

## The Professors Are Not Underpaid

*Compared with other leading Research I institutions, UNC-Chapel Hill compensates professors well above average. There is also no basis for the university's argument that it either suffers or will suffer from a 'brain drain.'*

**By George C. Leef and Jon Sanders**

Summary: Whether professors at UNC-CH (and other UNC campuses) are sufficiently well compensated to ensure the university is competitive with other universities around the nation has become a highly contentious issue. In this study, we argue that: 1) using an accurate and thorough cost-of-living index, compensation for professors at UNC-CH is significantly above average for Research I universities and above most other public universities; 2) using a broad "quality of living" index to adjust faculty salaries, compensation for professors at UNC-CH and NC State is even more competitive; and 3) speculation about a "brain drain" is not only unsupported by evidence, but contradicted by it.

---

In the July-August issue of *Clarion*, a publication of the Pope Center for Higher Education Policy, we argued that, after adjusting for cost of living differences, the salary of professors at UNC-CH compared favorably with that of professors at other Research I universities (the nation's top universities). That study found that salary at UNC-CH was fifth highest among public universities and 23rd out of all Research I institutions. Our study was criticized in a paper entitled "Comparing UNC-CH Faculty Salaries and Compensation Levels to those at Other Research Universities," written by Professors David Guilkey, Thomas Mroz, Paul Rhode, and Michael Salemi of the Economics Department at UNC-CH. In their paper, Guilkey *et al.* (hereafter referred to as the Guilkey paper) argued that the Pope Center study was flawed in that it focussed on salary alone rather than total compensation and that our cost-of-living data omitted Chapel Hill. The Guilkey paper concluded that compensation at UNC-CH is comparatively low, ranking only 58th among Research I universities.

Guilkey's points of criticism were well taken. It is more accurate to look at total compensation than salary alone, and the cost-of-living index we employed (ACCRA) did not include data for Chapel Hill in the fourth quarter of 1998 — the quarter on which our study was based — but only Raleigh and Durham. For most time periods, ACCRA has included Chapel Hill, but it was not included in that quarter and the omission is significant because the cost-of-living in Chapel Hill is somewhat higher than in many other parts of the Triangle.

With the reliability of ACCRA's index called into question (important data from other university locales might be omitted

at different times), we have chosen to use a different, more complete cost-of-living index for the purpose of comparing faculty compensation.

### ***Methodology of the New Study***

Our new cost-of-living study focuses on broad metropolitan areas in adjusting for the cost of living. The cost-of-living index used was provided by VirtualRelocation.com. It is a comprehensive index comprising 800 towns and cities across the U.S. and Canada based on the following factors: housing costs, property and income taxes, auto insurance, electricity costs, rent, and other variables including weather, crime, and median income. This index is preferable to the ACCRA index we have used in previous studies because it covers more areas and contains more information, including tax information.

The scope of this index allowed us to create metropolitan indices by providing a composite of the different costs within the towns comprising each metropolitan area. For example, the Triangle area comprises several cities and towns. VirtualRelocation.com provides cost-of-living data for the following Triangle locations: Chapel Hill, Raleigh, Durham, and Cary. We took the indices for those areas and weighted them according to population to create a composite index for the Triangle. Likewise, indices were generated for universities located in small, higher-cost areas within metropolitan areas (e.g., Ann Arbor, Cambridge, Palo Alto, Princeton) that would reflect the costs for the smaller areas — according to their respective populations — in the broader, composite indices generated for those metropolitan areas.

This raises a point of contention with Guilkey’s paper, which advocates using Chapel Hill, or alternatively, an average weighted according to where in the Triangle professors at Chapel Hill actually reside. We believe that this approach, which leads to the conclusion that UNC-CH compensation is low owing to the comparatively high cost of living in Chapel Hill, is not warranted.

First of all, although (according to Guilkey’s statistics) 71% of the professors at UNC-CH live in Chapel Hill, they could (and 29% do) live elsewhere in the Triangle, and undoubtedly make many of their purchases of good and services outside the city limits of Chapel Hill. Secondly, it would be a serious mistake to look just at the high-cost enclave of Chapel Hill in evaluating UNC compensation without making similar adjustments for other universities where many professors happen to live in small, high-cost areas, something the Guilkey paper did not do.

The Pope Center has previously argued for the use of a Triangle-wide cost-of-living index rather than one that centers on Chapel Hill. In fact, during debate over the issue that began after the Pope Center published a similar faculty-compensation study in 1996 using a Triangle-wide cost-of-living index, the late UNC-CH Chancellor Michael Hooker agreed with us, writing in a letter dated Sept. 26, 1996 to Jon Sanders, “A Triangle-wide cost-of-living index would be of significant value in constructing real comparisons within institutions in other metropolitan areas.”

In the instances where a university is located in a small town for which no separate index was available from VirtualRelocation.com, we used the index for the nearest city; for example, Roanoke, Virginia, for Virginia Tech in Blacksburg.

The universities included are the Research I universities according to the 1994 classification by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The compensation data was provided by the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP lacked data for only two universities — Boston University and Yeshiva University.

### ***The Results***

Using this approach, the compensation for professors at UNC-CH ranked 30th out of the 86 institutions for which compensation data were available (Table 1.a). Among the 59 public universities on the list, compensation at UNC-CH ranked 19th (Table 1.b.). Furthermore, among UNC-CH’s 17 self-designated “peer” institutions, compensation at UNC-CH ranked 7th (Table 1.c).

Although revealing, this approach evaluates primarily the purchasing power of compensation in the different areas. A better analysis, we believe, comes from looking not only at purchasing power, but at the quality of life that can be had with that purchasing power.

### ***Faculty Compensation and the Quality of Life***

There are many factors that go into an individual’s decision as to where he chooses to work and live. How much money he

will earn and how much it will purchase is a very important factor, but there are others: the climate, the availability of recreational and artistic amenities, crime, education, the employment outlook, ease of transportation and more. Nonpecuniary job characteristics such as those can strongly influence the choice of work. Indeed, Guilkey's paper adverts to the importance of considering them when he writes, "When choosing between job offers from different universities, a professor is unlikely to focus solely on the dollar amounts of the salary offers. The professor is likely to consider the local purchasing power of each offer in its respective community as well as the amenities offered by each community." (Emphasis added.) Unfortunately, neither of the two methods he uses (straight cost-of-living and a comparison of faculty compensation with that of other professionals in the area).

Believing that we cannot accurately compare faculty compensation unless we attempt to measure the "quality of life" a dollar of compensation can buy when living in an area, we looked for an index that encompasses a broad range of positive and negative factors that tend to affect people's decision making. Such an index is found in *Places Rated Almanac (PRA)* by David Savageau, which has been published since 1981.

*PRA* ranks metropolitan areas according to the following factors: the cost of living, transportation, jobs, education, climate, crime, the arts, health care, and recreation, providing "facts and figures on nine factors most of us would agree influence livability in metropolitan North America." Of course, this does not include every possible reason why a professor might be drawn to a particular university (such as the desire to work with certain scholars, or to be near family members), but it has the virtue of encompassing the most significant quantifiable measures of the attractiveness of metropolitan areas.

Using those nine factors, *PRA* constructs a rating for more than 350 metropolitan areas. In the current edition (published November 1999), the most highly rated area is Salt Lake City, with an index of 75.57. The Triangle area is rated sixth, with an index of 74.03.

Our approach is to compare the desirability of living in different areas where Research I universities are located, not just to look at the cost of living — although cost of living is a component of the desirability index. We do so by dividing the scores assigned in *PRA* to other areas by the Triangle's score. For example, Salt Lake City, rated as more desirable overall than the Triangle, receives an index of 1.02 ( $75.57/74.03$ ). An equal amount of income buys a slightly higher quality of life in Salt Lake City. On the other hand, Columbus, Ohio, to choose a lower rated locale, receives an index of .92 ( $68.14/74.03$ ). An equal amount of income buys a somewhat higher quality of life in the Triangle than it would in Columbus.

Multiplying the average total compensation for professors by the index number derived from the ratings of the metropolitan areas where the Research I universities are located (or in some cases, the nearest metropolitan area) gives us adjusted faculty compensation. Our findings are presented in Tables 2.a, 2.b and 2.c. In this analysis, UNC-CH ranks 24th out of all Research I universities. Among the 59 public universities on the list, compensation at UNC-CH ranked sixth. Among UNC-CH's 17 self-designated "peer" institutions, compensation at UNC-CH ranked 9th.

On November 15, UNC President Molly Broad issued a statement in which she said that the General Assembly needs to "make a long term commitment to restoring competitive salaries so we can maintain a quality education and the reputation of our university." Based on both our cost-of-living analysis and what we believe is the still more valid quality of life analysis, we conclude that there is no need to "restore" competitive salaries. They already are competitive.

### ***The "Peer Group"***

The Guilkey paper also looks at UNC-CH in comparison to what he calls "the peer group" of 17 universities. Why those particular universities are regarded as "the peer group" is not explained. Why, e.g., is Emory a "peer" but not the University of Georgia? Does anyone really regard Chapel Hill as a "peer" of the University of Chicago?

Nevertheless, applying our compensation rankings, we get a very different picture from that of the Guilkey analysis, which ranked UNC-CH 14th out of 17. Using our quality of life approach, six universities that were ranked as higher in compensation than UNC fall below it (Virginia, Michigan, Texas, Illinois, Ohio State, and Florida) while one (Berkeley) jumps above it. Our results put UNC ninth out of the 17 — in the middle of "the peer group."

### ***Adjusting the Salary/Benefit Mix***

There is another point worth noting here. The Guilkey paper argues that the competitive position of UNC-CH is actually worse than they portray because it pays a lower percentage of professors' compensation in untaxed benefits than do many

others — 19 percent compared to an average of 24 percent at other universities. “In fact,” the paper states, “UNC-CH is in the lowest one-tenth of all Research I universities in terms of total compensation paid as benefits.” Although no source was cited for this assertion, we have no reason to doubt that it is true.

What follows from this observation, however, is not the conclusion that total compensation at UNC-CH must be increased, but rather that the administration ought to consider altering the mix between taxable salary and untaxed benefits for its professors. By doing so, UNC could become more competitive without costing the taxpayers of the state more money.

### ***The “Brain Drain” Argument***

The real issue at hand is whether the compensation paid to UNC professors is sufficient to maintain a high quality faculty and recruit high quality newcomers when openings occur. The different statistical approaches we and others have used to measure “competitiveness” are indirect means of trying to answer that question. The direct approach would be to look at the university’s recent personnel experience to see if it is the case that a significant number of professors have made lateral moves to other universities because compensation was higher at the university to which they moved. We specify lateral moves because faculty moves owing to the acceptance of a higher position (for example, a professor leaving to become a department chairman or a dean) do not tell us anything about the competitiveness of our compensation for similar positions.

We first sought information on the alleged “brain drain” from the university. Jon Sanders phoned Prof. Guilkey to ask if he knew of any university study on faculty retention. He said he was not aware of any such study, but suggested that Sanders call Lynn Williford in the Office of Institutional Research at UNC-CH. Ms. Williford said there was no such study for the university, but said she would contact individual departments to see if they had any relevant information and send it to him. As of this date, no information has been received.

We then conducted our own study of personnel moves in and out of UNC-CH by using *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a weekly publication devoted to higher education. The Gazette section of *The Chronicle* lists appointments, resignations, and similar notices from universities across the nation. We searched back to 1995 for all notices pertinent to Chapel Hill.

The resulting information may not be comprehensive (we await additional information from the university to see whether it is or is not). Nevertheless, it is probative on the competitiveness issue. We found a mix of hires and departures (Tables 3.a. and 3.b.). Among the academic and administrative moves, there were more hires into UNC-CH (17) than departures from it (12). UNC-CH lost four faculty members to Research I institutions (three to “peer” institutions), but only one of those was a lateral move, with the others being promotions. Eight of the losses were to lower paying universities, but six of those were moves to a different rank or position.

On the other hand, UNC-CH gained nine faculty members from Research I institutions (five from “peer” institutions) and two of those hires were lateral moves. Three were clearly promotions and four others were difficult to categorize as either lateral or promotion.

Therefore, looking at the actual history of faculty moves to and from UNC-CH, there appears to be no evidence to support the idea that the university has suffered from a “brain drain.”

This finding should come as no surprise to those who have followed the history of the “brain drain” argument in UNC-CH’s lobbying efforts. Former UNC-CH Chancellor Paul Hardin himself blew the whistle on the practice in 1996. An article in *The News & Observer* dated June 4, 1996, sounds as if it could be written today:

Universities like to refer to the resulting “brain drain,” the phenomenon in which star professors are easily lured away. But there are no running tallies, no numbers to show how extensive the problem is.

Paul Hardin, the former UNC-CH chancellor who retired last year, said the theory was greatly exaggerated during the fight over state budget cuts a few years ago. It led to a generally accepted notion that the university was slipping, Hardin said. (“Brain drain, money matters collide,” by Jane Stancil and Bob Williams, *The News & Observer*, June 4, 1996.)

Of course, it can be argued that unless faculty compensation is increased, there will be a “brain drain” in the future. In evaluating that contention, it should be borne in mind that the average compensation for a full professor at UNC-CH is nearly \$105,000 per year. There is a very well supplied market for professorial services with many talented individuals who

would gladly accept that much to teach at UNC. If some faculty members find better offers at other universities, it is not as if it were impossible to hire a capable replacement.

To have a faculty member leave for employment elsewhere is not cause for rejoicing, but neither should it be presumed that the quality of education at the university must decline if one professor leaves and a replacement is hired. To speak of a “brain drain” is to imply that a departing professor will have to be replaced with someone who is less knowledgeable or less competent in teaching, researching, and writing.

That is a highly dubious assumption.

## ***Conclusion***

Whether one uses our cost-of-living analysis or our quality of life approach, it is evident that faculty compensation at UNC-CH is not “uncompetitive” with regard to other universities. While we are not saying that faculty compensation should never be increased, we maintain that at the current time there is no pressing need for an increase to be able to compete for academic talent.

---

## ***About the Authors:***

***George C. Leef*** is Director of the Pope Center for Higher Education Policy, a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that studies issues facing North Carolina colleges and universities. A former professor of law and economics and state legislative analyst in Michigan, Leef is the author of numerous articles and studies on public-policy issues for national research institutes and periodicals. Leef currently serves as publisher of Clarion, a bimonthly journal on higher-education issues, and as book review editor of The Freeman magazine, based in New York.

***Jon Sanders*** is the Director of Publications at the Pope Center for Higher Education Policy, for which he has written numerous articles and studies on higher-education issues. Sanders serves as editor of Clarion.

**Table 1. a. Compensation of Professors at All Research I Institutions, 1998-99 —adjusted for cost of living**

Rank	Institution	Type	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
			(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
1	Vanderbilt U	prv	169.5		114	2	91.9	4
2	U Tenn—Knoxville	pub	162		122.9	1	99.1	1
3	U Chicago	prv	154.4		104.2	6	95.2	2
4	Virginia Tech	pub	153.2		111	3	93.8	3
5	Duke U	prv	150.3		99.8	12	81.1	15
6	Northwestern U	prv	148.1		100.3	9	83.4	11
7	Purdue U	pub	147.5		102.1	8	85.6	10
8	Princeton U	prv	145.7		89	25	70.4	36
9	Emory U	prv	142.8		95.7	17	76.1	24
10	Cornell U	prv	140.9		103.6	7	91.4	6
11	Rutgers U	pub	139.5		108.3	5	79.3	18
12	U Alab—Birmingham	pub	136.1		96.3	16	81.9	13
13	U Kansas	pub	135.4		100.2	10	87	7
14	Texas A & M	pub	134.6		98.4	14	85.7	9
15	Louisiana St U	pub	134.1		99.2	13	85.9	8
16	Penn St U	pub	133.2		92.3	21	75.5	25
17	Indiana U	pub	132.6		97	15	77	23
18	Washington U	prv	131		85	31	79.9	16
19	U Misso—Columbia	pub	130.9		100.1	11	82.9	12
20	Utah St U	pub	130.3		109.3	4	91.5	5
21	Georgia Inst Tech	pub	127.9		94	18	81.7	14
22	U Georgia	pub	125.9		90.5	23	78.2	19
23	U Virginia	pub	124.9		86.9	29	68.7	38
24	Case W Reserve U	prv	124		92.8	19	77.6	20
25	U Rochester	prv	123.7		82.8	34	77.2	22
26	U Ariz	pub	123.2		86.9	28	77.6	21
27	U Florida	pub	122.9		91.2	22	79.4	17
28	Yale U	prv	122.8		71.8	58	58.2	62
29	U Utah	pub	122.1		87.2	27	74.4	28
30	UNC—Chapel Hill	pub	121.1		90.2	24	71	35
31	Iowa St U	pub	120.9		92.7	20	75.1	26
32	U Cincinnati	pub	117.8		87.7	26	71.6	33
33	U Minn—Twin Cities	pub	116.3		86.3	30	72.9	30
34	U Texas—Austin	pub	116.3		77.6	47	71.5	34
35	Ohio St U	pub	116.1		80.8	39	68.3	41
36	Carnegie-Mellon U	prv	115.5		81.6	36	72.2	32
37	U Nebraska—Lincoln	pub	114.9		84.1	32	72.6	31
38	Cal Inst Tech	prv	114.5		80.5	41	65.8	46
39	U Miami	prv	114.3		80	43	67.3	42
40	NC State U	pub	113.3		82.5	35	73	29
41	U Penn	prv	112.6		76.5	50	68.9	37
42	U Mich—Ann Arbor	pub	111.9		81.5	37	66.2	45
43	Florida St U	pub	110.2		83.5	33	74.4	27
44	SUNY—Buffalo	pub	109.4		78.9	45	61.3	54
45	U Illinois—Chicago	pub	109.3		81.2	38	68.4	39

Rank	Institution	Type	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
			(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
46	U Iowa	pub	108.2		75.9	52	65.2	48
47	Johns Hopkins U	prv	104.9		76.5	49	65.6	47
48	Ariz St U—Tempe	pub	104.6		78.2	46	64.4	49
49	U Cal—San Diego	pub	104.5		70.3	61	59	60
50	U Kentucky	pub	104.4		79.5	44	66.9	44
51	Mich St U	pub	103.9		80.2	42	67	43
52	U Cal—Los Angeles	pub	103.7		68	67	57	65
53	Brown U	prv	102.9		69.3	63	59.2	59
54	Virginia C'wealth U	pub	102.8		80.7	40	64	51
55	U Pittsburgh	pub	102		73.6	55	61	56
56	U Illinois—Urbana	pub	100.6		71.7	59	62.7	52
57	Georgetown U	prv	100		64.5	70	50.1	71
58	U Mass	pub	98.6		77.2	48	64.2	50
59	U Conn	pub	98.4		73.7	54	58.7	61
60	U Southern Cal	prv	97.8		71.8	57	62.5	53
61	U Wisc—Madison	pub	97.5		76.3	51	68.4	40
62	U Cal—Davis	pub	95.7		69.4	62	57.9	63
63	U Washington	pub	95.6		67.7	68	59.8	57
64	Wayne St U	pub	95.4		73.9	53	56.8	66
65	U Cal—Irvine	pub	95.3		68.3	66	55.3	68
66	U New Mexico	pub	94.4		70.8	60	59.5	58
67	Temple U	pub	89.7		68.4	65	49.9	72
68	New Mexico St U	pub	87.8		72	56	61.2	55
69	West Virginia U	pub	87.8		69.1	64	55.9	67
70	Oregon St U	pub	86.6		67.2	69	57.8	64
71	U Cal—Santa Barbara	pub	84.6		56.2	74	46.4	74
72	Colorado St U	pub	84		62.1	71	53.2	69
73	U Maryland—C Park	pub	80.8		58.2	73	52.6	70
74	U Colorado—Boulder	pub	79.6		58.3	72	48.8	73
75	Harvard U	prv	79.2		45.3	81	41.3	80
76	U Cal—Berkeley	pub	78.7		52.7	78	44	76
77	Stanford U	prv	76.8		53.9	77	43.7	77
78	SUNY—Stony Brook	pub	74.9		54.2	76	42.6	79
79	Howard U	prv	72.7		54.7	75	46.3	75
80	Mass Inst Tech	prv	70.6		49.2	79	42.7	78
81	U Cal—San Francisco	pub	62.7		47.4	80	38	81
82	Rockefeller U	prv	59.4		33.1	84	22	86
83	Tufts U	prv	58.6		40.6	82	32.9	82
84	New York U	prv	52.5		34.6	83	29.5	83
85	Columbia U	prv	48		32.7	85	26.7	85
86	U Hawaii—Manoa	pub	40.2		30.8	86	26.8	84
	Boston U (no comp. data)	prv	—		—	—	—	—
	Yeshiva U (no comp. data)	prv	—		—	—	—	—
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>			<i>109.0</i>		<i>78.1</i>		<i>65.5</i>	

**Table 1. b. Compensation of Professors at Public Research I Institutions, 1998-99 — adjusted for cost of living**

Rank	Institution	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
		(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
1	U Tenn—Knoxville	162		122.9	1	99.1	1
2	Virginia Tech	153.2		111	2	93.8	2
3	Purdue U	147.5		102.1	5	85.6	7
4	Rutgers U	139.5		108.3	4	79.3	12
5	U Alab—Birmingham	136.1		96.3	11	81.9	9
6	U Kansas	135.4		100.2	6	87	4
7	Texas A & M	134.6		98.4	9	85.7	6
8	Louisiana St U	134.1		99.2	8	85.9	5
9	Penn St U	133.2		92.3	14	75.5	16
10	Indiana U	132.6		97	10	77	15
11	U Misso—Columbia	130.9		100.1	7	82.9	8
12	Utah St U	130.3		109.3	3	91.5	3
13	Georgia Inst Tech	127.9		94	12	81.7	10
14	U Georgia	125.9		90.5	16	78.2	13
15	U Virginia	124.9		86.9	21	68.7	26
16	U Ariz	123.2		86.9	20	77.6	14
17	U Florida	122.9		91.2	15	79.4	11
18	U Utah	122.1		87.2	19	74.4	19
19	UNC—Chapel Hill	121.1		90.2	17	71	25
20	Iowa St U	120.9		92.7	13	75.1	17
21	U Cincinnati	117.8		87.7	18	71.6	23
22	U Minn—Twin Cities	116.3		86.3	22	72.9	21
23	U Texas—Austin	116.3		77.6	34	71.5	24
24	Ohio St U	116.1		80.8	28	68.3	29
25	U Nebraska—Lincoln	114.9		84.1	23	72.6	22
26	NC State U	113.3		82.5	25	73	20
27	U Mich—Ann Arbor	111.9		81.5	26	66.2	32
28	Florida St U	110.2		83.5	24	74.4	18
29	SUNY—Buffalo	109.4		78.9	32	61.3	38
30	U Illinois—Chicago	109.3		81.2	27	68.4	27
31	U Iowa	108.2		75.9	37	65.2	33
32	Ariz St U—Tempe	104.6		78.2	33	64.4	34
33	U Cal—San Diego	104.5		70.3	44	59	43
34	U Kentucky	104.4		79.5	31	66.9	31
35	Mich St U	103.9		80.2	30	67	30
36	U Cal—Los Angeles	103.7		68	49	57	47
37	Virginia C'wealth U	102.8		80.7	29	64	36
38	U Pittsburgh	102		73.6	40	61	40
39	U Illinois—Urbana	100.6		71.7	42	62.7	37
40	U Mass	98.6		77.2	35	64.2	35
41	U Conn	98.4		73.7	39	58.7	44
42	U Wisc—Madison	97.5		76.3	36	68.4	28
43	U Cal—Davis	95.7		69.4	45	57.9	45
44	U Washington	95.6		67.7	50	59.8	41
45	Wayne St U	95.4		73.9	38	56.8	48



<i>Rank</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Prof comp (adj)</i>		<i>Assoc prof comp (adj)</i>		<i>Asst prof comp (adj)</i>	
		<i>(\$1000s)</i>		<i>(\$1000s)</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>(\$1000s)</i>	<i>Rank</i>
46	U Cal—Irvine	95.3		68.3	48	55.3	50
47	U New Mexico	94.4		70.8	43	59.5	42
48	Temple U	89.7		68.4	47	49.9	53
49	New Mexico St U	87.8		72	41	61.2	39
50	West Virginia U	87.8		69.1	46	55.9	49
51	Oregon St U	86.6		67.2	51	57.8	46
52	U Cal—Santa Barbara	84.6		56.2	55	46.4	55
53	Colorado St U	84		62.1	52	53.2	51
54	U Maryland—C Park	80.8		58.2	54	52.6	52
55	U Colorado—Boulder	79.6		58.3	53	48.8	54
56	U Cal—Berkeley	78.7		52.7	57	44	56
57	SUNY—Stony Brook	74.9		54.2	56	42.6	57
58	U Cal—San Francisco	62.7		47.4	58	38	58
59	U Hawaii—Manoa	40.2		30.8	59	26.8	59
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>		<i>109.1</i>		<i>80.2</i>		<i>67.1</i>	

**Table 1. c. Compensation of Professors at UNC-Chapel Hill ‘Peer’ Institutions, 1998-99 — adjusted for cost of living**

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Prof comp (adj)</i>		<i>Assoc prof comp (adj)</i>		<i>Asst prof comp (adj)</i>	
			<i>(\$1000s)</i>		<i>(\$1000s)</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>(\$1000s)</i>	<i>Rank</i>
1	Vanderbilt U	prv	169.5		114	1	91.9	2
2	U Chicago	prv	154.4		104.2	2	95.2	1
3	Duke U	prv	150.3		99.8	3	81.1	3
4	Emory U	prv	142.8		95.7	4	76.1	5
5	U Virginia	pub	124.9		86.9	7	68.7	9
6	U Florida	pub	122.9		91.2	5	79.4	4
7	UNC—Chapel Hill	pub	121.1		90.2	6	71	7
8	U Texas—Austin	pub	116.3		77.6	10	71.5	6
9	Ohio St U	pub	116.1		80.8	9	68.3	11
10	U Penn	prv	112.6		76.5	11	68.9	8
11	U Mich—Ann Arbor	pub	111.9		81.5	8	66.2	12
12	U Cal—Los Angeles	pub	103.7		68	14	57	15
13	U Illinois—Urbana	pub	100.6		71.7	13	62.7	13
14	U Wisc—Madison	pub	97.5		76.3	12	68.4	10
15	U Washington	pub	95.6		67.7	15	59.8	14
16	U Cal—Berkeley	pub	78.7		52.7	17	44	16
17	Stanford U	prv	76.8		53.9	16	43.7	17
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>			<i>117.4</i>		<i>81.7</i>		<i>69.1</i>	

**Table 2. a. Compensation of Professors at All Research I Institutions, 1998-99 — adjusted for quality of life**

Rank	Institution	Type	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
			(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
1	Rockefeller U	prv	145.1		80.8	11	53.8	50
2	Harvard U	prv	138		79.1	18	72	7
3	Stanford U	prv	136.3		95.6	1	77.5	2
4	Duke U	prv	129.9		86.3	4	70.1	11
5	U Penn	prv	129.1		87.7	3	78.9	1
6	New York U	prv	128.2		84.6	7	72.1	6
7	U Cal—Berkeley	pub	128.2		85.9	5	71.7	9
8	Cal Inst Tech	prv	125		87.9	2	71.8	8
9	Georgetown U	prv	124.7		80.5	13	62.5	25
10	Mass Inst Tech	prv	123.1		85.7	6	74.4	3
11	Emory U	prv	122.6		82.1	9	65.3	19
12	U Chicago	prv	119.2		80.4	14	73.4	5
13	U Cal—San Diego	pub	118.6		79.8	15	66.9	15
14	Columbia U	prv	117.3		79.7	16	65.3	18
15	Carnegie-Mellon U	prv	114.3		80.8	10	71.5	10
16	Northwestern U	prv	114.3		77.4	22	64.3	20
17	Cornell U	prv	113.8		83.7	8	73.8	4
18	U Cal—Los Angeles	pub	112.8		74	28	62	26
19	Vanderbilt U	prv	111.7		75.1	24	60.6	30
20	Georgia Inst Tech	pub	109.7		80.7	12	70.1	12
21	Washington U	prv	107.2		69.6	37	65.4	17
22	U Minn—Twin Cities	pub	106.9		79.3	17	67	14
23	U Southern Cal	prv	106.4		78.1	20	67.9	13
24	UNC—Chapel Hill	pub	104.7		78	21	61.4	28
25	U Miami	prv	104		72.8	31	61.2	29
26	U Cal—Irvine	pub	103.4		74.1	27	60	32
27	Princeton U	prv	103.2		63	57	49.9	61
28	Temple U	pub	102.9		78.5	19	57.2	42
29	U Maryland—C Park	pub	102.3		73.7	29	66.6	16
30	U Rochester	prv	102.2		68.4	43	63.8	21
31	Tufts U	prv	102.1		70.8	34	57.3	41
32	Johns Hopkins U	prv	101.5		74.1	26	63.5	22
33	U Cal—San Francisco	pub	101.5		76.8	23	61.5	27
34	U Pittsburgh	pub	101		72.9	30	60.4	31
35	U Cal—Santa Barbara	pub	100.2		66.5	48	54.9	48
36	Case W Reserve U	prv	100.1		75	25	62.7	24
37	NC St U	pub	97.9		71.3	32	63.1	23
38	U Utah	pub	97.1		69.4	38	59.2	34
39	U Texas—Austin	pub	97		64.7	53	59.7	33
40	U Cal—Davis	pub	96.7		70	35	58.5	37
41	SUNY—Buffalo	pub	95.4		68.8	41	53.5	53
42	U Cincinnati	pub	95.4		71	33	58	39
43	Yale U	prv	94.6		55.3	65	44.8	69
44	SUNY—Stony Brook	pub	94.1		68.1	46	53.6	52
45	Ohio St U	pub	94		65.4	52	55.3	45

Rank	Institution	Type	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
			(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
46	U Mich—Ann Arbor	pub	93.5		68.2	45	55.4	44
47	U Washington	pub	92.8		65.8	50	58.1	38
48	Ariz St U—Tempe	pub	92.4		69.1	40	56.9	43
49	U Conn	pub	91.7		68.7	42	54.8	49
50	Howard U	prv	90.7		68.3	44	57.8	40
51	U Virginia	pub	90.4		62.9	58	49.7	62
52	U Alab—Birmingham	pub	89.4		63.3	55	53.8	51
53	Brown U	prv	89.3		60.2	60	51.4	56
54	Rutgers U	pub	89.2		69.3	39	50.7	60
55	Virginia C'wealth U	pub	88.8		69.8	36	55.3	47
56	U Illinois—Urbana	pub	88.6		63.2	56	55.3	46
57	U Hawaii—Manoa	pub	88.5		67.9	47	59.1	35
58	U Tenn—Knoxville	pub	87.3		66.2	49	53.4	54
59	U Wisc—Madison	pub	84		65.7	51	58.9	36
60	Virginia Tech	pub	83		60.1	62	50.8	59
61	Wayne St U	pub	82.8		64.1	54	49.3	63
62	U Ariz	pub	82.2		58	64	51.8	55
63	U Kentucky	pub	79.8		60.8	59	51.2	57
64	U Florida	pub	78.6		58.3	63	50.8	58
65	Iowa St U	pub	78.3		60.1	61	48.6	64
66	U New Mexico	pub	73.1		54.8	66	46.1	66
67	U Nebraska—Lincoln	pub	71.7		52.5	68	45.3	67
68	U Misso—Columbia	pub	71.4		54.7	67	45.2	68
69	U Iowa	pub	69.3		48.6	75	41.7	73
70	Florida St U	pub	68.8		52.1	69	46.4	65
71	U Illinois—Chicago	pub	67.3		50	71	42.1	72
72	Purdue U	pub	66.8		46.2	77	38.8	78
73	U Colorado—Boulder	pub	66.4		48.6	74	40.8	76
74	Mich St U	pub	65.5		50.5	70	42.2	71
75	Oregon St U	pub	64.1		49.7	73	42.8	70
76	Texas A & M	pub	64.1		46.8	76	40.8	75
77	U Mass	pub	63.8		50	72	41.5	74
78	Louisiana St U	pub	61.7		45.6	79	39.5	77
79	Indiana U	pub	60.8		44.5	80	35.3	81
80	Penn St U	pub	59.2		41	82	33.6	82
81	U Georgia	pub	57.9		41.7	81	36	80
82	Utah St U	pub	54.7		45.9	78	38.4	79
83	Colorado St U	pub	52.8		39	83	33.4	83
84	West Virginia U	pub	48.1		37.9	84	30.6	84
85	U Kansas	pub	41.8		30.9	86	26.9	85
86	New Mexico St U	pub	37.9		31.1	85	26.4	86
	Boston U (no comp. data)	prv	—		—	—	—	—
	Yeshiva U (no comp. data)	prv	—		—	—	—	—
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>			93.0		66.0		55.2	

**Table 2. b. Compensation of Professors at Public Research I Institutions, 1998-99 — adjusted for quality of life**

Rank	Institution	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
		(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
1	U Cal—Berkeley	128.2		85.9	1	71.7	1
2	U Cal—San Diego	118.6		79.8	3	66.9	4
3	U Cal—Los Angeles	112.8		74	9	62	7
4	Georgia Inst Tech	109.7		80.7	2	70.1	2
5	U Minn—Twin Cities	106.9		79.3	4	67	3
6	UNC—Chapel Hill	104.7		78	6	61.4	9
7	U Cal—Irvine	103.4		74.1	8	60	11
8	Temple U	102.9		78.5	5	57.2	19
9	U Maryland—C Park	102.3		73.7	10	66.6	5
10	U Cal—San Francisco	101.5		76.8	7	61.5	8
11	U Pittsburgh	101		72.9	11	60.4	10
12	U Cal—Santa Barbara	100.2		66.5	24	54.9	25
13	NC St U	97.9		71.3	12	63.1	6
14	U Utah	97.1		69.4	16	59.2	13
15	U Texas—Austin	97		64.7	29	59.7	12
16	U Cal—Davis	96.7		70	14	58.5	16
17	SUNY—Buffalo	95.4		68.8	19	53.5	29
18	U Cincinnati	95.4		71	13	58	18
19	SUNY—Stony Brook	94.1		68.1	22	53.6	28
20	Ohio St U	94		65.4	28	55.3	22
21	U Mich—Ann Arbor	93.5		68.2	21	55.4	21
22	U Washington	92.8		65.8	26	58.1	17
23	Ariz St U—Tempe	92.4		69.1	18	56.9	20
24	U Conn	91.7		68.7	20	54.8	26
25	U Virginia	90.4		62.9	33	49.7	36
26	U Alab—Birmingham	89.4		63.3	31	53.8	27
27	Rutgers U	89.2		69.3	17	50.7	35
28	Virginia C'wealth U	88.8		69.8	15	55.3	24
29	U Illinois—Urbana	88.6		63.2	32	55.3	23
30	U Hawaii—Manoa	88.5		67.9	23	59.1	14
31	U Tenn—Knoxville	87.3		66.2	25	53.4	30
32	U Wisc—Madison	84		65.7	27	58.9	15
33	Virginia Tech	83		60.1	36	50.8	34
34	Wayne St U	82.8		64.1	30	49.3	37
35	U Ariz	82.2		58	38	51.8	31
36	U Kentucky	79.8		60.8	34	51.2	32
37	U Florida	78.6		58.3	37	50.8	33
38	Iowa St U	78.3		60.1	35	48.6	38
39	U New Mexico	73.1		54.8	39	46.1	40
40	U Nebraska—Lincoln	71.7		52.5	41	45.3	41
41	U Misso—Columbia	71.4		54.7	40	45.2	42
42	U Iowa	69.3		48.6	48	41.7	46
43	Florida St U	68.8		52.1	42	46.4	39
44	U Illinois—Chicago	67.3		50	44	42.1	45
45	Purdue U	66.8		46.2	50	38.8	51

Rank	Institution	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
		(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
46	U Colorado—Boulder	66.4		48.6	47	40.8	49
47	Mich St U	65.5		50.5	43	42.2	44
48	Oregon St U	64.1		49.7	46	42.8	43
49	Texas A & M	64.1		46.8	49	40.8	48
50	U Mass	63.8		50	45	41.5	47
51	Louisiana St U	61.7		45.6	52	39.5	50
52	Indiana U	60.8		44.5	53	35.3	54
53	Penn St U	59.2		41	55	33.6	55
54	U Georgia	57.9		41.7	54	36	53
55	Utah St U	54.7		45.9	51	38.4	52
56	Colorado St U	52.8		39	56	33.4	56
57	West Virginia U	48.1		37.9	57	30.6	57
58	U Kansas	41.8		30.9	59	26.9	58
59	New Mexico St U	37.9		31.1	58	26.4	59
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>		83.2		60.9		50.8	

**Table 2. c. Compensation of Professors at UNC-Chapel Hill ‘Peer’ Institutions, 1998-99 — adjusted for quality of life**

Rank	Institution	Type	Prof comp (adj)		Assoc prof comp (adj)		Asst prof comp (adj)	
			(\$1000s)		(\$1000s)	Rank	(\$1000s)	Rank
1	Stanford U	prv	136.3		95.6	1	77.5	2
2	Duke U	prv	129.9		86.3	3	70.1	5
3	U Penn	prv	129.1		87.7	2	78.9	1
4	U Cal—Berkeley	pub	128.2		85.9	4	71.7	4
5	Emory U	prv	122.6		82.1	5	65.3	6
6	U Chicago	prv	119.2		80.4	6	73.4	3
7	U Cal—Los Angeles	pub	112.8		74	9	62	7
8	Vanderbilt U	prv	111.7		75.1	8	60.6	9
9	UNC—Chapel Hill	pub	104.7		78	7	61.4	8
10	U Texas—Austin	pub	97		64.7	14	59.7	10
11	Ohio St U	pub	94		65.4	13	55.3	14
12	U Mich—Ann Arbor	pub	93.5		68.2	10	55.4	13
13	U Washington	pub	92.8		65.8	11	58.1	12
14	U Virginia	pub	90.4		62.9	16	49.7	17
15	U Illinois—Urbana	pub	88.6		63.2	15	55.3	15
16	U Wisc—Madison	pub	84		65.7	12	58.9	11
17	U Florida	pub	78.6		58.3	17	50.8	16
<i>Average Compensation by Rank:</i>			106.7		74.1		62.6	

**Table 3.a. Professor Leaving UNC-Chapel Hill for Employment at Another University, 1995-99**

Year	Name	Left Rank	Left Univ.	Went to Rank	Went to Univ.	Promotion?	Peer?	Res. I?
98	D.C. Wilson	asst. dean	UNC-CH	vice president	U. Texas Medical Branch at Galveston	y	n	n
97	P.G. Feiss	senior assoc. dean	UNC-CH	dean	C of Wm. & Mary	y	n	n
95	J. Kretovics	coordinator, assoc. professor	UNC-CH	chairman, assoc. professor	W. Michigan	n	n	n
98	M. Rierson	associate dean	UNC-CH	vice president	Miami	y	y	n
98	J.M. Danko	executiv director, MBA program	UNC-CH	assoc. dean, grad school	Babson College	?	n	n
95	R. McCormick	provost, v. chancellor	UNC-CH	president	U. Washington	y	y	y
99	J.M. Sasson	professor	UNC-CH	professor	Vanderbilt U.	n	y	y
97	C.P. Zeithaml	professor	UNC-CH	dean	U. Virginia	y	y	y
98	E.S. Floyd	vice chancellor	UNC-CH	president	W. Michigan	y	n	n
97	E.D.E. Gordon	instructor	UNC-CH	asst. professor	Kennesaw State	y	n	n
97	B.V. Powell	professor	UNC-CH	dean	U. Mo. at Kan.City	y	n	n
96	C. Esser	"faculty member"	UNC-CH, Duke	chair	Kan. City Art Inst.	y	n	n

**Table 3.b. Professor Coming to UNC-Chapel Hill for Employment from Another University, 1995-99**

Year	Name	Left Rank	Left Univ.	Went to Rank	Went to Univ.	Promotion?	Peer?	Res. I?
97	T. Linden	anchor	(Lifetime Medical Television)	professor	UNC-CH	?	n	n
98	K. Moise	professor	Baylor College of Medicine	director, division of maternal-fetal medicine	UNC-CH	y	n	n
97	M.R. Grumet	dean	Brooklyn Co of CUNY	dean	UNC-CH	n	n	n
96	M.S. Murry	director	Cornell	asst. dean	UNC-CH	?	y	n
97	R.I. Palm	dean	U. Oregon	dean	UNC-CH	n	n	n
97	J.L. Houpt	dean	Emory	dean, v. chancellor	UNC-CH	?	y	y
97	B.N. Raphael	voice teacher	Harvard	professor	UNC-CH	y	y	n
95	D. Sonnenwald	NATO post- doctoral fellow	Risoe Nat'l Lab (Denmark)	asst. professor	UNC-CH	?	?	n
96	S.T. Kitchen	vice president	U Maryland Balt. Co.	v. chancellor	UNC-CH	n	n	n
99	E.R. Nichol, Jr.	professor	U. Colorado at Boulder	dean	UNC-CH	y	y	n
98	G.B. Newby	asst. professor	U. Illinois at Urbana	asst. professor	UNC-CH	n	y	y
97	R.S. Sullivan	director, Innovation Creativity Capital Institute	U. Texas at Austin	dean, school of business	UNC-CH	?	y	y
98	J.G. Marshall	professor	U. Toronto	dean, professor	UNC-CH	y	?	n
95	M.K. Hooker	system president	U. Massachusetts	chancellor	UNC-CH	n	y	n
98	C.L. Viles	research associate	U. Virginia	asst. professor	UNC-CH	y	y	y
95	B.J. Dempsey	research scientist, Computer Networks Library	U. Virginia	asst. professor	UNC-CH	?	y	y
95	E.S. Floyd	executive director	Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board	v. chancellor	UNC-CH	?	n/a	n

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education online, Gazette section. These tables look only at faculty and executive personnel transfers.