

Report on Faculty Salary Benchmarking – Year 1 and Year 2 Data
University of Toledo
April 4, 2004

Report Author: Robert Sheehan, Senior Vice Provost – Academic Affairs

A, eight-person Committee jointly appointed by the University Administration and the AAUP conducted this salary-study.

Committee members:

Richard E. Buehrer (Faculty, College of Business, IMES)
Matthew Dills (Administrator, Human resources, Compensation Administration)
Erik Johanson (Faculty, College of Arts & Sciences, Music)
James LeSage (Faculty, College of Arts & Sciences, Economics)
David Stern (Administrator, College of Arts & Sciences)
Kevin West (Administrator, Human resources, Faculty Relations)
Donald White (Faculty, College of Arts & Sciences, Mathematics)
Rob Sheehan (Administrator, Academic Affairs)

The Charge Report given to the Salary Benchmarking Committee is as follows:

The purpose of the joint AAUP/Administration Benchmarking Committee is to gather salary data by academic rank and discipline from public universities considered to be peer institutions to the University of Toledo. These data will provide a basis for benchmarking faculty salaries at the University of Toledo to the peer institutions.

To this end the committee will:

1. Identify a group of (10-12) public universities considered to be peer institutions to the University of Toledo. These institutions should be similar to the University of Toledo in size, mission, ranking, range of programs and other important characteristics. The peer institutions should include at least one Ohio public institution.
2. Gather salary data (mean and/or median salary, and salary range) by academic rank and discipline from these peer institutions, either by direct contact or through the use of salary data collected by one or more already existing salary surveys. This may require combining disciplinary data to fit the discipline categories at the University of Toledo.
3. Prepare a report by February 28, 2003 that will include UT salary and peer institution salary by discipline and rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer) **(note 1: This date was subsequently extended to end-of-term, Spring, 2003; Note 2: a decision was subsequently made to collect a second year's worth of UT and peer data for comparison purposes.)**.

Methodology Used in Study

Step 1: Identify comparison data to be used in making comparisons.

For purposes of this study, the Committee identified salary data submitted by institutions to the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) and similar data submitted by institutions belonging to the National Association of State universities and Land Grant Institutions (NASULGC) to the University of Oklahoma. Each of these national data submissions made use of identical definitions of rank, salary base, and clear rules of whom to include in the study (e.g., yes to department chairs but no to Associate Deans). At the time the data were collected from comparison institutions (Autumn, 2002), the Autumn, 2001 data were the most recent data available. Data gathered were the average salaries of faculty reported by discipline and faculty rank. Discipline data were coded using a standard convention (the U. S. Department of Education Classification of Instructional Programs – CIP). A second round of data were gathered from peer schools (and UT) reflecting Autumn, 2002 salaries.

Step 2: Select comparison institutions.

The Committee developed a population pool of 55 institutions from which the peers would be selected (See Appendix A). The pool included:

- All institutions belonging to the Urban 21 Group.
- All institutions belonging to the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities
- All public Universities in Ohio
- Several public institutions used in a similar effort by Cleveland State University

Each member of the committee was given a wide array of demographic characteristics for each institution (See Appendix B). Committee members rated and ranked the institutions' similarity to UT. A consensus process was used to identify 16 institutions most like The University of Toledo (See Appendix C).

Step 3: Obtain comparative data

Staff of the Human Resources Department of UT contacted their counterparts at each of the 16 institutions and requested copies of their CUPA or NASULGC salary reports. Of these 16 institutions, 12 institutions provided salary data to UT for Autumn, 2001 (See Appendix D).

For the second round of salary data, 11 institutions provided data although the specific mix of the institutions changed somewhat.

Step 4: Obtain UT salary data

Staff of the Human Resources Department of UT provided data for faculty at UT – these data had been previously submitted by UT to CUPA. The salary data were reviewed, verified and corrected when necessary on an individual faculty member basis. Additionally, the coding of each faculty member's department into its CIP code (Subject code) was reviewed, verified and corrected when necessary. There were instances when UT departmental subject codes needed minor modifications to provide comparison to available data from the comparison institutions. College deans and administrators then verified these salary corrections & subject code (CIP) assignments.

Step 5: Create a single comparison data-set for salary data

The CUPA and NASULGC data sets provided average faculty salary, by discipline and rank, along with the number of faculty represented by each average. Recognizing that some institutions had greater or fewer faculty members than others, a weighted average had to be created rather than simply taking the average of 12 averages. The methodology for creating this weighted average was verified and agreed upon the committee. This yielded a data-set by discipline and faculty rank combining all the comparison institutions together by discipline and faculty rank. As example:

Weighted Average Faculty Salaries – All Comparison Institutions Combined

		Assistant Professors		Associate Professors		Professors		Instructors	
final_CIP	Field	Salary	Faculty	Salary	Faculty	Salary	Faculty	Salary	Faculty
11	Computer and Information Sciences	\$ 64,620	21	\$ 75,849	54	\$ 97,568	39	\$ 46,016	5

Step 6: Compare UT Salaries to comparison group

UT data were then arrayed side-by-side with the comparison data and discrepancies between the UT means and comparison group means were computed. When UT average salaries were 85% or less of the comparison group salaries, these were flagged. For both year’s worth of data, specific comparisons were also conducted for every faculty member in each department to explore whether this type of average-to-average comparison was masking significant within-group variation. The following is an example of array of salaries to be found in the spread sheets.

Comparison of Average Salaries by Rank and Discipline: Peer Faculty Autumn 2002 (all combined from peer disciplines)

		Assistant Professors				
CIP	Major Field	Peers	UT	UT to Peers	Peers	UT
5	Area, Ethnic, Cultural, and Gender Studies	\$ 47,956	\$ 44,351	92%	9	2
9	Communication, Journalism and Related Programs	\$ 45,075	\$ 52,625	117%	58	3

For Fall, 2001 data, aggregate analyses at the college-level were also conducted though judged to be of little use for purposes of the group. This analysis was not repeated for Fall, 2002.

Step 6: Provide the data, analyses, and methodology to the administration and the AAUP to assist in planning for contract negotiations.

The raw data, analyses, and description of methodology is now being forwarded in draft form to the administration and the AAUP for review and discussion.

Appendix A –

Universities in the Initial selection Pool

1. Boise State University
2. Bowling Green State University
3. Brooklyn College, CUNY
4. California State University-Fresno
5. Central State University
6. City College of New York
7. Cleveland State University
8. Eastern Michigan University
9. Florida A&M University
10. Georgia State University
11. Hunter College, CUNY
12. Indiana University - Purdue University at Indianapolis
13. Kennesaw State University
14. Kent State University
15. Miami University
16. Northern Kentucky University
17. Oakland University
18. Ohio State University
19. Ohio University
20. Portland State University
21. San Diego State University
22. Shawnee State University
23. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
24. Southwest Missouri State University
25. SUNY Buffalo
26. Temple University
27. The University of Toledo
28. Towson University
29. University of Akron
30. University of Alabama-Birmingham
31. University of Alaska at Anchorage
32. University of Central Florida
33. University of Cincinnati
34. University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
35. University of Houston
36. University of Houston, Downtown
37. University of Illinois - Chicago
38. University of Massachusetts at Boston
39. University of Memphis
40. University of Missouri-Kansas City
41. University of Missouri-St. Louis
42. University of Nebraska at Omaha
43. University of New Mexico
44. University of New Orleans
45. University of North Texas
46. University of Pittsburgh
47. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
48. University of Texas at San Antonio
49. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
50. Virginia Commonwealth University
51. Washburn University
52. Wayne State University
53. Wichita State University
54. Wright State University
55. Youngstown State University

Appendix B – Variables Considered Universities in identifying Comparison Institutions

1. ACT University? (ACT Assessment Entrance Tests on Majority of Undergraduates)
2. Type of Institution
3. # full time faculty
4. City
5. State
6. Cost of Living Estimate Toledo = 1
7. Carnegie classification
8. Undergraduate in-state tuition and fees
9. Total enrollment
10. Graduate Enrollment as % of Total Enrollment
11. Undergraduate Enrollment as % of Total Enrollment
12. Highest Degree Offered
13. Types of colleges Within University

Appendix C - Universities in the 16 Comparison Institutions

1. University of Akron
2. University of Memphis
3. University of Houston
4. Georgia State University
5. Kent State University
6. University of Cincinnati
7. Univ. Wisconsin Milwaukee
8. SUNY Buffalo
9. Virginia Commonwealth
10. Wayne State University
11. Temple University
12. University New Mexico
13. University of New Orleans
14. Cleveland State University
15. University of Central Florida
16. Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis

Appendix D - Universities in the 12 Comparison Institutions Providing Salary Data

Fall, 2001 Salaries

1. University of Akron
2. University of Memphis
3. University of Houston
4. Georgia State University
5. Kent State University
6. Univ. Wisconsin Milwaukee
7. Wayne State University
8. Temple University
9. University New Mexico
10. University of New Orleans
11. Cleveland State University
12. Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis

Fall, 2001 Salaries

1. University of Akron
2. University of Memphis
3. University of Houston
4. Georgia State University
5. Kent State University
6. Wayne State University
7. University New Mexico
8. University of New Orleans
9. Cleveland State University
10. Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis
11. University of Central Florida