

Salary Report from Faculty Welfare Committee

SALARY COMPARISONS OF TEN SOUTHEASTERN STATE UNIVERSITIES, 1978-1988

AL = University of Alabama
 CL = Clemson University
 FL = University of Florida
 GA = University of Georgia
 KY = University of Kentucky
 MS = University of Mississippi
 NC = University of North Carolina
 SC = University of South Carolina
 TN = University of Tennessee
 VA = University of Virginia

Full Professors

1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
1. VA 37.5	1. VA 40.1	1. VA 38.0	1. VA 41.8	1. VA 44.8	1. VA 45.6	1. VA 49.0	1. VA 53.8	1. VA 59.0	1. VA 62.6
2. NC 35.7	2. NC 37.7	2. NC 37.8	2. NC 41.5	2. GA 41.1	2. GA 43.6	2. NC 46.2	2. NC 50.7	2. NC 53.2	2. NC 55.8
3. KY 31.4	3. GA 34.5	3. GA 35.5	3. GA 39.0	3. NC 40.6	3. NC 42.5	3. FL 45.2	3. GA 48.2	3. FL 50.9	3. FL 53.9
4. AL 31.3	4. AL 33.4	4. SC 33.8	4. CL 37.2	4. FL 37.7	4. FL 39.9	4. GA 44.9	4. FL 47.7	4. GA 50.7	4. GA 51.9
5. SC 30.6	5. SC 33.2	5. AL 33.0	5. SC 36.6	5. SC 37.5	5. SC 39.3	5. SC 41.6	5. AL 45.4	5. CL 46.3	5. SC 48.3
6. GA 30.3	6. KY 32.8	6. CL 32.2	6. AL 35.8	6. KY 37.4	6. KY 39.3	6. CL 41.1	6. SC 44.5	6. SC 46.1	6. TN 48.0
7. TN 29.7	7. TN 31.9	7. KY 31.6	7. KY 35.2	7. CL 36.4	7. CL 39.1	7. KY 40.0	7. CL 44.4	7. TN 45.6	7. AL 47.9
8. CL 28.0	8. CL 30.8	8. FL 30.9	8. FL 35.0	8. AL 35.1	8. AL 36.5	8. AL 39.4	8. KY 42.4	8. KY 45.4	8. CL 46.9
9. FL 27.8	9. FL 30.1	9. TN 30.2	9. MS 32.7	9. TN 34.5	9. MS 35.9	9. TN 38.9	9. TN 42.4	9. AL 45.3	9. KY 46.9
10. MS 27.3	10. MS 29.3	10. MS 29.8	10. TN 30.6	10. MS 32.7	10. TN 33.8	10. MS 37.2	10. MS 38.6	10. MS 38.6	10. MS 41.3

Associate Professors

1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
1. VA 26.4	1. VA 28.5	1. NC 27.0	1. NC 29.5	1. VA 30.7	1. NC 31.2	1. FL 34.7	1. NC 36.8	1. VA 39.9	1. VA 42.1
2. NC 25.8	2. NC 27.5	2. VA 26.9	2. VA 28.8	2. GA 29.8	2. GA 31.1	2. NC 34.1	2. VA 36.7	2. FL 38.8	2. FL 40.9
3. KY 24.4	3. GA 25.7	3. GA 26.0	3. GA 28.5	3. NC 29.3	3. VA 30.9	3. VA 33.6	3. FL 36.5	3. NC 38.5	3. NC 40.1
4. AL 24.0	4. AL 25.6	4. SC 25.2	4. CL 28.0	4. KY 28.3	4. CL 30.0	4. GA 32.0	4. GA 34.0	4. GA 35.3	4. GA 36.4
5. SC 23.2	5. KY 25.5	5. CL 25.2	5. SC 27.4	5. CL 28.0	5. FL 29.6	5. CL 31.2	5. AL 33.9	5. CL 34.4	5. AL 36.0
6. TN 23.2	6. TN 25.1	6. AL 25.1	6. KY 26.8	6. SC 27.7	6. KY 29.6	6. SC 30.5	6. CL 33.4	6. AL 33.9	6. CL 35.3
7. GA 22.9	7. SC 24.9	7. KY 24.3	7. AL 26.5	7. FL 27.6	7. SC 28.8	7. AL 30.1	7. SC 31.9	7. KY 33.7	7. TN 35.2
8. CL 22.5	8. CL 24.9	8. MS 23.5	8. FL 25.8	8. AL 26.9	8. MS 28.6	8. KY 29.8	8. KY 31.7	8. TN 33.3	8. KY 34.8
9. MS 22.4	9. MS 23.4	9. TN 23.5	9. MS 25.5	9. TN 26.4	9. AL 27.6	9. TN 29.7	9. TN 31.4	9. SC 33.2	9. SC 34.7
10. FL 21.4	10. FL 22.7	10. FL 22.9	10. TN 23.7	10. MS 25.9	10. TN 26.3	10. MS 29.0	10. MS 30.4	10. MS 30.6	10. MS 32.5

Assistant Professors

1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85		1985-86		1986-87		1987-88	
1. NC	21.8	1. NC	22.9	1. NC	22.1	1. NC	24.3	1. FL	24.1	1. FL	25.9	1. FL	30.1	1. FL	31.4	1. FL	32.9	1. NC	34.5
2. KY	19.8	2. GA	20.9	2. FL	20.7	2. FL	22.7	2. KY	23.3	2. NC	25.1	2. NC	27.8	2. NC	30.4	2. VA	32.0	2. FL	34.5
3. VA	19.3	3. KY	20.6	3. GA	20.5	3. GA	22.5	3. GA	23.2	3. CL	24.6	3. VA	26.0	3. VA	28.9	3. NC	31.4	3. VA	33.7
4. AL	19.2	4. AL	20.5	4. KY	20.1	4. KY	22.3	4. NC	23.1	4. SC	24.5	4. CL	25.9	4. CL	28.2	4. CL	29.6	4. SC	31.0
5. FL	19.0	5. FL	20.5	5. CL	19.9	5. CL	21.8	5. VA	22.6	5. GA	24.3	5. TN	25.8	5. AL	28.0	5. TN	29.1	5. GA	30.3
6. GA	18.9	6. TN	20.5	6. SC	19.8	6. SC	21.7	6. CL	22.4	6. KY	24.1	6. SC	25.3	6. TN	27.2	6. SC	28.9	6. TN	30.2
7. TN	18.9	7. VA	20.4	7. VA	19.4	7. VA	21.1	7. TN	21.9	7. MS	23.6	7. GA	25.1	7. SC	27.1	7. GA	28.8	7. KY	30.1
8. SC	18.7	8. CL	20.0	8. AL	19.3	8. MS	20.4	8. SC	21.8	8. VA	23.4	8. KY	24.7	8. GA	27.1	8. KY	28.7	8. AL	29.4
9. CL	18.2	9. SC	19.9	9. TN	18.9	9. AL	20.3	9. AL	20.9	9. AL	22.2	9. AL	24.1	9. KY	26.7	9. AL	28.0	9. CL	29.0
10. MS	17.6	10. MS	18.3	10. MS	18.5	10. TN	19.6	10. MS	20.3	10. TN	22.0	10. MS	23.1	10. MS	24.5	10. MS	25.0	10. MS	28.0

Analysis

This is a comparison of salaries paid the three professorial ranks at the ten state universities in the Southeast, including the University of South Carolina and Clemson University, which can be regarded as our peers. It is not a comparison of the University of South Carolina with the leading universities in the country. If it were, the picture would look bleaker. It would look still bleaker, if private universities such as Emory, Duke, or Vanderbilt were included as well.

Looking at the relative ranking, the survey shows that with respect to full professors USC traditionally has occupied the middle range. Having dipped to sixth place in 1985-87, the professors during the past year regained the fifth spot. The situation is absolutely dismal in the case of the associate professors, who slipped to place nine in 1986-87 and stayed there during 1987-88. It is this group of people, having been brought in at prevailing market rates, which egregiously has lost ground. Only the situation of the assistant professors has improved, driven by market forces.

The figures reflect only the salary levels to the end of the past academic year. USC's salary adjustments effective 1988-89 and where they place us in comparison will be available only in April or May 1989.

Based on a faculty comprised of 354 professors, 357 associate professors, and 225 assistant professors, it would require \$8.6 million to make us competitive with the leading university in the southeast, the University of Virginia. To reach our immediate neighbor to the north, the University of North Carolina, will require an outlay of \$5.4 million. In order to reach at least the national level on which we have to compete for faculty, the university needs to spend \$5.0 million.

This information was derived from Academe, the journal of the American Association of University Professors.