



March  
2006

---

## California Postsecondary Education Commission

---

# Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2006-07

---

*Based on a five-year trend, faculty salaries at the California State University could lag comparable institution salaries by 18% next year if no raises are given. University of California faculty could lag their counterparts by 14.5%.*

## Contents

|                                  |    |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Methodology .....                | 1  |
| Faculty Salary Trends .....      | 3  |
| Parity Figures for 2006-07 ..... | 4  |
| Implications .....               | 10 |

*The Commission advises the Governor and Legislature on higher education policy and fiscal issues. Its primary focus is to ensure that the state's educational resources are used effectively to provide Californians with postsecondary education opportunities. More information about the Commission is available at [www.cpec.ca.gov](http://www.cpec.ca.gov).*

---

Commission Report 06-01

The Commission regularly conducts a study on faculty salaries in California's public universities as compared with faculty salaries at comparable institutions. This study presents estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries that would enable California faculty to attain parity with their comparison groups in the coming fiscal year. The analysis is based on data from six of the eight University of California comparison institutions, and all 20 California State University comparison institutions.

## Methodology

The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups – one each for the California State University and the University of California. The procedures by which the systems collect data and the techniques used to analyze those data have been developed by the Commission in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the California State University, the University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst. The California Faculty Association is included as an observer on the Committee. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of the views of all interested parties, rather than the vision of any single individual or agency.

This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years; it consists of two primary elements: (1) collecting salary data from comparison institutions; and (2) a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank.

Display 1 shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. The Commission's Faculty

Salary Advisory Committee formulated each list and in the more than 40 years that the survey has been conducted, each list has changed several times.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both the California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on the previous five-year growth rate. The projected 2006-07 average rank-by-rank salaries for the comparison institutions are then compared to the current-year State University and University averages. These averages are then combined into an "All-Ranks Average" for each comparison group and each California system and compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the projected average for the comparison group next year with the current-year average for the California system produces the budget-year "parity figure."

## DISPLAY 1 Comparison Institutions

### The California State University

#### Northeast Region

Bucknell University\*  
Rutgers, the State University  
of New Jersey, Newark  
State University of New York,  
Albany  
Tufts University\*  
University of Connecticut

#### Southern Region

Georgia State University  
George Mason University  
North Carolina State University  
University of Maryland,  
Baltimore County

#### North Central Region

Cleveland State University  
Illinois State University  
Loyola University, Chicago\*  
Wayne State University  
University of Wisconsin,  
Milwaukee

#### Western Region

Arizona State University  
Reed College\*  
University of Colorado, Denver  
University of Nevada, Reno  
University of Southern California\*  
University of Texas, Arlington

### The University of California

Harvard University\*  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology\*  
Stanford University\*  
State University of New York, Buffalo  
University of Illinois, Urbana  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
University of Virginia, Charlottesville  
Yale University\*

\* Independent Institution.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

## Faculty Salary Trends

Display 2 shows the Commission's parity computations for the two public university systems, plus the actual salary increases granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the parity figure between CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable figure for UC and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During the recession in the early 1990s, few faculty salary increases were funded in the State budget. This worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's public institutions and their comparison groups to create the largest compensation disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s. This year, the salary deficiencies are again approaching record levels with both systems facing double-digit differences in achieving parity with their comparison institutions.

When California moved from recession to economic boom in the mid 1990s, faculty received more competitive salary increases. As a result of this trend, the necessary percentage increase for parity diminished significantly at both university systems. However recent and anticipated budget constraints have reversed the trend once again. The lag for the State University increased from 16.8% in the current year to a projected 18% for the 2006-07 fiscal year. The University of California's parity gap during the current year was 13.9%, while the projected lag for 2006-07 has grown to 14.5%.

| Year    | The California State University |                 | University of California |                 |
|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
|         | Parity Figure                   | Salary Increase | Parity Figure            | Salary Increase |
| 1981-82 | 0.5%                            | 6.0%            | 5.8%                     | 6.0%            |
| 1982-83 | 2.3                             | 0.0             | 9.8                      | 0.0             |
| 1983-84 | 9.2                             | 6.0             | 18.5                     | 7.0             |
| 1984-85 | 7.6                             | 10.0            | 10.6                     | 9.0             |
| 1985-86 | N/A                             | 10.5            | 6.5                      | 9.5             |
| 1986-87 | 6.9                             | 6.8             | 1.4                      | 5.0             |
| 1987-88 | 6.9                             | 6.9             | 2.0                      | 5.6             |
| 1988-89 | 4.7                             | 4.7             | 3.0                      | 3.0             |
| 1989-90 | 4.8                             | 4.8             | 4.7                      | 4.7             |
| 1990-91 | 4.9                             | 4.9             | 4.8                      | 4.8             |
| 1991-92 | 4.1                             | 0.0             | 3.5                      | 0.0             |
| 1992-93 | 6.0                             | 0.0             | 6.7                      | 0.0             |
| 1993-94 | 8.5                             | 3.0             | 6.5                      | 0.0             |
| 1994-95 | 6.8                             | 0.0             | 12.6                     | 3.0             |
| 1995-96 | 12.7                            | 2.5             | 10.4                     | 3.0             |
| 1996-97 | 9.6                             | 4.0             | 10.3                     | 5.0             |
| 1997-98 | 10.8                            | 4.0             | 6.7                      | 5.0             |
| 1998-99 | 11.2                            | 5.7             | 4.6                      | 4.5             |
| 1999-00 | 11.1                            | 6.0             | 2.9                      | 2.9             |
| 2000-01 | 8.9                             | 6.0             | 3.0                      | 3.0             |
| 2001-02 | 7.9                             | 3.2             | 3.9                      | 0.5             |
| 2002-03 | 10.6                            | 3.0             | 6.9                      | 0.5             |
| 2003-04 | 11.6                            | 0.8             | 9.2                      | 0.0             |
| 2004-05 | 12.7                            | 0.0             | 9.3                      | 0.0             |
| 2005-06 | 16.8                            | 3.5             | 13.9                     | 2.0             |
| 2006-07 | <i>18.00%</i>                   |                 | <i>14.50%</i>            |                 |

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

It is important to understand the meaning of these "parity" numbers. For example, when the Commission estimates a difference of 18% for State University faculty, it does not mean that its faculty was actually paid that percent less than their colleagues at comparable institutions. The parity number is a projection of a possible future (2006-07) salary increase at the comparison institutions based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that State University salaries would not increase at all in the 2006-07 fiscal year. Thus, the projected difference for 2006-07 can be quite different from the actual difference because the actual amount of salary increase that comparison institutions pay can be greater or less than projected. Further, any budget year salary increases provided to faculty at the University or State University could alter or eliminate the disparity between California institutions and their comparators.

## The Parity Figures for 2006-07

### California State University

Display 3 shows the parity calculations for the California State University for the current (2005-06) and budget (2006-07) years.

The “parity figure” for the State University system for 2006-07 is 18% - the percentage by which average salaries in the State University would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by the comparison institutions in 2006-07. It indicates that the all-ranks average salary in the current year is about 16.8% below that currently paid by the comparison group. These calculations are based upon actual information received from the 20 State University’s comparison institutions.

Displays 4 and 5 show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group for 2000-01 and 2005-06. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average growth rate that permits current-year salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the State University’s position for each rank and for all ranks relative to the entire list. It shows that from 2000-01 to 2005-06, the average of all State University faculty dropped from 8<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> out of 21 in its ranking with the comparison institution counterparts. Without future increases, the State University is likely to drop even further in ranking in the next few years.

Broken out by level, faculty at the professor level dropped from 15<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> in its ranking, while the associate professor level fell from 8<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup>, the assistant professor level fell from 10<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup>, and the instructor level fell from 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup>.

### University of California

This report contains current-year data from six of the eight University of California comparison institutions. Data were estimated for the other two institutions by taking 95% of the five-year average rate of salary increases provided by those two institutions as prescribed by the University’s methodology.

Display 6 shows the parity calculations for UC for both the current and budget years. For the University system, the methodology indicates a “parity figure” of 14.5%, which is the percentage amount by which UC faculty will lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2006-07. The display also shows that University average salaries lag the comparison group by 10.0% in the 2005-06 fiscal year.

Displays 7 and 8 presents 2000-01 and 2005-06 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that there is no change from last year in the public/independent relationship relative to faculty salaries – that is, each of the private comparison institutions pays more on average while each public comparator pays less. However, UC’s average salary has dropped in relation to the lowest private comparison institution and come much closer to the highest public comparison institution. Without future increases, the University is likely to drop down in ranking in the next few years, losing its historic median ranking between private and public institutions.

The University’s rank-by-rank position relative to its comparison institutions is still more consistent across all faculty groups than the state university’s rankings. For example, the current year University all-ranks average is at the median (5<sup>th</sup>), with full professors ranked 6<sup>th</sup>, associate professors ranked 7<sup>th</sup>, and assistant professors ranked 6<sup>th</sup>.

**DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2006-2007**

| <u>Academic Rank</u> | <u>Comparison Group Average Salaries 2000-2001</u> | <u>Comparison Group Average Salaries 2005-2006<sup>1</sup></u> | <u>Compound Rate of Increase</u> | <u>Comparison Group Projected Salaries 2006-2007</u> |
|----------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Professor            | \$89,347   | \$105,496  | 3.4%                             | \$109,060  |
| Associate Professor  | \$64,715   | \$74,582   | 2.9%                             | \$76,730   |
| Assistant Professor  | \$53,208   | \$62,210   | 3.2%                             | \$64,185   |
| Instructor           | \$39,249   | \$44,046   | 2.3%                             | \$45,073   |

  

| <u>Academic Rank</u>                                     | <u>California State University Actual Average Salaries 2005-2006</u> | <u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u> |                            | <u>Percentage Increase Required in CSU Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average</u> |                            |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
|  |  | <u>Actual 2005-2006</u>                  | <u>Projected 2006-2007</u> | <u>Actual 2005-2006</u>   | <u>Projected 2006-2007</u> |
| Professor  | \$86,056   | \$105,496                                | \$109,060                  | 22.6%   | 26.7%                      |
| Associate Professor                                      | \$68,162   | \$74,582                                 | \$76,730                   | 9.4%  | 12.6%                      |
| Assistant Professor                                      | \$57,071   | \$62,210                                 | \$64,185                   | 9.0%  | 12.5%                      |
| Instructor   | \$42,941   | \$44,046                                 | \$45,073                   | 2.6%  | 5.0%                       |
| Weighted by State University Staffing                    | \$71,159   | \$82,460                                 | \$85,106                   | 15.9%   | 19.6%                      |
| Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing              | \$70,220   | \$80,672                                 | \$83,221                   | 14.9%   | 18.5%                      |
| All-Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount <sup>2</sup> | \$70,924   | \$81,119                                 | \$83,693                   | 14.4%   | <b>18.0%</b>               |

  

| <u>Institutional Current-Year Staffing Pattern (Headcount Faculty)</u> | <u>Professor</u>            | <u>Associate Professor</u> | <u>Assistant Professor</u> | <u>Instructor</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
|  | California State University | 4,773                      | 2,449                      | 3,585             | 470          |
| Percent  | 42.3%                       | 21.7%                      | 31.8%                      | 4.2%              | 100%         |
| Comparison Institutions  | 5,034                       | 4,454                      | 3,843                      | 734               | 14,065       |
| Percent  | 35.8%                       | 31.7%                      | 27.3%                      | 5.2%              | 100%         |

1. Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.  
 2. "All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the State University and Comparison Institutions by 75% of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis.

# California Postsecondary Education Commission

---

**DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salaries, by Rank, 2000-01**

| Institution                | Professors   |                 |           | Associate Professors |                 |          | Assistant Professors |                 |           | Instructors |                 |          | Total Faculty |                      |           |
|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|
|                            | No.          | Average Salary  | Rank      | No.                  | Average Salary  | Rank     | No.                  | Average Salary  | Rank      | No.         | Average Salary  | Rank     | No.           | Weighted Ave. Salary | Rank      |
| Institution J <sup>1</sup> | 136          | \$109,511       | 1         | 119                  | \$81,330        | 1        | 93                   | \$62,664        | 2         | 35          | \$44,292        | 5        | <b>383</b>    | <b>\$83,420</b>      | <b>1</b>  |
| Institution Q <sup>1</sup> | 522          | 102,235         | 2         | 330                  | 71,196          | 3        | 241                  | 62,707          | 1         | 36          | 47,852          | 2        | <b>1,129</b>  | <b>82,991</b>        | <b>2</b>  |
| Institution B <sup>1</sup> | 436          | \$95,969        | 5         | 339                  | \$71,920        | 2        | 256                  | \$56,193        | 3         | 19          | \$50,854        | 1        | <b>1,050</b>  | <b>\$77,690</b>      | <b>3</b>  |
| Institution K              | 481          | 91,366          | 6         | 350                  | 66,378          | 6        | 250                  | 56,092          | 4         | 17          | 41,963          | 8        | <b>1,098</b>  | <b>74,604</b>        | <b>4</b>  |
| Institution N              | 223          | 88,770          | 8         | 186                  | 62,997          | 11       | 97                   | 53,147          | 6         | 0           |                 | 21       | <b>506</b>    | <b>72,467</b>        | <b>5</b>  |
| Institution R <sup>1</sup> | 223          | 97,800          | 4         | 265                  | 68,100          | 4        | 197                  | 50,800          | 14        | 71          | 43,400          | 7        | <b>756</b>    | <b>70,033</b>        | <b>6</b>  |
| Institution P <sup>1</sup> | 129          | 91,140          | 7         | 118                  | 66,765          | 5        | 64                   | 50,883          | 13        | 46          | 43,549          | 6        | <b>357</b>    | <b>69,734</b>        | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>CSU</b>                 | <b>6,050</b> | <b>\$80,302</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>1,885</b>         | <b>\$64,683</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>2,659</b>         | <b>\$51,932</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>490</b>  | <b>\$40,206</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>11,084</b> | <b>\$69,068</b>      | <b>8</b>  |
| Institution A              | 603          | 83,994          | 13        | 414                  | 60,831          | 14       | 277                  | 52,284          | 8         | 48          | 37,455          | 13       | <b>1,342</b>  | <b>68,639</b>        | <b>9</b>  |
| Institution S <sup>1</sup> | 268          | 85,970          | 10        | 250                  | 66,056          | 7        | 198                  | 51,685          | 11        | 32          | 45,663          | 3        | <b>748</b>    | <b>68,514</b>        | <b>10</b> |
| Institution M <sup>1</sup> | 165          | 85,544          | 11        | 130                  | 62,468          | 12       | 103                  | 50,011          | 15        | 7           | 39,107          | 10       | <b>405</b>    | <b>68,297</b>        | <b>11</b> |
| Institution G <sup>1</sup> | 154          | 81,200          | 14        | 227                  | 59,800          | 16       | 95                   | 49,800          | 16        | 0           | 0               | 18       | <b>476</b>    | <b>64,728</b>        | <b>12</b> |
| Institution I <sup>1</sup> | 120          | 86,199          | 9         | 122                  | 61,100          | 13       | 119                  | 52,307          | 7         | 25          | 37,763          | 11       | <b>386</b>    | <b>64,681</b>        | <b>13</b> |
| Institution F              | 177          | 99,609          | 3         | 282                  | 64,160          | 9        | 300                  | 53,582          | 5         | 92          | 33,260          | 17       | <b>851</b>    | <b>64,463</b>        | <b>14</b> |
| Institution C              | 70           | 84,521          | 12        | 103                  | 63,875          | 10       | 109                  | 51,667          | 12        | 2           | 45,605          | 4        | <b>284</b>    | <b>64,150</b>        | <b>15</b> |
| Institution T              | 246          | 78,062          | 16        | 268                  | 60,468          | 15       | 180                  | 51,976          | 9         | 9           | 36,876          | 14       | <b>703</b>    | <b>64,148</b>        | <b>16</b> |
| Institution O              | 211          | 77,164          | 18        | 170                  | 56,328          | 20       | 110                  | 49,430          | 17        | 5           | 34,972          | 16       | <b>496</b>    | <b>63,447</b>        | <b>17</b> |
| Institution L              | 50           | 76,630          | 19        | 27                   | 57,384          | 18       | 44                   | 48,301          | 19        | 0           | 0               | 19       | <b>121</b>    | <b>62,034</b>        | <b>18</b> |
| Institution D              | 155          | 71,577          | 20        | 184                  | 56,350          | 19       | 109                  | 45,473          | 21        | 6           | 37,490          | 12       | <b>454</b>    | <b>58,688</b>        | <b>19</b> |
| Institution H              | 252          | 68,817          | 21        | 190                  | 53,906          | 21       | 243                  | 46,246          | 20        | 0           | 0               | 20       | <b>685</b>    | <b>56,674</b>        | <b>20</b> |
| Institution E <sup>1</sup> | 121          | 77,583          | 17        | 117                  | 57,479          | 17       | 97                   | 49,003          | 18        | 109         | 35,621          | 15       | <b>444</b>    | <b>55,740</b>        | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Unweighted Totals</b>   | <b>4,742</b> | <b>\$88,307</b> |           | <b>4,191</b>         | <b>\$64,093</b> |          | <b>3,182</b>         | <b>\$52,848</b> |           | <b>559</b>  | <b>\$39,856</b> |          | <b>23,010</b> | <b>\$69,192</b>      |           |
| High-cost 10               | 2,274        | \$93,694        |           | 2,017                | \$67,361        |          | 1,463                | \$54,466        |           | 380         | \$41,804        |          | <b>6,134</b>  | <b>\$72,464</b>      |           |
| Low-cost 10                | 2,468        | 83,343          |           | 2,174                | 61,061          |          | 1,719                | 51,472          |           | 179         | 35,721          |          | <b>6,540</b>  | <b>66,256</b>        |           |
| <b>Weighted Totals</b>     | <b>4,742</b> | <b>\$89,347</b> |           | <b>4,191</b>         | <b>\$64,715</b> |          | <b>3,182</b>         | <b>\$53,208</b> |           | <b>559</b>  | <b>\$39,249</b> |          | <b>12,674</b> | <b>\$69,857</b>      |           |

1. Universities located in high-cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

**DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salaries, by Rank, 2005-06**

| Institution                | Professors   |                  |           | Associate Professors |                 |           | Assistant Professors |                 |           | Instructors |                 |           | Total Faculty |                      |           |
|----------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|
|                            | No.          | Average Salary   | Rank      | No.                  | Average Salary  | Rank      | No.                  | Average Salary  | Rank      | No.         | Average Salary  | Rank      | Total         | Weighted Ave. Salary | Rank      |
| Institution Q <sup>1</sup> | 590          | \$126,704        | 1         | 345                  | \$88,373        | 1         | 266                  | \$76,194        | 1         | 35          | \$46,942        | 5         | 1,236         | \$102,876            | 1         |
| Institution P <sup>1</sup> | 141          | 118,819          | 3         | 118                  | 83,738          | 3         | 57                   | 68,123          | 3         | 0           | 0               | 16        | 316           | 96,575               | 2         |
| Institution J <sup>1</sup> | 130          | 121,878          | 2         | 99                   | 86,276          | 2         | 89                   | 72,319          | 2         | 52          | 41,486          | 12        | 370           | 89,133               | 3         |
| Institution B <sup>1</sup> | 417          | 113,859          | 4         | 395                  | 81,700          | 4         | 315                  | 65,103          | 5         | 50          | 54,054          | 2         | 1,177         | 87,477               | 4         |
| Institution A              | 625          | 105,863          | 7         | 422                  | 70,939          | 12        | 348                  | 64,433          | 6         | 55          | 41,013          | 13        | 1,450         | 83,296               | 5         |
| Institution K              | 663          | 97,598           | 14        | 407                  | 71,891          | 11        | 335                  | 63,326          | 7         | 10          | 50,882          | 4         | 1,415         | 81,760               | 6         |
| Institution N              | 220          | 104,735          | 10        | 201                  | 74,221          | 8         | 163                  | 59,877          | 11        | 0           | 0               | 19        | 584           | 81,712               | 7         |
| Institution M <sup>1</sup> | 203          | 105,322          | 9         | 176                  | 78,093          | 6         | 151                  | 55,227          | 19        | 16          | 44,232          | 9         | 546           | 80,901               | 8         |
| Institution C              | 70           | 105,491          | 8         | 110                  | 78,876          | 5         | 119                  | 66,696          | 4         | 0           | 0               | 17        | 299           | 80,259               | 9         |
| Institution S <sup>1</sup> | 294          | 99,041           | 12        | 261                  | 75,339          | 7         | 243                  | 60,916          | 9         | 38          | 54,753          | 1         | 836           | 78,546               | 10        |
| Institution R <sup>1</sup> | 273          | 107,016          | 6         | 291                  | 74,108          | 9         | 288                  | 58,925          | 12        | 82          | 46,417          | 6         | 934           | 76,614               | 11        |
| Institution G <sup>1</sup> | 157          | 97,752           | 13        | 185                  | 72,919          | 10        | 51                   | 57,762          | 16        | 93          | 51,410          | 3         | 486           | 75,235               | 12        |
| Institution L              | 58           | 90,070           | 16        | 34                   | 67,268          | 18        | 34                   | 57,866          | 15        | 0           | 0               | 20        | 126           | 75,227               | 13        |
| Institution I <sup>1</sup> | 129          | 99,083           | 11        | 141                  | 70,082          | 13        | 124                  | 58,714          | 13        | 17          | 45,227          | 8         | 411           | 74,727               | 14        |
| Institution O              | 179          | 89,020           | 17        | 164                  | 67,520          | 16        | 187                  | 62,411          | 8         | 0           | 0               | 18        | 530           | 72,979               | 15        |
| <b>CSU</b>                 | <b>4,773</b> | <b>\$86,056</b>  | <b>20</b> | <b>2,449</b>         | <b>\$68,162</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>3,585</b>         | <b>\$57,071</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>470</b>  | <b>\$42,941</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>11,277</b> | <b>\$71,159</b>      | <b>16</b> |
| Institution F              | 177          | 110,112          | 5         | 309                  | 68,361          | 14        | 317                  | 59,928          | 10        | 117         | 39,849          | 14        | 920           | 69,862               | 17        |
| Institution T              | 218          | 86,360           | 19        | 273                  | 66,201          | 19        | 292                  | 56,166          | 18        | 8           | 46,286          | 7         | 791           | 67,851               | 18        |
| Institution D              | 150          | 86,868           | 18        | 196                  | 64,192          | 20        | 134                  | 51,368          | 21        | 13          | 44,181          | 10        | 493           | 67,078               | 19        |
| Institution H              | 235          | 76,653           | 21        | 210                  | 59,101          | 21        | 245                  | 54,485          | 20        | 0           | 0               | 21        | 690           | 63,440               | 20        |
| Institution E <sup>1</sup> | 105          | 91,088           | 15        | 117                  | 67,419          | 17        | 85                   | 58,543          | 14        | 148         | 39,324          | 15        | 455           | 62,084               | 21        |
| Unweighted Totals          | 5,034        | \$104,103        |           | 4,454                | \$73,587        |           | 3,843                | \$61,673        |           | 734         | \$44,740        |           | 14,065        | \$79,748             |           |
| High-cost 10               | 2,439        | \$111,619        |           | 2,128                | \$78,673        |           | 1,669                | \$63,756        |           | 531         | \$46,078        |           | 6,767         | \$84,311             |           |
| Low-cost 10                | 2,595        | 97,039           |           | 2,326                | 68,934          |           | 2,174                | 60,074          |           | 203         | 41,239          |           | 7,298         | 75,518               |           |
| <b>Weighted Totals</b>     | <b>5,034</b> | <b>\$105,496</b> |           | <b>4,454</b>         | <b>\$74,582</b> |           | <b>3,843</b>         | <b>\$62,210</b> |           | <b>734</b>  | <b>\$44,046</b> |           | <b>14,065</b> | <b>\$80,618</b>      |           |

1. Universities located in high-cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

**DISPLAY 6 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, and Projected Percentage UC Faculty Salary Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2006-07**

| <u>Academic Rank</u> | <u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u> |                | <u>Compound Rate of Increase</u> | <u>Comparison Group Projected Salaries, 2006-07</u> |
|----------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------------|---|
|                      | <u>2000-01</u>                           | <u>2005-06</u> |                                  |   |
| Professor            | \$110,275                                | \$134,747      | 4.1%                             | \$140,259   |
| Associate Professor  | \$74,170                                 | \$89,321       | 3.8%                             | \$92,704  |
| Assistant Professor  | \$62,038                                 | \$76,021       | 4.1%                             | \$79,176  |

| <u>Academic Rank</u>                                 | <u>University of Calif. Average Salaries, 2005-06</u> | <u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u> |                                      | <u>Percent Increase Required in UC Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average</u> |                          |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|  |   | <u>Actual 2005-06<sup>1</sup></u>        | <u>Projected 2006-07<sup>1</sup></u> | <u>Actual 2005-06</u>   | <u>Projected 2006-07</u> |
| Professor  | \$119,843   | \$134,747                                | \$140,259                            | 12.4%   | 17.0%                    |
| Associate Professor                                  | \$77,941  | \$89,321                                 | \$92,704                             | 14.6%   | 18.9%                    |
| Assistant Professor                                  | \$70,018  | \$76,021                                 | \$79,176                             | 8.6%  | 13.1%                    |
| Weighted by University of California Staffing        | \$101,508   | \$113,918                                | \$118,533                            | 12.2%   | 16.8%                    |
| Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing          | \$97,664  | \$109,504                                | \$113,933                            | 12.1%   | 16.7%                    |
| All-Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount <sup>2</sup> | \$100,547   | \$110,607                                | \$115,083                            | 10.0%   | <b>14.5%</b>             |

| <u>Institutional Budget-Year Staffing Pattern, (Full-Time-Equivalent Faculty)</u> | <u>Professor</u> | <u>Associate Professor</u> | <u>Assistant Professor</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| University of California  | 4,444.5          | 1,457.5                    | 1,496.9                    | 7,398.9      |
| Percent   | 60.1%            | 19.7%                      | 20.2%                      | 100.0%       |
| Comparison Institutions   | 4,312.7          | 1,882.1                    | 2,117.0                    | 8,311.8      |
| Percent   | 51.9%            | 22.6%                      | 25.5%                      | 100.0%       |

1. Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions. The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from six of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the other institutions.
2. All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75% of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the other's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis.



**DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries, by Rank, 2000-2001**

| 2000-01                | Type <sup>1</sup> | Professor      |                  |          | Associate Professor |                 |          | Assistant Professor |                 |          | Total Faculty  |                 |          |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
|                        |                   | No.            | Average Salary   | Rank     | No.                 | Average Salary  | Rank     | No.                 | Salary          | Rank     | No.            | Salary          | Rank     |
| Institution H          | I                 | 641            | \$130,480        | 1        | 111                 | \$79,979        | 2        | 233                 | \$70,453        | 2        | 985            | \$110,590       | 1        |
| Institution A          | I                 | 510            | 121,698          | 2        | 126                 | 87,809          | 1        | 214                 | 68,008          | 3        | 850            | 103,157         | 2        |
| Institution F          | I                 | 553            | 117,647          | 3        | 180                 | 78,750          | 3        | 169                 | 72,280          | 1        | 902            | 101,385         | 3        |
| Institution D          | I                 | 385            | 117,286          | 4        | 69                  | 71,045          | 6        | 182                 | 58,165          | 5        | 636            | 95,351          | 4        |
| <b>Univ. of Calif.</b> | <b>P</b>          | <b>3,747</b>   | <b>107,612</b>   | <b>5</b> | <b>1,206</b>        | <b>71,347</b>   | <b>5</b> | <b>970</b>          | <b>63,408</b>   | <b>4</b> | <b>5,923</b>   | <b>92,989</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| Institution B          | P                 | 453            | 101,666          | 7        | 261                 | 70,045          | 7        | 221                 | 56,902          | 7        | 934            | 82,264          | 6        |
| Institution E          | P                 | 696            | 102,151          | 6        | 350                 | 71,856          | 4        | 453                 | 57,819          | 6        | 1,499          | 81,680          | 7        |
| Institution G          | P                 | 803            | 93,936           | 9        | 458                 | 65,566          | 8        | 347                 | 56,281          | 8        | 1,608          | 77,731          | 8        |
| Institution C          | P                 | 299            | 94,020           | 8        | 205                 | 64,606          | 9        | 196                 | 54,598          | 9        | 700            | 74,368          | 9        |
| <b>Totals</b>          |                   | <b>4,339.4</b> | <b>\$110,275</b> |          | <b>1,760.1</b>      | <b>\$74,171</b> |          | <b>2,014.2</b>      | <b>\$62,038</b> |          | <b>8,113.7</b> | <b>\$91,379</b> |          |

**DISPLAY 8 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries, by Rank, 2005-2006**

| 2005-06                    | Type <sup>1</sup> | Professor      |                  |          | Associate Professor |                 |          | Assistant Professor |                 |          | Total Faculty  |                  |          |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|------------------|----------|
|                            |                   | No.            | Average Salary   | Rank     | No.                 | Average Salary  | Rank     | No.                 | Salary          | Rank     | No.            | Salary           | Rank     |
| Institution H              | I                 | 655            | \$162,976        | 1        | 136                 | \$97,752        | 3        | 221                 | \$88,266        | 1        | 1,012          | \$137,896        | 1        |
| Institution A              | I                 | 502            | 152,532          | 2        | 149                 | 106,016         | 1        | 202                 | 86,136          | 3        | 853            | 128,684          | 2        |
| Institution F <sup>2</sup> | I                 | 505            | 146,688          | 3        | 147                 | 98,870          | 2        | 175                 | 87,430          | 2        | 827            | 125,649          | 3        |
| Institution D <sup>2</sup> | I                 | 407            | 140,505          | 4        | 68                  | 86,346          | 4        | 199                 | 69,645          | 7        | 674            | 114,119          | 4        |
| <b>Univ. of Calif.</b>     | <b>P</b>          | <b>4,445</b>   | <b>119,843</b>   | <b>6</b> | <b>1,458</b>        | <b>77,941</b>   | <b>7</b> | <b>1,497</b>        | <b>70,018</b>   | <b>6</b> | <b>7,399</b>   | <b>101,509</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| Institution E              | P                 | 741            | 123,915          | 5        | 386                 | 83,579          | 5        | 413                 | 72,069          | 4        | 1,540          | 99,901           | 6        |
| Institution B              | P                 | 447            | 117,112          | 7        | 278                 | 80,734          | 6        | 222                 | 69,344          | 8        | 947            | 95,235           | 7        |
| Institution G              | P                 | 732            | 113,998          | 8        | 478                 | 77,559          | 8        | 409                 | 70,245          | 5        | 1,619          | 92,181           | 8        |
| Institution C              | P                 | 324            | 110,918          | 9        | 240                 | 76,239          | 9        | 276                 | 63,001          | 9        | 840            | 85,265           | 9        |
| <b>Total</b>               |                   | <b>4,312.7</b> | <b>\$134,747</b> |          | <b>1,882.1</b>      | <b>\$89,321</b> |          | <b>2,117.0</b>      | <b>\$76,021</b> |          | <b>8,311.8</b> | <b>\$110,893</b> |          |

1. I =Independent; P = Public.

2. Estimated data.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

## Implications

The Commission believes that any salary increase provided to faculty should take into consideration its impact on students, including the quantity and quality of faculty. However, current budget constraints suggest that faculty at both the California State University and the University of California are likely to receive minimal increases in 2006-07 commensurate with the figures estimated for their respective comparison institutions, in large part because of budget limitations that the State is facing in both the current and budgeted fiscal years. The implications of minimal or no salary increases definitely puts both the State University and the University at a disadvantage when retaining existing or recruiting new faculty who are critical to meeting the needs of students. If the differences are too large, both university systems could lose their best scholars to institutions offering more competitive salaries. Similarly, when recruiting new faculty, both systems must offer competitive packages to recent graduates, and to highly prized scholars working elsewhere, to make their offers most attractive. A reduction in the number of existing faculty, or an institution's inability to attract qualified scholars, could affect student access and undermine the quality of academic programs.

Compensation is only one factor that faculty use when considering job offers. Other factors such as cost of housing and quality of life often affect a faculty member's decision when accepting a new position in California. The Commission's parity calculations for the University and State University provide only one measure of institutional competitiveness for employing and retaining faculty.

Staff recommends that future faculty salary reports should be broadened to include other benefits such as sabbaticals, housing allowances, and bonuses in the equation. In addition, staff recommends that the current groups of comparable institutions be reexamined to ensure that they are still appropriate with regard to mission, scope, and size. Third, in order for the Commission to obtain the authority and resources necessary to conduct a comprehensive review of compensation practices, staff recommends that the Commission reaffirm the following resolution:

*In recognition of the inability of the current CPEC faculty and executive compensation reports to accurately reflect total compensation at California's public segments of higher education and at the recommendation of the Commission's Executive Director, the Commission supports all efforts to obtain the necessary authority and resources to undertake a comprehensive review of compensation policies within California higher education. The purpose of the review is to provide transparency and accountability in the compensation process.*

*The review must take into account the competitive market place for recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty and administrators. The review shall be undertaken with the consultation and cooperation of an appropriate advisory committee that should include, but not be limited to, representatives of the public segments.*



