

2006 Faculty Salary and Compensation Analysis

BP&D Committee
2005-2006 Academic Year

Kevin Owens, at-large, Chair
Doreen Saar, CoAS
Bruce Eisenstein, CoE
Charles Morscheck, CoMAD
Greg Hislop, IST
Francis McFadden, RCGCoPS
Anthony P. Curatola, LCoB
Peter Lewin, BE&S
Johnson Bowie, PEAC
Francis Harvey, SoEd
MaryEllen Smith Glasgow, CNHP
William Hickey, SPH
Michael Weingarten, CoM

Thomas Elzey, SVP Finance & Treasury, ex-officio

Revision history: This report was discussed by the full Faculty Senate at the meetings of August 24, 2006, and February 20, 2007. As a result of those discussions, it was revised by the 2006-7 BP&D Committee and submitted to the Senate for approval at the meeting of April 26, 2007. These revisions included the update of information in Table 5 (q.v.), and the discussion relating to this table. Appended are comments made by a Senator in an email relating to this report.

Executive Summary

This document is the fourth report in the span of five years of the state of faculty salaries and compensation at Drexel University produced by the Senate Committee on Budget, Planning and Development (SCBPD). Data contained in the report investigates average faculty salaries, average total annual compensation and annual salary raises by rank over the period of the last five to ten years in comparison to those of our benchmark institutions. It also surveys the effect of the local cost-of-living on the average faculty salary benchmarks.

The data presented here shows that:

- In AY 2005 the average salaries for associate professors and instructors position Drexel in the second quartile of those of our benchmark group. The average salary for assistant professors places Drexel in the first quartile in our group of benchmark institutions. The average salary for full professors rank 11th of the 12 universities in our benchmark group.
- In AY 2005 Drexel rose to 8th of the 12 reporting schools for benefits (expressed as a % of salary). Although this is an improvement over past years, the Drexel contribution is still approximately 1 % lower (on a relative basis) than both the median and average of our benchmark group.
- In AY 2005 raises for *continuing faculty* members at all ranks are generally above the median and average of our benchmark institutions.
- An analysis of cumulative % changes in continuing faculty salaries shows that changes at the associate, assistant and instructor levels are below both the median and average of our benchmarks for the period 1998-2005.
- Drexel is at the maximum in the spread, defined as the difference between the % change in continuing faculty salary and % change in average faculty salary, at both the full and associate professor levels. This implies a significant amount of faculty hiring in these levels at salaries above that of the continuing faculty.
- Average Drexel faculty salaries generally fall in the middle of our list of benchmark institutions when the local cost-of-living is taken into account.
- The ratio of the presidential salary to that of the average full professor is *significantly above the maximum* for the reporting set of category I private doctoral institutions.

While in its fifth year, the SCBPD feels that this analysis is still preliminary in that it addresses the issue of *average* faculty salaries and *average* continuing faculty salary raises over the last number of years. No attempt was made to evaluate salary gender equity or equity between or within the different colleges of the university. Analysis of that information, which continues to be unavailable to the committee at this time, requires closer cooperation and information sharing between the faculty and the Administration. Further, as discussed in both the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Salary and Compensation Report, more detailed information is required to explore the important and apparently problematic issue of merit pay and market rate adjustments. The SCBPD urges the Administration to answer a call to discuss the continuing concern of faculty salary equity on campus.

Introduction

This is the fourth report in the span of five years produced by the Senate Committee on Budget, Planning & Development (SCBPD) investigating the state of faculty salaries and compensation at Drexel University. The information contained here is extracted from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Annual Faculty Salary Survey, published in the March-April issue of the society journal *Academe*.

To be useful, the information concerning faculty salaries and compensation provided in this report must be put in perspective. This is done through the process of “benchmarking”, a comparison of our own institutional information to that from a defined set of other institutions. Benchmarking information is provided for the list of “national” and “local” benchmark institutions as defined in the latest Drexel University Strategic Plan entitled “A Time of Transforming Opportunity: Drexel University’s Strategic Plan 2004-2009”. It should be noted that the university has apparently embarked on the fast-track development of a new strategic plan under the direction of Provost Director; it is unclear whether the list of benchmark institutions used by the university as a whole will remain constant. This fact notwithstanding, while this list of benchmarking institutions is likely appropriate for comparison of the institution as a whole, it should be clearly stated that individual colleges or departments will likely and *should* have different sets of institutions to which they compare themselves. Further, to answer important questions such as the adequacy of adjunct salary rates, a responsible benchmark list must include those truly local institutions with which we compete for adjunct faculty talent. It must be understood that there is no “one size fits all” list that can be used for all comparison situations.

It is important to note that the faculty salary and compensation information for academic year (AY) 2002-2003 and later includes data for faculty in the College of Nursing and Health Professions and School of Public Health. Note 16 in the 2003 AAUP Salary Survey data table states that for Drexel University the salary data “includes faculty in the schools or programs of nursing, engineering and business”. As such, direct comparison of the salary and compensation numbers provided here with information contained in the 2002 Faculty Salary and Compensation Analysis compiled by the SCBPD is somewhat problematic.

Academic Year 2005 Faculty Salary and Compensation Information

Table 1 shows the average faculty salary by rank for Drexel University as compared to our benchmark institutions. The information in this table is extracted from the AAUP Annual Salary Survey, which is published in the March/April issue of the AAUP journal *Academe*. Of the 12 institutions reporting it can be seen that the average Drexel salary for full, associate and assistant professors ranks 11th, 5th and 3rd, respectively. For instructors Drexel is placed 4th of 8 institutions reporting, while the “all ranks” value (average of all faculty and instructor salaries) places Drexel 11th of 12 institutions reporting. In absolute terms the average faculty salaries for assistant professors are in the top quarter of our benchmark group, while we are in the middle of our group of benchmark institutions for the rank of associate professor and instructor. The average salaries for full professors are in the lowest quarter of our benchmark group, trailing all except for Lehigh University.

The faculty salary information for AY 2004 is shown in table 2 for comparison purposes. Table 2 shows that the salaries for full, associate and assistant professors ranked 11th, 7th, and 2nd of 11 institutions reporting. For instructors, Drexel ranked 5th of 9 institutions reporting and 11th of 11 institutions reporting for all ranks. Note that the average salary of both full and associate professors

at Drexel have increased significantly from AY2004 to AY2005. These somewhat unusual increases are investigated further in the discussion for tables 13 and 14 below. At the assistant professor level we have fallen one position, although the number of benchmark schools reporting information to the AAUP increased by one this year. At the instructor level we improved by one position, although the number of schools reporting at this level decreased by one.

Average faculty compensation (salary plus benefits) by rank is given in table 3 for AY 2005 and is also compared to our national and local benchmark institutions. This information is also extracted from the AAUP Salary Survey. Of the 12 institutions reporting it can be seen that the average total compensation for full, associate and assistant professors at Drexel ranks 12th, 9th and 4th, respectively. Drexel ranks 4th of 8 institutions reporting for instructors, while the “all ranks” value places Drexel 12th of 12 institutions reporting. Table 4 shows comparable information for academic year 2004. Two important trends are evident in the data presented. First, comparing table 1 to table 3, the consistent drop in ranking of average total compensation versus average salary suggests that Drexel faculty benefits packages are not as attractive as those at our benchmark institutions. In raw terms, average faculty compensation places Drexel in the lower quarter of our benchmark institutions at the full and associate professor rank, as well as in the upper half of all institutions reporting at the instructor level. Drexel still ranks in the second quarter of schools at the associate professor level. A comparison of table 3 to table 4 shows our ranking by average total compensation has stayed generally static.

Benefits

Table 5 shows the trend in faculty benefits as a percentage of salary for the academic years 1995-2005 for Drexel as compared to our benchmark institutions. This information is also extracted from the AAUP Salary Survey, except for the figure for 2005. Note that faculty benefits as a percentage of salary at Drexel dropped significantly in both AY 1999 and 2002. Compared to our benchmark institutions, Drexel falls from 3rd of 11 in AY 1998, to 9th of 11 in AY 1999; Drexel ranks 10th of 11 institutions reporting in AY 2002. In AY2005 we improved to 8th of 12 universities reporting. Table 5 also shows the average and median for our benchmark group over this period. In AY 2005 the benefits contribution of Drexel has improved but is still approximately 1% lower than both the median and average of our benchmark group. The issue of faculty benefits is often an important consideration in faculty hiring; this demonstrates that Drexel is at a significant disadvantage with respect to our benchmark group in this matter. To fully understand this issue, details of the scope and magnitude of expenditures classified as benefits (e.g., health care, retirement match, long-term disability coverage, tuition assistance, etc.) must be studied in more detail, particularly in comparison to similar expenditures at our benchmark institutions. Several years ago a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs was formed to collect data to produce such an analysis; it is not clear whether that committee produced any report or still even exists.

Salary Increments for Continuing Faculty

The average faculty salary or total compensation alone, however, is not sufficient to evaluate whether the faculty is adequately compensated, as there are reasons, such as new faculty hiring, why the averages reported to external organizations may be misleading in and of themselves. Further information that should be evaluated includes the percentage change in salary of the *continuing faculty*, which is unaffected by annual hiring. Table 6 shows the annual percentage change in *continuing faculty* salaries by rank for the last nine years for: 1) all categories of institution, and 2) category I (private, independent doctoral granting) institutions, again as reported in the AAUP

Annual Salary Survey. The annual percentage change in the consumer price index (CPI) is also reported for comparison. It can be seen that in general faculty at US institutions of higher education are doing well in comparison to recent changes in the CPI.

Detailed information on percent salary increases in AY 2005 for *continuing faculty* by rank for Drexel and our benchmark institutions is found in table 7. In terms of raises, Drexel ranks 4th, 4th, and 3rd of 11 schools reporting at the full, associate and assistant professor levels, respectively. Drexel now ranks 3rd of 7 at the instructor level. During AY 2005 the raises for continuing faculty at Drexel are in the second quartile of our benchmark institutions. This is a significant increase from AY 2004, when the raises for continuing faculty at Drexel were in the bottom quartile of our benchmark institutions. To gain a broader perspective, table 8 shows the annual percentage change in *continuing faculty* salaries by rank for the last nine years. The information from all of our benchmarking institutions is summarized in table 9 where the minimum, maximum, median and average annual percentage change for *continuing faculty* by rank is summarized for the last five years. The raises for *continuing faculty* afforded to Drexel faculty in AY 2005 were above both the average and median of our benchmark institutions for all levels except instructors. This is noteworthy in that the raises for continuing faculty in AY 2004 at Drexel were near the minimum of our benchmark institutions.

Trends in the salary increases for continuing faculty can also be explored by calculating the change in salary assuming a common base value. Table 10 shows the change in annual average faculty salary by rank for continuing faculty assuming 1998=100 and the continuing faculty salary raises given in table 8. Over the period of 1998-2005 the cumulative % increase in salary for continuing faculty at Drexel at the full, associate, assistant and instructor ranks are 39.5, 40.4, 38.9 and 39.2, respectively. As shown in table 11, where the cumulative % salary change values for our benchmark institutions are summarized, raises at the full professor level are at near the maximum (2nd of 8 schools reporting); unfortunately, the cumulative raises at the associate, assistant, and instructor levels are all below both the average and the median values for our set of benchmark institutions (the increase at the associate professor level being above the median is the one exception). The general conclusion for the years 1998-2005 is that the percentage increase in salary for continuing faculty members at Drexel is generally at or below the average or median when compared with either the national norms or those of our benchmark institutions. Contrary to claims by the Drexel Administration over the last few years, salary raises for continuing faculty members have not been “excessive” or even “generous”. There appears to be erosion in the level of faculty support at Drexel as compared to our benchmark institutions.

The average annual faculty salary and annual percentage change by rank for the last eleven years for Drexel and our benchmark institutions is given in table 12. The average salary information is extracted from the AAUP Annual Salary Survey reports, as published in the March/April 1996-2005 issues of *Academe*. It should be noted that the percent change values in these tables are calculated directly from the average salary values for *all faculty* members; as such they are different than the values given in table 7 for *continuing faculty* members only, as hiring, retirements and resignations influence these values. Comparing the data in table 10 to that in table 12 also shows another interesting trend at Drexel. The % increase in salary for full and associate professors is found to be significantly (approximately 25%) larger than that for *continuing faculty* over the same 1998-2005 time frame. This suggests a significant number of hires at these ranks at salary levels above that of the existing faculty.

Two new tables are included in the report this year to further investigate the effect of new hires on the average salary values reported in the AAUP salary survey. Table 13 directly compares the % change in continuing faculty salaries (denoted *% change* and found in table 7) to the % increase in average faculty salary (denoted *average chg* and given in table 12). The large differences for Drexel at the full, associate and assistant professor levels should be noted. These data are further investigated in table 14 where the *spread*, which is defined as the difference between the % change in continuing faculty salary and % change in average faculty salary are listed. If the spread is positive, it indicates that the increase in average faculty salary from AY 2004 to AY 2005 (tables 1 and 2) exceeds the increase in salary for continuing faculty (given in table 7). This could be the result of new hiring of faculty at salaries above those of the continuing faculty, or the retirement or resignation of relatively poorly paid continuing faculty at that level. Conversely, a negative spread would indicate the hiring of faculty at salaries below those of the continuing faculty, or the retirement or resignation of relatively highly paid continuing faculty at that level. We are not aware of any other studies which calculate a statistic like the spread as defined in table 14, or whether there is literature that would suggest that certain values of the spread are expected or healthy for an institution. As a means of comparison, table 14 gives the minimum, maximum, median and average values for the spread for our set of benchmark institutions. As most of the institutions in our benchmark group have a relatively large number of faculty, we would expect values close to zero; in fact, the mean and median values for our benchmark group are generally near zero. Note that at the full and associate professor levels Drexel is at the maximum; Drexel is near the minimum at the assistant professor level. This would seem to imply a significant amount of faculty hiring at salary levels above that of the continuing faculty. It is expected that this may contribute to concerns by the continuing faculty as they see their own salaries not keeping up with the significant increases posted by the average Drexel faculty salaries given in surveys like the AAUP Faculty Salary Survey.

Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment

The raw salary information provided in table 1 does not reflect the reality of cost-of-living differences in various parts of the country. This is problematic because several of our benchmark institutions are located in cities with a higher cost-of-living than the Philadelphia metropolitan region, while several others are located in generally more rural areas with a lower cost-of-living. Table 15 shows local cost-of-living and wage tax information for our national and local benchmark institutions. Table 16 shows cost-of-living adjusted AY 2005 average faculty salary information by rank as compared to our benchmark institutions. The salary information from table 1 is adjusted by the local cost-of-living (COL) figure obtained from the 4th quarter 2005 data provided by the American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association (which is based on methods developed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics). Note that a full description of the methods used for calculating the COL numbers can be found at http://www.coli.org/costofliving/coli_method2.html. A PDF copy of the manual describing these methods can also be downloaded at http://www.accra.org/edu_prof/pubs/colimanual.pdf. Due to the relatively high cost-of-living in the Philadelphia area it can be seen that average Drexel faculty salaries for full, associate and assistant professors rank 6th, 6th and 6th of the 12 institutions reporting, respectively. For instructors Drexel is 4th of 8 institutions reporting, and 7th of 12 for “all ranks”. This information demonstrates an issue of concern for the competitive recruitment of new faculty, who can look at Drexel from a national perspective. While the COL adjusted ranks are better than those in table 1 at the full professor levels, COL adjusted faculty salaries at Drexel fall squarely in the middle of our benchmarks. Of particular note is the COL adjusted salary for assistant professors, where the ranking drops from 2nd to 6th. Please note that the COL adjustment *does not* include the effect of the Philadelphia city wage tax,

which is clearly shown in table 15 as not favorable in comparing Drexel with our benchmark institutions. Even considering the relatively low state tax rate in Pennsylvania, the combination of the Philadelphia city wage tax and state tax put Drexel 3rd in terms of overall tax burden. It should also be noted in comparing the 4th quarter 2004 to 4th quarter 2005 COL values that the Philadelphia metropolitan area was *the only area* on our list of benchmarks that experienced an increase in COL.

Conclusions

The data presented here shows that in absolute terms, the average salaries for associate professors and instructors position Drexel in the second quartile of those of our benchmark group. While the average salary for assistant professors places Drexel in the first quartile in our group of benchmark institutions, the average salary for full professors ranks 11th of the 12 universities reporting. In AY 2005 Drexel rose to 8th of the 12 reporting schools for benefits (expressed as a % of salary). The Drexel contribution to benefits is still approximately 1% lower (on a relative basis) than both the median and average of our benchmark group. The raises for *continuing faculty* members at all ranks in AY 2005 are generally above the median and average of our benchmark institutions. Even so, an analysis of cumulative % changes in continuing faculty salaries shows that changes at the associate, assistant and instructor levels are below both the median and average of our benchmarks for the period 1998-2005. Drexel is at the maximum in the spread (which is defined as the difference between the % change in continuing faculty salary and % change in average faculty salary) at both the full and associate professor levels. This implies a significant amount of faculty hiring in these levels at salaries above that of the continuing faculty. Average Drexel faculty salaries fall squarely in the middle of our list of benchmark institutions when the local cost-of-living is taken into account.

While in its fourth year, the SCBPD still feels that this analysis is preliminary in that it addresses the issue of *average* faculty salaries and *average* continuing faculty salary increments over the last five years. No attempt was made to evaluate salary gender equity or equity between or within the different colleges of the university. Analysis of that information, which continues to be unavailable to the committee at this time, requires closer cooperation and information sharing between the faculty and the Administration. Further, as discussed in both the 2002 and 2003 Faculty Salary and Compensation Reports, more detailed information is required to explore the important and apparently problematic issue of merit pay and market rate adjustments. The SCBPD urges the Administration to answer a call to discuss the continuing concern of faculty salary equity on campus.

Appendix

Table 1 Academic year (AY) 2005 average faculty salary by rank compared to national and local benchmark institutions. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2006 issue of *Academe*.

	Faculty Salary (\$1000s)				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks
National Institutions					
Case Western Reserve University	117.4	84.5	62.7	48.0	88.5
Tufts University	114.7	85.3	67.7	NR	85.9
New York University	144.0	88.3	75.9	35.3	98.3
George Washington University	118.8	84.3	69.3	50.7	92.9
Boston University	117.0	78.6	66.0	42.7	84.9
Northeastern University	116.7	83.2	70.4	NR	82.5
Local Institutions					
University of Delaware	114.1	78.5	63.0	49.2	84.2
Rutgers University	116.8	80.7	65.3	38.4	91.2
University of Pittsburgh	113.2	75.5	64.6	41.6	79.3
Lehigh University	108.6	74.9	73.6	NR	89.9
Carnegie Mellon University	123.8	89.1	80.5	NR	96.6
Drexel University	112.8	84.3	74.3	45.1	79.6
Rank:	11	5	3	4	11
Schools reporting:	12	12	12	8	12

Notes: NR = not reported

Source:
AAUP Salary Survey, March/April 2006 *Academe*

Table 2 Academic year (AY) 2004 average faculty salary by rank compared to national and local benchmark institutions. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2005 issue of *Academe*.

	Faculty Salary (\$1000s)				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks
National Institutions					
Case Western Reserve University	112.3	79.8	66.8	42.8	85.8
Tufts University	109.4	82.5	65.8	51.0	82.2
New York University	138.1	85.4	73.7	33.9	94.0
George Washington University	110.3	80.7	63.2	51.9	85.8
Boston University	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Northeastern University	112.7	81.6	69.5	NR	80.5
Local Institutions					
University of Delaware	109.6	76.1	61.5	48.5	81.8
Rutgers University	112.9	77.7	62.8	38.0	88.7
University of Pittsburgh	109.8	74.0	63.6	42.3	77.9
Lehigh University	105.5	73.7	69.9	NR	86.8
Carnegie Mellon University	118.4	84.5	75.2	53.5	93.4
Drexel University	102.7	78.6	73.7	43.4	76.4
Rank:	11	7	2	5	11
Schools reporting:	11	11	11	9	11

Notes: NR = not reported

Table 3 Academic year (AY) 2005 average faculty compensation by rank compared to national and local benchmark institutions. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2006 issue of *Academe*.

National Institutions	Faculty Compensation (\$1000s)				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks
Case Western Reserve University	145.9	106.1	78.7	64.4	111.0
Tufts University	150.6	111.6	87.7	NR	112.3
New York University	190.8	117.1	100.7	46.8	130.4
George Washington University	144.2	103.2	84.6	61.5	113.1
Boston University	148.0	100.7	82.1	52.7	107.6
Northeastern University	144.0	105.1	86.3	NR	103.1
Local Institutions					
University of Delaware	147.5	106.2	86.2	69.5	112.0
Rutgers University	144.8	103.9	85.6	53.8	115.5
University of Pittsburgh	141.8	97.0	81.9	55.6	100.6
Lehigh University	139.3	98.4	92.0	NR	115.4
Carnegie Mellon University	153.4	110.8	99.0	NR	120.4
Drexel University	134.6	102.3	89.0	56.6	96.0
Rank:	12	9	4	4	12
Schools reporting:	12	12	12	8	12

Notes: NR = not reported

Source:
AAUP Salary Survey, March/April 2006 *Academe*

Table 4 Academic year (AY) 2004 average faculty compensation by rank compared to national and local benchmark institutions. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2005 issue of *Academe*.

	Faculty Compensation (\$1000s)				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks
National Institutions					
Case Western Reserve University	136.4	96.6	81.7	51.8	104.3
Tufts University	145.0	109.1	85.8	66.0	108.4
New York University	182.9	113.4	97.8	45.0	124.6
George Washington University	130.9	96.7	75.6	62.2	102.3
Boston University	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Northeastern University	138.7	102.8	84.0		100.0
Local Institutions					
University of Delaware	141.4	101.9	83.6	67.8	108.2
Rutgers University	140.1	100.0	82.4	53.3	112.4
University of Pittsburgh	136.7	94.1	80.2	55.2	98.1
Lehigh University	135.7	97.3	86.1		111.4
Carnegie Mellon University	146.7	106.3	93.2	65.5	116.6
Drexel University	122.5	96.1	88.8	54.7	92.6
Rank:	11	10	3	6	11
Schools reporting:	11	11	11	9	11

Notes: NR = not reported

Table 5 Academic year (AY) 1995-2005 faculty benefits as a percentage of salary as compared to national and local benchmark institutions. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 1996-2006 issue of *Academe*.

National Institutions	Benefits as a Percentage of Salary										
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Case Western Reserve University	23	23	24	23	23	24	25	25	27.0	21.5	25.3
Tufts University	30	27	27	25	29	30	30	29	31.9	31.8	30.8
New York University	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32.2	32.6	32.6
George Washington University	20	19	19	19	19	20	20	19	20.0	19.3	21.8
Boston University	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	26.7
Northeastern University	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	25	24.3	24.2	25.0
Local Institutions											
University of Delaware	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	31	31.1	32.3	33.0
Rutgers University	24	25	24	23	23	24	24	25	25.6	26.6	26.7
University of Pittsburgh	25	24	24	25	25	24	24	23	25.9	25.9	26.8
Lehigh University	27	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	27.4	28.3	28.4
Carnegie Mellon University	20	18	20	20	25	26	26	21	24.5	24.9	24.6
Drexel University	24	23	29	29	23	23	24	19	22.2	21.0	25.5 *
Rank:	7	8	3	3	9	10	8	10	10	10	8
Schools reporting:	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12

Notes: NR = not reported

Average	25.8	25.1	25.8	25.6	25.9	26.2	26.5	25.1	26.6	26.2	26.9
Median	25.0	25.0	26.0	25.0	25.0	26.0	26.0	25.0	25.9	25.9	26.7

Source:

AAUP Salary Survey, March/April 1996-2006 *Academe*

* The figure for 2005 was reported as 20.6% in the AAUP survey cited above, but this was considered erroneous by Drexel, and was corrected in reporting for the U.S. Department of Education for the IPEDS Human Resources Survey.

Table 6 Annual percentage change in continuing faculty salaries by rank for all categories of institution and category I, private, independent doctoral granting institutions, as compared to the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 1998-2006 issues of *Academe*.

From AY	To AY	1) Change in CPI	1) All categories combined				2) Category I- private independent			
			full	assoc	asst	inst	full	assoc	asst	inst
96/97	97/98	1.7	4.0	4.6	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.7	5.3	5.2
97/98	98/99	1.6	4.5	5.0	5.3	5.3	4.6	5.4	5.9	5.7
98/99	99/00	2.7	4.5	4.9	5.4	5.3	4.5	5.3	5.6	5.4
99/00	00/01	3.4	5.0	5.4	5.8	5.8	5.0	6.1	6.8	5.4
00/01	01/02	1.6	4.8	5.1	5.7	5.4	5.3	5.8	6.4	4.7
01/02	02/03	2.4	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.5	5.0	6.0	5.7	5.3
02/03	03/04	1.9	4.2	4.7	4.8	4.7	3.5	4.5	4.8	6.4
03/04	04/05	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.8	4.0	5.1	5.0	4.8
04/05	05/06	3.4	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.3	4.4	3.5	3.0	4.5

Sources:

- 1) AAUP Salary Survey, *Academe*, March/April 2003-2006
- 2) AAUP Salary Survey, *Academe*, March/April 1996-2006

Notes:

CPI = Consumer Price Index

Table 7 Annual percentage change in continuing faculty salaries by rank for AY2005 for Drexel faculty as compared to national and local benchmark institutions. American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2006 issues of *Academe*.

	% salary increase (continuing faculty)			
	full	assoc	asst	inst
National Institutions				
Case Western Reserve University	4.3	4.8	4.9	4.4
Tufts University	5.3	6.7	7.0	NR
New York University	4.2	5.9	5.7	13.3
George Washington University	8.9	7.8	11.5	14.2
Boston University	3.3	4.9	4.8	5.6
Northeastern University	3.2	3.1	3.3	NR
Local Institutions				
University of Delaware	5.4	4.6	5.7	4.6
Rutgers University	NR	NR	NR	NR
University of Pittsburgh	3.7	3.9	4.8	2.8
Lehigh University	3.2	3.7	3.7	NR
Carnegie Mellon University	3.2	3.9	4.6	NR
Drexel University	4.7	5.7	6.5	6.0
Rank:	4	4	3	3
Schools reporting:	11	11	11	7

Notes: NR = not reported

Source:
AAUP Salary Survey, March/April 2006 *Academe*

Table 8 Annual percentage changes in continuing faculty salaries by rank for Drexel faculty as compared to national and local benchmark institutions for the last nine years. American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 1998-2006 issues of *Academe*.

	AY	% salary increase (continuing faculty)			
		full	assoc	asst	inst
Drexel University	2005	4.7	5.7	6.5	6.0
	2004	4.3	4.1	4.3	2.3
	2003	5.6	6.2	5.0	6.0
	2002	4.5	3.8	2.9	4.6
	2001	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	2000	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	1999	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	1998	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1997	6.6	NR	5.6	NR
	AY	% salary increase (continuing faculty)			
National Institutions		full	assoc	asst	inst
Case Western Reserve University	2005	4.3	4.8	4.9	4.4
	2004	4.0	5.2	5.6	8.8
	2003	4.7	4.8	5.5	3.3
	2002	4.7	5.2	4.7	5.9
	2001	4.5	4.4	5.3	4.0
	2000	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1999	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1998	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1997	NR	NR	NR	NR
Tufts University	2005	5.3	6.7	7.0	NR
	2004	5.0	5.0	7.7	6.9
	2003	4.6	5.1	6.4	4.1
	2002	5.5	6.6	7.3	12.4
	2001	4.8	5.5	10.3	11.8
	2000	4.0	4.7	6.2	6.3
	1999	4.5	5.7	5.4	7.9
	1998	9.4	9.0	11.0	NR
	1997	5.2	5.1	6.9	NR
New York University	2005	4.2	5.9	5.7	13.3
	2004	4.5	5.3	4.5	4.3
	2003	0.7	1.3	1.7	10.2
	2002	4.8	5.3	4.4	7.2
	2001	5.0	5.1	5.5	3.0
	2000	5.0	5.1	4.7	4.2
	1999	4.5	3.9	3.6	8.4
	1998	3.6	4.2	5.0	9.6
	1997	4.1	4.3	4.0	6.2

George Washington University	2005	8.9	7.8	11.5	14.2
	2004	4.9	5.6	4.3	3.7
	2003	1.0	2.1	0.3	0.0
	2002	6.5	6.4	4.8	6.6
	2001	5.0	5.3	5.9	1.9
	2000	5.7	6.8	6.9	4.3
	1999	5.2	6.1	4.8	6.0
	1998	5.1	4.5	9.0	8.2
	1997	5.6	5.2	5.4	8.6
Northeastern University	2005	3.2	3.1	3.3	NR
	2004	4.9	5.8	5.1	NR
	2003	5.4	5.1	5.3	NR
	2002	8.6	7.7	6.7	NR
	2001	5.9	6.2	5.7	NR
	2000	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1999	NR	NR	NR	NR
	1998	3.7	3.7	4.2	NR
	1997	6.0	5.6	11.1	NR

		% salary increase (continuing faculty)			
Local Institutions	AY	full	assoc	asst	inst
University of Delaware	2005	5.4	4.6	5.7	4.6
	2004	5.1	4.5	4.8	5.0
	2003	4.3	4.6	4.7	3.7
	2002	3.3	4.3	4.8	4.6
	2001	5.8	5.1	5.1	4.2
	2000	4.3	4.5	5.3	7.4
	1999	3.5	4.0	4.7	4.6
	1998	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1997	4.3	4.7	5.5	6.5
University of Pittsburgh	2005	3.7	3.9	4.8	2.8
	2004	4.5	5.0	5.8	3.6
	2003	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.9
	2002	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.2
	2001	4.7	5.7	6.5	5.3
	2000	4.6	5.1	5.7	4.9
	1999	4.5	4.8	5.1	4.3
	1998	3.6	4.1	4.4	3.2
	1997	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1
Lehigh University	2005	3.2	3.7	3.7	NR
	2004	4.2	3.6	4.1	NR
	2003	3.7	3.8	5.5	NR
	2002	4.4	4.8	5.3	NR
	2001	3.2	4.8	6.7	1.8
	2000	4.4	4.8	4.3	NR
	1999	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
	1998	3.1	4.1	4.5	1.9
1997	2.9	3.7	4.1	1.4	

Carnegie Mellon University	2005	3.2	3.9	4.6	NR
	2004	4.4	6.7	6.4	3.2
	2003	4.7	6.0	6.2	NR
	2002	4.1	5.0	5.6	NR
	2001	4.6	6.2	6.7	NR
	2000	4.5	6.4	8.4	NR
	1999	4.3	6.2	6.0	NR
	1998	4.3	7.3	6.0	4.3
	1997	4.0	8.1	7.3	6.0

Table 9 Summary of annual percentage change in continuing faculty salaries by rank for Drexel and its national and local benchmark institutions. For each year the minimum, maximum, median and average percentage changes are computed from the raw data in table 8. American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2002-2006 issues of *Academe*.

AY2005	full	assoc	asst	inst
minimum	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.8
maximum	8.9	7.8	11.5	14.2
median	4.3	4.7	5.3	5.3
average	4.6	5.0	5.8	7.6
Drexel	4.7	5.7	6.5	6.0
AY2004	full	assoc	asst	inst
minimum	4.0	3.6	4.1	2.3
maximum	5.1	6.7	7.7	8.8
median	4.5	5.1	5.0	4.0
average	4.6	5.1	5.3	4.7
Drexel	4.3	4.1	4.3	2.3
AY2003	full	assoc	asst	inst
minimum	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.0
maximum	5.6	6.2	6.4	10.2
median	4.6	4.8	5.2	3.7
average	3.9	4.4	4.5	4.3
Drexel	5.6	6.2	5.0	6.0
AY2002	full	assoc	asst	inst
minimum	3.3	3.8	2.9	4.2
maximum	8.6	7.7	7.3	12.4
median	4.6	5.1	4.8	5.9
average	5.1	5.4	5.1	6.5
Drexel	4.5	3.8	2.9	4.6
AY2001	full	assoc	asst	inst
minimum	3.2	4.4	5.0	1.8
maximum	5.9	6.2	10.3	11.8
median	4.9	5.2	5.8	4.1
average	4.9	5.3	6.3	4.6
Drexel	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 10 Cumulative change in annual average faculty salary by rank for continuing faculty (assuming 1998 =100) and the *continuing faculty* raises given in table 7. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 1999-2006 issues of *Academe**.

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	% increase 98-2005
Drexel University									
full	100.0	105.0	110.3	115.8	121.0	127.7	133.2	139.5	39.5
assoc	100.0	105.0	110.3	115.8	120.2	127.6	132.8	140.4	40.4
asst	100.0	105.0	110.3	115.8	119.1	125.1	130.5	138.9	38.9
inst	100.0	105.0	110.3	115.8	121.1	128.4	131.3	139.2	39.2
Tufts University									
full	100.0	104.5	108.7	113.9	120.2	125.7	132.0	139.0	39.0
assoc	100.0	105.7	110.7	116.8	124.5	130.8	137.3	146.6	46.6
asst	100.0	105.4	111.9	123.5	132.5	141.0	151.8	162.4	62.4
inst	100.0	107.9	114.7	128.2	144.1	150.0	160.4		
New York Univ.									
full	100.0	104.5	109.7	115.2	120.7	121.6	127.1	132.4	32.4
assoc	100.0	103.9	109.2	114.8	120.9	122.4	128.9	136.5	36.5
asst	100.0	103.6	108.5	114.4	119.5	121.5	127.0	134.2	34.2
inst	100.0	108.4	113.0	116.3	124.7	137.4	143.3	162.4	62.4
G. Washington									
full	100.0	105.2	111.2	116.8	124.3	125.6	131.7	143.5	43.5
assoc	100.0	106.1	113.3	119.3	127.0	129.6	136.9	147.6	47.6
asst	100.0	104.8	112.0	118.6	124.3	124.7	130.1	145.0	45.0
inst	100.0	106.0	110.6	112.7	120.1	120.1	124.5	142.2	42.2
Univ. Delaware									
full	100.0	103.5	108.0	114.2	118.0	123.1	129.3	136.3	36.3
assoc	100.0	104.0	108.7	114.2	119.1	124.6	130.2	136.2	36.2
asst	100.0	104.7	110.2	115.9	121.4	127.1	133.2	140.8	40.8
inst	100.0	104.6	112.3	117.1	122.4	127.0	133.3	139.5	39.5
Univ. Pittsburgh									
full	100.0	104.5	109.3	114.4	119.3	124.6	130.2	135.0	35.0
assoc	100.0	104.8	110.1	116.4	121.5	127.4	133.7	139.0	39.0
asst	100.0	105.1	111.1	118.3	124.0	128.8	136.3	142.8	42.8
inst	100.0	104.3	109.4	115.2	120.0	123.5	128.0	131.6	31.6
Lehigh University									
full	100.0	103.0	107.5	111.0	115.9	120.1	125.2	129.2	29.2
assoc	100.0	103.0	107.9	113.1	118.6	123.1	127.5	132.2	32.2
asst	100.0	103.0	107.4	114.6	120.7	127.3	132.6	137.5	37.5
Carnegie Mellon									
full	100.0	104.3	109.0	114.0	118.7	124.3	129.7	133.9	33.9
assoc	100.0	106.2	113.0	120.0	126.0	133.6	142.5	148.1	48.1
asst	100.0	106.0	114.9	122.6	129.5	137.5	146.3	153.0	53.0

Table 11 Summary of the % increase in annual average faculty salary by rank for continuing faculty for the period 1998-2005 (assuming 1998 = 100) from the data given in table 10.

	Full	Assoc	Asst	Inst
Drexel University	39.5	40.4	38.9	39.2
Rank	2	4	6	3
Schools reporting	8	8	8	5
Benchmarks				
minimum	29.2	32.2	34.2	31.6
maximum	43.5	48.1	62.4	62.4
median	35.7	39.7	41.8	39.5
average	36.1	40.8	44.3	43.0

Table 12 Annual average faculty salary and annual percentage change by rank (for all faculty) for the last ten years. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 1996-2006 issues of *Academe**.

Drexel University

AY	Average salary (1000s)					AY	% change				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	68.4	51.0	47.9		59.2						
1996	71.0	52.4	51.5		62.0	95-96	3.80	2.75	7.52		4.73
1997	72.0	53.6	53.3	32.3	55.8	96-97	1.41	2.29	3.50		-10.00
1998	75.7	57.2	55.9	34.6	57.4	97-98	5.14	6.72	4.88	7.12	2.87
1999	84.4	64.1	61.2	36.4	63.4	98-99	11.49	12.06	9.48	5.20	10.45
2000	89.1	67.6	64.3	39.2	66.7	99-00	5.57	5.46	5.07	7.69	5.21
2001	93.4	71.7	65.8	38.0	69.2	00-01	4.83	6.07	2.33	-3.06	3.75
2002	92.2	70.1	66.1	40.8	69.0	01-02	-1.28	-2.23	0.46	7.37	-0.29
2003	99.8	74.1	72.3	42.8	74.4	02-03	8.24	5.71	9.38	4.90	7.83
2004	102.7	78.6	73.7	43.4	76.4	03-04	2.91	6.07	1.94	1.40	2.69
2005	112.8	84.3	74.3	45.1	79.6	04-05	9.83	7.25	0.81	3.92	4.19
% change											
AY98-05	49.0	47.4	32.9	30.3	38.7						

National Institutions

Case Western Reserve University

	Average salary (1000s)						% change				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	79.6	56.8	49.0	41.7	63.7						
1996	82.1	58.8	50.4	42.6	66.2	95-96	3.14	3.52	2.86	2.16	3.92
1997	83.7	60.7	51.1	42.1	67.8	96-97	1.95	3.23	1.39	-1.17	2.42
1998	86.4	63.4	53.3	44.0	69.9	97-98	3.23	4.45	4.31	4.51	3.10
1999	89.6	64.2	55.6	43.1	72.4	98-99	3.70	1.26	4.32	-2.05	3.58
2000	92.9	67.2	56.8	45.3	74.7	99-00	3.68	4.67	2.16	5.10	3.18
2001	96.7	69.1	61.4	48.5	77.6	00-01	4.09	2.83	8.10	7.06	3.88
2002	101.9	71.9	65.1	48.0	81.0	01-02	5.38	4.05	6.03	-1.03	4.38
2003	106.9	75.4	64.9	47.3	83.3	02-03	4.91	4.87	-0.31	-1.46	2.84
2004	112.3	79.8	66.8	42.8	85.8	03-04	5.05	5.84	2.93	-9.51	3.00
2005	117.4	84.5	62.7	48.0	88.5	04-05	4.54	5.89	-6.14	12.15	3.15
% change											
AY98-05	35.9	33.3	17.6	9.1	26.6						

Tufts University

	Average salary (1000s)						% change				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	77.4	58.4	45.1	30.1	62.1						
1996	80.1	59.7	45.6	25.6	64.0	95-96	3.49	2.23	1.11	-14.95	3.06
1997	83.4	62.6	48.3	41.9	64.3	96-97	4.12	4.86	5.92	63.67	0.47
1998	85.7	63.1	48.5	38.1	65.6	97-98	2.76	0.80	0.41	-9.07	2.02
1999	89.3	66.3	50.0	39.9	66.9	98-99	4.20	5.07	3.09	4.72	1.98
2000	92.6	68.4	52.0	47.6	69.7	99-00	3.70	3.17	4.00	19.30	4.19
2001	96.4	71.9	56.4	43.9	72.4	00-01	4.10	5.12	8.46	-7.77	3.87
2002	100.0	76.0	59.8	47.5	75.6	01-02	3.73	5.70	6.03	8.20	4.42
2003	103.0	77.3	61.7	49.0	77.5	02-03	3.00	1.71	3.18	3.16	2.51

2004	109.4	82.5	65.8	51.0	82.2	03-04	6.21	6.73	6.65	4.08	6.06
2005	114.7	85.3	67.7	NR	85.9	04-05	4.84	3.39	2.89	NR	4.50
% change											
AY98-05	33.8	35.2	39.6	NR	30.9						

New York University

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	96.8	63.7	54.4	39.4	74.0						
1996	102.5	65.4	56.5	40.4	77.2	95-96	5.89	2.67	3.86	2.54	4.32
1997	106.4	68.4	57.2	40.2	79.9	96-97	3.80	4.59	1.24	-0.50	3.50
1998	110.0	71.7	61.0	42.1	82.9	97-98	3.38	4.82	6.64	4.73	3.75
1999	116.1	75.0	63.6	42.6	86.8	98-99	5.55	4.60	4.26	1.19	4.70
2000	120.8	76.0	66.7	35.8	88.9	99-00	4.05	1.33	4.87	-15.96	2.42
2001	126.4	78.4	70.2	35.1	92.0	00-01	4.64	3.16	5.25	-1.96	3.49
2002	132.2	82.6	73.1	33.2	93.1	01-02	4.59	5.36	4.13	-5.41	1.20
2003	134.2	82.7	74.8	33.9	92.2	02-03	1.51	0.12	2.33	2.11	-0.97
2004	138.1	85.4	73.7	33.9	94.0	03-04	2.91	3.26	-1.47	0.00	1.95
2005	144.0	88.3	75.9	35.3	98.3	04-05	4.27	3.40	2.99	4.13	4.57
% change											
AY98-05	30.9	23.2	24.4	-16.2	18.6						

George Washington University

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	81.2	58.8	48.3	36.1	66.5						
1996	84.2	60.7	49.4	35.4	69.0	95-96	3.69	3.23	2.28	-1.94	3.76
1997	87.2	62.5	50.8		71.3	96-97	3.56	2.97	2.83		3.33
1998	90.1	65.4	52.7	42.3	73.5	97-98	3.33	4.64	3.74		3.09
1999	93.4	69.1	53.4	45.8	76.0	98-99	3.66	5.66	1.33	8.27	3.40
2000	98.3	72.2	56.9	45.3	79.7	99-00	5.25	4.49	6.55	-1.09	4.87
2001	103.3	74.2	58.4	46.7	81.4	00-01	5.09	2.77	2.64	3.09	2.13
2002	107.5	76.4	60.6	44.7	84.6	01-02	4.07	2.96	3.77	-4.28	3.93
2003	106.4	76.4	60.6	50.3	81.6	02-03	-1.02	0.00	0.00	12.53	-3.55
2004	110.3	80.7	63.2	51.9	85.8	03-04	3.67	5.63	4.29	3.18	5.15
2005	118.8	84.3	69.3	50.7	92.9	04-05	7.71	4.46	9.65	-2.31	8.28
% change											
AY98-05	31.9	28.9	31.5	19.9	26.4						

Northeastern University

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	75.8	57.8	50.3		58.5						
1996	75.6	56.9	49.0		58.4	95-96	-0.26	-1.56	-2.58		-0.17
1997	79.2	59.5	50.7		61.3	96-97	4.76	4.57	3.47		4.97
1998	81.6	60.9	52.9		62.5	97-98	3.03	2.35	4.34		1.96
1999	85.0	62.2	55.1		63.7	98-99	4.17	2.13	4.16		1.92
2000	88.1	64.4	58.3		64.7	99-00	3.65	3.54	5.81		1.57
2001	93.3	68.5	60.3		68.0	00-01	5.90	6.37	3.43		5.10
2002	102.0	72.7	65.0		72.8	01-02	9.32	6.13	7.79		7.06
2003	108.4	76.8	66.5		76.3	02-03	6.27	5.64	2.31		4.81

2004	112.7	81.6	69.5	80.5	03-04	3.97	6.25	4.51	5.50
2005	116.7	83.2	70.4	82.5	04-05	3.55	1.96	1.29	2.48
% change									
AY98-05	43.0	36.6	33.1	32.0					

Local Institutions

University of Delaware

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	
1995	79.7	57.3	45.3	32.9	61.2						
1996	83.3	58.7	46.8	34.5	63.7	95-96	4.52	2.44	3.31	4.86	4.08
1997	86.3	61.0	48.4	36.3	66.6	96-97	3.60	3.92	3.42	5.22	4.55
1998	90.3	63.8	49.9	36.9	69.3	97-98	4.63	4.59	3.10	1.65	4.05
1999	91.9	65.0	52.1	39.0	71.1	98-99	1.77	1.88	4.41	5.69	2.60
2000	95.7	67.1	53.5	41.7	72.9	99-00	4.13	3.23	2.69	6.92	2.53
2001	100.0	70.0	56.1	43.4	75.1	00-01	4.49	4.32	4.86	4.08	3.02
2002	101.9	71.1	58.5	45.0	76.9	01-02	1.90	1.57	4.28	3.69	2.40
2003	105.8	73.4	60.1	46.9	79.4	02-03	3.83	3.23	2.74	4.22	3.25
2004	109.6	76.1	61.5	48.5	81.8	03-04	3.59	3.68	2.33	3.41	3.02
2005	114.1	78.5	63	49.2	84.2	04-05	4.11	3.15	2.44	1.44	2.93
% change											
AY98-05	26.4	23.0	26.3	33.3	21.5						

Rutgers University

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	
1995	90.8	65.6	49.8	30.8	71.9						
1996	89.4	64.2	48.4	30.4	70.5	95-96	-1.54	-2.13	-2.81	-1.30	-1.95
1997	90.0	70.4	55.3	41.9	74.9	96-97	0.63	9.66	14.26	37.83	6.24
1998	94.8	68.3	50.6	32.8	73.5	97-98	5.38	-2.98	-8.50	-21.72	-1.87
1999	98.8	70.8	53.1	33.7	75.4	98-99	4.22	3.66	4.94	2.74	2.59
2000	102.4	72.8	55.3	35.3	77.5	99-00	3.64	2.82	4.14	4.75	2.79
2001	105.7	74.0	56.7	35.6	79.1	00-01	3.22	1.65	2.53	0.85	2.06
2002	108.5	75.7	59.5	38.2	84.8	01-02	2.65	2.30	4.94	7.30	7.21
2003	110.9	76.8	61.2	37.8	87.4	02-03	2.21	1.45	2.86	-1.05	3.07
2004	112.9	77.7	62.8	38.0	88.7	03-04	1.80	1.17	2.61	0.53	1.49
2005	116.8	80.7	65.3	38.4	91.2	04-05	3.45	3.86	3.98	1.05	2.82
% change											
AY98-05	23.2	18.2	29.1	17.1	24.1						

University of Pittsburgh

Average salary (1000s)						% change					
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	full	assoc	asst	inst	all	
1995	76.8	53.7	42.9	33.9	56.8						
1996	79.1	55.3	44.7	35.7	58.9	95-96	2.99	2.98	4.20	5.31	3.70
1997	80.8	56.4	45.7	36.7	60.2	96-97	2.15	1.99	2.24	2.80	2.21
1998	82.8	58.6	48.1	37.4	62.3	97-98	2.48	3.90	5.25	1.91	3.49
1999	85.9	60.6	50.8	39.4	64.4	98-99	3.74	3.41	5.61	5.35	3.37
2000	90.9	63.6	53.1	39.4	67.1	99-00	5.82	4.95	4.53	0.00	4.19
2001	95.8	65.4	56.6	40.7	69.8	00-01	5.39	2.83	6.59	3.30	4.02

2002	102.4	68.0	59.6	40.9	74.7	01-02	6.89	3.98	5.30	0.49	7.02
2003	105.6	70.2	61.6	42.3	76.8	02-03	3.12	3.24	3.36	3.42	2.81
2004	109.8	74.0	63.6	42.3	77.9	03-04	3.98	5.41	3.25	0.00	1.43
2005	113.2	75.5	64.6	41.6	79.3	04-05	3.10	2.03	1.57	-1.65	1.80
% change											
AY98-05	36.7	28.8	34.3	11.2	27.3						

Lehigh University

	Average salary (1000s)						% change				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	79.0	55.9	44.5		65.8						
1996	81.1	57.4	45.8		67.1	95-96	2.66	2.68	2.92		1.98
1997	83.3	59.0	47.0		69.4	96-97	2.71	2.79	2.62		3.43
1998	84.6	60.1	48.2		71.7	97-98	1.56	1.86	2.55		3.31
1999	88.5	63.2	51.8		75.5	98-99	4.61	5.16	7.47		5.30
2000	91.2	65.6	56.3		78.0	99-00	3.05	3.80	8.69		3.31
2001	93.6	67.6	62.3		80.5	00-01	2.63	3.05	10.66		3.21
2002	97.0	71.0	63.6		82.4	01-02	3.63	5.03	2.09		2.36
2003	101.3	72.7	67.1		84.8	02-03	4.43	2.39	5.50		2.91
2004	105.5	73.7	69.9		86.8	03-04	4.15	1.38	4.17		2.36
2005	108.6	74.9	73.6		89.9	04-05	2.94	1.63	5.29		3.57
% change											
AY98-05	28.4	24.6	52.7		25.4						

Carnegie Mellon University

	Average salary (1000s)						% change				
	full	assoc	asst	inst	all		full	assoc	asst	inst	all
1995	88.6	59.1	52.6	66.8	73.5						
1996	91.1	62.1	54.3		76.0	95-96	2.82	5.08	3.23		3.40
1997	93.9	66.1	56.2		79.0	96-97	3.07	6.44	3.50		3.95
1998	97.0	66.7	59.6		81.5	97-98	3.30	0.91	6.05		3.16
1999	99.7	69.7	63.2		84.4	98-99	2.78	4.50	6.04		3.56
2000	105.0	73.5	68.1		88.7	99-00	5.32	5.45	7.75		5.09
2001	108.8	78.5	69.8		92.3	00-01	3.62	6.80	2.50		4.06
2002	109.2	76.9	70.6		85.5	01-02	0.37	-2.04	1.15		-7.37
2003	114.7	82.3	71.2		90.4	02-03	5.04	7.02	0.85		5.73
2004	118.4	84.5	75.2	53.5	93.4	03-04	3.23	2.67	5.62		3.32
2005	123.8	89.1	80.5		96.6	04-05	4.56	5.44	7.05		3.43
% change											
AY98-05	27.6	33.6	35.1		18.5						

* Note that the % change for “all ranks” can be negative even if the % change for each component is positive, as this number depends on the number of faculty in each rank, and can be affected by the number of retirements, resignations and new hiring over the year in question.

Table 13 Comparison of the % raise for continuing faculty to the change in average faculty salary from AY2004 to AY2005. Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2005-2006 issues of *Academe*.

University	type	% change			
		full	assoc	asst	inst
CWRU	% raise	4.3	4.8	4.9	4.4
	average chg	4.5	5.9	-6.1	12.1
Tufts	raise	5.3	6.7	7.0	NR
	average chg	4.8	3.4	2.9	NR
NYU	% raise	4.2	5.9	5.7	13.3
	average chg	4.3	3.4	3.0	4.1
GWU	raise	8.9	7.8	11.5	14.2
	average chg	7.7	4.5	9.7	-2.3
Northeastern	% raise	3.2	3.1	3.3	NR
	average chg	3.5	2.0	1.3	NR
U Del	% raise	5.4	4.6	5.7	4.6
	average chg	4.1	3.2	2.4	1.4
Rutgers	% raise	NR	NR	NR	NR
	average chg	3.5	3.9	4.0	1.1
U Pitt	% raise	3.7	3.9	4.8	2.8
	average chg	3.1	2.0	1.6	-1.7
Lehigh	% raise	3.2	3.7	3.7	NR
	average chg	2.9	1.6	5.3	NR
CMU	% raise	3.2	3.9	4.6	NR
	average chg	4.6	5.4	7.0	NR
Drexel	% raise	4.7	5.7	6.5	6.0
	average chg	9.8	7.3	0.8	3.9

Table 14 Comparison of the spread between the % raise for continuing faculty and the change in average faculty salary from AY2004 to AY2005, as computed from the raw data in table 13.

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Salary Survey, as published in the March/April 2005-2006 issues of *Academe*.

University	spread			
	full	assoc	asst	inst
CWRU	0.2	1.1	-11.0	7.7
Tufts	-0.5	-3.3	-4.1	NR
NYU	0.1	-2.5	-2.7	-9.2
GWU	-1.2	-3.3	-1.8	-16.5
Northeastern	0.3	-1.1	-2.0	NR
U Del	-1.3	-1.4	-3.3	-3.2
Rutgers	NR	NR	NR	NR
U Pitt	-0.6	-1.9	-3.2	-4.5
Lehigh	-0.3	-2.1	1.6	NR
CMU	1.4	1.5	2.4	NR
Drexel	5.1	1.6	-5.7	-2.1
minimum	-1.3	-3.3	-11.0	-16.5
maximum	5.1	1.6	2.4	7.7
average	0.3	-1.1	-3.0	-4.6
median	-0.1	-1.7	-3.0	-3.8

Table 15 Local cost-of-living and local/state wage tax information for national and local benchmark institutions. The local cost-of-living (COL) figure is obtained from the 4th quarter 2004 data provided by the American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association. Local wage tax information obtained on 5/13/05 from www.adp.com/taxfin/toolbox/citytax/index.html.

National Institutions	Cost of Living (1)		Local Wage Tax Info (2)			State Tax Info (3)	
	4th Q 05	Note	Non-res %	Res %	Details	Rate	Notes
Case Western Reserve University	99.2	Cleveland, OH	2.0	2.0	Cuyahoga	5.943	\$80-100K
Tufts University	135.4	Boston, MA				5.3	non-interest
New York University	204.3	Manhattan				6.85	>\$40K
George Washington University	142.4	Washington, DC				9.0	>\$30K
Boston University	135.4	Boston, MA				5.3	non-interest
Northeastern University	135.4	Boston, MA				5.3	non-interest
Local Institutions							
University of Delaware	103.2	Wilmington, DE				5.95	>\$60K
Rutgers University	133.0	Newark, Elizabeth NJ				5.525	\$70-150K
University of Pittsburgh	93.0	Pittsburgh, PA	1.0	1.0	Allegheny, 2.0% School	3.07	
Lehigh University	95.9	Williamsport, Q3 2004	0.50	0.50	Northhampton, 0.5% school	3.07	
Carnegie Mellon University	93.0	Pittsburgh, PA	1.0	1.0	Allegheny, 2.0% School	3.07	
Drexel University	123.9	Philadelphia, PA	3.8197	4.331		3.07	

Notes:

(1) ACCRA (American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association, www.accra.org), US avg=100.0
ACCRA Cost of Living Index, 38(4), 2005 (February 2006)

(2) Information obtained 5/13/05 from www.adp.com/taxfin/toolbox/citytax/index.html

(3) Information obtained 5/12/05 from http://www.homefair.com/homefair/readart.html?NETSCAPE_LIVEWIRE.scr=homefair&art=ataxes
updated May 2003 and http://www.taxadmin.org/fta/rate/ind_inc.html, data updated 2005.

Table 16 Cost-of-living adjusted academic year 2005 average faculty salary information by rank as compared to national and local benchmark institutions. The salary information in table 1 is adjusted by the local 4th Q 05 cost-of-living (COL) information reproduced from table 15.

	COL		COL Adjusted Faculty Salary (\$1000s)				
	4th Q 04 (1)	4th Q 05 (2)	full	assoc	asst	inst	all ranks
National Institutions							
Case Western Reserve Univ.	101.3	99.2	118.3	85.2	63.2	48.4	89.2
Tufts University	138.6	135.4	84.7	63.0	50.0	NR	63.4
New York University	211.6	204.3	70.5	43.2	37.2	17.3	48.1
George Washington University	144.5	142.4	83.4	59.2	48.7	35.6	65.2
Boston University	138.6	135.4	86.4	58.1	48.7	31.5	62.7
Northeastern University	138.6	135.4	86.2	61.4	52.0	NR	60.9
Local Institutions							
University of Delaware	106.7	103.2	110.6	76.1	61.0	47.7	81.6
Rutgers University	133.8	133.0	87.8	60.7	49.1	28.9	68.6
University of Pittsburgh	94.6	93.0	121.7	81.2	69.5	44.7	85.3
Lehigh University	98.0	95.9	113.2	78.1	76.7	NR	93.7
Carnegie Mellon University	94.6	93.0	133.1	95.8	86.6	NR	103.9
Drexel University	118.7	123.9	91.0	68.0	60.0	36.4	64.2

Rank: 6 6 6 4 7
 Schools reporting: 12 12 12 8 12

Notes: NR = not reported

Sources:

AAUP Salary Survey, March/April 2006 Academe

(1) ACCRA (American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association, www.accra.org), US avg=100.0, ACCRA Cost of Living Index, 37(4), 2004 (February 2005).

(2) ACCRA (American Chamber of Commerce Researchers Association, www.accra.org), US avg=100.0, ACCRA Cost of Living Index, 38(4), 2005 (February 2006).

Appendix

Dear Kevin:

In my capacity as one of the senators from CoE, I would like to offer my input on the salary survey that you distributed.

I would like to first thank you and your team for the hard work that went into this. However, there are issues of substance relating to this report. I'll try to briefly document the major issues below and would be happy to talk with you if you have further questions. My hope is that you and your team view these comments constructively, as no doubt the administration readers of this report will be even more critical than I can be. As it stands, however, I cannot endorse this report.

Obvious Problems:

(1) Nearly exclusive use of averages

Nearly all data you have is average salary data. The pages that seem most problematic are 9-to-11. Without medians this data is very misleading.

I would like to refer you to the CRA Taulbee Survey <http://www.cra.org/statistics/> This is of Computer Science and ECE. I strongly believe that unless we have data at this level (average, median plus high-lows) , the 'average' data is more or less useless.

(2) Lack of any comparative faculty quality/productivity analysis

Drexel has 3 members of the NAE, CMU has something like 30 members of the NAE and NAS. Drexel has 0 Nobel Laurates, CMU has 1 or 2.

Clearly, these factors need to be acknowledged and normalized for. I would suspect that the salaries of the NAE members might skew the averages.

The administration can easily look at numbers like this, or at things like external research funding, publication impact factors, productivity in terms of PhD's granted, books published, etc. Without such figures, its hard to say that we are undercompensated. Indeed, if we were dead last in each of these categories, then we can't fairly say we are undercompensated.

(3) Lack of any disciplinary breakdown

All of the disciplines are lumped together, hence its hard to tell much about over or undercompensation. Certain departments are competitive, some aren't. Without knowing more, again the data is muddled. Clearly, B-school salaries and those in Culture and Coms are not comperable.

Thanks again for accepting these inputs.

Bill Regli
Senator, CoE

--

William C. Regli, Ph.D.
Drexel University regli@drexel.edu
Department of Computer Science <http://www.cs.drexel.edu/~regli>
College of Engineering Tel: + 1 (215) 895 - 6827
Philadelphia, PA 19104 Fax: + 1 (215) 895 - 0545