

# Report on Faculty Compensation

## September 2000

### *Table of Contents*

Executive Summary .....	2
Introduction.....	2
Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Schools .....	2
Nature of the University .....	2
Summary of Method.....	3
Findings .....	3
Schools and Salaries.....	3
Benefits.....	5
Summer Teaching Pay.....	5
Conclusions .....	6
Appendix	
Table A1: Comparison Schools on Selected Criteria .....	7
Table A2: Weighted Average Salaries .....	7
Table A3: Salaries Adjusted for Cost of Living .....	8
Table A4: Salaries at Best National LAS Colleges.....	9
Table A5: Percent Increase in Salary .....	10
CUPA data: Salaries by Discipline among Comparison Schools	11



## **Executive Summary**

For the purpose of comparing Truman State University's compensation (salary and benefits) structure to other institutions of higher education, 11 comparison schools were identified based on a number of criteria. For the purpose of examining Truman's summer pay structure, a number of other public universities in Missouri were surveyed, as well as the 11 designated comparison schools. The comparison school group, as identified, consists of eight COPLAC universities (Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges and universities), and three other schools.

Data collected suggest that Truman's faculty compensation package--salary and benefits--lags behind the average of comparable schools. This appears to be true at all ranks, although most notably at the rank of full professor. Regardless of rank, evidence based on some measures, as presented below, indicate that this lag may be substantial. In all comparisons regarding summer pay, Truman is positioned firmly at the bottom of the scale.

### **I. Introduction**

Extensive information on salary structures of comparison schools—narrowly defined and more broadly construed—was collected; however, opportunities to supplement salaries through internal grants were not identified. Comparative data on Truman's benefits package are provided; however, an extensive and detailed comparison of benefit packages with similar institutions was ultimately beyond our capacity due to limitations in professional (human resources) expertise and time constraints.

The issue of faculty compensation must be evaluated in various contexts. At a minimum, such contexts would include two considerations: a) faculty compensation compared with other similar schools, b) the nature of the university charter, mission, reputation and academic aspirations.

#### **A. Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Similar Schools**

Addressed below.

#### **B. Nature of the University**

As most students and employees are well aware, Truman State University is Missouri's designated public liberal arts and sciences university, with highly selective admission and an institutional commitment to excellence. A recognized element of this excellence is high-quality faculty. One explicit goal of *Affirming the Promise (1997-2007)*<sup>1</sup>, is to "recruit and retain diverse faculty with impressive academic credentials, solid experience in the liberal arts and sciences, dedication to the support and cultivation of student progress, and a strong commitment to continuing scholarly and professional development" (p. 60).

But Truman is more than a collection of aspirations. The quality of its existing faculty is reflected in the institution's high academic ratings. Truman enjoys a regional and even national reputation across several education-related domains. This fact makes the selection of a comparison group of similar institutions particularly challenging. In terms of university mission the 17 member institutions of COPLAC would be a logical comparison group; however, these schools vary widely on certain key comparison criteria and very few enjoy the academic reputation of Truman.

This effort is complicated even further by Truman's supportive institutional value of affordability (*Affirming*, pp. 5, 12-13) and its commitment to a lean administrative and staffing structure in conjunction with its emphasis on institutional quality. Just as "higher education in Missouri has, historically, functioned in the context of two competing values" (pro-education yet anti-tax, see *Affirming*, p. 67), so Truman's commitment to maximum quality at minimum cost also constitutes a fundamental tension.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Affirming the Promise, An Agenda for Excellence in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: University Master Plan 1997-2007*. Truman State University.

## II. Summary of Method

The first step was to determine the schools that were most comparable to Truman. The committee used the following criteria:

- Student enrollment, and the nature and extent of any postgraduate academic programs
- Percentage of undergraduate student body graduating within the top 10 percent and top 25 percent of their high school class
- SAT and ACT scores
- Percentage graduating within six years
- Student to faculty ratio
- Percentage of full-time faculty

The most important of these were enrollment, ratio, and percentage of full-time faculty. Also considered was the Carnegie category of the institution. Schools not in Category IIA (like Truman) or IIB were automatically excluded. (These categories are defined below.) Using these criteria, the committee began by examining other COPLAC schools, since this association features medium-sized schools with a largely undergraduate liberal arts and sciences mission. We then examined extensive reports from *Peterson's* in order to identify additional schools similar to Truman on these criteria. Over several meetings, the committee examined potential comparison schools and narrowed the list to eleven public universities. The Truman Faculty Senate approved the committee's selection at its meeting on March 16, 2000. The committee utilized three sources of faculty salary and compensation data: (a) an annual survey conducted by the American Association for University Professors (AAUP), (b) the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), and, to a limited extent, the National Center for Education Statistics IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System). Table 1 presents AAUP data from 1997, 1998, and 1999. For each institution, average salaries are reported for professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and a weighted average for all ranks at the institution as a whole. These data do not, however, account for the wide variation between disciplines in salaries and overall compensation. We therefore also include data at the conclusion of the Appendix from CUPA's annual report on faculty salaries, which is broken down by discipline and level. We have picked the disciplines reported by CUPA that seemed to best reflect disciplines at Truman, although inevitably there are differences.

## III. Findings

The findings are presented primarily in tabular format under three headings: (a) Identification of comparative schools and their salary scales; (b) benefit packages; (c) summer teaching pay. Again, lack of time and expertise precluded a thorough examination of benefit packages. To aid readability of the narrative portion of this report, some tables are positioned in the Appendix.

### A. Schools and Salary

For the list of comparison schools and their scores on selected criteria, see Table A1. Table 1 (below) summarizes salary data (in thousands) for Truman and the comparison schools. Table A2 shows weighted average salaries for 1999, by rank, for Truman and the comparison schools.

**Table 1. Comparison Schools: Faculty Salaries & Total Compensation Packages, by Rank, 1997-99  
With U.S. News & World Report Rankings, 1999**

(As Reported by Participating Institutions. Source: AAUP's *Academe*, March-April issue, 1998, 99 & 00)

	U.S. News Ranking	CAT	Salary					Compensation Package					
			PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	
<b>COPLAC</b>													
CA-Sonoma State	97	IIA	66.9	53.0	44.3		60.7	82.6	66.5	56.0		75.2	
	98	Regional	67.3	52.6	43.2		59.6	75.2	59.1	48.5		66.6	
	<b>99</b>	West, 21	71.5	56.8	45.4		63.3	87.8	70.7	57.0		77.8	
MD-St. Mary's	97	IIB	60.2	47.4	40.4	37.3	44.6	74.3	59.0	50.7	47.1	55.7	
	98	National, LAS	70.0	54.7	40.3		53.0	86.8	68.2	50.2		66.0	
	<b>99</b>	Second Tier	72.4	55.5	41.1		54.4	89.7	69.3	51.8		68.0	
MN-UM-Morris	97	IIB	62.5	47.0	38.6	34.7	45.5	81.1	62.5	52.3	47.6	60.6	
	98	National Univ.	64.9	49.4	37.8	34.3	46.7	84.6	65.9	51.9	47.7	62.7	
	<b>99</b>	Second Tier	67.2	51.4	38.7	35.9	48.5	88.7	69.6	54.3	50.9	66.1	
<b>MO-TRUMAN</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>IIA</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>46.4</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>53.9</b>	
	<b>98</b>	Regional	<b>58.7</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>45.6</b>	<b>73.1</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>49.6</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>57.3</b>	
	<b>99</b>	Midwest, 9	<b>62.0</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>59.4</b>	
NC-UNC-Asheville	97	IIB	61.9	48.8	36.5		47.0	74.5	59.2	44.6		57.0	
	98	National LAS	64.2	49.4	37.2		48.9	77.1	59.8	45.4		59.1	
	<b>99</b>	Fourth Tier	65.2	49.9	38.8		49.9	77.5	59.9	46.9		59.8	
NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	97	IIA	74.7	60.0	47.2		58.6	94.1	75.7	59.5		73.8	
	98	Regional	77.2	61.9	48.5		60.5	98.6	79.0	61.9		77.2	
	<b>99</b>	North, 8	78.1	62.4	47.5		59.4	102.2	81.6	62.2		77.8	
NY-SUNY-Geneseo	97	IIA	55.6	44.3	36.1	33.6	43.3	71.3	57.1	45.4	41.8	55.2	
	98	Regional	58.2	47.2	38.7	34.6	45.8	74.8	60.5	48.7	43.2	58.3	
	<b>99</b>	North, 8	59.7	48.6	40.2	35.2	47.1	77.2	62.8	50.3	42.8	60.1	
SC-College of Charleston	97	IIA	56.1	46.8	37.4	30.3	43.8	68.5	57.7	46.5	38.2	54.0	
	98	Regional	57.4	46.8	38.2	31.5	44.5	70.4	58.0	47.8	39.8	55.3	
	<b>99</b>	South, 11	60.9	49.7	40.1	33.8	47.4	74.3	61.2	49.9	42.6	58.5	
VA-Mary Washington	97	IIB	57.1	45.7	37.0		46.2	69.9	56.6	46.4		57.2	
	98	Regional	62.1	49.2	40.0		50.1	76.5	61.2	50.5		62.3	
	<b>99</b>	South, 5	Not reported										
<b>Non-COPLAC</b>													
KY-Murray State	97	IIA	54.4	45.6	37.8		43.5	69.9	59.0	49.4		56.0	
	98	Regional	57.0	48.2	40.1		45.4	73.7	62.8	52.6		59.2	
	<b>99</b>	South, 29	60.8	50.1	41.4		47.4	77.6	64.7	53.7		61.1	
MN-Winona State	97		-										
	98	Reg. Mid-West	IIB	60.0	48.1	41.2	31.4	50.4	75.6	60.6	52.0	39.6	63.5
	<b>99</b>	Second Tier	Not reported										
WI-Lacrosse	97	IIA	56.5	47.2	42.3		47.9	71.8	30.7	54.9		61.5	
	98	Regional	58.0	49.2	43.7		49.2	74.3	63.8	52.3		62.7	
	<b>99</b>	Midwest, 23	60.8	51.7	45.1		51.0	77.3	66.5	53.6		64.3	

**Notes To Tables Based on (AAUP) Data:**

(From *Academe*, March-April 2000, p. 37)

*Salary.* This figure represents the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration. Where faculty members are given duties for eleven or twelve months, salary is converted to a standard academic-year basis.

*Compensation.* Compensation represents salary plus major fringe benefits.

*Category IIA (Comprehensive Institutions).* These institutions are characterized by diverse postbaccalaureate programs (including first professional), but do not engage in significant doctoral-level education.

*Category IIB (General Baccalaureate).* These institutions are characterized by their primary emphasis on general undergraduate baccalaureate-level education.

Table 2, below, shows Truman’s relative position to the 11 comparison schools by academic rank in terms of salary and compensation. For this information adjusted by cost-of-living (COL) see Table A3. When factoring in the COL, Truman moves from low in the bottom half of the comparison institutions to fairly high in the top half. However, there is some question about the appropriateness of considering COL in determining comparability of salaries.

**Table 2. Truman Rank Against 11 Comparison Institutions by Faculty Rank in Salary and Compensation -- Not Adjusted for Cost of Living**  
(Source of Data: AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

	<u>Salary</u>					<u>Compensation Package</u>				
	<u>PR</u>	<u>AO</u>	<u>AI</u>	<u>IN</u>	<u>AR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>AO</u>	<u>AI</u>	<u>IN</u>	<u>AR</u>
Truman Rank	7	6	10	-	9	9	7	10	-	11

There is another way to compare Truman with peer universities—a way that takes into account this school’s drive for academic quality and outstanding faculty. This alternative involves making an institutional commitment to being competitive at some level with institutions of higher education well known for excellence. Truman’s Master Plan takes this approach where it states the goal of increasing the salaries of full-time, regular assistant and associate professors at Truman to at least 90 percent of the average for nationally ranked liberal arts colleges and increase full professors to at least 80 percent of the comparable national average (“provided sufficient mission enhancement funds are available”). Using the administration-provided list of U.S. News’ 25 Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, Truman fell about 10 percent short of those goals in 1999 (see Table A4).

**B. Benefits**

Comparative data from IPEDS regarding Truman’s Medical/Dental plan, relative to the comparison schools, also suggests that faculty benefits at Truman are relatively low (see Table 3).

**Table 3. Medical/Dental Plans: 9/10 Month Contracts, Expenditures--1998**  
From the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)  
(Faculty Salaries Data: Fringe benefits of full-time instructional faculty(SAL98\_B))

<u>Institution Name</u>	<u>Total \$</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Average \$</u>
College of NJ	2,111,998	322	6,559
UM-Morris	695,742	114	6,103
UW-La Crosse	1,739,486	337	5,162
Winona State	1,163,452	280	4,155
Sonoma State	861,507	215	4,007
SUNY-Geneseo	778,416	226	3,444
Murray State	1,066,611	318	3,354
Mary Washington Coll	538,614	161	3,345
St. Mary’s Coll of MD	332,472	111	2,995
Coll of Charleston	904,912	368	2,459
<b>Truman State Univ</b>	<b>829,150</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>2,369</b>
UNC-Asheville	279,335	161	1,735

**C. Summer teaching pay**

Faculty salary compensation for summer teaching at Truman is among the lowest of the comparison schools (see Table 4 below). Among the seven schools that remunerate as a percentage of salary, Truman is at the

bottom. However, compared to the two schools that pay a flat rate, Truman's summer salary compares favorably, except at the rank of assistant professor.

**Table 4. Faculty Summer Pay Calculation per Three-Credit Hour Course**

Data for 1999/00 Academic Year (compiled by Professor Gary Jones)

**Percentage Based Schools**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Comments</u>
UM-Morris	9.00%	Of base annual salary per previous academic year
Coll of Charleston	7.50%	Of 9-month salary; summer cap is 22.5% of salary
Murray State	7.50%	
Mary Washington Coll	7.20%	Of base salary; guaranteed, if course is listed, it's taught
Winona State	6.75%	
Coll. of NJ	6.25%	Or 5.25% without Ph.D.
<b>Truman State Univ</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	

**Flat Rate Schools**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Amount</u>
UNC-Asheville	IN=2220, AI=2280, AO=2550, PR=2925
SUNY-Geneseo	\$2400 per course

(Note: Sonoma State pays a flat rate by rank but it varies based on enrollment; St. Mary's Coll of MD pays a flat rate by rank but exact figures were unavailable)

(Note: converting Truman's percentage to a flat rate and based on average salaries at each rank, AI=1985, AO=2530, PR=3100)

**IV. Conclusions**

The market is competitive. If Truman cannot remain competitive in terms of faculty salaries and total compensation packages, the talent may go elsewhere. Truman's faculty compensation package lags behind that of comparable institutions. Faculty salaries are lower than at comparable institutions, and Truman remains slightly short of its Master Plan goals for salaries at all ranks. This lag does not seem to be improving, despite recent raises (Table A5). Although somewhat selective, data suggests that Truman is also not keeping pace with comparable universities in the realm of employee benefits. However, if Truman is serious about evaluating the state of its institutional benefits package then consideration might be given to calling in the experts.



# APPENDIX

**Table A1. Comparison Schools on Selected Criteria**

(Source: Peterson's Guide)

Public Schools	Undergraduates (Graduate Students)	Student:Faculty Ratio	UG Faculty (% fulltime)	6-year Graduation Rate	(Average) SAT Verbal Middle 50%*	(Average) SAT Math Middle 50%*	(Average) ACT Middle 50%*	Top 10% of HS Class	Top 25% of HS Class
College of New Jersey	5853 (858)	14:1	626 (52%)	80%	(607) 560-660	(620) 580-670		59%	92%
University of Charleston	8876 (0)	18:1	671 (68%)	52%	(576) 530-620	(563) 520-600	(25) 22-28	27%	58%
Mary Washington	3596 (36)	18:1	242 (73%)	74%	550-650	550-630		44%	82%
University of Minnesota- Morris	1919 (0)	16:1	120 (100%)	63%	(550) 520-650	(570) 540-690	(24) 22-28	45%	76%
Murray State University	7347 (1556)	16:1	481 (77%)				(23)	30%	64%
University of North Carolina - Asheville	2760 (40)	11:1	287 (56%)	52%	510-630	520-620	21-26	25%	66%
Sonoma State University	5856 (1147)	19:1	520 (49%)	45%	(522) 500-599	(523) 500-599		25%	55%
St Mary's of Maryland	1539 (0)	13:1	173 (65%)	374%	(621) 580-680	(616) 570-660		48%	80%
SUNY - Geneseo	5197 (300)	19:1	334 (75%)	77%	(600) 560-640	(604) 570-620	(26) 24-28	48%	92%
<b>Truman State University</b>	<b>5967 (354)</b>	<b>16:1</b>	<b>396 (90%)</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>(614) 560-670</b>	<b>(610) 560-670</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>81%</b>
Winona State University	6138 (615)	21:1	350 (93%)		(530)	(560)	(23) 21-25	20%	45%
University of Wisconsin- La Crosse	8324 (682)	20:1	478 (75%)	51%			(24) 22-26	23%	62%

**Table A2. Weighted Average Salaries, by Rank, by Comparison Universities**

AAUP 1999-00 Salary Survey

University	Prof.	Assoc.	Assist.	Instr.	All Ranks
Sonoma State University	71,900	56,800	45,400	32,400	63,300
Trenton State College	78,100	62,400	47,500	42,700	59,400
St. Mary's Coll. of Maryland	72,400	55,500	41,100	38,400	54,400
Univ. of N.C. at Asheville	65,200	49,900	38,800	34,400	51,300
Murray State University	60,800	50,100	41,400	29,000	50,200
Univ. Minnesota-Morris	67,200	51,400	38,700	35,900	48,500
<b>Truman State Univ.</b>	<b>62,000</b>	<b>50,600</b>	<b>39,700</b>	<b>32,600</b>	<b>47,500</b>
SUNY College at Geneseo	59,700	48,600	40,200	35,200	47,500
College of Charleston	60,900	49,700	40,100	33,800	47,400
Winona State University	-	-	-	-	-
<i>* Arithmetic Average</i>	<i>67,039</i>	<i>53,063</i>	<i>41,652</i>	<i>35,209</i>	<i>52,759</i>
<i>* Weighted Average</i>	<i>67,066</i>	<i>52,989</i>	<i>42,271</i>	<i>34,344</i>	<i>52,798</i>
Weighted Avg minus Truman	5,066	2,389	2,571	1,744	5,298

*\* Arithmetic and Weighted Averages do not include the Requesting Institution*

**Table A3. Comparison Institutions, Average Faculty Salary by Rank, Adjusted for Cost of Living**

(Salaries in Thousands; Source: AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

Average Salary of Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	78.1	70.3
2) KY - Murray State	60.8	63.2
3) MN - UM - Morris	67.2	62.5
<b>4) MO - Truman</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>62.0</b>
5) MD - St. Mary's	72.4	61.5
6) WI - La Crosse	60.8	57.2
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	65.2	56.1
8) SC - College of Charleston	60.9	49.3
9) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	59.7	49.0
10) CA - Sonoma State	71.5	46.5
VA - Mary Washington		
MN - Winona State		

Average Salary of Associate Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	62.4	56.2
2) KY - Murray State	50.1	52.1
<b>3) MO - Truman</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>50.6</b>
4) WI - La Crosse	51.7	48.6
5) MN - UM - Morris	51.4	47.8
6) MD - St. Mary's	55.5	47.2
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	49.9	42.9
8) SC - College of Charleston	49.7	40.3
9) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	48.6	39.9
10) CA - Sonoma State	56.8	36.9
VA - Mary Washington		
MN - Winona State		

Average Salary of Assistant Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) KY - Murray State	41.4	43.1
2) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	47.5	42.8
3) WI - La Crosse	45.1	42.4
<b>4) MO - Truman</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>39.7</b>
5) MN - UM - Morris	38.7	36.0
6) MD - St. Mary's	41.1	34.9
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	38.8	33.4
8) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	40.2	33.0
9) SC - College of Charleston	40.1	32.5
10) CA - Sonoma State	45.4	29.5
11) VA - Mary Washington		
12) MN - Winona State		

Cost of Living Factors:

- Trenton NJ (.90)
- St Mary's MD (.85)
- Asheville NC (.86)
- Morris MN (.93)
- Charleston SC (.81)
- Murray KY (1.04)
- LaCrosse WI (.94)
- Sonoma CA (.65)
- Geneseo NY (not available, used Rochester .82)

Source: Homefair.com Cost Index

**Table A4. U.S. News 25 Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, Alpha by State  
Faculty Salaries by Rank; Total Compensation by All Ranks, 1999**

(Source: Colleges, *U.S. News & World Report*; List from Truman's office of Institutional Research)  
(Source of Salaries, AAUP's *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

	State	CAT	Faculty Salaries by Rank					Total Comp
			PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	AR
Claremont McKenna	CA	IIB	90.5	61.8	48.8		70.7	86.1
Pomona	CA	IIB	88.7	66.1	55.6		72.2	88.8
Trinity	CT	IIB	89.4	64.6	46.4		67.5	85.2
Wesleyan	CT	IIA	87.8	60.4	49.4		73.0	91.7
Grinnell	IA	IIB	86.3	63.1	47.0	42.7	64.6	80.9
Amherst	MA	IIB	92.8	64.7	52.8		79.9	100.8
College of the Holy Cross	MA	IIB	81.4	60.7	47.1		62.7	78.0
Mount Holyoke	MA	IIB	84.6	60.7	49.3		69.0	85.6
Smith	MA	IIA	89.8	63.1	49.9	40.7	73.3	94.3
Wellesley	MA	IIB	95.4	68.2	53.9		78.0	100.8
Williams	MA	IIB	93.7	65.1	53.0		73.8	93.2
Bates	ME	IIB	80.6	57.9	45.3		62.7	78.9
Bowdoin	ME	IIB	89.8	64.7	48.7	43.1	65.5	82.6
Colby	ME	IIB	91.2	61.5	47.6		68.1	83.4
Carlton	MN	IIB	79.6	59.5	47.7		66.5	86.9
Macalester	MN	IIB	80.1	60.3	45.2	37.5	61.2	75.6
Davidson	NC	IIB	76.3	54.1	44.1		61.6	80.8
Colgate	NY	IIB	90.1	67.4	49.7		69.4	87.4
Hamilton	NY	IIB	80.2	61.0	46.9	42.4	64.7	83.1
Vassar	NY	IIB	85.5	61.6	47.6	40.8	62.8	80.3
Oberlin	OH	IIB	77.5	59.9	46.2	40.7	64.4	83.5
Bryn Mawr	PA	IIA	85.6	61.7	48.6		65.2	82.4
Haverford	PA	IIB	82.6	61.6	48.3		63.6	88.0
Swarthmore	PA	IIB	94.2	66.4	51.6	45.4	74.7	93.1
Washington and Lee	VA	IIB	82.9	56.5	46.6		68.8	85.6
Middlebury	VT	IIB	<u>88.3</u>	<u>63.2</u>	<u>50.4</u>	<u>45.3</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>84.0</u>
<u>Crude Average</u>			<u>86.3</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>48.8</u>	<u>42.1</u>	<u>68.1</u>	<u>86.2</u>
Truman's Goal (PR*80%) <sup>1</sup>			69.1					
Truman's Goal (AO*90%) <sup>1</sup>				55.9				
Truman's Goal (AI*90%) <sup>1</sup>					43.9			
<u>Truman's Actual, 1999</u>			<u>62.0</u>	<u>50.6</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>32.6</u>	<u>47.6</u>	<u>59.4</u>
Difference, 1999			<u>-\$7,074.0</u>	<u>-\$5,332.0</u>	<u>-\$4,182.0</u>			
Percent of Goal			89.8%	90.5%	90.5%			

<sup>1</sup> *Affirming the Promise*, p. 63

**Table A5. Percent Increase in Salary for Continuing Faculty,**  
 AAUP Salary Survey, 1999-2000 Academic Year

<b>University</b>	<b>Prof.</b>	<b>Assoc.</b>	<b>Asst.</b>	<b>Instr.</b>	<b>AR</b>
College of Charleston	6.96	7.18	7.08	8.13	7.15
St. Mary's Coil.of Maryland	7.63	5.67	6.86	3.86	6.75
Univ. of N.C. at Asheville	5.35	5.76	5.77	6.68	5.60
Murray State University	5.43	5.42	5.47	4.97	5.43
SUNY College at Geneseo	4.55	5.46	5.90	6.10	5.33
<i>Truman State Univ.</i>	5.40	5.30	5.10	4.50	5.22
Sonoma State University	-				-
Trenton State College	-				-
Univ. Minnesota-Morris	-				-
Winona State University	-				-