

1985-87 SPECIAL COMPENSATION
INCREASES FOR UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM FACULTY

State of Wisconsin

Legislative Fiscal Bureau

January, 1987



1985-87 SPECIAL COMPENSATION
INCREASES FOR UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM FACULTY

State of Wisconsin

Prepared by
David Suchman

Legislative Fiscal Bureau

January, 1987



1985-87 SPECIAL COMPENSATION
INCREASES FOR UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM FACULTY

On September 22, 1983, Governor Earl appointed a faculty compensation study committee by executive order. The committee was directed to study the current and historical levels of faculty salaries and other employee compensation, the internal and external salary pay plan practices of the University of Wisconsin System and the State of Wisconsin, and possible funding sources for any recommended changes in compensation. Two co-chairs were appointed by the Governor: the University of Wisconsin System Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of the Department of Administration. Fourteen additional members were appointed including: one former and two current regents, the chancellor of the Milwaukee campus, faculty members from Madison, Eau Claire, the Rock County Center, two legislators, a student, a union official, two businesspersons, and the Secretary of the Department of Employment Relations.

The major issue addressed by the committee concerned the selection of institutions with which to compare University of Wisconsin salaries. This focus was dictated by concern that University of Wisconsin salaries had become noncompetitive, the impetus for formation of the committee. In this regard, several potential groups of comparison campuses were considered. University of Wisconsin institutions were divided into Madison, Milwaukee, the university cluster and the centers for comparison purposes. For Madison, Milwaukee and the university cluster, comparisons were made with a group selected for statistical similarity of institutions (the "cluster analysis" group), a group of institutions traditionally used for this purpose (the "instructional funding" group), and groupings of high-paying institutions advanced respectively for Madison, Milwaukee and the university cluster.

The "cluster analysis" groups were selected on the basis of a statistical analysis which determined which institutions in the country were similar in regard to: (1) enrollment, (2) student-faculty ratios, (3) proportion of faculty who are full professors, (4) research expenditures per faculty, (5) graduate degrees awarded as a proportion of all degrees, (6) doctoral degrees awarded as a proportion of all graduate degrees, and (7) professional degrees awarded as a proportion of all graduate degrees. Alternative peer groups for Madison, Milwaukee and the university cluster were discussed and rejected by the committee. These alternatives represented groups of institutions where salaries were higher than either the "instructional" or "cluster analysis" groups. The basis for their rejection tended to be either that they appeared arbitrary in nature or included private institutions structured very differently from public ones.

The study committee made its report on March 30, 1984. That report was the basis of a number of recommendations relating to levels of special compensation increases for faculty. Those recommendations were that:

1. Sufficient funds should be included in the 1985-87 Executive Budget to improve faculty salaries within each rank to at least the median of the applicable "Cluster Analysis" peer groups.

2. The Board of Regents should adjust faculty salaries as necessary to put all institutions in a comparable position relative to their competition for highly qualified faculty.

3. UW faculty salaries should be increased so as to be competitive with peer institutions and to remain in a competitive position in future years.

Other recommendations dealt with changes in the pay plan process including the timing of Regent pay plan requests, factors to be considered by the Department of Employment Relations in its recommendations to the Joint Committee on Employment Relations and Regent authority to reallocate funding for compensation increases and to expend certain tuition revenues without specific legislative approval.

The committee chose the "cluster analysis" groups as the most appropriate ones with which to compare UW salaries. However, it did modify the group for the university cluster. The original analysis for the university cluster indicated that the cluster institutions should be divided into three groups each with its own comparison group. These groups all included institutions from across the nation. Objections were raised to dividing the university cluster and the committee decided to use midwestern institutions eliminating those that had doctoral programs and those with small enrollments.

In regard to center campuses, the committee dismissed any comparison with peer institutions and chose, rather, to recommend that center campus salaries be increased to the same level as university cluster salaries. In regard to UW-Extension, the committee recommended that the same dollar increases, by rank, recommended for the Madison campus be given to Extension faculty. Percentage increases would have been 15% at Madison, 10.6% at Milwaukee, 6.2% at university cluster institutions, 17.5% at centers and 16.6% in Extension.

The 1985-87 Budget

The regents, in reviewing the recommendations of the committee, altered them in three ways. They recommended that: (1) the centers be given the same percentage increase as Madison, 15% rather than 17.5%; (2) the university cluster receive 9% increases rather than 6.2%; and, (3) Extension receive the same percentage as Madison, 15% rather than 16.6%.

The changes proposed by the regents increased annual funding requirements from \$28.1 million (\$18.9 million GPR, \$9.2 million Other) to \$30.4 million (\$20.4 million GPR, \$10.0 million Other). It was recommended that the \$30.4 million be phased so that 40% of increases would be granted on January 1, 1986, 30% on July 1, 1986, and 30% on January 1, 1987. This phasing, combined with base reallocations of \$586,400 in 1985-86 and \$1,460,100 in 1986-87, resulted in funding levels of \$5,807,300 (\$3,902,900 GPR, \$1,904,400 Other) in 1985-86 and \$27,072,300 (\$18,194,400 GPR,

\$8,877,900 Other) in 1986-87. Annual costs when fully implemented in 1987-88 would be approximately \$33.6 million (\$21.4 million GPR, \$12.2 million Other), thereby, resulting in full financing costs in 1987-89 of \$10.0 million (\$6.4 million GPR, \$3.6 million Other) over 1985-87. The Regents' plan was included by the Governor in his 1985-87 budget recommendations.

The Governor's budget proposal also contained statutory modifications which would: (a) specify that the Board of Regents is to recognize competitive factors in the recruitment and retention of faculty and academic staff when allocating funding to campuses; (b) grant the Board the authority to increase salaries above the approved pay plan to recognize competitive factors and require that such increases be annually reported to the Governor and the Joint Committee on Finance; (c) direct the Secretary of the Department of Employment Relations to base compensation recommendations to the Joint Committee on Employment Relations (JCOER) on factors of competition, rates of pay in other public services, universities and commercial and industrial enterprises, recommendations of the Regents, studies, prevailing wage rates, costs and standards of living, and the state's employment policies.

Funding under the Governor's proposal was not appropriated to the University but was to be part of compensation reserves. As such, in order for funds to be made available to the University, appropriate action by JCOER would be required. In the absence of Committee action, funding would remain in compensation reserves and not be available for faculty pay increases in the absence of action by the Joint Committee on Employment Relations.

Finally, it can be noted that the Assembly Select Committee on the Future of the University recommended that faculty be given pay increases amounting to 15% at Madison, the Centers and Extension; 12% at Milwaukee; and, 10% at university cluster institutions. This plan required funding of approximately \$36,409,200 (\$23,032,000 GPR, \$13,377,200 Other) in 1985-87 and of \$69,985,700 (\$44,951,100 GPR, \$25,034,500 Other) in 1987-89. The select committee recommended that the additional GPR cost of its plan be funded from base reallocations within the University. These reallocations would total approximately \$934,700 in 1985-87 and \$1,634,100 in 1987-89.

After reallocations within the University's base budget, the net fiscal change of the special compensation increases as enacted in 1985 Act 29 was \$20,788,900 GPR, \$1,791,200 FED, \$8,826,200 PR and \$67,400 SEG.

Act 29 specified that although the salary increases were to be granted in amounts averaging the previously mentioned percentages, individual faculty members would be granted increases greater or less than the specified increase, with some receiving no increase. The pay increases were to be distributed in three phases: 40% on January 1, 1986, 30% on July 1, 1986, and the remaining 30% on January 1, 1987.

Wisconsin Act 120 (the budget repair bill), while maintaining the level of compensation increases, delayed the distribution of the second and third installments. The second installment (30%) was to be distributed on

November 1, 1986 (instead of July 1, 1986), while the third installment (30%) will be on June 1, 1987 (instead of January 1, 1987). This delay reduced GPR funding for 1986-87 by \$4,704,700.

Plans for Distribution of Raises

In addition to the special compensation increases, university faculty were also eligible for 1985-87 pay plan increases averaging 6% annually. Individuals must have been judged to be performing satisfactorily in order to qualify for the minimum across-the-board salary increase. For the first year of the biennium, an employe whose performance was judged satisfactory was entitled to an across-the-board adjustment of no less than 2% but no more than 4% of base pay; for the second year, this range was between 2% and 4 1/2%. The remainder was to be distributed on the basis of merit.

Two additional statutory changes were made in Act 29. An amendment to s. 36.09(1)(j) authorizes the Board of Regents to reallocate funds to supplement pay plans if necessary in the future to stay abreast of the market for faculty and academic staff. In 1985-86, \$38,400 was redistributed for this purpose. As a supplement to the "catch-up" authorization, under s. 36.09(1)(h) and (j), the System President authorized use of equity adjustments to accelerate the correction of structural salary inequities at three universities with the lowest salary averages in the Cluster. This correction, included in the three-phase plan is approximately 2% for UW-River Falls, and 1% each for UW-Stevens Point, and UW-Stout.

To summarize, the total pay plan and catch up package is as follows:

TABLE I

Payplan and Catch-Up Salary Increases

	1985-86 Pay Plan 7-1-85	1986-87 Pay Plan 7-1-86	1985-87 Catch-Up 1-1-86 (40%) 11-1-86 (30%) 6-1-87 (30%)	Cumulative Percentage*
UW-Madison	6%	6%	15.0%	28.9%
UW-Milwaukee	6	6	12.0	25.6
UW-River Falls	6	6	12.0	25.6
UW-Stout	6	6	11.0	24.5
UW-Stevens Point	6	6	11.0	24.5
Other UW-Cluster	6	6	10.0	23.4
UW-Extension	6	6	14.1	27.9
UW-Centers	6	6	15.0	27.9

*Percentages reflect the effects of compounding across two years of increases.

Within the basic guidelines established in the budget bills, each campus prepared its own set of guidelines for the distribution of the payplan and catch-up monies. These are summarized in Table II.

1. Pay Plan--The following campuses used the minimum (2%) for across-the-board and 4% for Merit: Madison, Milwaukee, Eau Claire, Green Bay, Parkside, River Falls, Stevens Point and Superior. Others split 2% for merit and 4% across the board (Stout and LaCrosse) while Oshkosh and Whitewater split half and half. Platteville varied its guidelines by college. Only Milwaukee and Whitewater changed guidelines during the second year of the biennium. (See Table II).

2. Catch-Up: The criteria varied widely from campus to campus. Most of the plans, however, did account for individual merit, individual market value (the value of the individual faculty member in the market), market value of discipline (the demand for faculty members within a given discipline), and salary compression due to years of service (the longer a faculty member was employed, the greater he/she fell behind inflation and the market). Merit was on the top of most lists, ranging from about 40% to 80% of the increases. Some campuses, such as Madison, Stout and Platteville were less formal in their guidelines allowing more individual discretion in the allocation of the funds. Many campuses retained some money to be distributed for exceptional circumstances.

Most campuses appeared to make one catch-up determination and then divided it into three increments. Others, such as Madison, La Crosse, Stout, Parkside, Superior and Milwaukee varied the catch-up distributions in each increment.

Distribution of Monies. Tables III and IV show the distribution of total salary increases by percent for each year of the biennium. In the discussions that follow total pay increases are the only figures referenced, because pay plan and catch-up were combined to address competitive concerns and separating them would not present a complete picture. One might expect the salary distributions to be "normally distributed" with a broad central peak and a symmetric fall-off on each side of the peak. From the tables, one can see that the distributions to the Madison and Extension faculties had a broad flat peak while at other campuses the distributions had a narrow range. At Madison, there were also a number of faculty singled out for very large increases. Milwaukee, the Cluster campuses and the Center campuses distributed their raises much as one might expect with a peak around a central point. One may conclude that at Madison and Extension, a greater use of individual merit or market factors, rather than group factors was made, and that exceptional individuals had a greater chance for rewards.

Analysis of Madison Pay Raises

Table VI, discussed later, shows the position relative to its peers of the Madison faculty prior to the 1985-87 pay raises. At all three faculty levels, UW-Madison salaries were at or next to the bottom with respect to its peers, as much as 18% below the median.

TABLE II
Pay Plan and Catch-Up Criteria

	<u>1985-1986</u>	<u>1986-1987</u>
Madison	Pay Plan: 2/3 merit & retention 1/3 across the board	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: based on payroll and relative competitive position, retention & meritorious service	Same Criteria Different Distribution
Milwaukee	Pay Plan: as above	Pay Plan: 3.8% merit & retention 2.2% across the board
	Catch-up: 46% compression/yrs of service 46% merit/market conditions 8% discretionary	Same Criteria but somewhat Different Distribution
Eau Claire	Pay Plan: as above	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 50% merit 10% market 15% compression/general 25% years of service	Same Criteria Similar Distribution
Green Bay	Pay Plan: as above	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 50% merit 30% compression 20% market value	Same Criteria Similar Distribution
LaCrosse	Pay Plan: 1/3 merit & retention 2/3 across the board	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 60% merit 30% market factors 10% retention	Same Criteria but Different Distribution
Oshkosh	Pay Plan: 1/2 merit & retention 1/2 across the board	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 40% merit 25% individual market value 30% compression 5% exceptional conditions	Same Criteria Similar Distribution

Table II (continued)

Parkside	Pay Plan: as Madison	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 85% merit 15% indiv adjustment	Same Criteria Different Distribution
Platteville	Pay Plan: varies by college	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: employment market factors	Same Criteria Similiar Distribution
River Falls	Pay Plan: as Madison	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 60% merit 20% market by rank 10% market by discipline 10% dean's fund	Same Criteria Similar Distribution
Stevens Point	Pay Plan: as Madison	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 30% merit 30% merit by rank 30% compression 10% market factors	Same Criteria, somewhat Different Distribution
Scout	Pay Plan: 1/3 merit & retention 2/3 across the board	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: merit,market,longevity, & academic rank	Same Criteria but Different Distribution
Superior	Pay Plan: as Madison	Same Criteria
	Catch-up: 70% merit 30% market factors	Same Criteria Different Distribution
Whitewater	Pay Plan: 1/2 merit & retention 1/2 across the board	Pay Plan: as Madison
	Catch-up: 40% merit 45% compression/competition 10% college fund 5% indiv market factors	Same Criteria and Similar Distribution

TABLE III

1985-86
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY INCREASES--PAY PLAN AND CATCH-UP--FACULTY ONLY
BY ONE-PERCENT INCREASE*

% Increase Range	Madison		Milwaukee		University Cluster		Centers		Extension		System Administration & Systemwide Accounts		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Increase	7		5	1%	30	1%			4	1%			46	1%
.01% - 1.00%	1												1	
1.01% - 2.00%	23	1%	3		9				6	1	1	25%	42	1
2.01%- 3.00%	22	1	6	1	11		3	1%	11	3			53	1
3.01%- 4.00%	20	1	5	1	17	1	1		9	2			52	1
4.01%- 5.00%	43	2	16	2	67	2	4	1	13	3			143	2
5.01%- 6.00%	76	4	28	4	165	5	8	2	29	7	1	25	306	4
6.01% - 7.00%	70	4	36	5	165	5	4	1	25	6			301	4
7.01% - 8.00%	107	5	39	5	206	7	8	2	16	4	1	25	377	5
8.01% - 9.00%	164	8	79	10	433	14	15	4	32	7			723	11
9.01% - 10.00%	202	10	103	13	568	18	23	7	39	9	1	25	936	14
10.01% - 11.00%	224	11	100	13	522	17	39	11	40	9			925	14
11.01% - 12.00%	190	9	101	13	377	12	81	23	32	8			781	12
12.01% - 13.00%	177	9	72	9	207	7	51	15	35	8			542	8
13.01% - 14.00%	140	7	50	7	135	4	55	16	29	7			409	6
14.01% - 15.00%	131	6	37	5	80	3	16	5	18	4			282	4
15.01% - 16.00%	108	5	26	3	39	1	19	6	17	4			209	3
16.01% - 17.00%	89	4	16	2	27	1	7	2	20	5			159	2
17.01% - 18.00%	65	3	15	2	25	1	6	2	13	3			124	2
18.01% - 19.00%	69	3	10	1	8				9	2			96	1
19.01% - 20.00%	43	2	4	1	6		1		1				55	1
Over 20.00%	<u>109</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>7</u>			<u>185</u>	<u>3</u>
TOTAL	2,080	100%	765	100%	3,122	100%	349	100%	427	100%	4	100%	6,747	100%

*The data exclude classified staff and personnel in the State Executive Salary Group Plan.

TABLE IV
 1986-87
 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
 DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY INCREASES--PAY PLAN AND CATCH-UP--FACULTY ONLY
BY ONE-PERCENT INCREASE*

% Increase Range	<u>Madison</u>		<u>Milwaukee</u>		<u>University Cluster</u>		<u>Centers</u>		<u>Extension</u>		<u>System Administration & Systemwide Accounts</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Increase	5	0%	13	2%	13	0%	3	1%	1	0%			35	0%
.01% - 1.00%	1	0					1	0					2	0
1.01% - 2.00%	19	1	2	0	22	1	1	0	1	0			45	1
2.01%- 3.00%	14	1	6	1	21	1			3	1			44	1
3.01%- 4.00%	11	0	3	0	14	0	2	0	2	1			32	0
4.01%- 5.00%	23	1	14	2	43	1	6	2	6	3			92	1
5.01%- 6.00%	44	2	22	3	155	5	14	4	10	4	1	25%	246	4
6.01% - 7.00%	39	2	27	3	122	4	11	3	3	1	1	25	203	3
7.01% - 8.00%	53	2	16	2	105	3	4	1	9	4	1	25	188	3
8.01% - 9.00%	76	3	37	5	177	5	5	1	14	6			309	4
9.01% - 10.00%	88	4	53	6	357	11	6	2	7	3			511	7
10.01% - 11.00%	128	6	71	9	436	13	12	3	12	5			659	9
11.01% - 12.00%	150	7	118	15	513	16	21	6	12	5			814	12
12.01% - 13.00%	191	8	113	14	486	15	22	6	11	5	1	25	824	12
13.01% - 14.00%	212	9	89	11	309	9	56	15	18	8			684	10
14.01% - 15.00%	198	9	73	9	181	6	61	17	21	9			534	8
15.01% - 16.00%	177	8	48	6	123	4	54	15	18	8			420	6
16.01% - 17.00%	171	8	35	4	80	2	36	10	14	6			336	5
17.01% - 18.00%	158	7	31	4	42	1	19	5	9	4			259	4
18.01% - 19.00%	127	6	9	1	19	1	15	4	11	5			181	3
19.01% - 20.00%	80	4	3	0	19	1	8	2	6	3			116	2
Over 20.00%	267	12	24	3	23	1	11	3	45	19			370	5
TOTAL	2,232	100%	807	100%	3,260	100%	368	100%	233	100%	4	100%	6,904	100%

*The data exclude classified staff and personnel in the State Executive Salary Group Plan.

Table V shows the results after the first phase of catch-up and pay plan. At the full professor level, UW-Madison now ranked 10 out of 13; it was 10 out of 13 at the associate professor level, and tied for 7 out of 13 at the assistant professor level. Raises at UW-Madison were far greater than at any of its peers. It is interesting to note that when the average salary of all faculty is compared, rather than salary by rank, UW-Madison now becomes 7 out of 13. The reason for this becomes apparent when one examines the relative distribution of faculty by rank. At UW-Madison, almost 65% of the faculty are full professors with only Cal-Berkeley having a higher percentage. In fact, the percentage of full professors is less than 50% at four of the peer institutions. Consequently, although the average full professor salary is low with respect to its peers, the progression through the ranks at Madison appears faster; therefore, the salary of average faculty member at UW-Madison may not be as disproportionately low as some statistical comparisons suggest. It is possible that the faster progression through faculty ranks may be used as an offset to the lower salary levels. The special compensation increases may make it possible for Madison to continue to promote faculty more rapidly than other institutions while at the same time paying salaries comparable to other institutions within each rank.

Finally, the fringe benefit package at Madison is better than at many of its peer institutions resulting in a better relative position for Madison faculty when total compensation is compared. In fact, when the average faculty total compensation is ranked, UW-Madison ranks 5 out of 13 after the first year raises.

Although complete details of all of salary plans at other universities for 1986-87 are not known as of this date, the UW-System Administration has made a phone survey of other institutions which can be used for comparison purposes. The results appear in Table VI, showing the progression of salary levels from before the 1985-87 salary increases to their full implementation. For full professors, UW-Madison salary levels now rank 6 out of 13, slightly above the median; at the associate professor level, the rank is 6 out of 13, and at the assistant professor level, the rank is 5 out of 13 about 6% above the median. In addition, the average salary and total compensation comparisons should also show comparable improvements. Using these estimates, it appears as though the special compensation supplements accomplished their intended goal at UW-Madison of bringing salary levels up to the median of its peer institutions.

During the discussions preceding the catch-up increases, concern was expressed that certain disciplines were being subjected to great outside market pressures for faculty. The following tables address the question (for UW-Madison) of whether the total pay increases alleviated this problem on a discipline by discipline basis.

1. Table VII shows the progression of salaries, by discipline, through the biennium. It is apparent that the increases varied both by field and by faculty rank. For example, engineering and law had high increases, while music and veterinary medicine were lower. (Some unusually high or low numbers may be due to disciplines with very few faculty at a given level.)

TABLE V

UW-Madison and Peer Institutions After Phase I Catch-Up
Ranked by Prof Salaries

Institution	1985-1986 Salary (\$ Thousand)				% Increase (over 1984-85)			Total Compensation (\$ Thousand)				Number of Faculty			
	Ave	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Ave	Total	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Cal-Berkeley	\$50.1	\$59.2	\$38.2	\$33.1	---	---	---	\$72.0	\$47.7	\$41.8	\$61.5	1,347.0	68.6%	17.4%	14.0%
UCLA	46.4	57.6	37.4	32.8	---	---	---	70.1	46.7	41.4	57.2	1,368.0	60.7	19.2	20.1
Michigan	42.6	51.8	38.3	32.2	5.5	5.9	6.5	62.3	47.4	40.1	51.9	1,534.0	55.4	22.2	22.4
Ohio State	40.4	51.0	37.4	31.7	7.0	7.0	8.1	60.6	44.9	38.4	48.4	1,764.0	40.6	31.7	27.7
Illinois	42.5	51.0	35.6	31.5	8.9	9.6	10.0	56.4	39.7	35.2	47.2	1,925.0	51.6	27.2	21.2
Texas-Austin	38.2	48.3	33.2	29.3	7.0	8.3	11.2	57.3	40.4	35.9	45.9	1,808.0	46.5	27.4	26.2
Purdue	37.4	48.0	34.0	28.2	6.8	6.9	8.6	59.2	42.3	34.5	46.0	1,337.0	42.2	30.1	27.7
Minnesota	39.9	47.2	34.5	29.6	7.1	7.7	8.5	58.4	43.6	37.6	49.9	1,695.0	53.1	27.1	19.8
Indiana	36.7	44.8	32.3	27.1	10.3	9.7	11.0	56.4	41.3	35.0	46.7	1,200.0	51.2	28.5	20.3
WISCONSIN (MADISON)	39.0	44.6	32.8	29.3	13.5	16.1	14.4	55.1	41.3	37.1	48.6	1,375.0	64.8	14.6	20.6
Iowa	36.8	43.9	33.2	28.2	1.5	2.8	4.7	53.1	41.6	34.8	45.0	1,017.0	46.0	29.3	24.7
Washington	36.0	43.2	31.3	28.1	7.0	7.7	7.0	51.7	38.3	34.7	43.5	1,442.0	50.4	30.0	19.6
Michigan State	36.4	42.8	32.3	27.6	---	---	---	52.4	40.4	34.9	45.1	1,793.0	55.0	24.1	20.8

TABLE VI

UW-Madison and Peers Ranked by Prof Salary
(\$ Thousand)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>1986-87</u>			<u>1985-86</u>			<u>1984-85</u>		
	<u>Prof</u>	<u>Assoc</u>	<u>Asst</u>	<u>Prof</u>	<u>Assoc</u>	<u>Asst</u>	<u>Prof</u>	<u>Assoc</u>	<u>Asst</u>
Cal-Berkeley	(1) 62.8	(2) 40.5	(1) 35.1	59.2	38.2	33.1	54.3	34.9	29.6
UCLA	(2) 61.1	(4) 39.6	(2) 34.8	57.6	37.4	32.8	51.7	33.7	28.7
Michigan	(3) 54.9	(1) 40.6	(3) 34.1	51.8	38.3	32.2	48.1	35.9	29.5
Ohio State	(4) 54.1	(5) 39.6	(5) 33.6	51.0	37.4	31.7	47.6	35.2	30.0
Illinois	(5) 54.1	(3) 37.7	(4) 33.4	51.0	35.6	31.5	47.0	32.8	29.0
WISCONSIN (MADISON)	(6) 51.3	(6) 37.0	(6) 33.3	44.6	32.8	29.3	39.5	28.8	25.9
Texas-Austin	(7) 51.2	(9) 35.2	(8) 31.1	48.3	33.2	29.3	45.5	31.1	27.1
Purdue	(8) 50.9	(8) 36.0	(9) 29.9	48.0	34.0	28.2	45.2	32.1	26.8
Minnesota	(9) 50.0	(7) 36.6	(7) 31.4	47.2	34.5	29.6	44.4	32.7	28.0
Indiana	(10) 47.5	(11) 34.2	(13) 28.7	44.8	32.3	27.1	40.6	29.7	25.3
Iowa	(11) 46.5	(10) 35.2	(10) 29.9	43.9	33.2	28.2	43.5	32.6	27.5
Washington	(12) 45.8	(13) 33.2	(11) 29.8	43.2	31.3	28.1	40.8	29.1	25.8
Michigan State	(13) 45.4	(12) 34.2	(12) 29.3	42.8	32.3	27.6	40.3	30.4	25.8
Peer Group Median	51.1	36.3	31.3	48.2	34.3	29.5	45.4	32.7	27.8
UW-Madison	51.3	37.0	33.3	44.6	32.8	29.3	39.5	28.8	25.9
UW-Madison Increase	15.0%	12.8%	13.7%	12.9%	13.9%	13.1%			

T E VII

Faculty Catch-Up By Discipline

UW-Madison Discipline	1985-1986						1986-1987						1985-1987		
	Prof	Base Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Base Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Engineering	\$40,612	\$34,484	\$30,851	18.7%	17.8%	17.5%	\$48,264	\$39,748	\$36,516	17.8%	12.6%	11.5%	36.5%	30.4%	29.0%
Law	47,184	38,396	36,249	17.5	16.0	17.8	55,733	43,527	42,950	17.9	21.9	16.2	35.4	37.9	34.0
Arch/Env Design	34,158	26,577	24,196	16.2	13.0	9.6	40,320	30,758	27,279	17.5	17.3	14.5	33.7	30.3	24.1
Geography	36,066	25,366	23,759	14.9	17.6	8.9	41,702	30,514	25,069	16.9	14.7	7.7	31.8	32.3	16.6
Pol Sci/Urb Std	42,968	26,701	23,790	13.2	16.7	10.2	46,583	29,940	25,878	17.3	17.6	11.3	30.5	34.3	21.5
Foreign Lang	34,728	25,052	21,967	14.4	14.9	12.0	38,679	27,661	23,955	15.4	14.6	11.4	29.8	29.5	23.4
Business	48,442	36,899	34,506	13.8	15.4	9.5	54,674	42,519	39,771	15.7	19.4	12.4	29.5	34.8	21.9
Chemistry	40,903	26,706	25,594	12.3	18.1	14.3	45,620	31,543	28,775	17.2	16.8	11.2	29.5	34.9	25.5
Agr & Nat Res	36,598	27,432	25,554	13.7	14.5	10.0	42,483	31,726	28,113	15.4	15.6	13.6	29.1	30.1	23.6
Computer Sci	48,396	37,224	34,280	12.9	11.4	15.6	54,908	40,679	38,465	16.2	15.1	12.1	29.1	26.5	27.7
Physics	39,654	26,619	22,400	14.7	30.4	10.4	45,144	29,910	30,000	14.2	19.3	7.2	28.9	49.7	17.6
Soc/Anthro	37,054	25,726	22,981	13.7	20.5	15.9	42,453	30,971	26,100	14.9	16.1	15.1	28.6	36.6	31.0
Interdisc Std	37,989	30,555	24,240	13.8	16.1	11.2	43,088	37,640	26,907	14.7	16.1	12.4	28.5	32.2	23.6
Home Econ	36,221	26,972	22,998	13.0	14.8	7.7	41,450	29,570	25,093	15.3	13.2	14.8	28.3	28.0	22.5
History	38,333	24,992	24,500	13.2	14.6	10.2	44,228	28,355	23,000	15.1	13.1	15.2	28.3	27.7	25.4
Pub Affr	37,435	28,070	22,553	12.5	16.1	5.7	40,487	29,912	24,146	15.4	11.3	8.8	27.9	27.4	14.5
Area/Ethnic Std	36,000	27,665	22,593	15.5	16.6	9.3	39,846	33,053	24,695	12.3	14.7	17.4	27.8	31.3	26.7
Biol/Life Sci	37,468	27,267	27,145	13.0	14.8	8.2	42,301	30,904	29,130	14.6	16.0	12.4	27.6	30.8	20.6
Philosophy	37,596	21,350	20,900	13.5	40.5	12.9	42,512	30,000	24,800	13.8	11.3	8.1	27.3	51.8	21.0
Health Sci	37,910	30,272	24,568	13.4	11.0	13.8	43,352	33,757	28,463	13.9	17.1	12.2	27.3	28.1	26.0
Psychology	42,802	26,597	20,947	13.4	10.4	17.4	48,326	30,980	24,442	13.9	14.2	12.7	27.3	24.6	30.1
Communication	37,450	26,933	22,736	13.4	20.8	10.5	41,217	31,081	24,901	13.8	18.5	13.9	27.2	39.3	24.4
Economics	45,537	35,477	29,412	10.6	14.2	13.0	53,411	39,410	32,389	16.3	16.3	15.0	26.9	30.5	28.0
Math/Stat	41,586	27,579	25,160	12.7	17.6	13.6	47,296	32,028	28,863	14.1	18.7	17.8	26.8	36.3	31.4
English	35,504	24,923	21,507	12.7	11.9	13.3	39,753	27,661	23,955	14.1	14.9	11.9	26.8	26.8	25.2
Theater Arts	31,671	25,685	24,500	14.2	17.3	9.7	35,015	30,312	26,865	12.5	14.3	14.1	26.7	31.6	23.8
Geology	41,124	25,131	27,331	11.7	19.6	11.6	46,945	30,301	27,746	14.9	14.2	8.0	26.6	33.8	19.6
Education	38,265	25,901	22,721	12.4	14.0	16.1	42,496	29,286	26,651	13.8	12.5	10.5	26.2	26.5	26.6
Music	34,696	26,985	24,431	11.8	11.2	11.4	37,981	31,097	26,414	13.7	12.2	11.3	25.5	23.4	22.7
Medicine	41,508	33,078	27,546	11.8	12.5	14.8	46,322	36,943	31,461	13.5	15.0	13.8	25.3	27.5	28.6
Library Sci	36,567	31,352	---	11.2	19.3	---	41,208	37,408	---	13.4	19.0	---	24.6	38.3	---
Art	33,023	24,338	21,694	10.6	15.6	11.6	35,796	27,999	24,152	13.5	12.3	10.2	24.1	27.9	21.8
Phy Ed	37,861	29,187	24,161	10.1%	15.1	7.4	41,730	33,603	25,625	12.9	14.0	10.8	23.0	29.1	18.2
Veterinary	49,218	39,838	31,454	8.9	10.1	7.8	53,273	43,464	33,953	9.9	8.3	8.9	18.8	18.4	16.7
Average				13.5%	16.1%	14.4%									

2. Table VIII attempts to address the relationship between UW-Madison faculty salaries (for full professors) with the outside market for all public universities. The market salaries were determined by a survey conducted by the office of Institution Research, Oklahoma State University. As such, the comparison is at best, a gross qualitative one. The market figures are for 1985-86, so we can only approximate how well market factors were addressed by the 1985-87 increases. The column headed "UW Minus Market" indicates the fields where the largest monetary gaps existed after the first pay increase--these include law, art, english, public affairs, sociology/anthropology, and foreign languages. When this column is compared with the one headed "1986-87 Raise," we see that the pattern of salary increases only somewhat resemble the market factors, and the resulting differences are at least as great as when the process began. Currently, the disciplines that should be feeling the greatest market pressure are Art, Foreign Languages, English, Public Affairs and Library Science. One may conclude that, in general, the market problems were shifted among disciplines rather than alleviated.

3. Table IX indicates the full two year raises and estimated final salary levels by discipline. In general, the traditional humanities areas now fall at the low end of the salary scale.

Analysis of UW-Cluster Pay Raises

Similar analyses were made for the Cluster campuses as were presented for UW-Madison. Table X shows the three-year evolution of faculty salaries (using the same procedures as previously described) by faculty level. Prior to Catch-Up, the Cluster average salaries were about 7% below their peer group medians, with only isolated cases of an individual campus being above the median. By 1986-87, the following projected relative salaries indicate: (a) at the Assistant Professor level, the all cluster average is slightly above the median--six campuses are above the median, and five are below; the greatest deficit is at UW-Stout, \$1,100 below the median; (b) at the Associate Professor Level the all cluster average is within \$200 of the median--four campuses are above the median, and seven are below; five of these lie from \$1,100 to \$1,500 below the median; UW-River Falls, however, is \$2,700 below; (c) at the full Professor level the all cluster average is about 1% below the median--three are above and eight are below the median, with six of the eight within 3% of the mid point; UW-Stout and UW-River Falls are the exceptions.

To summarize the general changes, the cluster campuses, in average, are within 1% of the peer group median, which was the intended goal. The two campuses which most consistently fall outside of this envelope are UW-Stout and UW-River Falls, where the added salary increases did not completely bring them up to their peers.

The breakdown of faculty by rank is similar to its peers, so in this case, the average salary statistics are similar to the tables shown. When looking at the total compensation figures, Table XI, Wisconsin campuses generally move up several notches due to better fringe packages. Although no comparable outside market information is available by discipline for the cluster peer institutions, salary increases by discipline for the cluster

TABLE VIII

UW-Madison Catch-Up By Discipline and
Market Factors

UW-Madison Discipline	1984-85 Salary	1985-86 Salary	1985-87 Increase	* 1985-86 Market	* UW Minus Market	1986-87 UW Raise
Engineering	\$40,612	\$48,264	36.5%	\$50,390	(\$2,126)	\$8,591
Law	\$47,184	\$55,733	35.4%	\$62,177	(\$6,444)	\$9,976
Arch/Env Design	\$34,158	\$40,320	33.7%	\$43,032	(\$2,712)	\$7,056
Pol Sci/Urb Std	\$42,968	\$46,583	30.5%	\$45,519	\$1,064	\$8,059
Foreign Lang	\$34,728	\$38,679	29.8%	\$43,317	(\$4,638)	\$5,957
Business	\$48,442	\$54,674	29.5%	\$50,792	\$3,882	\$8,584
Chemistry	\$40,903	\$45,620	29.5%	\$47,639	(\$2,019)	\$7,847
Computer Sci	\$48,396	\$54,908	29.1%	\$51,840	\$3,068	\$8,895
Agr & Nat Res	\$36,598	\$42,483	29.1%	\$42,147	\$336	\$6,542
Physics	\$39,654	\$45,144	28.9%	\$47,639	(\$2,495)	\$6,410
Soc/Anthro	\$37,054	\$42,453	28.6%	\$45,519	(\$3,066)	\$6,325
Interdisc Std	\$37,989	\$43,088	28.5%	\$42,828	\$260	\$6,334
History	\$38,333	\$44,228	28.3%	\$45,519	(\$1,291)	\$6,678
Home Econ	\$36,221	\$41,450	28.3%	\$41,836	(\$386)	\$6,342
Pub Affr	\$37,435	\$40,487	27.9%	\$43,757	(\$3,270)	\$6,235
Area/Ethnic Std	\$36,000	\$39,846	27.8%	\$41,309	(\$1,463)	\$4,901
Biol/Life Sci	\$37,468	\$42,301	27.6%	\$45,050	(\$2,749)	\$6,176
Psychology	\$42,802	\$48,326	27.3%	\$44,812	\$3,514	\$6,717
Communication	\$37,450	\$41,217	27.2%	\$41,151	\$66	\$5,688
Math/Stat	\$41,586	\$47,296	26.8%	\$46,056	\$1,240	\$6,669
English	\$35,504	\$39,753	26.8%	\$43,283	(\$3,530)	\$5,605
Geology	\$41,124	\$46,945	26.6%	\$47,639	(\$694)	\$6,995
Education	\$38,265	\$42,496	26.2%	\$40,577	\$1,919	\$5,864
Music	\$34,696	\$37,981	25.5%	\$39,845	(\$1,864)	\$5,203
Library Sci	\$36,567	\$41,208	24.6%	\$43,821	(\$2,613)	\$5,522
Art	\$33,023	\$35,796	24.1%	\$39,845	(\$4,049)	\$4,832

*Taken from the 1985-86 Faculty Salary Surveys by Discipline of Institutions Belonging to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, Oklahoma State University.

TABLE IX

UW-Madison Final Salary By Discipline After Catch-up

UW-Madison Discipline	1985-1987 Increase			Est. Final Salary		
	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Engineering	36.5%	30.4%	29.0%	\$56,855	\$44,756	\$40,715
Law	35.4%	37.9%	34.0%	\$65,709	\$53,059	\$49,908
Arch/Env Design	33.7%	30.3%	24.1%	\$47,376	\$36,079	\$31,234
Geography	31.8%	32.3%	16.6%	\$48,750	\$35,000	\$26,999
Pol Sci/Urb Std	30.5%	34.3%	21.5%	\$54,642	\$35,209	\$28,802
Foreign Lang	29.8%	29.5%	23.4%	\$44,636	\$31,700	\$26,686
Business	29.5%	34.8%	21.9%	\$63,258	\$50,768	\$44,703
Chemistry	29.5%	34.9%	25.5%	\$53,467	\$36,842	\$31,998
Agr & Nat Res	29.1%	30.1%	23.6%	\$49,025	\$36,675	\$31,936
Computer Sci	29.1%	26.5%	27.7%	\$63,803	\$46,822	\$43,119
Physics	28.9%	49.7%	17.6%	\$51,554	\$35,683	\$32,160
Soc/Anthro	28.6%	36.6%	31.0%	\$48,778	\$35,957	\$30,041
Interdisc Std	28.5%	32.2%	23.6%	\$49,422	\$43,700	\$30,243
Home Econ	28.3%	28.0%	22.5%	\$47,792	\$33,473	\$28,807
History	28.3%	27.7%	25.4%	\$50,906	\$32,070	\$26,496
Pub Affr	27.9%	27.4%	14.5%	\$46,722	\$33,292	\$26,271
Area/Ethnic Std	27.8%	31.3%	26.7%	\$44,747	\$37,912	\$28,992
Biol/Life Sci	27.6%	30.8%	20.6%	\$48,477	\$35,849	\$32,742
Philosophy	27.3%	51.8%	21.0%	\$48,379	\$33,390	\$26,809
Health Sci	27.3%	28.1%	26.0%	\$49,378	\$39,529	\$31,935
Psychology	27.3%	24.6%	30.1%	\$55,043	\$35,379	\$27,546
Communication	27.2%	39.3%	24.4%	\$46,905	\$36,831	\$28,362
Economics	26.9%	30.5%	28.0%	\$62,117	\$45,834	\$37,247
Math/Stat	26.8%	36.3%	31.4%	\$53,965	\$38,017	\$34,001
English	26.8%	26.8%	25.2%	\$45,358	\$31,782	\$26,806
Theater Arts	26.7%	31.6%	23.8%	\$39,392	\$34,647	\$30,653
Geology	26.6%	33.8%	19.6%	\$53,940	\$34,604	\$29,966
Education	26.2%	26.5%	26.6%	\$48,360	\$32,947	\$29,449
Music	25.5%	23.4%	22.7%	\$43,184	\$34,891	\$29,399
Medicine	25.3%	27.5%	28.6%	\$52,575	\$42,484	\$35,803
Library Sci	24.6%	38.3%	—	\$46,730	\$44,516	\$0
Art	24.1%	27.9%	21.8%	\$40,628	\$31,443	\$26,616
Phy Ed	23.0%	29.1%	18.2%	\$47,113	\$38,307	\$28,393
Veterinary	18.8%	18.4%	16.7%	\$58,547	\$47,072	\$36,975

TABLE X

UW Cluster Campuses and Peers Ranked by Prof Salary (\$ Thousand)

	1986-1987			1985-1986			1984-1985		
	PROF	ASSOC	ASST	PROF	ASSOC	ASST	PROF	ASSOC	ASST
Michigan Tech	\$50.0	\$36.4	\$30.6	\$47.6	\$34.7	\$29.1	\$43.9	\$32.4	\$27.2
Wright State	49.3	37.3	31.1	46.4	35.1	29.3	42.9	32.7	27.5
Univ. of Toledo	46.6	37.2	30.2	42.5	33.9	27.6	40.0	31.5	25.5
Univ. of Akron	46.1	36.0	30.7	43.4	33.9	28.9	40.1	31.6	26.3
Kent State	45.5	34.9	29.2	42.9	32.9	27.5	40.6	30.9	26.1
Ohio Univ.	45.4	35.5	29.5	42.8	33.5	27.8	39.7	31.3	26.1
Minnesota-Duluth	45.0	35.0	28.4	42.7	33.2	26.9	40.8	32.5	25.8
Youngstown State	44.2	36.8	28.6	40.9	34.0	26.5	37.8	31.6	25.0
Oakland Univ	44.2	34.8	29.5	41.5	32.6	27.7	38.5	29.8	25.2
UW-PKS	44.0	33.1	29.3	39.3	30.1	25.4	36.0	27.7	23.5
Northern Illinois	43.0	34.0	27.5	40.6	32.1	25.9	37.6	29.8	24.2
St. Cloud State	43.0	33.0	27.7	40.9	31.3	26.3	39.6	30.9	25.2
Indiana-Northwest	42.8	33.1	26.8	39.8	31.4	26.3	38.5	29.5	22.6
SIU-Carbondale	42.2	32.6	26.5	39.8	30.8	25.0	36.8	28.4	24.0
Bimidji State	42.1	33.2	26.9	40.1	31.6	25.6	38.9	31.2	25.0
Michigan-Flint	41.9	34.5	28.9	39.7	32.7	27.3	38.0	30.0	25.9
UW-OSH	41.6	34.3	28.7	37.2	31.3	27.4	33.6	27.7	23.5
Central Michigan	41.6	34.7	29.1	39.4	32.9	27.6	37.7	31.3	26.2
UW-SUP	41.3	32.1	26.9	37.7	28.8	24.6	34.4	26.0	22.0
Purdue-Calumet	41.2	32.5	26.9	38.9	30.7	25.4	37.2	29.0	24.1
Michigan-Dearborn	41.2	31.2	27.7	38.4	29.1	25.8	35.9	27.2	23.8
Western Michigan	40.9	33.2	28.0	38.6	31.3	26.4	36.8	29.9	25.3
UW-WTW	40.4	33.6	29.3	36.5	30.6	26.8	33.4	28.1	24.3
UW-GBY	40.4	31.9	28.2	36.9	29.6	24.4	34.1	27.3	21.3
Northern Michigan	40.1	33.3	25.6	37.7	31.3	24.1	35.3	29.5	23.5
UW-STP	40.1	32.1	27.7	35.6	28.9	24.9	32.0	26.2	23.2
UW-EAU	40.0	31.8	27.6	36.7	29.2	25.5	33.8	26.9	23.3
UW-LAC	39.9	35.1	29.4	36.4	31.7	27.8	33.4	28.3	26.6
Grand Valley St.	39.7	33.3	26.1	37.5	31.4	24.6	35.1	29.3	24.1
UW-PLT	39.6	34.0	29.4	35.3	30.8	27.1	32.1	28.1	24.9
Eastern Michigan	39.5	33.3	28.1	37.3	31.4	26.5	35.1	30.3	25.7
Chicago State	39.5	34.2	29.2	37.3	32.3	27.5	30.4	25.4	21.3
SIU-Edwardsville	39.1	33.3	28.9	36.9	31.4	27.3	34.3	28.9	25.4
Indiana-Fort Wayne	39.1	31.6	25.1	37.2	30.0	23.9	34.8	28.2	22.8
Indiana-Southeast	38.9	29.3	24.1	35.5	26.8	22.0	32.4	25.5	19.5
UW-STO	38.8	32.2	26.9	35.2	29.3	25.2	32.2	26.7	22.9
Indiana- South Bend	38.5	32.0	24.9	35.9	29.8	23.3	34.9	28.1	22.9
UW-RVF	38.4	30.6	27.0	34.7	27.3	24.2	31.6	25.2	21.5
Indiana State	38.2	30.1	24.7	36.0	28.4	23.3	33.3	26.6	21.9
Ferris State	37.7	32.1	28.1	35.9	30.5	26.8	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Northern Iowa	37.6	31.0	26.2	35.4	29.1	24.6	34.8	28.7	24.1
Western Illinois	36.7	31.8	27.8	34.6	30.0	26.2	32.2	32.9	24.0
Saginaw Valley St.	36.1	31.0	28.0	34.1	29.2	26.4	32.5	27.7	25.3
Eastern Illinois	35.6	35.1	29.8	33.6	33.1	28.1	31.4	26.0	21.6
Northeastern Ill.	35.1	29.8	26.0	33.1	28.1	24.5	30.9	25.9	23.1
PEER GROUP MEDIAN	40.7	33.3	28.0	37.0	30.6	25.8	35.2	29.2	24.5
UW-CLUSTER AVE	40.3	33.1	28.6	36.3	29.9	26.1	33.0	27.3	23.7
UW-CLUSTER INCREASE	11.00%	10.70%	9.60%	10.00%	9.50%	10.10%			

TABLE XI

UW Cluster Campuses and Peer Institutions After Phase I Catch-Up
Ranked by Prof Salary

Institution	1985-86 Salary				% Increase			Total Compensation				Number of Faculty			
	Ave	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Ave	Total	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Michigan Tech	\$34.8	\$47.6	\$34.7	\$29.1	7.8%	7.3%	8.0%	\$58.6	\$43.1	\$36.5	\$43.3	309.0	26.2%	34.6%	39.0%
Wright State	35.6	46.4	35.1	29.3	8.7	9.1	9.9	56.4	43.2	36.2	26.9	404.0	29.7	39.9	30.0
Univ. of Akron	34.6	43.4	33.9	28.9	9.7	8.6	9.6	52.3	41.3	35.2	42.0	700.0	32.6	37.6	25.0
Kent State	33.8	42.9	32.9	27.5	6.6	7.4	7.5	51.9	40.4	34.3	41.5	659.0	31.1	34.7	34.0
Ohio Univ.	35.2	42.8	33.5	27.8	8.8	8.8	9.3	51.9	41.2	34.7	43.1	574.0	38.0	35.2	27.0
Minnesota-Duluth	32.4	42.7	33.2	26.9	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	53.3	42.0	34.5	41.0	283.0	27.9	39.2	33.0
Toledo	36.0	42.5	33.9	27.6	7.0	7.3	7.3	52.0	42.1	34.8	44.4	533.0	50.7	30.2	19.0
Oakland Univ.	33.5	41.5	32.6	27.7	9.3	10.9	11.6	54.0	43.3	36.9	44.2	319.0	32.0	41.7	26.0
Youngstown State	33.9	40.9	34.0	26.5	9.6	10.1	10.5	49.9	42.1	33.5	42.0	405.0	44.7	30.4	25.0
St. Cloud State	32.6	40.9	31.3	26.3	4.3	6.5	7.3	50.2	39.2	33.2	40.6	433.0	45.3	21.7	33.0
Northern Illinois	30.7	40.6	32.1	25.9	8.0	8.2	8.8	44.9	35.8	29.1	34.3	847.0	38.8	33.1	28.0
Bemidji State	31.6	40.1	31.6	25.6	4.3	5.1	5.3	49.1	39.2	32.1	39.2	182.0	40.1	36.9	33.0
SIU-Carbondale	30.9	39.8	31.4	26.3	10.1	11.3	10.5	44.1	35.0	29.4	34.5	850.0	31.1	32.5	37.0
Indiana-Northwest	29.5	39.8	30.8	25.0	6.1	6.7	8.0	50.5	39.6	32.3	37.9	109.0	21.1	42.2	27.0
Michigan-Flint	30.9	39.7	32.7	27.3	10.2	6.5	7.9	48.7	40.6	34.3	38.6	126.0	30.2	40.5	30.0
Central Michigan	32.3	39.4	32.9	27.6	5.3	5.6	5.1	50.2	42.4	35.4	41.4	533.0	38.5	28.5	23.0
UW-Parkside	30.5	39.3	30.1	25.4	10.8	10.5	8.9	49.1	38.2	32.3	38.6	146.0	25.3	50.7	24.0
Purdue-Calumet	29.2	38.9	30.7	25.4	5.8	5.7	6.9	48.4	38.6	31.5	36.3	206.0	18.0	44.7	27.0
Western Michigan	32.9	38.6	31.3	26.4	5.5	5.9	6.4	47.8	39.0	33.3	40.9	695.0	44.2	36.3	20.0
Michigan-Dearborn	30.5	38.4	29.1	25.8	7.0	7.9	9.5	47.0	36.3	32.7	38.0	140.0	41.4	38.6	20.0
Northern Michigan	30.4	37.7	31.3	24.1	7.6	8.2	7.6	47.1	39.3	30.5	38.2	275.0	50.2	31.3	19.0
UW-Superior	31.4	37.7	28.8	24.6	9.8	10.5	10.8	47.3	36.5	31.4	39.7	92.0	47.8	30.4	22.0
Grand Valley State	32.3	37.5	31.4	24.6	7.0	6.5	8.0	46.1	39.0	31.0	40.0	208.0	33.7	52.4	14.0
Eastern Michigan	32.6	37.3	32.3	27.5	7.3	7.1	6.8	46.8	40.0	35.0	41.1	480.0	49.0	32.7	18.0
Chicago State	31.9	37.3	31.4	26.5	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	43.4	36.8	31.3	37.4	230.0	43.0	31.7	25.0
Indiana-Fort Wayne	27.8	37.2	30.0	23.9	6.0	4.5	7.3	46.6	38.1	30.2	35.0	270.0	17.0	39.3	44.0
UW-Oshkosh	31.4	37.2	31.3	27.4	10.9	10.8	9.8	46.7	39.6	34.9	39.7	354.0	41.2	29.4	30.0
UW-Green Bay	29.9	36.9	29.6	24.4	9.1	10.7	14.8	46.4	37.0	31.2	37.8	137.0	27.0	54.7	18.0
SIU-Edwardsville	32.1	36.9	31.4	27.3	7.8	8.7	9.2	41.0	35.0	30.5	35.7	435.0	49.7	31.5	19.0
UW-Eau Claire	30.7	36.7	29.2	25.5	10.1	10.7	11.2	46.1	37.1	32.6	38.8	365.0	36.7	34.2	29.0
UW-Whitewater	31.2	36.5	30.6	26.8	10.2	11.5	10.7	45.9	38.7	34.2	39.4	326.0	50.0	21.2	29.0
UW-LaCrosse	30.9	36.4	31.7	27.8	10.3	11.1	11.3	45.7	40.1	35.3	39.1	290.0	40.3	32.8	21.0
Indiana State	29.6	36.0	28.4	23.3	8.8	7.9	7.8	45.6	36.1	29.0	37.2	604.0	47.4	22.8	30.0
Ferris State	29.7	35.9	30.5	26.8	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	45.2	38.9	34.5	37.9	423.0	21.7	40.2	28.0
Indiana-South Bend	29.9	35.9	29.8	23.3	6.0	6.5	6.1	45.9	38.3	30.2	38.5	123.0	29.3	52.0	19.0
UW-Stevens Point	30.1	35.6	28.9	24.9	11.7	11.1	10.1	44.8	36.6	31.9	38.1	330.0	49.4	20.9	30.0
Indiana-Southeast	27.7	35.5	26.8	22.0	7.3	7.5	11.0	45.3	34.5	28.5	35.6	86.0	34.9	41.9	23.0
Northern Iowa	27.9	35.4	29.1	24.6	1.9	2.1	2.4	43.1	35.7	30.0	34.0	492.0	27.4	32.5	40.0
UW-Platteville	30.6	35.3	30.8	27.1	11.2	10.5	9.1	44.4	39.0	34.5	38.7	217.0	41.9	25.8	34.0
UW-Stout	28.4	35.2	29.3	25.2	10.9	11.5	11.1	44.3	37.2	32.1	36.1	238.0	42.9	29.4	28.0
UW-River Falls	29.3	34.7	27.3	24.2	10.4	11.4	11.8	43.7	34.8	31.0	37.2	222.0	43.2	26.1	31.0
Western Illinois	29.4	34.6	30.0	26.2	9.1	9.0	8.7	38.5	33.5	29.3	32.8	532.0	42.1	33.3	25.0
Saginaw Valley State	30.4	34.1	29.2	26.4	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	43.0	37.1	33.6	38.5	122.0	45.1	30.3	25.0
Eastern Illinois	27.8	33.6	33.1	28.1	8.9	9.7	9.9	37.4	31.3	26.0	21.6	445.0	43.4	31.0	6.0
Northeastern Illinois	29.1	33.1	28.1	24.5	8.8	9.3	8.7	36.8	31.4	27.5	32.3	335.0	50.7	23.9	25.0
Cluster-Average	30.4	36.3	29.9	26.1	10.0	9.5	10.1	45.9	37.8	32.9	38.5	247.0	40.5	32.3	27.5
UW-Centers	26.1	33.1	27.4	23.0	12.2	12.3	12.9	41.8	34.9	29.5	33.3	318.0	13.5	47.5	39.0

campuses as a group are shown in Table XII. As with UW-Madison, the faculty with the lowest salaries are in the humanities and social sciences; the lowest two-year raises were also found in these fields. The differences among disciplines in both salary levels and increases is much smaller in this case than at UW-Madison.

Analysis of UW-Milwaukee Pay Raises

UW-Milwaukee's standing relative to its peers is comparable to the other Wisconsin campuses. (See Table XIII) For 1986-87, for two ranks of faculty, the salaries at UW-Milwaukee are at or above its peer group median with the greatest difference being found for full professors. As with the other Wisconsin campuses, when total compensation levels are compared, (Table XIV) UW-Milwaukee fares even better. Therefore, in the aggregate, the special compensation pay increases at UW-Milwaukee appears to be successful.

Summary

The purpose of the UW System Special Compensation salary increases was to bring salaries of UW faculty up to comparable levels with their peers. The statistics shown here indicate that, in the aggregate, this goal was achieved. The case becomes less clear when viewing the results on a discipline-by-discipline basis. It is also possible, that when viewing the manner in which these pay increases were distributed, one may conclude that at some campuses, they were handled as an extension of the pay plan rather than as "special compensation" pay increases. The latter were intended to address different circumstances than the former.

TABLE XII

UW Cluster Catch-Up Pay By Discipline

UW-CLUSTER Discipline	1985-1987 Increase			Estimated Final Salary		
	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Business	23.5%	24.0%	17.0%	\$44,899	\$38,379	\$33,182
Computer Sci	28.8	23.1	16.9	42,867	39,978	33,081
Theater Arts	21.7	24.4	24.0	42,272	30,903	25,029
Interdisc Std	22.8	22.6	19.1	41,009	32,334	26,127
Economics	22.7	25.3	20.8	40,931	33,180	29,384
Library Sci	18.6	21.8	20.2	40,919	33,486	32,853
Engineering	24.2	21.2	17.9	40,865	35,210	29,370
History	22.5	21.1	16.8	40,582	33,638	27,381
Psychology	20.9	21.8	19.9	40,540	32,009	27,102
Education	22.5	21.9	17.4	40,513	33,476	28,343
Math/Stat	23.8	21.4	19.9	40,502	33,739	29,345
Home Econ	24.2	24.1	21.1	40,272	33,293	29,325
Phy Ed	23.5	22.1	19.5	40,248	32,509	29,319
Chemistry	24.4	26.6	18.6	40,191	31,048	26,712
Geology	24.3	21.3	20.0	40,169	32,292	27,399
Indus Tech	23.8	25.3	22.2	40,082	32,421	28,445
Physics	24.7	21.8	21.9	39,967	33,160	28,443
Biol/Life Sci	23.8	22.3	19.0	39,861	31,648	26,390
Communication	20.6	23.1	19.0	39,778	32,287	27,049
Art	22.2	21.8	21.5	39,475	31,104	26,160
Pol Sci/Urb Std	22.6	20.1	19.7	39,287	31,829	26,541
Geography	21.3	21.6	19.3	39,172	31,962	26,652
Health Sci	26.8	22.2	20.2	39,004	33,358	28,845
English	22.6	22.1	20.4	38,991	31,649	27,733
Foreign Lang	23.0	22.4	20.3	38,982	32,155	26,325
Philosophy	24.0	23.3	18.1	38,930	31,852	26,503
Music	21.4	23.5	20.2	38,925	30,694	26,054
Soc/Anthro	23.6	21.9	22.6	38,241	31,370	25,929
Agr & Nat Res	24.3	21.0	18.4	38,017	31,708	26,873
Pub Affr	23.5	21.0	18.0	37,393	32,613	28,015

TABLE XIII

UW-Milwaukee and Peers Ranked by Prof Salary
(\$ Thousand)

Institution	1986-87			1985-86			1984-85		
	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst
Suny-Buffalo	(1) 55.5	39.6	31.3	52.8	37.7	29.8	52.8	37.4	29.1
Rutgers-Newark (est.)	(2) 54.9	42.8	33.4	51.8	40.4	31.5	48.3	35.1	25.6
Cincinnati	(3) 50.2	37.8	29.6	47.1	35.5	27.9	44.0	33.3	27.0
Illinois-Chicago	(4) 50.0	36.4	31.4	47.4	34.5	29.8	44.2	31.9	27.0
Georgia State	(5) 49.9	36.5	30.2	47.2	34.6	28.6	43.7	32.9	26.5
Wayne State	(6) 49.1	36.4	30.5	43.6	32.3	27.2	40.7	30.0	24.7
Cleveland State	(7) 49.0	36.9	30.0	46.6	35.2	28.6	44.3	33.2	27.2
UW-MILWAUKEE	(8) 48.2	35.9	30.6	43.1	31.9	27.7	39.3	28.7	24.6
Texas-Dallas	(9) 47.3	34.5	30.0	46.4	33.8	29.4	46.0	32.4	27.2
Toledo	(10) 46.6	37.2	30.2	42.5	33.9	27.6	40.0	31.5	25.5
Temple	(11) 46.3	34.4	28.9	43.4	33.7	27.8	41.5	31.9	26.3
Akron	(12) 46.1	35.8	29.4	43.4	33.9	28.9	40.1	31.6	26.3
Louisville	(13) 43.4	32.4	27.1	40.3	30.1	25.3	38.4	28.6	24.5
Missouri-KC	(14) 40.5	32.2	26.6	39.0	30.9	25.6	36.9	29.1	23.5
New Orleans	(15) 39.5	31.3	25.2	37.6	29.8	24.0	37.0	28.8	23.1
Peer Group Median	47.3	36.4	29.9	45.6	34.0	27.7	43.5	32.3	27.8
UW-Milwaukee	48.2	35.9	30.6	43.1	31.9	27.7	39.3	28.7	24.6
UWM Increase	11.8%	12.5%	10.5%	9.7%	11.1%	12.6%			

TABLE XIV

UW-Milwaukee and Peer Institutions After Phase I Catch-Up
Ranked by Prof Salary

Institution	1985-86 Salary				% Increase			Total Compensation				Number of Faculty			
	Ave	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Ave	Total	Prof	Assoc	Asst
SUNY-Buffalo	\$41.1	\$52.8	\$37.7	\$29.8	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	\$65.4	\$47.1	\$37.1	\$51.6	780.0	44.7%	34.2%	21.0%
Rutgers-Newark	41.4	51.8	40.4	31.5	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	61.5	48.5	38.2	49.6	372.0	30.1	39.8	30.0
Illinois-Chicago	36.2	47.4	34.5	29.8	8.9	8.9	9.6	52.5	38.5	33.4	40.4	1,085.0	33.0	36.3	31.0
Georgia State	37.1	47.2	34.6	28.6	8.3	8.9	10.3	57.5	42.9	35.7	45.7	390.0	38.7	36.4	25.0
Cincinnati	37.8	47.1	35.5	27.9	9.6	11.3	12.8	58.6	44.2	34.7	47.1	950.0	39.6	37.2	23.0
Cleveland State	36.2	46.6	35.2	28.6	6.2	6.1	7.3	56.3	43.0	35.4	44.3	467.0	29.6	34.7	21.0
Texas-Dallas	37.5	46.4	33.8	29.4	6.0	7.0	6.0	54.8	40.6	36.1	44.9	199.0	39.2	40.6	26.0
Wayne State	34.2	43.6	32.3	27.2	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	53.1	39.9	33.8	42.1	758.0	39.2	36.2	20.0
Temple	36.1	43.4	33.7	27.8	5.3	5.8	6.5	53.3	41.8	34.8	44.7	1,132.0	42.7	37.6	21.0
Akron	34.6	43.4	33.9	28.9	9.7	8.6	9.6	52.3	41.3	35.2	42.0	700.0	32.6	40.6	29.0
UW-M	34.2	43.1	31.9	27.7	10.5	12.1	12.0	53.6	40.2	35.1	43.0	715.0	34.4	28.3	25.0
Toledo	36.0	42.5	33.9	27.6	7.0	7.3	7.3	52.0	42.1	34.8	44.4	555.0	50.1	34.1	22.0
Louisville	32.8	40.3	30.1	25.3	5.4	5.6	11.5	48.5	36.6	30.0	39.9	613.0	42.9	34.3	33.0
Missouri-KC	32.4	39.0	30.9	25.6	6.5	6.5	6.8	46.7	37.3	30.7	39.0	443.0	41.3	37.3	25.0
New Orleans	28.6	37.6	29.8	24.0	0.2	0.7	1.3	42.6	33.9	27.4	32.5	395.0	37.2	37.2	28.0

UW-Milwaukee and Peer Institutions After Phase I Catch-Up
Ranked by Prof Compensation

Institution	1985-86 Salary				% Increase			Total Compensation				Number of Faculty			
	Ave	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Ave	Total	Prof	Assoc	Asst
SUNY-Buffalo	\$41.1	\$52.8	\$37.7	\$29.8	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	\$65.4	\$47.1	\$37.1	\$51.6	780.0	44.7%	34.2%	21.0%
Rutgers-Newark	41.4	51.8	40.4	31.5	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	61.5	48.5	38.2	49.6	372.0	30.1	39.8	30.0
Illinois-Chicago	37.8	47.1	35.5	27.9	9.6%	11.3%	12.8%	58.6	44.2	34.7	47.1	950.0	39.6	37.2	23.0
Georgia State	37.1	47.2	34.6	28.6	8.3	8.9	10.3	57.5	42.9	35.7	45.7	690.0	38.7	36.4	25.0
Cincinnati	36.2	46.6	35.2	28.6	6.2	6.1	7.3	56.3	43.0	35.4	44.3	467.0	29.6	49.5	21.0
Cleveland State	37.5	46.4	33.8	29.4	6.0	7.0	6.0	54.8	40.6	36.1	44.9	199.0	39.2	34.7	26.0
Texas-Dallas	34.2	43.1	31.9	27.7	10.5	12.1	12.0	53.6	40.2	35.1	43.0	715.0	34.4	40.6	25.0
Wayne State	36.1	43.4	33.7	27.8	5.3	5.8	6.5	53.3	41.8	34.8	44.7	1,132.0	42.7	36.2	21.0
Temple	34.2	43.6	32.3	27.2	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	53.1	39.9	33.8	42.1	758.0	39.2	40.6	20.0
Akron	36.2	47.4	34.5	29.8	8.9	8.9	9.6	52.5	38.5	33.4	40.4	1,085.0	33.0	36.3	31.0
UW-M	34.6	43.4	33.9	28.9	9.7	8.6	9.6	52.3	41.3	35.2	42.0	700.0	32.6	37.6	29.0
Toledo	36.0	42.5	33.9	27.6	7.0	7.3	7.3	52.0	42.1	34.8	44.4	555.0	50.1	28.3	?
Louisville	32.8	40.3	30.1	25.3	5.4	5.6	11.5	48.5	36.6	30.0	39.9	613.0	42.9	34.1	33.0
Missouri-KC	32.4	39.0	30.9	25.6	6.5	6.5	6.8	46.7	37.3	30.7	39.0	443.0	41.3	34.3	25.0
New Orleans	28.6	37.6	29.8	24.0	0.2	0.7	1.3	42.6	33.9	27.4	32.5	395.0	37.2	37.2	28.0