

AAUP Report on 1966-67 Salary Survey

Private institutions of higher education continue to lead their public counterparts in levels of faculty pay in the current academic year, but they are fast losing ground because of greater percentage increases at the public institutions, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reported.

The average top-level annual salary at the private universities exceeded that of the public institutions by more than \$2000, according to the preliminary report of the 1966-67 AAUP salary survey. However, between academic years 1964-65 and 1966-67, compensation for professors at public universities had increased by 15.2 percent as compared with 12.1 percent at private independent universities.

At this rate, the AAUP predicted, the public universities would catch up with their private counterparts in about a decade. The report expressed concern over the "financial crisis" that threatens the private schools and said that the association intends to study it further.

In the salary survey, the institutions are graded on average and minimum compensation scales, a double-A rating being the highest. This year 28 schools received a rating of A or better on both scales, as compared with 22 last year.

Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa, which recently lost its academic accreditation, was the only institution to rate a double A on both scales. Last year it received the double A on the minimum scale and a single A on the average scale.

Amherst College jumped from single A's on both scales last year to a double A on the minimum scale this year.

Six institutions moved up into the straight-A rank this year. The six (with last year's ratings in parentheses) are: Brandeis (average scale, B; minimum scale, B); Brown (average, B; minimum, grade not authorized for publication last year); Cornell (average, A; minimum, B); State University of New York at Binghamton (average, B; minimum, A); Queens College (average, B; minimum, A); and Stanford (average, A, minimum, B).

Institutions that maintained the high rank they held last year are Lake Forest College, with ratings of A on the average scale and AA on the minimum, and 18 institutions with ratings of A on both scales: Brooklyn College, California Institute of Technology, University of Chicago, City College of New York, Columbia, Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Knox, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, State University of New York (at Buffalo and Stony Brook), University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, University of Rochester, Swarthmore, Wesleyan, and Yale.

Trailing closely were the University of Michigan and Northwestern University, with ratings of A on the average scale and B on the minimum.

New York was the only state whose public institutions ranked A on both scales.

The scales used in grading are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Scale of average and minimum salaries corresponding to ranks of AA and A.

Position	Salary	
	AA	A
<i>Average</i>		
Professor	\$24,510	\$19,630
Assoc. professor	14,790	12,790
Asst. professor	11,210	9,890
Instructor	8,420	7,560
<i>Minimum</i>		
Professor	17,220	14,530
Assoc. professor	12,490	10,850
Asst. professor	9,370	8,290
Instructor	7,100	6,390

Copies of the survey will be available from the AAUP in August.

The results prompted a member of the University of California Board of Regents to ask that salaries there be increased. Edward Carter, former board chairman, pointed out that Stanford and Caltech were ahead of the University of California, which ranked 42nd in the nation for average salary of full-time faculty members.

Governor Reagan, commenting on Carter's remarks, said that faculty salaries were due for a 7-percent increase in the 1967-68 fiscal budget, and added, "We have to remember the fringe benefits, too."



Representative Daniel J. Flood

At the hearings, which were held in April and published last week,* Flood asked James B. Cardwell, HEW's budget chief, to discuss the guidelines that were used in preparing the budget. Replied Cardwell, "... we indicated to all our operating agencies and the National Institutes of Health that this would be a tough budget year and that they should be prepared to rank their requirements by priority."

"Did you ask them to read the election returns?" Flood asked.

"In effect we did, yes," Cardwell said.

Just how Flood would treat NIH if given free rein cannot be said with certainty, but at various points throughout the proceedings he demonstrated a Fogarty-like impatience with the tightness of the administration's budget. Noting that the Institute of General Medical Sciences would be cutting back on support of fellowships, he declared, "I have heard all these statements that we don't have doctors, we don't have dentists, we don't have technicians, . . . we don't have this and we don't have that; we can't do this because we can't get the faculty. But then all I have seen here, institute after institute, is cutbacks on training grants, cutbacks on fellowships. How in the world did you put this together?"

To which NIH director James A. Shannon replied, "We can only say that when the final decision had to be made, within a budget ceiling either to support already established scientists or to train, we elected to support those already trained."

* Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1968, Hearings, Part 5, and Report, available from the House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D.C.