting university, teaching seven courses during the academic year while actively researching and supervising the research of both undergraduate and graduate students is an extremely heavy load to manage. Faculty at UMBC and UMCP have lighter teaching loads, likely leaving more time to engage in scholarly endeavors (Johnson & Harvey, 2002; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), while faculty at MSU must strive to balance their heavier teaching and research responsibilities. The time that faculty at MSU are able to devote to their scholarship is likely shortened compared to their counterparts.

Table 3
Faculty Scholarship Productivity at MSU and UMBC for Academic Year 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSU</th>
<th>UMBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Faculty</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books published</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed Publications</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed publications</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative activities</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Presentations</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$27,780,000</td>
<td>$85,078,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.umsa.umd.edu/ and Morgan State University’s Office of Institutional Research

While both institutions have managed to produce an impressive array of scholarship, UMBC exceeds MSU’s scholarly production in virtually every category. According to the 2006-2007 report on scholarly productivity, approximately 47% (270 out 573) of faculty at MSU engaged in some form of scholarly activity (e.g., publishing books/journal articles, conference presentations, securing grants/contracts) in that year, compared with 60% of faculty (476 of 792) at UMBC. Some of this can be attributed to UMBC having more research faculty than MSU; the faculty at UMBC is approximately 38% (792 vs. 573) larger than the faculty at MSU. However, the
differentials in productivity exceed institutional differences in faculty size. There were 174% more refereed publications (737 vs. 269), 381% more creative activities (529 vs. 110), almost 300% more professional presentations (1,238 vs. 312) completed by UMBC faculty as compared to MSU faculty. Further, UMBC professors earned 200% more in grants and contracts than their counterparts at MSU ($85.1 million vs. $27.8 million). Certainly, part of these disparities can be attributed to faculty at UMBC teaching less and having more time to devote to their scholarship.

Discussion

According to Morgan State’s strategic plan for 2008 to 2012, reaching parity with peer doctoral research universities in the state is a high priority (Morgan State University, 2007). It is listed as the first of eight strategic goals identified by MSU leaders. To reach this objective, administrators acknowledge the importance of increased resources targeted at faculty recruitment and research, citing the need for more salary incentives and benefits to attract top scholars, including “state-of-the-art equipment and lighter teaching loads to support research” (p. 29).

Implementing policies and programs, which would enable MSU to take its place as a competitive doctoral research program in the state, requires changes in budget allocation within the institution (Morgan State University, 2007), coupled with more funding for institutional development. Hypothetically, these concerns could and should have been addressed in Maryland’s efforts to comply with the Fordice ruling to desegregate state higher education institutions. While many states continue to grapple with what constitutes full compliance with Fordice, Maryland has articulated a clear compliance agenda with OCR. The state of Maryland has argued it has fulfilled the obligations of its OCR agreement to enhance its public HBCUs, making them competitive with their PWI counterparts through increased funding for campus buildings and the development of academic programs.

Despite these initiatives, our study confirms important disparities between state HBCUs and PWIs which continue to exist in the state of Maryland. While attention and resources have been focused on making improvements to physical plant and diminishing program duplication, state policymakers have largely ignored the importance of attending to faculty development in promoting institutional quality and prestige. There are consistent and persistent differences in salary, workload, and productivity between faculty at MSU and UMBC (a similar Maryland state research university). Such measures of inequality hamper HBCUs’ attempts to enhance their competitiveness and compatibility with their White peers, impeding their ability to racially diversify their student bodies— which was purportedly thought to emanate from the implications of Fordice (Gasman, et al., 2007). These measures of institutional inequality call into question the assertion that Maryland has engendered institutional fairness and equality between its public HBCUs and their White counterparts.

Tension between states and public HBCUs over the lack of compliance with Fordice is not limited to Maryland (Jaschik, 2006, 2007; Minors, 2008; Pluvoise, 2006; Powers, 2008). HBCUs in other states are grappling with similar concerns, and struggling with issues of institutional parity between public HBCUs and their PWI counterparts. For example, Minor (2008) highlights the inequity in the funding appropriations between public HBCUs and their PWI counterparts. These issues impact faculty salary and workload since an institutions funding is inextricably linked to financial support for faculty. In regard to salary disparities, Gasman et al., (2007) report that the average salary for an associate professor at a Black college is $53,070, while the average associate professor’s salary at a PWI is $60,073.
Interestingly, we found little difference between the salaries of associate professors at MSU and UMBC. Rather, the widening disparities appear to be between the pay of assistant and full professors at these two institutions. The reasons for these salary divergences, at the highest and lowest levels of faculty rank, are unclear. Perna, Gerald, Baum, and Milem, (2007) found similar trends in a research study on Black faculty and administrators working at universities in the South. It is important to consider what distinctions at these two levels of academic rank might mean for faculty recruitment and retention at HBCUs. Considering persistent increases in the cost of higher education, young scholars are increasingly burdened with significant loans from their undergraduate and graduate education (Johnstone, 1991; Zusman, 1999). The need to repay these debts may make salary more important in making decisions about where to begin one’s career. Lower salaries for assistant professors may also make it easier for other institutions to recruit faculty away before they have developed a sense of institutional loyalty.

Implications of lower salaries relative to national and PWI averages for full professors may also have implications for faculty retention. As associate professors transition to full professor status and retirement approaches, HBCU professors may be more interested in and likely to transition to PWIs offering lower teaching loads and higher salary as a place to end their careers. Senior scholars are often more adept and experienced in obtaining grants and other funding for research and the support of graduate students, making them valuable institutional assets and mentors for junior faculty. Salary disparities add to the challenges of recruiting and retaining these individuals, who can add to collective institutional knowledge and experience.

While some may ignore or minimize the importance of salary and resource disparities and choose to work at HBCUs based on their commitment to their unique mission, differences in workload and productivity may serve as insurmountable barriers to faculty recruitment and retention. Professors at MSU were expected to teach more than their colleagues at UMBC. Teaching, in and of itself, is not a bad thing; however, it is an activity which draws faculty time away from research and goes relatively unconsidered in the tenure and advancement process at research universities (Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). While some may argue that MSU is an HBCU, thus more focused on teaching and less stringent in terms of scholarly activity, this is not the case. Broadly, HBCUs are requiring more and more of their professors to engage in research activities (Johnson & Harvey, 2002), and as a doctorate granting university, research is a core element in MSU’s mission and tenure evaluation process (Morgan State University, 2007). Thus, the data presented in this study suggest that professors at MSU are not only paid less; they are asked to teach more and have less time for research, thus making them more vulnerable to difficulty when being evaluated for tenure and advancement.

Although Maryland has declared that it will continue to invest in the operation and capital budgets of their HBCUs if and when the OCR acknowledges that Maryland has honored its agreement, many leaders at HBCUs are in disbelief (C. Jackson, Personal communication, March 5, 2008). Minor (2008) echoes this sentiment, explaining that “the structure of most desegregation settlements in higher education are finite, meaning once payments have been made or certain benchmarks are met, the funding is concluded” (p. 26). These concerns are particularly compelling as a report released by the National Governors Association shows that state support for higher education is expected to decline as states experience revenue shortfalls (National Governors Association, 2007). Thus, it will be harder and harder for states to find funding to support changes in institutional budgets, particularly around faculty salary and workload that would increase parity between HBCUs and PWIs.
Looking to the future, HBCU leaders and administrators have argued that it is Maryland’s responsibility to make these institutions comparable if it wants to have highly skilled and educated citizens to lead the state’s economy (C. Jackson, Personal communication, March 5, 2008). Like many states, Maryland is experiencing a change in its demographics, with a decline of the White population and significant growth in non-Whites. As such, HBCUs leaders have shifted the basis of their disputes with the state from citing a lack of compliance with a legal decree to expressing their concerns about the state’s economic prosperity and competitiveness. Perna et al., (2006) and Minor (2008) raised similar perspectives. Specifically, Minor contends that during this time of concern with access to postsecondary education, training a diverse and globally competitive workforce, “the need to increase support of HBCUs now extends beyond issues of equity, social justice, or past discrimination. It is now a matter of meeting public needs and producing educated citizens that contribute to advancing communities” (p. 32). HBCUs are important institutions, which have played a disproportionate role in teaching and training a diverse population, particularly those who would otherwise not have access to higher education (Allen, Jewell, Griffin, & Wolf, 2007; Harper & Gasman, 2008; Kim, 2002; Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002; Palmer & Gasman, 2008). Thus, beyond fulfilling an obligation to implement the Fordice decision, the state of Maryland would be wise to offer more comprehensive support to their HBCUs, particularly in terms of faculty development, as a means to offer as many high quality opportunities to educate the citizens of the state.
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