

April 24, 2006

To: John Carroll Faculty

From: The Rank, Tenure and Salary Committee

Re: CUPA salary figures for 2004-2005

Accompanying this memo are three documents summarizing John Carroll faculty salary data through 2004-05. These data are provided to the Faculty Forum by the Academic Vice President. CUPA figures lag the current budget by a year, so these figures do not include data for this year in which there were no raises.

CUPA (College and University Personnel Association) is an organization that member institutions send salary data to and, in return, obtain comparative salary information from a list of specified institutions. In the early 1990's John Carroll decided to compare itself to all CUPA members who also have accredited AACSB Schools of Business. The comparative list is referred to as a Special Study and, while the individual institutions can vary from year to year, the number of institutions has gradually increased over time to 281 for the 2004-05 Special Study.

The [CUPA Special Study](#) is the basis for determining the percentile rank of average salaries of full-time faculty by department. CUPA defines departments somewhat differently than does John Carroll. This is why, for example, PL and RL are treated as a single department for three years in the 1990's (incorrectly reported as: "from 1995 onward" in an earlier version of this memo) and EC, FN, MK and MN are treated as separate departments since 2002.

These summary data for average salaries in ranks by department are influenced by small N values as well as turnover of more highly paid retiring faculty and the promotion of less well-paid junior faculty. Nevertheless, some trends are clear. The number of departments with average salaries for Professors above the 50th percentile has remained steady and even increased in from 2002 onward. In 2004-05, in 14 of 19 departments the average salary for Professors was at the 50th percentile or higher for their disciplines. On the other hand, the average salaries of Associate Professors have fared less well. In the early 1990's, average salaries in nearly all departments were above the 50th percentile of the comparative group, but declined until 2002-03 when the average salary was at or above the 50th percentile in just 7 of 18 departments. Average salaries recovered in 2003-04 and 2004-05 but not to the point that they were in the mid-1990's. To a similar but lesser degree, comparative average salaries of Assistant Professors peaked in the mid-1990's, declined, but then substantially recovered in 2003-2005. Thus, it is clear that this current year of no raises will have its greatest impact on the comparative average salaries of Associate Professors. Salary compression at the Associate Professor level appears to becoming a long term problem in the John Carroll salary structure.

The [second table](#) breaks salary goals down by department. For those not familiar with this format, individual departments are not identified but designated anonymously by letter. Each cell shows how much money is needed to raise department faculty at a given rank to the 50th, 65th, or 80th percentile of the comparative CUPA group for that discipline. The table shows that the total dollar amount to reach the percentile goals actually declined in 2004-05 relative to the previous year. Next year's data will undoubtedly reverse the picture. The data show that more than half (54%) of the ~\$100,000 needed to reach the 50th percentile across all departments and ranks would have to go to Associate Professors, who comprised just 32% of the 2004-05 faculty. The Rank, Tenure and Salary Committee has always viewed the 50th percentile of the CUPA comparative group as a floor we must not fall below. The RTS recommends that the Faculty begin a discussion to address what we perceive to be growing salary inequity by rank. This problem may become exacerbated during lean budget years unless special attention is paid to it.

The [last document](#) presents a gender breakdown of salary by rank and compares JCU data to a group of schools designated *CatIIa*. The data show that salaries of female Professors have improved over time but still lag salaries of male Professors by about 5%. At the Associate level, average salaries of women have been equal to or surpassed those of their male counterparts in most recent years (an effect of salary compression?). At the Assistant and Instructor levels, average salaries of females are less by 5-10% than average male salaries in the same discipline. The discrepancy in average salaries for Assistant Professors is a perplexing piece of data, given JCU's use of CUPA figures to set incoming salaries for new hires. One factor may be that women are being promoted to the Associate level at a more rapid rate than men leaving relatively more highly paid males at the Assistant level. The RTS recommends that the cause of this discrepancy be investigated more fully.