

Issues in Faculty Salaries and Higher Education Financing

By John W. Curtis

This 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 differentiated 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 itself, are widely differentiated according to 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 policy-makers. 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 2003-2004 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 2003-2004 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 itself 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 dis-

tinguishing 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 in the United States are employed at public institutions. However, as Table A indicates, faculty salaries at private-independent four-year institutions are 8 to 28 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 upward by a relatively small group of large research universities that pay higher salaries. By contrast, in Table B average salaries for private baccalaureate colleges in some states are depressed by combining private-independent and church-related colleges into one category, 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 primary issue of interest to state policy-makers: 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 pri-

Table A: Average Full-Time Faculty Salary 2003–2004, By Institutional Category and Control

	Public		Private-Independent		Church-Related	
	Average salary 2003–2004	Percent increase over 2002–2003	Average salary 2003–2004	Percent increase over 2002–2003	Average salary 2003–2004	Percent increase over 2002–2003
Doctoral	\$71,815	2.0%	\$91,865	2.9%	\$77,271	3.2%
Master's	58,668	0.5	63,252	3.2	58,563	2.4
Baccalaureate	53,666	1.4	63,236	3.9	50,475	2.8
Associate	50,958	0.4	39,168	n.d	36,048	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.

vate institutions that took place between 1978-1979 and 2001-2002. Most of the decline occurred before the mid-1990s; the relative salaries of faculty in the public and private sectors remained roughly constant between 1996-1997 and 2001-2002. ...[H]owever, average salaries in public institutions of higher education dropped this past year relative to those in private institutions.¹

The public/private salary gap continued to widen in 2003-2004, as Table A indicates. The table shows the increase in average salary levels from 2002-2003, by institutional type. Overall, faculty salary levels at public institutions increased at or below the rate of inflation (measured at 1.9 percent from December 2002 to December 2003), while salary levels at private-independent institutions rose at substantially higher rates. Although these differences for a single year are small, the cumulative effect over time is stark: During the 1970-1971 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 2003-2004, that gap was 29 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 generally 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 be 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 men and women faculty, differences 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 women faculty over more than a quarter century. When faculty 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 women 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 women full-time faculty 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.

HIGHER EDUCATION

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 women 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 men and women faculty.² It concluded that, even when all of those factors are controlled in the analysis, men still earn 9.4 percent more than women, on average. 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 men and women faculty—that not attributable to differences on observable factors—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.”³ What many statistical analyses fail to investigate, however, are the reasons why 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,⁴ a region dominated by private higher education institutions, and the Pacific,⁵ 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,⁶ with salaries in the latter region falling generally into the middle range nationally. Salary growth in the Middle Atlantic region⁷ has also generally kept pace, while faculty salaries in the East North Central⁸ and, especially, East South Central⁹ 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 discussed above, salaries for indi-

vidual faculty members also vary according to a number of specific aspects of the individual situation. In recent years, salary differences between faculty 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. Faculty salaries are also affected by the presence of collective bargaining, although a comprehensive recent analysis of the net impact of collective bargaining remains to be done. On the one hand, faculty collective bargaining may lead to higher salary levels for the faculty as a whole, and may lessen inequities within the compensation system; on the other hand, collective bargaining may act to preserve aspects of faculty self-governance and peer review, which can reinforce the differences by discipline and rank discussed above. 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.”¹⁰ 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 both 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 FY 2001 state and local governments supplied 40 percent of current-fund revenues for public higher education institutions, down from 49 percent only 20 years previously.¹¹ 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 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.¹² 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 2003-2004 *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession*, average faculty salaries have not kept pace with increasing tuition prices 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.¹³

Seen in this broader context, rising tuition prices are a consequence of the trend also producing increased disparities in faculty salaries between public and private institutions: a withdrawal of public funding. If, at the same time, needy students do not receive aid sufficient to match increased tuition prices, enrollment patterns may shift as well. This complicated matrix points toward a single outcome, if trends remain on the same course: higher education will become increasingly differentiated in terms of quality, and will be increasingly less accessible to financially disadvantaged students—reversing four decades of developments in the American system of public higher education.

There are several thousand institutions of higher education in the United States, reflecting the wide variety of institutional traditions, missions and resources that is a central feature of the American system. Faculty in these institutions fill a number of roles and bring differing professional qualifications to their positions; with more than 600,000 full-time faculty employed in different institutional situations across the country, the variation in faculty salaries is tremendous. This article has provided an overview of the key factors differentiating faculty salaries. It has also identified critical issues facing state government policy-makers 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 women faculty; and the consequences 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

HIGHER EDUCATION

to high-quality higher education becomes increasingly apparent, state policy-makers must identify sufficient resources to allow their higher education sectors to meet these new demands.

Notes

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

² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education 2002*. (NCES 2002-025) Washington, DC: 103.

³ 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.

⁴ New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island.

⁵ Pacific: Alaska, California, Guam, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington.

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

⁷ Middle Atlantic: New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania.

⁸ East North Central: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin.

⁹ East South Central: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee.

¹⁰ *Condition of Education 2002*, 103

¹¹ Figure for FY 2001 from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2001 and Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2001* (NCES 2004-155) Washington, DC: 57. 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) Table 334.

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

¹³ 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.

Note

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 2003–2004,
BY STATE, INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL, INSTITUTION CATEGORY, AND ACADEMIC

State or other jurisdiction	Public											
	Doctoral				Master's				Baccalaureate			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	All
United States	94,498	66,194	56,247	71,815	74,911	59,407	49,870	58,668	68,788	55,831	46,293	53,666
Alabama	82,413	61,045	51,135	63,946	65,172	53,476	46,210	51,343
Alaska	72,356	56,908	48,547	55,706	70,325	55,351	48,253	53,817
Arizona	88,910	61,979	54,857	69,757	85,654	65,651	52,326	61,305
Arkansas	81,900	61,036	53,160	63,950	66,307	56,335	46,262	51,237	61,130	52,717	42,662	46,818
California	112,304	71,683	61,634	89,475	83,503	67,574	55,174	69,736	85,362	74,348	67,114	67,225
Colorado	89,571	66,907	56,838	72,186	78,220	59,936	53,552	57,989	62,213	50,537	43,859	46,783
Connecticut	106,660	76,330	61,731	83,684	78,966	61,116	50,990	64,091
Delaware	105,821	73,390	60,060	79,385	71,262	59,119	50,113	56,672
Florida	88,609	63,393	54,998	66,653	75,938	59,540	51,430	57,092	74,047	58,249	43,932	57,755
Georgia	101,064	68,381	59,938	75,777	69,758	55,706	46,662	53,345	63,775	54,058	44,382	49,924
Hawaii	86,516	64,908	55,465	69,709	66,993	56,403	46,320	55,150
Idaho	70,733	56,731	48,101	57,328	63,523	53,169	45,320	50,64	53,780	45,083	36,097	43,734
Illinois	94,618	65,936	56,559	71,181	73,152	59,100	48,874	55,096
Indiana	92,382	65,365	54,633	70,263	75,615	60,470	50,198	56,204	68,771	56,115	44,484	50,675
Iowa	96,620	68,386	58,674	75,426	78,414	60,778	51,478	60,703
Kansas	81,959	60,985	51,744	64,517	68,394	55,261	45,519	53,712
Kentucky	88,547	63,103	53,399	69,382	70,311	56,159	48,166	52,738
Louisiana	84,788	61,722	53,359	60,994	62,377	52,506	44,661	48,390	48,256	42,634	34,807	40,498
Maine	72,467	61,566	48,494	59,673	75,913	58,500	46,629	59,259	57,434	47,730	39,831	47,950
Maryland	106,677	73,576	63,817	80,254	78,108	62,002	51,894	57,845	93,890	73,493	59,663	77,730
Massachusetts	89,190	70,784	57,854	73,812	80,735	63,757	55,118	68,096	65,558	53,473	43,601	57,601
Michigan	100,220	71,379	58,971	76,258	75,056	60,609	50,772	58,725
Minnesota	102,012	69,879	60,585	83,407	74,676	61,370	50,008	60,605	72,836	55,819	47,265	58,583
Mississippi	75,354	58,977	50,081	57,786	53,362	49,742	42,300	44,940	54,958	49,220	43,064	44,711
Missouri	89,857	64,145	53,195	68,404	65,119	52,562	44,125	51,156	62,598	50,058	42,627	48,690
Montana	69,490	53,817	47,231	55,381	59,286	48,028	45,940	47,665	58,197	50,051	43,978	49,192
Nebraska	90,872	65,381	56,156	72,417	68,722	56,876	48,343	55,438	60,596	44,768	39,848	48,096
Nevada	94,769	71,457	54,990	71,647
New Hampshire	90,603	68,483	56,054	74,121	68,786	55,083	45,997	57,456
New Jersey	112,533	79,908	63,592	87,110	92,679	72,745	57,584	73,906	90,986	71,433	54,187	71,809
New Mexico	78,046	59,580	51,199	62,252	58,294	48,728	42,889	46,333
New York	100,562	72,689	60,232	78,386	83,789	65,509	52,859	65,465	81,317	62,593	52,287	62,652
North Carolina	95,846	68,141	58,478	72,325	74,959	59,559	51,852	57,613	65,300	53,440	48,540	53,057
North Dakota	68,178	56,646	50,167	53,666	52,834	44,564	40,061	40,318
Ohio	91,074	64,833	53,225	68,399	76,575	60,499	50,119	63,941	64,765	55,173	42,691	51,488
Oklahoma	81,086	58,405	50,022	61,536	59,312	50,432	44,724	48,352	52,536	45,992	37,862	42,648
Oregon	79,232	60,524	51,752	60,066	58,590	48,482	40,662	47,777	55,646	47,874	41,056	46,900
Pennsylvania	104,271	72,391	61,070	75,164	86,705	69,859	57,105	66,691	77,603	62,457	51,991	56,177
Rhode Island	86,043	62,804	55,950	74,578	65,374	55,204	48,101	57,711
South Carolina	86,455	63,028	55,984	67,576	64,892	54,377	45,190	52,848	60,936	52,349	43,510	48,680
South Dakota	69,137	54,422	45,909	52,586	67,141	54,979	48,722	55,481	59,737	51,587	45,535	47,626
Tennessee	86,088	64,070	53,440	65,944	67,245	53,347	45,460	53,652
Texas	93,741	63,571	57,199	69,233	67,902	56,069	48,142	53,251	70,646	54,967	46,957	51,324
Utah	83,166	58,938	52,109	64,866	62,039	49,599	42,443	49,268
Vermont	82,762	62,980	52,064	60,313	54,919	46,562	36,729	46,921
Virginia	99,708	68,949	56,296	73,872	67,059	56,859	47,590	54,886	73,854	57,068	44,845	56,632
Washington	89,611	64,191	59,997	70,438	65,103	52,856	45,621	52,911
West Virginia	75,755	58,849	47,707	60,075	61,997	49,797	40,764	50,947	58,635	48,319	40,536	46,476
Wisconsin	93,283	68,747	60,468	77,314	66,864	54,843	47,534	56,045
Wyoming	77,708	58,574	55,432	61,910
District of Columbia
Puerto Rico	56,408	47,786	39,258	48,158

See footnotes at end of table.

HIGHER EDUCATION

AVERAGE FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARY IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS 2003–2004, 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	118,735	76,740	66,039	88,308	79,130	61,237	50,289	61,115	72,617	55,290	46,002	56,472
Alabama	68,459	53,812	46,758	54,561	67,659	55,288	43,547	55,485
Alaska
Arizona	70,560	59,698	46,585	54,267
Arkansas	58,881	48,453	42,497	49,318
California	122,226	82,095	69,488	95,693	90,600	67,611	55,791	69,585	90,624	66,064	53,314	72,303
Colorado	88,239	66,959	55,354	68,935	90,453	64,710	51,400	70,484
Connecticut	138,830	78,450	66,514	102,291	90,347	66,328	55,326	69,212	91,737	68,524	52,922	70,460
Delaware	59,338	51,519	42,157	49,979
Florida	97,240	63,961	57,362	69,088	76,997	57,698	48,432	59,212	63,292	53,163	46,508	51,588
Georgia	126,457	81,124	72,325	96,945	77,149	57,851	47,991	57,300	64,173	52,662	42,584	50,640
Hawaii	61,878	55,497	44,398	50,425
Idaho
Illinois	124,460	77,585	67,640	91,556	67,766	57,744	47,805	56,720	64,339	52,248	44,524	51,627
Indiana	116,508	77,304	65,990	92,508	70,574	55,229	45,564	54,359	66,212	52,172	46,611	54,813
Iowa	80,181	56,517	48,926	61,452	62,506	51,027	43,579	51,421
Kansas	52,452	48,414	46,710	47,436	46,587	39,425	34,999	38,821
Kentucky	65,342	56,261	48,081	60,522	56,861	47,588	41,144	48,405
Louisiana	100,161	69,662	61,099	74,512	82,820	59,101	47,518	59,271	57,616	48,671	40,969	48,706
Maine	65,735	55,286	44,589	50,166	92,147	64,340	51,925	68,358
Maryland	111,770	78,209	63,223	81,800	79,522	61,025	51,709	60,497	69,145	56,107	45,637	56,805
Massachusetts	132,507	82,236	73,255	99,513	92,571	69,095	58,533	70,325	93,264	66,196	53,956	72,486
Michigan	58,768	49,067	41,085	47,372	64,463	52,782	44,418	54,140
Minnesota	78,936	64,745	54,879	64,426	70,704	53,273	42,118	49,968	73,661	56,162	47,054	57,488
Mississippi	61,217	53,023	41,677	48,164	69,855	52,284	46,498	52,933
Missouri	110,386	70,493	61,506	82,064	66,900	54,510	46,557	55,068	56,605	48,797	42,290	46,808
Montana	48,599	38,285	34,761	42,434
Nebraska	82,462	60,156	49,044	58,153	57,286	45,963	40,942	46,365
Nevada
New Hampshire	117,957	81,417	67,851	94,755	70,411	55,350	48,756	58,385	64,850	53,479	44,704	53,420
New Jersey	134,425	77,263	64,634	98,287	80,337	67,477	51,661	66,070	66,328	52,561	43,911	53,295
New Mexico	60,002	48,718	43,289	50,705
New York	117,529	78,977	66,785	88,585	81,744	64,540	53,718	64,024	84,301	62,326	50,103	64,076
North Carolina	128,604	85,354	74,642	103,948	80,389	61,474	47,358	60,754	59,808	47,800	40,749	47,391
North Dakota	44,957	41,442	39,202	40,354
Ohio	106,940	75,408	64,909	83,257	75,958	56,883	48,822	57,59	68,933	55,550	46,116	55,875
Oklahoma	74,344	55,137	46,846	55,538	46,742	42,169	36,525	39,249
Oregon	77,001	59,328	48,918	60,448	78,544	55,027	48,033	61,453
Pennsylvania	120,785	82,623	75,014	94,851	84,897	65,407	51,653	62,821	76,051	58,731	47,729	57,644
Rhode Island	116,912	73,695	65,518	93,930	77,453	57,806	49,971	55,107	90,943	72,721	61,169	76,553
South Carolina	66,613	49,432	43,451	51,420
South Dakota	55,464	47,239	40,324	44,334
Tennessee	117,125	76,206	64,336	85,847	60,414	53,058	44,187	51,182	57,878	45,944	39,638	45,366
Texas	101,681	70,397	62,871	74,046	72,694	55,281	45,725	56,538	59,395	52,165	41,893	48,881
Utah	68,014	56,981	48,564	55,680
Vermont	67,191	54,535	44,204	57,480	87,210	60,522	53,648	66,750
Virginia	67,958	55,487	46,041	55,161	69,430	53,845	44,069	55,037
Washington	71,908	60,502	47,919	58,015	69,879	54,409	47,728	57,077
West Virginia	52,041	46,257	37,673	43,747
Wisconsin	88,100	66,118	58,743	66,439	59,200	49,045	42,363	47,155	63,149	52,229	44,049	51,425
Wyoming
District of Columbia	103,076	72,199	58,279	76,894	99,109	73,050	55,795	79,079	62,371	49,805	41,094	49,178
Puerto Rico	39,784	34,896	31,419	33,599	42,489	30,724	29,545	30,376

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 2003-04" *Academe* 90, no. 2 (March/April 2004)

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.