A A U P NEWSLETTER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS I. U. Bloomington

1975-76 Number 2

NATIONAL SALARY FIGURES AVAILABLE The national AAUP has made available its annual report on the economic status of the profession, with figures given for 1974-75. In this news-

letter, we are reporting two comparisons: first, the Big Ten figures are given with schools listed from best to worst in terms of median salary. These are reported in Table 1. Next, Professor Richard Hake has devised a comparison of I. U.'s average compensation with that of 9 of 11 schools having more graduate programs rated in the top 20 (in non-engineering areas) in the Roose-Anderson Report. These are Harvard, Wisconsin, Chicago, Yale, Illinois, Michigan, Stanford, Cornell, and Princeton. Data for Berkeley and UCLA are unavailable. These comparisons are shown in Table 2.

In both of these comparisons, I. U. has an unenviable position. The only Big Ten school reporting a lower median salary figure than I. U. is Iowa. (Michigan State did not report a median figure). No Big Ten school reported lower salary increase figures for professorial ranks. (Salary increase percentages for Iowa, Michigan State, and Illinois were not reported.) If mean salaries for each rank are used as the basis for comparison, I. U. ranks 6th for full professors. 8th for associate professors, and second for assistant professors.

In the comparison with schools having more graduate programs rated in the top 20, two notable facts emerge. First, I. U.'s position has worsened since 1971-72, and second, while the average compensation of I. U. assistant professors compares favorably with the overall average compensation of the nine other schools (a comparison which holds for the Big Ten as well), associate and full professors fare much worse. In fact, in 1974-75, average compensation for full professors was 12.57% less than the overall full professor average for the nine other schools, and for associate professors, 5.1% less. While it is important that I. U. remain competitive in hiring new assistant professors. it is equally important that this competitive position not be maintained at the expense of the higher ranks. Our excellence as a graduate training institution, particularly in terms of research training rests largely on the reputation of senior faculty. If we lose our outstanding researchers and scholars to other institutions, we have gained little more than the opportunity to house them while they mature. It is to be hoped that the salaries of our senior faculty will not continue to slide in such national comparisons.

TABLE 1 - BIG TEN COMPARISONS

Michigan State (Not Reported)	Iowa (16,300)	Indiana (16,600)	Minnesota (16,700)	Purdue (16,900)	Ohio State (17,300)	Wisconsin (18,200)	Illinois (18,600)	Northwestern (19,300)	Michigan (19,700)	figure)	INSTITUTION (Listed with median salary
26,7	25.5	26,8	26,4	27,7	25,3	26,9	26,1	30,5	29,8	neare FULL	AVERA (incl BY RA
20,8 17,3	19,8	19,6	26,4 19,6	27,7 20,2	19,1	18,8	19,8	30,5 21,0	22,0	nearest hundred	AVERAGE COMPENSATION (includes fringe ben BY RANK (rounded to
17,3	16,4	16,5	16,1	16,0	15,3	17,0	15,8	16,6	18,0	red	ENSATIO
14.2	13,6	13,9	16,1 13,7	16,0 11,2	15,3 12,1	13,6	13,5	13,5	13,8	INSTR	AVERAGE COMPENSATION (includes fringe benefits) BY RANK (rounded to
16.0	15.3	19.0	18.5	18.3	13.3	17.8	13.1	14.1	16.5	LULL	FRINGE OF AV.
17.6	16.2	20.1	18.9	19.3	13.4	19.7	13.5	15.9	18.2	ASSOC	FRINGE AS % OF AV. SALARY
19.1	17.0	20.6 20.7	19.4	19.0 11.2	13.6	20.8	13.9 14.3	16.9 17.3	19.4	TSSA	×
20.4	17.2	20.7	19.4 20.3	11.2	13.8	22.1	14.3	17.3	21.1	INSTR	
NOT REPORTED	NOT REPORTED	5.0	5.1	6.8	7.4	5.6	NOT	6.4	8.8	FULL	ACTUA
		5.8	5.9	6.7	9.0	6.5	REPORTED	8.2	9.4	ASSOC	ACTUAL SALARY INCREASE
		5.7	5.9	6.9	8.8	6.0	CED	8.2	9.4	ASST	24
		6.7	6.1	7.8	11.7	5.1		13.3	8.8	INSTR	

TABLE 2 - COMPENSATION COMPARISONS

A A U P BULLETIN DATA

C = Average compensation by rank (Salary adjusted to 9-month basis + countable fringe benefits) rounded to nearest 10^2 dollars. Units of C are 10^3 dollars.

Schools having	T			1					
more graduate				i		- 1			
programs (in	1			ı		1			
non-engineering				1		- 1			
program areas)				l		}			
than I.U./Blgtm				1		1			
according to						1			
F. Franz's	1971/72			1 19	972/73	- 1	1973/74		
analysis of	-				,	i			
Roose-Anderson	l c	С	С	c	С	С	С	С	С
Report.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.
Meport of	11111	111110011	11111111		1100001	110041			1,000
1. Harvard	28.2	19.1	15.0	28.2	20.2	14.6	31.1	19.6	15.6
2. Wisconsin	22.4	16.3	13.8	24.2	17.8	15.1	25.2	18.6	15.9
3. Chicago	27.5	19.2	15.2	28.8	19.7	15.6	30.7	20.8	16.6
4. Yale	28.9	18.2	13.9	29.7	18.1	13.6	30.9	18.7	13.8
5. Illinois	23.5	17.2	14.1	24.4	17.7	14.7	25.3	18.3	15.1
6. Michigan	24.9	18.4	15.3	26.2	19.5	16.0	27.8	20.8	17.1
4,0				27.4		15.7	29.0	20.3	16.5
 Stanford Cornell 	26.4	18.7	14.7		19.7	14.7		19.8	15.4
	25.7	18.2	14.5	26.9	18.6		28.7		
Princeton	25.8	17.0	13.3	26.9	17.9	14.0	28.2	18.9	14.4
£´c	233.3	162.3	129.8	242.7	169.2	13.4	256.9	175.8	140.4
T . 14 (T**)	25.	17.70	1/ 0	٠, ،	70.7	15.0	25.0	10.1	76.1
Indiana(IU)	24.1	17.70		24.8	18.1	15.3	25.8	19.1	16.1
C-C (IU)	+1.82	+0.33		+2.17	+0.7	-0.42	2.74		-0.50
100(C-C(IU))/	+7.55%	+1.86	% -2.7%	+8.75%	+3.8/%	-2.74%	+10.62%	+2.23%	-3.11%
C(IU)									
	1974/75								
1. Harvard	32.5	21.1	16.0						
2. Wisconsin	26.9	19.8	17.0						
3. Chicago	31.9	21.9	17.3				ì		
4. Yale	32.0	19.1	14.0						
5. Illinois	27.1	19.2	16.0				l.		
6. Michigan	29.8	22.0	18.0				ı		
7. Stanford	30.7	21.2	16.7				1		
8. Cornell	30.3	20.9					1		
			16.3				1		
9. Princeton	30.3	20.2	15.1						
≴c	271.5	185.4	146.4						
Ĉ= € C/9	30.17	20.60	16.27						
Indiana(IU)	26.8	19.6	16.5						
C-C (IU)	+3.37	+1.0	-0.23				1		
100(C-C(IV))/		% _5.1%	-1.39%						
100(0-0(10))	1.25.37	" _J.I%	-1.394				I		

AAUP URGES EQUAL PENSION BENEFITS FOR WOMEN FACULTY The debate over equal pension benefits for academic women has expanded within recent weeks as AAUP's President William W. Van Alstyne (Law, Duke University) and Senator Birch Bayh (D-Indiana)

joined those who are urging the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council to recommend a federal policy requiring equal pension benefits. General Secretary Joseph Duffey had asked President Ford earlier to provide similar guidance to the EEOCC's staff, which is preparing a regulation for a uniform federal policy on equality in employment-related pension benefits.

On September 30 Professor Van Alstyne wrote to Secretary of Labor John Dunlop, a member of the EEOCC, expressing the AAUP's view on reconciling Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with "recent inconsistent interpretations and tentative rules adopted by the Department of Labor in respect to the Equal Pay Act of 1963." Van Alstyne pointed out that a very substantial proportion of AAUP members pay monthly premiums to the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association (TIAA) under retirement plans adopted by their institutions. Male and female professors make identical payments and, consistent with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the institutions make equal percentage contributions in which there is no difference linked to either the sex or race of the academic employee. "Upon retirement at the same age, however," Van Alstyne said, "female emeritus professors receive smaller monthly payments than their male colleagues. The exclusive test that TIAA utilizes in determining this uniformly lesser payment is the sex of the annuitant." The impact, according to Van Alstyne, is "stark and obvious." 'Women, having paid as much as men for their annuity, are compelled to live in retirement more miserably than men solely because of their sex."

While TIAA is not the faculty member's employer and therefore not directly subject to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Pay Act, or Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the institutions which contract out their annuity plan to TIAA are employers and thereby come under the jurisdiction of the three federal laws.

Van Alstyne urged Secretary Dunlop to support the approval of a federal regulation mandating the use of premium or rate tables which do not differentiate on the basis of sex, and thus requiring both equal contributions and equal periodic benefits. He rejected the argument advanced by TIAA and others that "male faculty members would themselves somehow become the victim of discrimination were their female colleagues to receive the same monthly retirement payment as they." "The foolishness of this position," he said, "as a practical matter should be self-evident. Its unacceptability as a matter of law is plain...."

This Mailing Sponsored By A.A.U.P.