

# HIGHER EDUCATION UPDATE

NUMBER UP/04-01  
MARCH 2004



*News from the*

## CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Howard Welinsky, *Chair*  
Olivia K. Singh, *Vice Chair*  
Alan Arkatov  
George T. Caplan  
Carol Chandler  
Irwin S. Field  
Reed Hastings  
Odessa P. Johnson  
Hugo Morales  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.  
Evonne Seron Schulze  
Rachel E. Shetka  
Faye Washington  
Dezie Woods-Jones

Robert L. Moore  
*Executive Director*

1303 J Street, Suite 500  
Sacramento, California 95814-2938  
Telephone (916) 445-7933 (Voice)  
FAX Number (916) 327-4417

---

## *Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2004-05*

---

ANNUALLY, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the California State University and the University of California submit to the California Postsecondary Education Commission information on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for a set of comparison colleges and universities located primarily outside of California.

Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries in California public universities that will enable them to attain parity with their respective comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. These final parity figures for both systems are based on final data from five of the eight University of California comparison institutions, and 19 of the 20 California State University comparison institutions. A preliminary estimate of faculty salary parity was reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst last December.

This report contains a brief description of the methodology employed to calculate the parity percentages, and the faculty salary increase trends over the past 23 years. Supplemental Budget Language adopted by the Legislature in 1998 precludes changes in the methodology prior to the 2002-03 budget cycle. Because of the lengthy lead times required to develop the Governor's Budget, if any changes in the methodology are contemplated for the 2005-06 cycle, discussions among the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee should begin no later than the of 2004.

---

### **A summary of the 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 designed and refined periodically by the Commission in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the California State University, University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, with the California Faculty Association included on the Committee as an observer. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of several compromises among interested parties, rather than the vision of any single individual or agency.

This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years, and can be found in considerable detail in several previous Commission reports. These include the June 1987 report *Faculty Salary Revisions* (CPEC 87-27), the June 1989 report *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology* (CPEC 89-22), and the 1997 faculty salary report (CPEC 97-2), which includes 1996-97 adjustments.

The methodology 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 below shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. The members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee formulated each list through extensive discussions and compromises. In the more than 38 years that the survey has been conducted, each list has changed several times, most recently in 1993-94 when three institutions in the State University comparison group were replaced. The University of California list is unchanged since 1988.

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 2004-05 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."

---

### Faculty salary trends

Display 2 on the next page shows the Commission's salary computations for each of the two public university systems, plus the actual amounts granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the salary lag between CSU and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable lag for UC and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During California's severe economic recession between 1991-92 and 1994-95, few if any 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 senior 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 percentage salary increases, with slightly larger in-

---

*DISPLAY 1 Faculty Salary Comparison Institutions for the California State University and the University of California*

#### 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

#### 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.

**DISPLAY 2 Comparison of Faculty Salary Parity Figures, with Actual Percentage Increases Provided, 1981-82 Through 2004-05**

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	2.0	3.9	0.5
2002-03	10.6	2.0	6.9	0.5
2003-04	11.6	0.8	9.2	0.0
2004-05	12.7	N/A	10.6	N/A

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission

creases accruing to faculty at the California State University. As a result of this trend, the parity figure declined significantly during that period for faculty at both university systems. However recent and anticipated budget constraints have reversed the trend once again. The University of California’s parity gap during the current year was 6.1%, while the projected lag for 2004-05 has grown to 10.6%. At the University, faculty received no cost of living increase this year, while at the State University, faculty received an average salary increase of 0.8%. However, the lag for the State University increased from a current difference 9.2% in the current year to a projected 12.7% for the 2004-05 fiscal year.

It is important to understand the meaning of these “parity” numbers. For example, when the Commission estimates a lag of 12.7% for State University faculty, it does

not mean that its faculty was actually paid that percent less than their colleagues at comparable institutions. This figure is a projection of a possible future (2004-05) increase based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that State University salaries would not increase at all in the 2003-04 fiscal year. Thus, the projected lag for 2004-05 can be quite different from the actual lag because of the actual amount of salary increase that comparison institutions pay can be greater or less than that projected. Further, the any current year salary increase provided to University or State University could lower the projected percentage, with the potential, although unlikely, of there being no lag at all.

### The parity figures for 2004-05

#### California State University

Display 3 on the next page shows the parity calculations for the California State University for the current (2003-04) and budget (2004-05) years.

The “parity figure” for the State University system for 2004-05 is 12.7% — 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 2004-05. It indicates that the all ranks average salary in the current year is about 9.2% below that currently paid by the comparison group. These calculations are based upon actual information received from 19 of the 20 State University’s comparison institutions. Comparative salaries were preliminary for one institution that was reconciling its database at the time of publication of this report.

Displays 4 and 5 on the following pages show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group for 1998-99 and 2003-04. 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 in 2003-05 on average all State University faculty placed 12<sup>th</sup> in their ranking with the comparison institution counterparts — directly at the median.

For the current year, faculty at the professor and assistant professor levels rank below the median, at the 17<sup>th</sup> place. Associate professors and instructors placed at 11<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> places respectively. The overall average for all fac-

*DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1998-99 and 2003-04; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2004-05; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2004-05*

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries 1998-99<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries 2003-04<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Compound Rate of Increase</u>	<u>Comparison Group Projected Salaries 2004-05</u>
Professor	\$82,618	\$97,255	3.3%	\$100,480
Associate Professor	\$59,770	\$69,378	3.0%	\$71,478
Assistant Professor	\$48,827	\$58,162	3.6%	\$60,233
Instructor	\$38,621	\$41,574	1.5%	\$42,192

  

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>California State University Actual Average Salaries 2003-04</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u>		<u>Percentage Increase Required in California State University Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average</u>	
		<u>Actual 2003-04</u>	<u>Projected 2004-05</u>	<u>Actual 2003-04</u>	<u>Projected 2004-05</u>
Professor	\$83,434	\$97,255	\$100,480	16.6%	20.4%
Associate Professor	\$67,380	\$69,378	\$71,478	3.0%	6.1%
Assistant Professor	\$54,572	\$58,162	\$60,233	6.6%	10.4%
Instructor	\$42,058	\$41,574	\$42,192	-1.2%	0.3%
Weighted by State University Staffing	\$69,711	\$77,568	\$80,122	11.3%	14.9%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$68,561	\$75,187	\$77,615	9.7%	13.2%
<i>All Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount<sup>2</sup></i>	\$69,424	\$75,782	\$78,242	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>12.7%</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	5,367	2,119	3,764	424	11,674
<i>Percent</i>	<i>46.0%</i>	<i>18.2%</i>	<i>32.2%</i>	<i>3.6%</i>	
Comparison Institutions	4,799	4,147	3,487	668	13,101
<i>Percent</i>	<i>36.6%</i>	<i>31.7%</i>	<i>26.6%</i>	<i>5.1%</i>	

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.

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1998-99

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 J <sup>1</sup>	134	98,282 (1)		124	72,689 (1)		92	58,338 (1)		25	43,259 (4)		375	76,351 (1)	
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	489	93,261 (2)		336	66,215 (2)		231	57,153 (2)		43	48,145 (2)		1,099	75,637 (2)	
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	478	\$90,486 (5)		335	\$66,147 (3)		234	\$51,223 (4)		11	\$43,205 (5)		1,058	\$73,604 (3)	
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	118	86,681 (6)		125	63,815 (4)		51	48,198 (8)		2	55,533 (1)		296	70,184 (4)	
Institution K	446	82,607 (7)		337	59,283 (9)		198	52,238 (3)		5	38,472 (9)		986	68,313 (5)	
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	244	92,106 (3)		260	62,335 (5)		165	47,963 (9)		63	42,690 (6)		732	67,328 (6)	
Institution N	247	79,943 (11)		191	57,668 (11)		74	47,447 (11)		0	0 --		512	66,937 (7)	
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	163	81,774 (9)		130	60,392 (7)		94	48,996 (6)		8	32,097 (16)		395	65,930 (8)	
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	276	80,857 (10)		246	61,738 (6)		206	48,273 (7)		21	44,220 (3)		749	64,589 (9)	
Institution F	204	91,452 (4)		264	60,298 (8)		282	50,564 (5)		39	39,476 (7)		789	63,845 (10)	
Institution A	614	77,285 (13)		456	57,361 (13)		267	47,336 (12)		55	30,690 (17)		1,392	63,173 (11)	
<b>CSU</b>	<b>6,382</b>	<b>\$71,586 (17)</b>		<b>1,945</b>	<b>\$57,229 (14)</b>		<b>1,966</b>	<b>\$46,355 (14)</b>		<b>343</b>	<b>\$36,197 (8)</b>		<b>10,636</b>	<b>\$63,155 (12)</b>	
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	155	82,212 (8)		228	57,510 (12)		122	44,930 (17)		2	37,861 (11)		507	61,957 (13)	
Institution C	80	78,801 (12)		104	58,931 (10)		85	47,559 (10)		0	0 --		269	61,247 (14)	
Institution T	262	70,579 (18)		303	55,048 (15)		117	47,081 (13)		6	38,019 (10)		688	59,459 (15)	
Institution L	49	71,947 (16)		27	53,301 (17)		35	44,566 (18)		0	0 --		111	58,778 (16)	
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	118	75,386 (14)		134	53,166 (18)		94	46,285 (16)		24	33,704 (15)		370	57,242 (17)	
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	114	71,985 (15)		123	53,928 (16)		107	47,036 (15)		48	37,747 (12)		392	55,317 (18)	
Institution D	156	67,617 (19)		199	53,152 (19)		102	40,614 (21)		11	35,031 (14)		468	54,815 (19)	
Institution O	207	66,945 (20)		189	49,728 (20)		159	43,204 (19)		1	35,051 (13)		556	54,246 (20)	
Institution H	263	62,716 (21)		195	49,345 (21)		239	41,160 (20)		14	30,493 (18)		711	51,168 (21)	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,817</b>	<b>\$81,407</b>		<b>4,306</b>	<b>\$59,087</b>		<b>2,954</b>	<b>\$48,427</b>		<b>378</b>	<b>\$39,166</b>		<b>12,455</b>	<b>\$64,586</b>	
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,289</b>	<b>\$87,470</b>		<b>2,041</b>	<b>\$62,476</b>		<b>1,396</b>	<b>\$50,389</b>		<b>247</b>	<b>\$41,738</b>		<b>5,973</b>	<b>\$68,372</b>	
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,528</b>	<b>75,917</b>		<b>2,265</b>	<b>56,033</b>		<b>1,558</b>	<b>46,670</b>		<b>131</b>	<b>34,315</b>		<b>6,482</b>	<b>61,098</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,817</b>	<b>\$82,618</b>		<b>4,306</b>	<b>\$59,770</b>		<b>2,954</b>	<b>\$48,827</b>		<b>378</b>	<b>\$38,621</b>		<b>12,455</b>	<b>\$65,317</b>	

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2003-04

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>	561	\$116,527 (1)		335	\$81,319 (1)		252	\$70,869 (1)		46	\$49,765 (3)		1,194	\$94,440 (1)	
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	134	103,731 (5)		114	77,111 (3)		61	59,850 (5)		0	0 --		309	85,247 (2)	
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	125	113,276 (2)		89	79,428 (2)		67	65,727 (2)		40	40,476 (10)		321	84,895 (3)	
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	393	104,107 (4)		336	76,530 (4)		289	61,132 (3)		19	57,707 (1)		1,037	82,345 (4)	
Institution K	495	94,855 (10)		329	68,689 (10)		261	60,768 (4)		10	55,066 (2)		1,095	78,505 (5)	
Institution N	218	98,060 (7)		181	69,245 (9)		142	57,062 (9)		0	0 --		541	77,658 (6)	
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	170	95,668 (9)		156	69,526 (8)		114	54,700 (15)		9	41,925 (8)		449	75,106 (7)	
Institution A	621	91,722 (12)		412	63,914 (17)		287	57,734 (7)		42	37,636 (13)		1,362	74,480 (8)	
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	286	90,700 (13)		250	70,145 (6)		222	57,837 (6)		38	47,195 (4)		796	73,002 (9)	
Institution C	70	97,434 (8)		106	71,234 (5)		115	57,191 (8)		0	0 --		291	71,987 (10)	
Institution R <sup>1,2</sup>	263	99,821 (6)		271	69,711 (7)		251	54,381 (19)		90	43,988 (6)		875	71,718 (11)	
<b>CSU</b>	<b>5,367</b>	<b>\$83,434 (17)</b>		<b>2,119</b>	<b>\$67,380 (11)</b>		<b>3,764</b>	<b>\$54,572 (17)</b>		<b>424</b>	<b>\$42,058 (7)</b>		<b>11,674</b>	<b>\$69,711 (12)</b>	
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	130	93,715 (11)		136	64,670 (14)		122	54,614 (16)		21	40,508 (9)		409	69,662 (13)	
Institution L	52	84,982 (16)		28	63,430 (18)		43	54,712 (14)		0	0 --		123	69,494 (14)	
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	168	89,234 (14)		199	65,032 (13)		46	54,540 (18)		77	46,007 (5)		490	69,355 (15)	
Institution F	183	107,363 (3)		286	66,785 (12)		290	56,621 (11)		106	38,313 (12)		865	68,473 (16)	
Institution T	251	83,398 (18)		267	64,596 (15)		264	56,642 (10)		8	37,534 (14)		790	67,638 (17)	
Institution O	183	80,467 (20)		166	60,847 (20)		148	56,417 (13)		0	0 --		497	66,752 (18)	
Institution D	153	83,387 (19)		187	61,796 (19)		127	47,719 (21)		34	38,575 (11)		501	63,245 (19)	
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	113	87,228 (15)		116	64,111 (16)		97	56,621 (12)		128	37,455 (15)		454	60,749 (20)	
Institution H	230	73,684 (21)		183	57,909 (21)		289	50,618 (20)		0	0 --		702	60,076 (21)	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,799</b>	<b>\$96,139</b>		<b>4,147</b>	<b>\$68,641</b>		<b>3,487</b>	<b>\$57,598</b>		<b>668</b>	<b>\$42,105</b>		<b>13,101</b>	<b>\$74,422</b>	
<b>High cost 10</b>	<b>2,343</b>	<b>\$102,361</b>		<b>2,002</b>	<b>\$72,559</b>		<b>1,521</b>	<b>\$59,809</b>		<b>468</b>	<b>\$43,423</b>		<b>6,334</b>	<b>\$78,369</b>	
<b>Low cost 10</b>	<b>2,456</b>	<b>90,204</b>		<b>2,145</b>	<b>64,985</b>		<b>1,966</b>	<b>55,887</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>39,022</b>		<b>6,767</b>	<b>70,727</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,799</b>	<b>\$97,255</b>		<b>4,147</b>	<b>\$69,378</b>		<b>3,487</b>	<b>\$58,162</b>		<b>668</b>	<b>\$41,574</b>		<b>13,101</b>	<b>\$75,159</b>	

1. Universities located in higher cost areas.

2. Preliminary data

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

ulty is at the median is because the State University has 46.0% of its faculty at the full professor rank, while the comparison institutions, as a group, have only 36.6% of their faculty at that rank.

### *University of California*

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

Display 6 on the next page shows the parity calculations for UC for both the current and budget years. For the University system, the methodology indicates a "parity figure" of 10.6%, which is the percentage amount by which UC faculty will lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2004-05. The display also shows that University average salaries lag the comparison group by 6.1% in the 2003-04 fiscal year.

Display 7 presents 1998-99 and 2003-04 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that the University has slightly improved the relative strength of its median position over the five-year period. Five years ago, \$9,000 separated University salaries from the institution just below it; today the University's average is about \$3,400 higher than that institution. 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.

The Universities rank-by-rank position relative to its comparison institutions is more consistent than it is with the State University. For example, where in the current year the University's all-ranks average is at the median – fifth of nine listed, including the University of California – of the comparison institutions listed, it is sixth for full professors, sixth for associate professors, and sixth for assistant professors. The consistency of the University's position occurs because the distribution of faculty at each professorial rank in that system is slightly different to the distribu-

tion of faculty at its eight comparison institutions.

### *Issues of competitiveness*

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 or no salary increases in 2004-05 commensurate with the estimated lag of their respective comparison institutions, in large part because of the significant budget shortfall the State is facing during both the current and budgeted fiscal years. The implications of no or minimal salary increases might put 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 lag is too disparate, 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.

The current national recession may temper the negative effects of small or no salary increases on the University and State University in the short term, in that many public colleges and universities throughout the nation are also facing limited salary increases, in large part because of major budget shortfalls in other states. However, once the national economy improves, the State must consider what levels of compensation are best for recruiting and retaining faculty. Likewise, policy makers should recognize that compensation is only one factor that faculty use when considering job offers. Other externalities such as cost of housing, quality of life, and climate 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 such faculty.

**DISPLAY 6** *University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1998-99 and 2003-04; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2004-05; and Projected Percentage UC Faculty Salary Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2004-05*

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u>		<u>Compound Rate of Increase</u>	<u>Comparison Group Projected Salaries, 2004-05</u>	
	<u>1998-99<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>2003-04<sup>1</sup></u>			
Professor	\$100,650	\$123,829	4.2%	\$129,069	
Associate Professor	\$67,635	\$82,782	4.1%	\$86,197	
Assistant Professor	\$55,856	\$69,024	4.3%	\$72,009	

  

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>University of Calif. Average Salaries, 2003-04</u>	<u>Comparison Group Average Salaries</u>		<u>Percent Increase Required in University Ave. Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average</u>	
		<u>Actual 2003-04</u>	<u>Projected 2004-05</u>	<u>Actual 2003-04</u>	<u>Projected 2004-05</u>
		Professor	\$113,563	\$123,829	\$129,069
Associate Professor	\$74,101	\$82,782	\$86,197	11.7%	16.3%
Assistant Professor	\$65,805	\$69,024	\$72,009	4.9%	9.4%
Weighted by University of California Staffing	\$96,985	\$105,639	\$110,104	8.9%	13.5%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$92,306	\$100,366	\$104,611	8.7%	13.3%
<b>All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$95,815</b>	<b>\$101,684</b>	<b>\$105,984</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>10.6%</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	4,092.9	1,302.0	1,220.5
<i>Percent</i>	<i>61.9%</i>	<i>19.7%</i>	<i>18.5%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Comparison Institutions	4,334.9	1,842.4	2,211.4	8,388.7
<i>Percent</i>	<i>51.7%</i>	<i>22.0%</i>	<i>26.4%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

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 seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eighth institution.
2. All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75 percent of their own staffing pattern and 25 percent of the other's staffing pattern.

Source: CPEC staff analysis



DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 1998-99 and 2003-04

<u>1998-99</u>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	615	\$117,890	1	115	\$68,778	3	202	\$63,041	1	932	\$99,942	1
Institution A	I	501	112,690	2	139	78,360	1	178	62,384	3	818	95,910	2
Institution F	I	543	107,663	3	170	73,514	2	185	63,009	2	898	91,999	3
Institution D	I	365	107,186	4	88	64,758	6	182	52,238	6	635	85,557	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>3,473</b>	<b>99,027</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,192</b>	<b>66,698</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>58,111</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5,695</b>	<b>84,860</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution E	P	688	93,230	6	364	67,794	4	387	52,565	5	1,439	75,860	6
Institution B	P	429	92,117	7	267	63,901	7	217	51,350	7	914	74,168	7
Institution G	P	827	85,665	9	488	60,357	8	361	51,284	8	1,675	70,897	8
Institution C	P	302	86,834	8	215	59,826	9	183	49,643	9	700	68,814	9
<b>Totals</b>		<b>4,270.3</b>	<b>\$100,650</b>		<b>1,846.1</b>	<b>\$67,635</b>		<b>1,895.1</b>	<b>\$55,856</b>		<b>8,011.4</b>	<b>\$83,357</b>	

  

<u>2003-04</u>	Type <sup>1</sup>	<u>Professor</u>			<u>Associate Professor</u>			<u>Assistant Professor</u>			<u>Total Faculty</u>		
		Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank	Number	Salary	Rank
Institution H <sup>2</sup>	I	607	\$152,627	1	109	\$93,078	2	240	\$82,602	1	956	\$128,258	1
Institution F	I	505	134,679	3	147	90,776	3	175	80,273	2	827	115,362	2
Institution A	I	515	132,187	4	135	94,315	1	209	69,127	3	859	110,893	3
Institution D <sup>2</sup>	I	407	135,122	2	68	83,037	4	199	66,977	4	674	109,747	4
<b>Univ. of Calif.</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>4,093</b>	<b>113,563</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,302</b>	<b>74,101</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1,221</b>	<b>65,805</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6,615</b>	<b>96,985</b>	<b>5</b>
Institution E	P	757	116,395	5	400	81,142	5	453	66,422	5	1,610	93,576	6
Institution B <sup>2</sup>	P	470	104,740	8	263	71,590	8	229	59,605	9	961	84,933	7
Institution G	P	782	105,157	7	476	71,666	7	472	63,429	7	1,730	84,560	8
Institution C	P	292	100,396	9	244	71,417	9	235	59,680	8	771	78,815	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,334.9</b>	<b>\$123,829</b>		<b>1,842.4</b>	<b>\$82,782</b>		<b>2,211.4</b>	<b>\$69,024</b>		<b>8,388.7</b>	<b>\$101,700</b>	

1. I =Independent; P = Public.

2. Estimated data

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

