At the risk of making public the fact that I have been slow-witted in not seeing it earlier, I have now come to realize that something is radically wrong about the way faculty members of the College of Liberal Arts are compensated, and what the remedy must be.

Here is a sample of some interesting figures, showing median starting salaries (i.e., for the first year in rank) of full professors, nation-wide. These figures are salary-only amounts; they do not include fringe benefits. All are computed for nine-month years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full professor of</th>
<th>Median starting salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages (misc.)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who are familiar with typical starting salaries for professors in the College of Liberal Arts will observe that the median salaries shown in this table are not greatly out of line with what CLA professors are actually paid, but they will also notice that the great majority of CLA full professors who have been in rank from five to ten years are still at the level of these first-year-in-rank salaries.

Properly academic readers of what I have set down thus far will chide me, as they should, for failing to specify the year to which the data of the table apply, and the source of the table. I hasten to rectify the omission: the figures are excerpted from a report (which includes data for many disciplines, not just those I have cited) of the Commission on Administrative Affairs of the American Council on Education, and the full table, for all ranks and disciplines, may be found in The Chronicle of Higher Education of February 12, 1968. That's right, 1968. The median starting salaries shown are for the academic year 1967-68.

I trust that the point has now been adequately made, but a little elaboration may do no harm. A certain full professor of philosophy whom I know intimately, now at last, in his sixth year in rank is to be paid a salary equal to the median starting salary for philosophy professors, nation-wide, six years ago. This cannot be owing to the fact that somebody up there does not like me (I am, in fact, well known to be thoroughly lovable), for my case is typical among full professors in the CLA. Moreover, CLA faculty of other
ranks have not, by the medians of the full table, been adequately paid either.

Faculty members in other schools of the university may wish to consult the source I have cited, or more current salary data if it is available by rank and discipline, to compare their own salary levels with those of their colleagues at other American universities. They may not like what they find.

My reluctant conclusion is that there is only one measure that can restore salary equity for us: unionization, at the earliest possible time.

I have not been enthusiastic about unionization in the past, but at the age of 52 I find that I am not too old to learn the hard way. Nor have I seen fit to join the OSEA, supposing that I had not enough in common with forklift operators to justify membership in an organization that embraces them and other non-academic types. Now I propose to join that organization, because it is the only organization that is pressing hard to represent the faculty in collective bargaining. If it is not the ideal organization to represent us, it is the only one that has shown any likelihood of doing so in the near future.

Peter Anton
Philosophy Department

September 18, 1973
Objectivity in Evaluation

For evaluations to have clear meaning we must know the desires of the evaluators which influence approval or disapproval of the teaching. The answers provided by my students in large courses last Spring Term indicated 38% favor classroom-only course content with no reading assigned outside class, while about 50% wanted a list of questions from which all testing would come verbatim and 40% disapproved the answering of student questions in class. Disparate preferences among students in the same class will tend to frustrate efforts to earn good ratings unless instructors can arrange for the students holding opposing views to assemble as separate class sections which get treated according to their preferences. Such adaptation deserves consideration by the overwhelming majority of faculty members reported by the ACE as believing that promotions should depend upon teaching effectiveness measured at least in part by student evaluations (1).

"Appropriate student input" needs definition not yet stipulated by the new administrative regulations on tenure adopted by the State Board on 23 July 1973. In addition to possible contradictory preferences among students cited above, impediments to meaningful evaluation may include increasing student boredom with evaluations (2) and the susceptibility of any audience to dramatic illusions.

An amusing experiment at USC arose from published suggestions "that student ratings of educators depend largely on personality variables and not educational content" (3). In their experiment the USC investigators "programmed an actor to teach charismatically and nonsubstantively on a topic about which he knew nothing." The USC researchers reported that their experiment supported the hypothesis that "given a sufficiently impressive lecture paradigm, an experienced group of educators participating in a new learning situation can feel satisfied that they have learned despite irrelevant, conflicting, and meaningless content conveyed by the lecturer." Using the name "Dr. Myron L. Fox", the actor lectured to educators, psychiatrists, and administrators. The audience reaction reported on evaluation forms gave him very high numerical scores. Although these graduate audiences should have penetrated the fraud easily, they entered notes on the evaluation form such as "excellent presentation", "warm manner", "good flow", "lively examples", and "relaxed manner".

As "Professor X" says, "The professor who today would be great is one who combines wisdom with good stage presence. In short he has to be half ham." (4) Ernest van den Haag suggests it is likely that students will confuse present enjoyment of education with other returns from education (5). Dr. Fox doubtless provided enjoyment for his experienced graduate audiences.
The USC experiment points to the possibility of "training actors to give legitimate lectures as an innovative educational approach toward student-perceived satisfaction with the learning process", and the investigators also suggest providing "the scholar-educator with a more dramatic stage presence". Such emphases on classroom dramatics suggest the evolution of new patterns of higher education in which theatrical production techniques become important ingredients with experts in such productions contributing importantly to the administration of future colleges to enhance the teaching effectiveness. Possibly the pure subject-matter expert will assume the role of technical consultant to the writers, producers, and actors instead of himself vying for ratings as dramatic articulator. By 1984, a scant decade away, we may already see many recorded presentations on video cassettes leading to the lifelong educational advancement suggested by L. G. Heller (6).

Having clearly defined goals, criteria, and procedures for evaluation, universities may more surely ward off the evils of an academic spoils system and avert the accusation of subjectivity in conducting evaluations and making decisions on tenure and promotion. Leaving the criteria unstated or ambiguous, using irregular evaluation procedures, and failing to focus on priorities and clear objectives will invite such incidents as those reported in the press concerning the sudden dismissal last April of a 25-year veteran zoology professor from his tenured position at Idaho State University with the ensuing $2 Million lawsuit begun in August (7).
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