

# Issues in Faculty Salaries and Higher Education Financing

By John W. Curtis

*The article provides an overview of several systematic factors contributing to the variation in faculty salaries. Institutional type is the most significant factor in determining faculty salaries overall; faculty members are also compared according to academic rank. Two other important factors are gender and region, and several individual factors are also identified. The article also discusses several policy issues related to the decline in state funding for higher education.*

Faculty salaries, like much of American higher education, vary widely based on several factors. The most significant sources of variation are institutional type, including both the level of degree offered and institutional affiliation, and academic rank. Two other important factors affecting salaries are gender and regional location. Finally, a number of factors affecting the salaries of individual faculty members are specific to each situation, even though commonalities can be observed across the spectrum. These individual factors include the faculty member's discipline, record of publications and scholarship, the presence of collective bargaining, and race or ethnicity. This article provides an overview of the most salient differences in faculty salaries, as identified above, and points to trends which should be of particular interest to policymakers. In addition, it situates the consideration of faculty salaries within the context of broader issues in public higher education.

The source of primary data presented here is the annual Faculty Compensation Survey conducted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The AAUP survey includes accredited institutions at all levels, both public and private. AAUP has collected and published faculty salary data in its "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession" for nearly six decades. Table B reports average faculty salary at four-year institutions for academic year 2004–05 by state, level and control of

institution, and academic rank. (The AAUP collects data from associate degree colleges as well, but the survey response for 2004–05 did not provide sufficient cases for an accurate breakdown by state.)

In comparing faculty salaries between states, the most important factor—and perhaps the most significant source of variation in faculty salaries overall—is institutional type. Institutional type can be divided into two components: the level of institution, categorized in the AAUP survey by highest degree; and the control of the institution, generally distinguishing between public and private. Table A shows the variation in national average faculty salary by these two components of institutional type.

Approximately 70 percent of full-time faculty members in the United States are employed at public institutions. However, as Table A indicates, faculty salaries at private-independent four-year institutions are 9 to 29 percent higher than those at public institutions. (Private-independent associate degree institutions, by contrast, are few in number and tend to compensate their faculty at lower levels.) Table A distinguishes between two categories of institutions that are often lumped together as "private"—those that are independent and those that are affiliated with a religious denomination. Faculty salaries at institutions in the latter category are generally lower, although the average for church-related doctoral institutions is pushed up by a relatively small group of large research universities

**Table A**  
**Average Full-Time Faculty Salary 2004–05, by Institutional Category and Control**

	Public		Private-Independent		Church-Related	
	Average salary 2004–05	Percent increase over 2003–04	Average salary 2004–05	Percent increase over 2003–04	Average salary 2004–05	Percent increase over 2003–04
Doctoral	73,960	3.0%	95,299	3.7%	79,041	2.3%
Master's	59,874	2.1	65,073	2.9	59,800	2.1
Baccalaureate	55,376	3.2	65,520	3.6	51,931	2.9
Associate	51,573	1.2	50,029	n.d.	35,097	n.d.

Source: American Association of University Professors, Faculty Compensation Survey.

Notes: Includes all full-time primarily instructional faculty, with or without academic rank. Figures are weighted average (mean) salaries; salaries of faculty members on 12-month contracts have been adjusted to an academic year (9-month) equivalent.

n.d. = no data. There were too few responding institutions for meaningful analysis.

## HIGHER EDUCATION

that pay higher salaries. By contrast, the average salaries for private baccalaureate colleges in some states are depressed by combining private-independent and church-related colleges into one category (Table B). This occurs since the proportion of church-related colleges is much larger in some states and most church-related colleges are in the baccalaureate category.

Tables A and B give an indication for the most current year of the issue of primary interest to state policymakers: the divergence of faculty salaries between public and private sectors. At the national level, and in most states, faculty at public institutions receive lower salaries on average than do faculty at comparable private institutions. But this situation is not static. The AAUP annual report has followed the trend of public/private differentials for many years. As Ronald G. Ehrenberg summarized in a recent AAUP report:

Several researchers have used AAUP data to document the decrease in the average salary of faculty members at public academic institutions relative to that of their peers at private institutions that took place between 1978–79 and 2001–02. Most of the decline occurred before the mid-1990s; the relative salaries of faculty in the public and private sectors remained roughly constant between 1996–97 and 2001–02. ... [H]owever, average salaries in public institutions of higher education dropped this past year relative to those in private institutions.<sup>1</sup>

The public/private salary gap continued to widen in 2004–05, as Table A indicates. The table shows the increase in average salary levels by institutional type from 2003–04. Overall, faculty salary levels at public institutions increased below the rate of inflation (measured at 3.3 percent from December 2003 to December 2004), while salary levels at private-independent institutions rose at higher rates. Although these differences for a single year are small, the cumulative effect over time is stark: During the 1970–71 academic year, the average full professor at a private-independent doctoral university earned 10 percent more than his or her counterpart at a public doctoral university; by 2004–05, that gap was 30 percent.

Although average faculty salary alone is not a sufficient indicator of institutional quality, it seems self-evident to observe that, given substantial and widening differences in pay over time, public colleges and universities will have difficulty attracting and keeping the most productive and innovative scholars and teachers. This becomes a public policy issue if we wish to make high-quality higher education accessible to large segments of the public, and

not only to those who can pay the cost of, and gain admission to, private universities and colleges.

For the comparison of average faculty salaries between states, Table B also shows the important distinction between senior faculty members (holding the rank of professor) and entry-level faculty (assistant professors). Differences between states in average salary at either rank could indicate a disadvantage in attracting highly-qualified faculty, whether they are established scholars who bring immediate prestige and assume leadership of both scholarly projects and collegiate governance structures, or entry-level faculty who represent the potential for developing research and teaching.

A number of researchers have investigated the continuing salary differences between male and female faculty, which cut across institutional type and academic rank. The AAUP has collected institution-level data on average salaries by gender since the mid-1970s. An analysis of those data indicates a remarkably persistent salary disadvantage for female faculty over more than a quarter century. When faculty members of the same rank are compared, average salaries for women are 7 to 12 percent lower than those of men. The greatest differences are at the rank of full professor. There are some variations in this comparison by institutional type, as average salaries are more equal in baccalaureate and associate colleges, and are generally more equal at public colleges and universities. However, it is also the case that female faculty are more likely to hold positions that have lower salaries on average: they are more likely than men to be at public community colleges; they are less likely to achieve the rank of professor; and they are less likely to have tenure. (Women are also more likely than men to hold part-time faculty positions, but the AAUP survey includes salary data only for full-time faculty.) As a result, when the weighted average salaries of all full-time female faculty members are compared with all full-time men, women receive only about 80 percent of the salary of men. The AAUP data indicate that this has been the case since the late 1970s, with surprisingly little change in the overall figure.

The AAUP data allow only for comparisons of institutional averages. Other investigators have utilized individual-level data to attempt to determine whether gender differences in salary can be attributed to differences in the distribution of female faculty according to other professional characteristics. A recent analysis of 1998 data by the U.S. Department of Education considered some 13 factors that might contribute to the salary difference between male

and female faculty.<sup>2</sup> It concluded that, even when all those factors are controlled in the analysis, men still earn 9.4 percent more on average than women. Toutkoushian and Conley, in a recent comprehensive review and extension of various analytical models developed during the 1990s, found that progress appeared to have been made in narrowing the “unexplained” salary gap between male and female faculty but that the gap remains at between 4 and 6 percent.

As they point out, “[t]hese unexplained wage gaps are not only statistically significant, but are large in a practical sense especially when compounded over a woman’s career. These inequities persist across most institution types and fields, and thus we should not lose focus on the fact that more improvement in the situation for women is needed.”<sup>3</sup> What many statistical analyses fail to investigate, however, are the reasons that women continue to be overrepresented in the situations that result in lower average salary, as noted above. That, too, is a critical policy issue that remains to be addressed if women are to participate fully in the academic profession.

Faculty salaries also vary by geographic region. The AAUP data, divided into nine regions, indicate that the highest overall average faculty salaries are found in New England,<sup>4</sup> a region dominated by private higher education institutions, and the Pacific,<sup>5</sup> heavily influenced by relatively high salaries in California. An analysis of regional salary trends over time indicates that the regional differences have also been widening. Growth in average salaries over the last 25 years has been most rapid in New England and in the South Atlantic,<sup>6</sup> with salaries in the latter region falling generally into the middle range nationally. Salary growth in the Middle Atlantic region<sup>7</sup> has also generally kept pace, while faculty salaries in the East North Central<sup>8</sup> and, especially, East South Central<sup>9</sup> regions have fallen further behind. The latter two regions are characterized by more public institutions, especially at the doctoral level, reflecting the public/private salary disparities discussed above.

In addition to the broad differences in faculty salaries by categories previously discussed, salaries for individual faculty members also vary according to a number of specific aspects of the individual situation. In recent years, salary differences between faculty members in different disciplines have emerged as a recurring topic for discussion, with the influence of “the market” often cited as the force driving widening disparities even within the same institution. Faculty in fields such as business, engineering or computer technologies, whose skills have been in demand in the private sector, have frequently been able to secure

higher salaries than their colleagues in the humanities and social sciences. Analyses such as the two individual-level studies cited previously have also concluded that faculty members with a more substantial record of publications and scholarship earn higher salaries, even when other factors are taken into account. This likely reflects the continuing premium accorded to research among the several roles of faculty, an emphasis that appears to apply to faculty even in predominantly teaching institutions. Finally, the existence of systematic differences in faculty salary by race or ethnicity is a controversial topic, on which there is not conclusive evidence. The U.S. Department of Education analysis referenced above concluded that “... some racial/ethnic differences (in salary) existed in 1998. Compared with White faculty, Asian/Pacific Islander faculty had higher average salaries, were more likely to hold advanced degrees, and had greater representation at public doctoral, research, and medical institutions. Black faculty had lower average salaries and were less likely to have advanced degrees or attain tenure or full professorship than White faculty.”<sup>10</sup> However, the analysis concluded that when all factors were considered simultaneously, racial or ethnic category did not represent a statistically significant source of differences in faculty salaries.

In recent years, the issue of faculty compensation has increasingly been linked to other trends in higher education financing. Although space does not allow for a full consideration of these issues here, it is important to include them in order to place faculty salaries in their proper context.

The fundamental challenge facing higher education in the last few years has been a withdrawal of public funding. This has happened both directly and indirectly, and at state and federal levels. Direct funding of public higher education institutions from state sources has not kept pace with rising overall costs, so that states are now providing a smaller percentage of institutional revenues than ever before. According to figures compiled by the U.S. Department of Education, in Fiscal Year 2003 state and local governments supplied 37 percent of total revenues for public higher education institutions, down from 49 percent only 20 years before.<sup>11</sup> And this figure is much lower at large research universities, where the proportion of state support now frequently falls below 20 percent.

Faced with a decline in state revenues, public institutions have raised tuition at an accelerated pace. Some observers have portrayed this as a shift to a “high tuition/high aid” model, in which rising tuition prices would be met with increased levels of financial aid so that students with financial need

## HIGHER EDUCATION

would not be denied access to college. It does not appear that student financial aid has kept pace with increased tuition prices, however. The largest federal source of student financial aid is the Pell Grant program. The maximum Pell award has remained flat for several years, so that needy students must find additional sources for more of their tuition bills. At the same time, many states and institutions have shifted funding for student aid programs from need-based to merit-based awards. As Donald E. Heller notes, merit-based awards increased from 9 percent of state grants awarded without consideration of need in 1981 to nearly 25 percent of those awards in 2001. And at the same time, non-need-based aid increased to 44 percent of all grant aid.<sup>12</sup> Thus, rising tuition prices threaten the ability of low-income students to afford higher education, because need-based financial aid has not kept pace with tuition increases.

Nor have tuition revenues fueled higher faculty salaries. As reported in the AAUP's 2004–05 "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession," average faculty salaries have not kept pace with increasing tuition rates over the last 25 years. The report compared faculty salary data from the AAUP annual survey with figures on tuition from the College Board's annual report *Trends in College Pricing*. It concluded:

The bottom line is that although faculty and staff salary increases obviously contribute to increases in tuition, other factors have played more important roles during the last quarter century. These factors include the escalating costs of benefits for all employees, reductions in state support of public institutions, growing institutional financial-aid costs, expansion of the science and research infrastructure at research universities, and the increasing costs of information technology. If tuition and fee increases had been held to the rate of average faculty salary increases during this period, average tuition and fees would be substantially lower today in both the public and private sectors.<sup>13</sup>

Viewed in this broader context, rising tuition rates are a consequence of the trend also producing increased disparities in faculty salaries between public and private institutions: a withdrawal of public funding. This article has provided an overview of the key factors differentiating faculty salaries. It has also identified critical issues facing state government policymakers with regard to their public higher education sectors: the long-term decline in faculty salaries at public institutions, relative to those at private institutions; disadvantages for female faculty; and the con-

sequences of a withdrawal of state funding for both quality and accessibility at public colleges and universities. States look to their higher education institutions to provide high-quality education in a range of rapidly changing fields of endeavor, as centers of innovation in science and technology, and as sources of solutions to pressing social needs. As enrollments continue to grow and the need for expanded access to high-quality higher education becomes increasingly apparent, state policymakers must identify sufficient

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Ronald G. Ehrenberg, "Unequal Progress: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession," *Academe* 89, no. 2 (March–April 2003): 26.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education 2002*. (NCES 2002-025) Washington, D.C.: 103.

<sup>3</sup> Robert K. Toutkoushian and Valerie Martin Conley. "Progress for Women in Academe, Yet Inequities Persist: Evidence from NSOPF:99." *Research in Higher Education* 46, no. 1 (February 2005): 1–28.

<sup>4</sup> New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island.

<sup>5</sup> Pacific: Alaska, California, Guam, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington.

<sup>6</sup> South Atlantic: Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia.

<sup>7</sup> Middle Atlantic: New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania.

<sup>8</sup> East North Central: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin.

<sup>9</sup> East South Central: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee.

<sup>10</sup> *Condition of Education 2002*, 103.

<sup>11</sup> Figure for FY 2003 from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2003; Graduation Rates 1997 & 2000 Cohorts; and Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2003* (NCES 2005-177) Washington, D.C.: 9–10. Figure for FY 1981 from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics 2003*. (Available online at [http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03\\_tf.asp](http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03_tf.asp)) Table 334.

<sup>12</sup> Donald E. Heller, "The Changing Nature of Financial Aid," *Academe* 90, no. 4 (July–August 2004): 36–38.

<sup>13</sup> Ronald G. Ehrenberg, "Don't Blame Faculty for High Tuition: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession," *Academe* 90, no. 2 (March–April 2004): 30.

---

## About the Author

John W. Curtis is director of research at the American Association of University Professors in Washington, D.C. He holds a Ph.D. in sociology from Johns Hopkins University, and has worked at colleges and universities in the United States, Germany, and Kenya. Opinions expressed in this article are those of the author, and not of the AAUP.

**Table B**  
**AVERAGE FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARY IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS 2004–05,**  
**BY STATE, INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, INSTITUTION CATEGORY, AND ACADEMIC RANK**

State or other jurisdiction	Public											
	Doctoral				Master's				Baccalaureate			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All
United States .....	97,837	68,533	58,249	73,960	76,533	60,839	51,218	59,874	71,048	57,980	48,138	55,376
Alabama .....	90,461	64,794	54,557	69,056	67,574	54,584	46,704	52,416	...	...	...	...
Alaska .....	76,776	59,934	50,061	58,053	74,457	58,576	50,363	56,968	...	...	...	...
Arizona .....	95,195	65,480	57,880	73,606	88,825	70,815	54,836	63,758	...	...	...	...
Arkansas .....	84,505	63,032	54,560	66,496	68,204	58,369	48,086	52,363	62,457	53,027	43,815	47,886
California .....	112,059	73,523	62,935	90,062	83,472	67,257	55,642	69,644	87,401	75,606	67,618	68,110
Colorado .....	91,897	67,904	58,698	73,530	80,100	61,223	54,371	59,033	64,424	53,913	45,375	49,991
Connecticut .....	110,922	78,961	63,824	85,960	81,803	63,751	52,590	66,757	...	...	...	...
Delaware .....	109,631	76,053	61,455	81,793	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Florida .....	90,769	65,251	56,883	68,029	77,630	60,851	52,333	57,910	75,601	59,265	45,854	58,436
Georgia .....	102,859	69,438	60,940	76,728	69,721	55,796	47,259	53,027	67,640	56,508	45,404	50,563
Hawaii .....	90,455	67,971	58,113	72,535	...	...	...	...	68,805	58,190	49,962	56,776
Idaho .....	71,840	57,563	48,614	58,709	66,696	54,741	46,716	50,859	55,370	45,631	38,959	47,402
Illinois .....	98,003	67,794	58,910	73,695	75,359	60,677	50,156	56,806	...	...	...	...
Indiana .....	95,022	67,289	56,523	72,101	77,416	61,762	51,267	57,466	70,535	57,889	45,864	52,414
Iowa .....	98,146	69,847	60,504	76,887	80,693	62,387	52,927	62,920	...	...	...	...
Kansas .....	86,187	63,896	54,083	67,101	70,056	55,685	46,639	53,770	...	...	...	...
Kentucky .....	89,189	64,866	54,800	70,277	71,878	57,235	49,650	53,808	...	...	...	...
Louisiana .....	86,936	64,593	54,924	63,328	64,390	53,689	45,726	49,272	65,410	51,893	43,789	46,071
Maine .....	74,152	63,021	47,836	60,938	78,683	60,616	48,300	61,133	58,454	47,585	39,922	48,330
Maryland .....	110,694	75,847	67,873	83,719	79,930	63,562	52,759	59,516	98,374	75,064	60,611	80,004
Massachusetts .....	101,957	81,453	63,704	82,192	79,257	63,308	53,159	65,470	65,186	54,955	43,662	56,524
Michigan .....	103,114	72,680	59,823	76,500	76,722	61,197	51,998	59,670	...	...	...	...
Minnesota .....	105,362	70,676	62,525	85,788	75,748	59,678	51,089	61,091	72,678	57,603	47,968	58,057
Mississippi .....	78,893	61,983	52,513	59,773	...	...	...	...	55,683	50,323	44,055	45,814
Missouri .....	93,490	65,645	54,450	70,402	65,971	53,388	45,692	52,539	65,972	51,410	44,481	50,819
Montana .....	69,205	54,597	47,555	55,195	59,061	48,120	46,481	47,184	57,350	47,648	44,113	48,167
Nebraska .....	93,929	68,119	57,572	75,112	69,897	58,121	49,620	56,541	60,443	45,119	41,380	49,866
Nevada .....	100,556	74,330	59,811	75,537	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
New Hampshire .....	95,416	71,581	60,197	78,606	73,318	59,734	49,364	60,891	...	...	...	...
New Jersey .....	114,614	81,028	65,377	88,309	95,798	74,726	59,834	76,211	94,016	72,749	54,025	72,394
New Mexico .....	82,184	61,476	53,677	65,123	59,029	49,926	44,487	47,992	...	...	...	...
New York .....	104,580	75,241	62,299	81,424	85,045	66,094	54,486	66,432	84,869	64,901	53,709	65,062
North Carolina .....	100,875	71,113	61,418	75,450	79,500	62,632	54,984	60,695	70,075	56,878	52,034	56,570
North Dakota .....	70,685	57,237	50,967	54,798	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Ohio .....	94,253	66,750	54,911	70,114	78,921	63,032	52,792	65,920	70,636	58,064	47,089	55,065
Oklahoma .....	84,676	61,934	52,681	64,062	63,912	54,635	47,235	51,249	49,054	42,820	36,798	42,537
Oregon .....	80,046	60,588	52,646	60,472	58,540	47,809	39,987	47,551	55,426	47,731	40,643	45,975
Pennsylvania .....	108,149	74,833	62,108	76,842	86,113	69,478	55,959	66,937	76,635	63,187	53,831	56,009
Rhode Island .....	85,412	62,313	55,308	73,697	64,907	54,910	48,228	57,413	...	...	...	...
South Carolina .....	91,356	66,366	59,663	71,419	68,472	58,282	46,895	55,696	63,316	54,642	46,115	50,991
South Dakota .....	72,964	56,787	47,106	54,625	69,213	56,512	49,827	55,754	61,270	55,604	45,323	49,454
Tennessee .....	89,064	66,573	56,142	67,424	69,428	56,044	46,792	55,623	...	...	...	...
Texas .....	99,347	67,475	59,661	72,906	74,088	59,744	51,597	56,717	72,173	58,524	50,268	53,552
Utah .....	86,934	61,841	55,597	64,868	63,481	50,928	44,587	50,832	...	...	...	...
Vermont .....	86,858	65,314	55,259	63,295	...	...	...	...	54,456	44,648	36,577	48,150
Virginia .....	103,621	71,034	58,694	76,515	70,393	59,694	49,480	57,494	78,404	61,015	48,170	59,860
Washington .....	93,656	66,952	61,462	73,151	66,757	54,580	46,908	53,619	...	...	...	...
West Virginia .....	76,302	59,762	49,140	61,029	63,200	51,787	42,603	53,145	58,182	50,356	41,666	46,048
Wisconsin .....	94,736	68,936	60,471	77,619	67,139	55,193	47,697	56,549	...	...	...	...
Wyoming .....	82,531	62,381	58,932	65,047	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District of Columbia .....	...	...	...	...	72,207	57,075	45,773	61,779	...	...	...	...
Guam .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	70,952	56,727	45,138	54,304
Puerto Rico .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	56,447	47,262	37,272	46,735

See footnotes at end of table.

# HIGHER EDUCATION

## AVERAGE FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARY IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS 2004–05, BY STATE, INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, INSTITUTION CATEGORY, AND ACADEMIC RANK— Continued

State or other jurisdiction	Private											
	Doctoral				Master's				Baccalaureate			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All
United States .....	123,016	79,637	68,006	91,280	81,187	62,827	51,747	62,658	75,112	57,259	47,678	58,618
Alabama .....	...	...	...	...	71,187	55,616	49,309	56,713	68,837	55,748	43,551	56,501
Alaska .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Arizona .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	67,018	63,861	48,937	56,470
Arkansas .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	59,338	49,345	41,072	49,239
California .....	128,091	85,038	73,818	100,265	92,692	69,852	58,206	72,544	94,518	68,330	55,913	75,269
Colorado .....	92,393	68,820	57,218	69,686	33,373	29,647	26,572	29,581	94,645	65,858	53,147	72,369
Connecticut .....	145,550	82,142	69,402	106,577	93,452	68,854	57,042	71,384	94,288	69,818	55,054	72,590
Delaware .....	...	...	...	...	60,557	58,100	52,953	55,437	60,968	51,914	42,463	51,478
Florida .....	103,029	68,335	62,706	73,229	79,339	59,998	50,042	61,065	66,054	55,429	48,528	54,008
Georgia .....	131,898	84,309	74,471	101,351	80,643	60,147	50,628	60,564	65,173	53,772	43,496	51,663
Hawaii .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	70,176	56,385	47,703	54,526
Idaho .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	53,261	45,045	38,910	43,592
Illinois .....	130,095	81,095	67,366	94,189	69,508	59,358	47,942	57,488	66,397	54,627	45,290	53,897
Indiana .....	118,670	78,750	67,677	94,675	76,488	57,976	48,661	57,537	67,063	52,726	46,901	54,987
Iowa .....	...	...	...	...	82,985	60,077	49,607	62,239	63,231	52,156	44,445	52,193
Kansas .....	...	...	...	...	55,178	50,772	47,407	48,919	47,585	40,367	35,262	39,832
Kentucky .....	...	...	...	...	68,861	56,956	46,305	57,082	59,366	49,463	42,091	49,551
Louisiana .....	102,827	73,450	61,263	74,245	92,514	64,385	52,058	66,787	56,717	48,254	40,678	48,472
Maine .....	...	...	...	...	68,727	58,443	47,253	53,178	97,772	70,553	56,753	76,478
Maryland .....	115,540	79,520	65,025	85,016	81,532	64,241	52,855	62,403	71,469	57,537	48,825	58,816
Massachusetts .....	136,455	84,593	74,677	102,785	94,683	71,437	60,062	71,572	98,136	68,771	56,052	76,001
Michigan .....	...	...	...	...	74,636	59,136	49,176	57,912	66,524	54,440	45,801	55,680
Minnesota .....	80,055	67,136	56,746	66,535	64,859	53,029	45,275	51,824	75,974	57,346	49,319	59,520
Mississippi .....	...	...	...	...	63,453	52,390	44,260	49,946	73,155	54,347	46,783	54,480
Missouri .....	115,501	72,942	62,249	85,078	68,951	55,162	47,704	55,737	57,090	50,388	42,956	47,438
Montana .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	53,568	42,210	37,795	45,886
Nebraska .....	...	...	...	...	80,522	60,348	48,893	58,033	59,473	48,207	42,307	47,684
Nevada .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
New Hampshire .....	124,496	86,010	68,957	99,513	79,856	63,571	47,647	65,055	67,610	55,825	45,707	54,700
New Jersey .....	138,953	78,217	66,809	101,355	83,909	70,763	54,443	66,526	68,728	57,531	48,283	58,291
New Mexico .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	64,717	52,309	45,925	58,091
New York .....	121,874	81,231	68,034	90,119	84,946	65,806	54,764	65,582	87,414	64,878	51,980	66,654
North Carolina .....	131,246	89,481	75,460	106,709	79,836	63,189	47,921	62,129	62,368	49,383	42,894	49,640
North Dakota .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	48,848	43,000	40,233	42,351
Ohio .....	109,616	79,079	68,518	86,252	76,967	57,478	49,905	58,303	70,671	56,642	46,664	56,827
Oklahoma .....	...	...	...	...	77,956	56,814	47,777	58,152	...	...	...	37,292
Oregon .....	...	...	...	...	76,542	58,194	49,082	59,075	79,353	56,758	48,158	61,965
Pennsylvania .....	124,658	85,105	77,824	97,253	86,435	66,405	53,082	64,167	78,695	60,515	49,212	59,435
Rhode Island .....	123,090	78,370	69,725	99,013	77,639	60,112	51,054	56,968	97,816	75,920	65,304	82,229
South Carolina .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	69,360	52,286	44,523	54,064
South Dakota .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	56,364	49,080	42,544	46,488
Tennessee .....	123,905	79,043	65,009	90,957	63,865	54,692	46,069	53,757	60,982	48,947	43,592	49,817
Texas .....	104,504	72,236	65,410	76,063	74,963	57,175	47,829	58,859	59,042	51,670	42,695	49,215
Utah .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	66,842	58,699	50,544	56,803
Vermont .....	...	...	...	...	69,280	55,999	44,893	58,710	94,521	64,751	55,305	70,132
Virginia .....	64,555	56,567	50,222	55,904	60,975	49,964	43,652	50,123	77,526	60,448	49,305	61,290
Washington .....	...	...	...	...	74,245	61,935	50,471	59,555	68,246	54,107	47,095	56,046
West Virginia .....	...	...	...	...	65,130	52,367	44,742	49,566	52,314	46,239	35,802	43,480
Wisconsin .....	94,143	69,729	59,696	69,431	62,146	49,907	42,741	46,903	64,112	53,490	44,950	52,566
Wyoming .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
District of Columbia .....	108,647	75,502	60,989	80,990	102,981	75,922	58,134	82,482	63,736	51,776	43,573	51,082
Guam .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Puerto Rico .....	...	...	...	...	40,314	36,525	31,833	34,803	41,052	31,676	29,091	30,679

Source: American Association of University Professors, Faculty Compensation Survey. More extensive tables and complete definitions are in "The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession 2004–05" *Academe* 91, no. 2 (March/April 2005).

Notes:  
 ... — Indicates no responses in that category.  
 "Prof."=Professor; "Assoc."=Associate Professor; "Asst."=Assistant Professor; "All" includes all full-time faculty, with or without academic rank.

Data include full-time primarily instructional faculty only.  
 Figures are weighted average (mean) salaries; salaries of faculty members on 12-month contracts have been adjusted to an academic year (9-month) equivalent.