

1999-2000 Annual Review of Faculty Salaries

April 11, 2001

From: Faculty Status Committee

Ray Benton, School of Business Administration (Department of Marketing), Chair, Faculty Status Committee
 Tim Austin, Department of English
 Robert Flanigan, Medical School
 Jennifer Haworth, School of Education
 Gloria Jacobson, School of Nursing
 David Mirza, School of Business Administration (Department of Economics)

This document contains the following elements:

Table 1:? Percentile Comparisons of Loyola to all other Group I Universities, 92-93 through 99-00,

Table 2:? Percentage Change by Rank,

Table 3: Time Series regressions past 25 years,

Table 4:Nominal and Real Salaries, 99-00 (this table is attached and is organized by geographical region and within region by listed by school),

Table 5:? Salary Rankings, 99-00 (this table is attached and reports the number of schools with nominal and real salaries greater than Loyola).

Definition of Terms:

Group I:? Doctoral granting institutions,

Group IIA:? Non-doctoral granting institutions with comprehensive masters and professional degree programs,

Group IIB:? Institutions with general baccalaureate degrees without masters or post-baccalaureate professional programs.

Some Background Information

Faculty Council has traditionally provided the university administration with comparative salary information.? The data reported is extracted from *Academe*.? *Beginning in 1985 the administration requested data be provided in such a way that it reflects regional costs of living.? Therefore, beginning in 1985, a subcommittee of the Faculty Status Committee defined a panel of 101 Group I and IIA schools in cities for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reports specific information.? Each year since, the data has been reported to the administration reflecting not only nominal (actually received) salaries but also real salaries (actually received salaries adjusted to reflect regional costs of living).[1]? The salaries reported in Academe are labeled ?average salaries? but it is unclear what is actually being reported?mean salaries or median salaries.? Because we report median salaries to ourselves (http://www.luc.edu/depts/acadaff/faculty_salaries.html) it is supposed that we report median salary data to Academe as well.? However, different schools may report data differently.?*

The 1999-2000 Salaries Report

Each year there are a handful of schools that do not report salary information to Academe; this past year (1999-2000) 96 schools reported salary data.[2]?

The salaries reported in the March-April 2000 issue of Academe put Loyola University Chicago in the third quintile (the middle fifth) for Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors for Group I universities.?(The nominal and real salaries for each level are reported in Table 4.? Nominal salaries are: Professors--\$83,600; Associate Professors--\$58,900; Assistant Professors--\$49,800).

Loyola University Chicago?s percentile ranking has been steadily decreasing since 1993-1994 (see Table 1).? Professors fell

twelve places, largely, one suspects, as a result of the early transition option offered through Loyola 2000.? Associate Professors fell seven places and Assistant Professors fell two places with respect to two years ago.? (**Note:** It appears that there was a typographical error in the salary reported for the Assistant Professor rank last year.? This year?s report uses the number reported last year, so what appears to be an improvement may not be.)

Table 1: Percentile Comparison of Loyola to All Group I Universities						
	Salary Only			Compensation (Salary plus benefits)		
	Full	Associate	Assistant	Full	Associate	Assistant
92-93	72.9	73.3	68.3			
93-94	81.6	79.8	71.4	76.3	74.1	65.4
94-95	78.3	74.7	59.5	72.8	71.3	55.9
95-96	75.5	71.2	56.0	70.5	68.8	55.4
96-97	72.0	67.8	52.2	71.2	67.4	56.2
97-98	70.7	64.5	55.7	68.9	68.4	66.5
98-99	68.8	56.6	40.0	66.7	58.0	43.2
99-00	56.1	50.1	49.2	51.5	47.0	50.6

?The decline in percentile ranking is worrisome because of what it represents.? In reviewing these data the Faculty Status Committee noticed that this relative decline in salaries at Loyola University Chicago occurred after a relative increase during the 1980s.? The 1980s increase attracted excellent young faculty to the university representing, in essence, **an investment in intellectual capital that the university cannot afford to give up and certainly does not want to squander as we strive to solve genuine financial problems.**? If we do so we will have solved the financial problems at the cost of a weakened academic base.?

Not only does the percentile ranking fall within each category, but a close inspection of the data in [Table 1](#) reveals the compensation percentile to be invariably lower than the salary percentile.? This suggests (or is evidence that) the total benefits package is less than adequate, compared to other schools, because when benefits are included in the data professors at Loyola **fall** in the percentile ranking rather than **move up**.???

With respect to "real" salaries (see [Table 4](#)), salaries adjusted for regional differences in the cost of living as defined by the BLS, Consumer Expenditure Survey, 1994-95, Professors and Associate Professors each fell eleven places, while Assistant Professors fell one with respect to two years ago.? As the panels for Group I and Group IIA schools reveal (see [Table 5](#)), the majority of these changes came with respect to other Group I schools.? The comparison with the Catholic schools in our panel (see [Table 5](#)) shows a similar pattern, particularly at the Professor and Associate Professor levels.? In addition, this report normally compares Loyola with our closest competitors: DePaul, Notre Dame, and Marquette.? We were third, with Marquette below us, at the Professor level for both nominal and real salaries and at the Assistant Professor level for nominal salaries.? In the other three categories, we were fourth.? It has not been customary to compare Loyola to the other eleven schools in the Chicago area.? In the future that comparison might be worth considering, too, especially as it relates to how each adjusts, or fails to adjust, for changes in the cost of living in Chicago (more about comparisons based on the cost of living, below).

The percentage changes by rank from 96-97 academic year to 97-98 are presented in below (see [Table 2](#)). These numbers should be compared to a median increase of 4.8 percent for continuing faculty in all the 2,576 institutions reported in *Academe* (4.9 percent for Group I schools).

Table 2: Percentage change by Rank, 96-97 to 97-98	

schools have changed categories in the interim. ?This past year Adelphi, Detroit, Roosevelt, and San Francisco did not send data to Academe.? Adelphi and Detroit have been absent for the past several years.

[3] Our comparisons use the current reported U.S. city average CPI-U index from Consumer Price Index.? This figure is customarily revised after we collect it.