

## FACULTY SALARIES, COMPENSATION, AND COMPRESSION AT WARTBURG COLLEGE, 1998-2006

### *Prefatory remarks*

1. All data in this report are from the AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years. One should note that these data are submitted by each institution of higher education. They are virtually identical to data that institutions are required by federal law to submit to the National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (NCES/IPEDS) if said institution makes application for participation in or participates in any federally based financial assistance program under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It is interesting that many institutions submit their data to AAUP on their NCES/IPEDS forms. Moreover, because the NCES did not collect data for the 2000-01 year, the number of institutions reporting to AAUP decreased by 18% that year (*Academe*, March-April 2001, p. 34).
2. The AAUP research team reports salary and compensation figures in thousands and rounds to the nearest hundred. Whenever a calculation is made, such as percentile ranks, the original data are utilized in the calculation and only the final statistic is then rounded to the nearest hundred (*Academe*, March-April, 2004, p. 47).
3. All monetary figures are nominal; they do not take the inflation rate into account.
4. Only “instructional faculty” (full-time faculty whose major regular responsibilities are teaching and research) are included in this report. Wartburg College construes instructional faculty as ranked academic faculty, including endowed chairs.
5. The compression comparisons made in this report are primarily “between” rank comparisons. No attempt to compare “within” rank compression is possible given the extreme reluctance of many college administrations to report individual salaries within ranks.
6. Those wishing to discredit any of the findings presented here may point to the existence of “outliers” in the ranks which may serve, primarily, to overstate the salary and compression figures. While this is undoubtedly the case at many institutions, it can be argued that “outliers” exist due to many reasons (e.g., lack of appropriate terminal degree for promotion in rank even if they have served an appropriate number of years in rank to be eligible for promotion, appointments to joint “administrative” positions, holding an endowed chair, etc.) which allow them to be present at all ranks. The 2004-05 list of ranked faculty provide an example. Simplistic scatterplot analyses of within-rank salary and years served in rank would probably identify two assistant and three associate professors at Wartburg College as “outliers” due to their inability to be promoted further due to terminal degree considerations. Some might argue that these cases serve to increase between-rank compression because they inflate within-rank averages. And they would be right. However, “outliers” also exist at the professor level in the form of endowed chairs. During 2004-05 there were six endowed chairs at the professor rank (and one at assistant and two at associate). Wartburg’s IRS Form 990 for that year indicates that the two highest compensated ranked faculty, at \$97,815 and \$96,225, also held endowed chairs. The net effect is that the averages reported for the professor rank are also going to be inflated. In sum, outliers have not been taken out of this analysis because access to the raw data simply is not available. The best one can do is to indicate that the existence of outliers is more than probable but is no more likely to influence the results in favor of any of the ranks.
7. The following tables report salary and compensation compression figures for (1) Wartburg College, (2) IIB Private, Church-Related Institutions, (3) Wartburg College Benchmark Institutions, and (4) Luther College. Incorporation of these various levels-of-analysis provide a more illuminating picture than that provided by more limited analyses. Unless otherwise stated, all statements herein refer to the 1998-06 period for the ranks of professor, associate, and assistant, and to the 2002-06 period for the rank of instructor.
8. Finally, it goes without saying that, regardless of the findings, this report may not be a popular document with everyone. This document may be received differently depending in part on the rank of the individual reading it. The intention of this report is in no way further to divide the faculty at Wartburg College. Rather, the report attempts to uncover any “rank bias” that may exist due to salary and compensation compression. Moreover, in the interest of promoting community, I would hope that any bias that is evident would be immediately addressed by the faculty and administration of Wartburg College.

**The Case of Wartburg College**

Table 1 provides salary and related data over the 1998-06 period for Wartburg College. An initial look indicates that salaries have increased within each rank. On average, salary for the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor increased by \$10,200, \$11,300, \$10,100, and \$5,800, with an average annual percentage rate of increase of 2.6, 3.4, 3.7, and 4.5 percent, respectively. An assessment of the years where there are data for all ranks, 2002-06, saw average salary increase by \$4,300, \$6,200, \$4,500, and \$5,800 and an average annual percentage rate increase by 2.4, 4.2, 3.4, and 4.5 percent, respectively. Taken together, these two sets of figures indicate that the rank of professor, followed closely by assistant professor, have been most disadvantaged, relatively speaking. This becomes increasingly alarming for the rank of professor when assessing the 2002-06 period, as all other ranks have fared considerably better over the last four years.

Table 1 also reports average salary as a percentage of the average salary at the next highest rank. Assistants have averaged 91.6% of average associate salary and 74.3% of average professor salary while associates have averaged 81.1% of the average professor salary. Remarkably, instructors averaged 95.7% of the average assistant salary over the last four years. Complementing these numbers is the trend with respect to this variable. The percent of average assistant salary accounted for by instructors increased from 93.8 to 97.1% over 2002-06. The percent of average associate salary accounted for by assistants stayed relatively constant, moving from 90.1 to 89.9%. Comparisons of the rank of professor with every other rank indicate extensive salary compression over the years. First, the data make quite clear that the relative position of the average associate salary vis-à-vis that of the average professor has increased considerably—from 79.7% in 1998-99 to 84.6% in 2005-06. Increasing compression is also extensive between the professor and assistant ranks, moving from 71.8% in 1998-99 to 76.1% in 2005-06.

**Table 1. Wartburg College: Annual Average Salary (in thousands), Annual Percentage Salary Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Salary as a Percentage of Salary at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

<i>Year/Rank</i>	<i>Professor</i>		<i>Associate Professor</i>		<i>Assistant Professor</i>		<i>Instructor</i>	
<b>2005-06</b> n=34/20/27/3	63.5 (3) 1.3%	<b>41</b> <b>76.1%</b>	53.7 (3) 3.1%	<b>43</b> <b>84.6%</b>	48.3 (2) 2.6%	<b>62</b> <b>89.9%</b>	46.9 (1) 2.9%	<b>85</b> <b>97.1%</b>
<b>2004-05</b> n=31/23/27/3	62.7 (3) 2.0%	<b>44</b> <b>75.1%</b>	52.1 (3) 3.8%	<b>46</b> <b>83.1%</b>	47.1 (2) 0.9%	<b>63</b> <b>90.4%</b>	45.6 (1) 2.7%	<b>85</b> <b>96.8%</b>
<b>2003-04</b> n=30/23/24/3	61.5 (3) 3.9%	<b>46</b> <b>75.9%</b>	50.2 (3) 5.7%	<b>43</b> <b>81.6%</b>	46.7 (2) 6.6%	<b>72</b> <b>93.0%</b>	44.4 (1) 8.0%	<b>84</b> <b>95.1%</b>
<b>2002-03</b> n=27/27/23/3	59.2 (3) 3.5%	<b>46</b> <b>74.0%</b>	47.5 (4) 2.8%	<b>37</b> <b>80.2%</b>	43.8 (3) 2.3%	<b>59</b> <b>92.2%</b>	41.1 (1)	<b>81</b> <b>93.8%</b>
<b>2001-02</b> n=26/23/27/0	57.2 (3) 2.1%	<b>45</b> <b>74.8%</b>	46.2 (4) 3.6%	<b>37</b> <b>80.8%</b>	42.8 (2) 3.4%	<b>63</b> <b>92.6%</b>		
<b>2000-01</b> n=32/23/21/1	56.0 (3) 2.6%	<b>47</b> <b>73.9%</b>	44.6 (4) 3.0%	<b>36</b> <b>79.6%</b>	41.4 (2) 4.0%	<b>63</b> <b>92.8%</b>		
<b>1999-00</b> n=28/27/19/0	54.6 (3) 2.6%	<b>52</b> <b>72.9%</b>	43.3 (3) 1.4%	<b>40</b> <b>79.3%</b>	39.8 (2) 4.2%	<b>64</b> <b>91.9%</b>		
<b>1998-99</b> n=24/27/19/0	53.2 (3) 2.5%	<b>54</b> <b>71.8%</b>	42.4 (3) 3.2%	<b>45</b> <b>79.7%</b>	38.2 (2) 5.5%	<b>62</b> <b>90.1%</b>		
<b><math>\bar{Y}</math></b>	58.5	<b>(-13)</b>	47.5	<b>(-2)</b>	43.5	<b>(E)</b>	44.5	<b>(+4)</b>
<b><math>\bar{Y}</math> annual</b>	2.6%	<b>74.3%</b>	3.4%	<b>81.1%</b>	3.7%	<b>91.6%</b>	4.5%	<b>95.7%</b>

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Salary equals “contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration.”

*Italics:* Percent increase in average faculty member salary from year 1 to year 2.

**Rectangle Block:** Salary as a percent of salary at next highest rank.

**Gray Block:** Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

**Green Block:** Assistant Professor Salary as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

Although not reported in the table, compression has also increased at yet a higher rate over the 2002-06 period between the ranks of professor and instructor, from 69.4% to 73.9%.

Comparing the average salaries of the ranks with similar IIB institutions serves to highlight the contention that the most critical aspect of the compression problem between ranks is that which exist between the rank of professor and every other rank. Presented in table 1, in parentheses, is the collapsed ranking that AAUP researchers assign to each rank depending on how the average salary at that rank compares to the average salary at that same rank at other IIB institutions. For example, in 2005-06 the collapsed ranking of the average salary of the rank of professor at Wartburg was a 3 (on the 1\*-5 categorization scheme). This ranking means that the average salary falls somewhere between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 59.9<sup>th</sup> percentile when compared to other IIB institutions. The problem is that the collapsed ranking masks significant trends in how comparable IIB institutions averages fare. For example, the annual collapsed ranking for the average salary of the rank of professor is always 3. However, the actual fact is that the non-collapsed ranking has deteriorated most notably—moving from the 54<sup>th</sup> percentile in 1998-99 to the 41<sup>st</sup> percentile in 2005-06. In effect, the average salary of professors at Wartburg has lost thirteen percentile points when compared to professors’ average salaries at other IIB institutions. Associates have fared much better as they have only lost two percentile points. Still better off are assistant professors, who have held even, and instructors, who have actually gained 4 percentile points. Finally, one should take note of the relative differences between the ranks. The instructor and assistant ranks find themselves, on average, at the 84<sup>th</sup> and 64<sup>th</sup> percentiles, respectively. More disconcerting is the fact that associates and professors find themselves, on average, at the 41<sup>st</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> percentiles, respectively.

Table 2 provides compensation and related data over the 1998-06 period for Wartburg College. The data on compensation largely mirror that of salary. While average compensation has increased for all ranks,

**Table 2. Wartburg College: Annual Average Compensation (in thousands), Annual Percentage Compensation Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Compensation as a Percentage of Compensation at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

Year/Rank	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
2005-06 n=34/20/27/3	83.4 (3) 1.1%	45 77.7%	72.1 (3) 3.2%	53 86.5%	64.8 (2) 5.9%	71 89.9%	61.8 (1) 3.7%	86 95.4%
2004-05 n=31/23/27/3	82.5 (3) 1.2%	49 74.2%	68.9 (3) 4.1%	51 83.5%	61.2 (2) 2.7%	65 88.8%	59.6 (1) 3.5%	89 97.4%
2003-04 n=30/23/24/3	81.5 (3) -1.2%	53 73.1%	66.2 (3) 4.3%	51 81.2%	59.6 (2) 4.2%	69 90.0%	57.0 (1) 4.4%	85 95.6%
2002-03 n=27/27/23/3	82.5 (2) 5.8%	60 69.3%	63.5 (3) 4.4%	49 77.0%	57.2 (2) 2.9%	56 90.1%	54.6 (1)	85 95.5%
2001-02 n=26/23/27/0	78.0 (2) 6.4%	60 71.3%	60.8 (3) 3.6%	48 77.9%	55.6 (2) 4.3%	72 91.4%		
2000-01 n=32/23/21/1	73.3 (3) 2.1%	56 72.7%	58.7 (3) 3.5%	51 80.1%	53.3 (2) 4.5%	70 90.8%		
1999-00 n=28/27/19/0	71.8 (2) 4.5%	60 71.0%	56.7 (3) 2.7%	54 79.0%	51.0 (2) 6.5%	70 89.9%		
1998-99 n=24/27/19/0	68.7 (2) 3.9%	60 69.7%	55.2 (3) 1.5%	55 80.3%	47.9 (2) 4.6%	61 86.8%		
$\bar{Y}$ $\bar{Y}$ annual	77.7 3.0%	(-15) 72.4%	62.8 3.4%	(-2) 80.7%	56.3 4.5%	(+10) 89.7%	58.3 3.9%	(+1) 96.0%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Compensation equals “salary plus institutional contributions to benefits.”

Italics: Percent increase in average faculty member compensation from year 1 to year 2.

Rectangle Block: Compensation as a percent of compensation at next highest rank.

Gray Block: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

Green Block: Assistant Professor compensation as a percentage of Full Professor.

( ): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

it is evident that the professor rank is in an extremely disadvantageous position relative to other ranks. On average compensation for the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor increased by \$14,700, \$16,900, \$16,900, and \$7,200, with an average annual percentage rate of increase of 3.0, 3.4, 4.5, and 3.9 percent, respectively. This finding becomes even worse over the last four years as average compensation increased by \$900, \$8,600, \$7,600, and \$7,200, and the average annual percentage rate of increase were 0.4, 3.9, 4.3, and 4.9 percent for the same ranks. These data indicate that the professor rank has been greatly disadvantaged, relatively speaking, over the 1998-06 period and critically so during the 2002-06 period. Relatively speaking the ranks of associate, assistant, and instructor have benefited greatly in terms of average compensation.

The data in table 2 also indicate that compression is once again problematic between the ranks. The assistant rank averaged 89.7% of average associate compensation and 72.4% of average professor compensation while associates averaged 80.7% of average professor compensation. As with salaries, instructors averaged 96.0% of average assistant compensation. The trends for compensation compression also indicate significant increases in compression between the rank of professor and every other rank. The percentage of average professor compensation accounted for by associates and assistants increased by 6.2 and 8.0 percentage points. Also noteworthy is the existence of increasing compression between the associate and assistant ranks as the latter gained 3.1 percentage points. On the positive side, this latter compression effect has been overcome in the 2002-06 period. On the negative side, however, the rank of professor vis-à-vis other ranks has deteriorated at an even greater rate because the average compensation of associates, assistants, and instructors has gained on that of professors by 9.5, 8.4, and 7.9 percentage points over the 2002-06 period.

An assessment of average compensation for similar ranks at other IIB institutions accentuates the increasingly disadvantageous position of the professor rank and the increasingly advantageous position of the assistant rank. Shockingly, the average compensation of the professor rank at Wartburg has lost fifteen percentile points (60<sup>th</sup> percentile in 1998-99 to 45<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2005-06). On the positive side, however, is that both the associate and instructor ranks have basically maintained their percentile placement and the rank of assistant has increased greatly (from 61<sup>st</sup> percentile in 1998-99 to 71<sup>st</sup> percentile in 2005-06). It is instructive again to note the differences between the ranks. In 2005-2006, the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor were at the 45<sup>th</sup>, 53<sup>rd</sup>, 71<sup>st</sup>, and 86<sup>th</sup> percentile for similar ranks at IIB institutions.

### **Private Church-Related Institutions**

Table 3 provides salary and related data over the 1998-06 period for IIB private church-related institutions. A comparison of these figures to those of Wartburg College reveals great differences. While salaries here have also increased, the rank of professor has seen the largest absolute increase as professor, associate, assistant, and instructor ranks increased \$14,300, \$12,600, \$9,700, and \$3,700, with average annual percentage rates of increase of 3.5, 3.6, 3.4, and 3.2 percent, respectively. What is especially noteworthy here is that the average annual percentage increases of the four ranks all fell within four-tenths of one percentage point as opposed to a range of 1.9 percentage points at Wartburg. In sum, the associate rank is a little higher while the rank of professor is considerably better off than these ranks at Wartburg. On the other side of the coin, however, the position of the assistant rank is marginally lower while the instructor rank is significantly worse. The extent of these differences becomes less when looking at the last four years. For the 2002-06 period the absolute increase in average salary for the same ranks was \$5,500, \$5,700, \$3,800, and \$3,700 while average annual percentage rates of increase became more variable at 2.9, 3.7, 2.9, and 3.2 percent, respectively.

A comparative assessment of salary compression between ranks also reveals extensive differences with the Wartburg data. For example, the assistant rank has averaged 84.4% of average salary of the associate rank and 69.1% of the professor rank while the associate rank has averaged 81.9% of the professor rank. While the latter figure is comparable to the compression figure for the same rank at Wartburg, the numbers for the assistant rank as a percentage of the average salary of both the associate and professor ranks are considerably lower than their Wartburg counterparts by 7.2 and 5.2 percentage points, respectively. Moreover, increasing compression between all the ranks is virtually non-existent for this comparison group.

An assessment of average salary for similar ranks at other IIB institutions also gives rise to dramatic differences. First, the rank of professor only lost four percentile points, moving from the 51<sup>st</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup> percentile. Second, both the associate and assistant ranks gained ground, moving from the 47<sup>th</sup> to 50<sup>th</sup> and 45<sup>th</sup> to 46<sup>th</sup> percentile, respectively. Third, the instructor rank gained only one percentile point. What is perhaps the most interesting difference is that the percentile

**Table 3. Private, Church-Related Institutions: Annual Average Salary (in thousands), Annual Percentage Salary Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Salary as a Percentage of Salary at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

<i>Year/Rank</i>	<i>Professor</i>		<i>Associate Professor</i>		<i>Assistant Professor</i>		<i>Instructor</i>	
<b>2005-06</b> n=209	66.5 (3) 4.2%	<b>47</b> 69.0%	55.4 (3) 5.9%	<b>50</b> 83.3%	45.9 (3) 2.9%	<b>46</b> 82.9%	38.5 (3) 2.7%	<b>41</b> 83.9%
<b>2004-05</b> n=215	63.8 (3) 1.9%	<b>46</b> 70.0%	52.3 (3) 2.5%	<b>45</b> 82.0%	44.6 (3) 3.2%	<b>45</b> 85.3%	37.5 (3) 2.2%	<b>43</b> 84.1%
<b>2003-04</b> n=228	62.6 (3) 2.6%	<b>49</b> 69.0%	51.0 (3) 2.6%	<b>47</b> 81.5%	43.2 (3) 2.6%	<b>46</b> 84.7%	36.7 (3) 4.6%	<b>45</b> 85.0%
<b>2002-03</b> n=230	61.0 (3) 3.6%	<b>50</b> 69.0%	49.7 (3) 3.1%	<b>46</b> 81.5%	42.1 (3) 3.9%	<b>46</b> 84.7%	35.1 (3)	<b>40</b> 83.4%
<b>2001-02</b> n=250	58.9 (3) 3.3%	<b>51</b> 68.9%	48.2 (3) 3.4%	<b>47</b> 81.8%	40.6 (3) 3.3%	<b>47</b> 84.2%		
<b>2000-01</b> n=252	57.0 (3) 4.2%	<b>50</b> 68.9%	46.6 (3) 4.5%	<b>47</b> 81.8%	39.3 (3) 4.5%	<b>45</b> 84.3%		
<b>1999-00</b> n=292	54.7 (3) 4.8%	<b>52</b> 68.7%	44.6 (3) 4.2%	<b>49</b> 81.5%	37.6 (3) 3.9%	<b>46</b> 84.3%		
<b>1998-99</b> n=294	52.2 (3) 3.2%	<b>51</b> 69.3%	42.8 (3) 2.6%	<b>47</b> 82.0%	36.2 (3) 3.1%	<b>45</b> 84.6%		
<b>Y</b> <b>Y</b> annual	59.6 3.5%	<b>(-4)</b> 69.1%	48.8 3.6%	<b>(+3)</b> 81.9%	41.2 3.4%	<b>(+1)</b> 84.4%	37.0 3.2%	<b>(+1)</b> 84.1%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Salary equals “contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration.”

*Italics*: Percent increase in average faculty member salary from year 1 to year 2.

**Rectangle Block**: Salary as a percent of salary at next highest rank.

**Gray Block**: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

**Green Block**: Assistant Professor salary as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

rankings between ranks are much closer together than those revealed in the Wartburg data. In 2005-06, the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor were much tighter at the 47<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 46<sup>th</sup>, and 41<sup>st</sup> percentile for similar ranks at IIB institutions. In essence, it does not appear that certain ranks are “targeted” for great gains at the cost of relatively lower average salaries at the other ranks.

Table 4 provides compensation and related data over the 1998-06 period for IIB private church-related institutions. These data, without exception mirror the patterns for salaries uncovered in table 3. However, when compared to the compensation data for Wartburg in table 2, notable differences emerge. While compensation increased for all ranks, the ranks of professor and associate fared considerably better and the ranks of assistant and instructor worse than the same ranks at Wartburg. The difference between these benchmark institutions and Wartburg in compensation at the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor was \$5,600, \$1,100, \$-2,900, and \$-1,900, respectively. This difference is also reflected in the fact that the average annual percentage rate of increase in compensation for the rank of professor (3.0% vs. 3.9%) and associate (3.4% vs. 4.1%) were considerably lower in the Wartburg data while that for the rank of assistant was higher (4.5% vs. 4.2%). It is also pertinent to note that the assistant and instructor ranks at Wartburg outpaced the average annual compensation of those in the same ranks at IIB private church-related institutions each and every year in the analysis. On average, the rank of assistant was \$4,400 higher while that of instructor was \$11,600 higher. Even though the rank of professor at Wartburg fared comparably worse in 2005-06, on average it also exceeded the comparison group by approximately \$1,800 annually. Finally, the rank of associate averaged only \$700 better annually than its counterpart in this comparison group.

**Table 4. Private, Church-Related Institutions: Annual Average Compensation (in thousands), Annual Percentage Compensation Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Compensation as a Percentage of Compensation at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

Year/Rank	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
2005-06 n=209	85.8 (3) 4.3%	49 68.6%	71.4 (3) 5.8%	51 83.2%	58.9 (3) 3.0%	46 82.5%	49.1 (3) 3.2%	42 83.4%
2004-05 n=215	82.3 (3) 2.6%	48 69.5%	67.5 (3) 3.5%	47 82.0%	57.2 (3) 4.2%	46 84.7%	47.6 (3) 3.3%	42 83.2%
2003-04 n=228	80.2 (3) 3.0%	51 68.5%	65.2 (3) 2.7%	47 81.3%	54.9 (3) 3.2%	45 84.2%	46.1 (3) 5.3%	44 84.0%
2002-03 n=230	77.9 (3) 4.0%	52 68.3%	63.5 (3) 3.8%	49 81.5%	53.2 (3) 4.5%	47 83.8%	43.8 (3)	40 82.3%
2001-02 n=250	74.9 (3) 4.2%	52 68.0%	61.1 (3) 4.1%	49 81.6%	50.9 (3) 4.1%	46 83.3%		
2000-01 n=252	71.9 (3) 4.5%	52 68.0%	58.7 (3) 5.0%	51 81.6%	48.9 (3) 7.3%	44 83.3%		
1999-00 n=292	68.8 (3) 5.0%	53 67.6%	55.9 (3) 4.7%	51 81.3%	46.5 (3) 3.6%	45 83.2%		
1998-99 n=294	65.5 (3) 3.5%	52 68.5%	53.4 (3) 2.9%	48 81.5%	44.9 (3) 3.7%	44 84.1%		
$\frac{Y}{Y}$ annual	75.9 3.9%	(-3) 68.4%	62.1 4.1%	(+3) 81.8%	51.9 4.2%	(+2) 83.6%	46.7 3.9%	(+2) 83.2%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Compensation equals "salary plus institutional contributions to benefits."

*Italics*: Percent increase in average faculty member compensation from year 1 to year 2.

Rectangle Block: Compensation as a percent of compensation at next highest rank.

Gray Block: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

Green Block: Assistant Professor compensation as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

A rather large difference in compensation compression is evident between Wartburg and the current comparison group. While associate and assistant ranks at Wartburg radically increased the percentage of professor compensation that their rank accounted for, by 6.2 and 8.0 percentage points, these same ranks in the comparison group saw virtually negligible increases of 1.7 and 0.1 percentage points, respectively. Unlike the Wartburg data in table 2, there is relatively no increased compensation compression between the rank of professor and associate (1.7 vs. 9.5 percentage points), professor and assistant (0.3 vs. 8.4 percentage points), and professor and instructor (1.0 vs. 7.9 percentage points).

The evaluation of how this comparison group compared to similar IIB institutions also highlighted differences with the Wartburg data. The rank of professor lost only 3 percentile points rather than the fifteen seen in the Wartburg data. Moreover, the associate rank saw an increase of 3 percentile points for the comparison group instead of a loss of 2 percentile points as revealed in the Wartburg data. Most pronounced, however, is the fact that the assistant rank only gained 2 percentile points in the comparison group over this period instead of the increase of 10 percentile points uncovered in the Wartburg data. Finally, in 2005-06, the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor were at the 49<sup>th</sup>, 51<sup>st</sup>, 46<sup>th</sup>, and 42<sup>nd</sup> percentile for similar ranks at IIB institutions. This is a much more egalitarian and equitable distribution than that which was depicted in the Wartburg data.

### Wartburg College Benchmark Institutions

Table 5 provides salary and related data over the 1998-06 period for the newly redefined list of benchmark institutions for Wartburg College. A comparison of these figures to the Wartburg data once again reveals great differences. While salaries at the benchmark institutions have also increased, the rank of professor has seen the largest absolute increase. Professor, associate, assistant, and instructor ranks increased \$11,800, \$8,000, \$8,300, and \$1,900, with an average

**Table 5. Wartburg Peer Institutions: Annual Average Salary (in thousands), Annual Percentage Salary Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Salary as a Percentage of Salary at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

Year/Rank	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
2005-06 n=384/456/441/79	66.7 (3) 4.4%	48 69.6%	53.6 (3) 1.7%	43 80.4%	46.4 (3) 2.9%	49 86.6%	39.5 (3) 5.6%	48 85.1%
2004-05 n=385/436/449/68	63.9 (3) 0.2%	46 70.6%	52.7 (3) 2.3%	47 82.5%	45.1 (3) 3.0%	48 85.6%	37.4 (3) 0.3%	43 82.9%
2003-04 n=379/428/469/64	63.8 (3) 3.2%	53 68.7%	51.5 (3) 1.6%	49 80.7%	43.8 (3) 2.8%	51 85.0%	37.3 (3) -0.8%	50 85.2%
2002-03 n=357/434/490/72	61.8 (3) 2.3%	52 68.9%	50.7 (3) 2.0%	51 82.0%	42.6 (3) 1.2%	49 84.0%	37.6 (2)	60 88.3%
2001-02 n=353/423/466/76	60.4 (3) 3.6%	56 69.7%	49.7 (3) 4.0%	57 82.3%	42.1 (3) 5.5%	58 84.7%		
2000-01 n=337/377/411/70	58.3 (3) 2.6%	55 68.4%	47.8 (3) 1.7%	55 82.0%	39.9 (3) 3.9%	50 83.5%		
1999-00 n=369/394/444/72	56.8 (3) 3.5%	58 67.6%	47.0 (2) 3.1%	62 82.7%	38.4 (3) 0.8%	53 81.7%		
1998-99 n=354/379/405/53	54.9 (3) 2.4%	59 69.4%	45.6 (2) 3.2%	62 83.1%	38.1 (2) 3.0%	62 83.6%		
$\bar{Y}$ $\bar{Y}$ annual	60.8 2.8%	(-11) 69.1%	49.8 2.5%	(-19) 82.0%	42.1 2.9%	(-13) 84.3%	38.0 1.5%	(-12) 85.4%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Salary equals "contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration."

Italics: Percent increase in average faculty member salary from year 1 to year 2.

Rectangle Block: Salary as a percent of salary at next highest rank.

Gray Block: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

Green Block: Assistant Professor salary as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

annual percentage rate of increase of 2.8, 2.5, 2.9, and 1.7 percent, respectively. The average annual salary of the associate and full professor ranks at Wartburg was, on average, \$2,300 less than these ranks at the benchmark institutions. Conversely, the ranks of assistant and instructor at Wartburg fared quite favorably as they exceeded, by an annual average of \$1,400 and \$6,500 respectively, the average annual salary of their counterparts at the benchmark institutions. Further assessment of the last four years illustrates that the ranks of associate, assistant, and instructor at Wartburg have outpaced their similar ranks at the benchmark institutions while the rank of professor has failed to keep pace. The increase in the average annual salary over the 2002-06 period for the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor has been \$4,900, \$2,900, \$3,800, and \$1,900, respectively, at the benchmark institutions but \$4,300, \$6,200, \$4,500, and \$5,800 for the same ranks at Wartburg. Finally, it is instructive to note that in 2005-06 only the rank of professor at Wartburg did not exceed (-\$3,200 less) its counterpart rank at the benchmark institutions.

The evaluation of salary compression between ranks at the benchmark institutions also reveals extensive differences with the Wartburg data. For example, the assistant rank has averaged 84.3% of average associate salary and 69.1% of average professor salary while the associate rank has averaged 82.0% of average professor salary. Of interest here is the fact that these salary compression percentages are all within one-tenth of one percentage point of the salary compression numbers of the IIB private church-related institutions. One still should note, however, that while there was no significant increase in salary compression between the ranks of professor and associate or professor and assistant, that salary compression between the ranks of associate and assistant did increase by three percentage points.

An assessment of average salary for similar ranks at other IIB institutions also gives rise to dramatic differences with the Wartburg data. Whereas the Wartburg data indicated that only the rank of professor lost an extensive amount of ground in percentile ranking, the data in table 5 indicate that all ranks have lost an extreme amount of ground over the

years. Among the benchmark institutions, the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor have loss 11, 19, 13, and 12 percentile points, respectively. On the positive side, however, is the fact that in 2005-06 the percentile ranks of professor (48<sup>th</sup>), associate (43<sup>rd</sup>), assistant (49<sup>th</sup>), and instructor (48<sup>th</sup>) is considerably more egalitarian and equitable than those revealed in the Wartburg data (41<sup>st</sup>, 43<sup>rd</sup>, 62<sup>nd</sup>, and 85<sup>th</sup>, respectively). In sum, the salary compression data of the benchmark institutions more closely resembles that of the IIB private church-related institutions than the data of Wartburg College.

Table 6 provides compensation and related data over the 1998-06 period for the newly redefined list of benchmark institutions for Wartburg College. These data also depart from the patterns found in the Wartburg data in several ways. While compensation increased for all ranks, the rank of professor was the only one that fared better within the benchmark institutions. Whereas the Wartburg data show that total compensation for the rank of professor increased \$14,700 over the 1998-06 period, the same rank increased by \$16,600 among the benchmark institutions. Conversely, total increase in compensation at the associate (\$16,900 vs. \$13,300), assistant (\$16,900 vs. \$13,800), and instructor (\$7,200 vs. \$1,900) ranks was considerably higher at Wartburg than at the benchmark institutions. Moreover, while the average annual percentage rate of increase in compensation for the rank of professor was lower at Wartburg (3.0 vs. 3.1 percent) it was significantly higher than the benchmark institutions for the rank of associate (3.4 vs. 3.0 percent), assistant (4.5 vs. 3.5 percent), and instructor (3.9 vs. 1.3 percent). As was the case with IIB private, church-related institutions, the ranks of assistant and instructor at Wartburg College far outpaced the average annual compensation of those in the same ranks at the benchmark institutions each and every year in the analysis. On average, the assistant rank was \$2,800 higher while the instructor rank was \$9,600 higher annually. The associate rank, while having outpaced the comparison group from 2004-06, still averaged an annual loss of \$1,100 to the benchmark institutions. Finally, the rank

**Table 6. Wartburg Peer Institutions: Annual Average Compensation (in thousands), Annual Percentage Compensation Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Compensation as a Percentage of Compensation at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

<i>Year/Rank</i>	<i>Professor</i>		<i>Associate Professor</i>		<i>Assistant Professor</i>		<i>Instructor</i>	
<b>2005-06</b> n=384/456/441/79	86.1 (3) 4.2%	<b>50</b>	70.2 (3) 2.6%	<b>47</b>	60.5 (3) 3.8%	<b>53</b>	50.5 (3) 4.8%	<b>50</b>
<b>2004-05</b> n=385/436/449/68	82.6 (3) 1.1%	<b>49</b>	68.4 (3) 2.5%	<b>50</b>	58.3 (3) 3.9%	<b>51</b>	48.2 (3) 1.5%	<b>46</b>
<b>2003-04</b> n=379/428/469/64	81.7 (3) 2.0%	<b>52</b>	66.7 (3) 2.1%	<b>52</b>	56.1 (3) 2.4%	<b>51</b>	47.5 (3) -2.3%	<b>51</b>
<b>2002-03</b> n=357/434/490/72	80.1 (3) 3.0%	<b>56</b>	65.3 (3) 2.4%	<b>55</b>	54.8 (3) 1.7%	<b>54</b>	48.6 (2) -	<b>66</b>
<b>2001-02</b> n=353/423/466/76	77.8 (2) 4.1%	<b>60</b>	63.8 (2) 5.8%	<b>60</b>	53.9 (2) 7.6%	<b>63</b>	-	-
<b>2000-01</b> n=337/377/411/70	74.7 (2) 3.0%	<b>60</b>	60.3 (3) 1.5%	<b>56</b>	50.1 (3) 4.4%	<b>52</b>	-	-
<b>1999-00</b> n=369/394/444/72	72.5 (2) 4.3%	<b>62</b>	59.4 (2) 4.4%	<b>63</b>	48.0 (3) 2.8%	<b>55</b>	-	-
<b>1998-99</b> n=354/379/405/53	69.5 (2) 3.3%	<b>62</b>	56.9 (2) 2.5%	<b>61</b>	46.7 (3) 1.7%	<b>55</b>	-	-
<b>̄</b>	78.1 3.1%	<b>(-12)</b>	63.9 3.0%	<b>(-14)</b>	53.6 3.5%	<b>(-2)</b>	48.7 1.3%	<b>(-16)</b>
<i>annual</i>								

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Compensation equals "salary plus institutional contributions to benefits."

*Italics*: Percent increase in average faculty member compensation from year 1 to year 2.

**Rectangle Block**: Compensation as a percent of compensation at next highest rank.

**Gray Block**: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

**Green Block**: Assistant Professor compensation as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

of professor at Wartburg only fared better than the benchmark institutions from 2001-03 and has since been outpaced by \$1,000 annually.

**The Case of Luther College**

Table 7 provides salary and related data over the 1998-06 period for Luther College. Of the comparison groups, the data for Luther provide the largest degree of divergence from the Wartburg data. While the average salary for all ranks has continued to increase throughout the period under study, the data, like the data of the other comparison groups, indicate a more egalitarian and equitable distribution in the growth of salaries between ranks. They also indicate that salary compression isn't nearly the problem at Luther that it is at Wartburg. This appears, in large part, to be a consequence of not overemphasizing the ranks of assistant and instructor at the cost of underemphasizing the ranks of professor and associate. On average, salary for the ranks of professor, associate, assistant, and instructor increased by \$12,700, \$11,100, \$8,500, and \$5,200, with an average annual percentage rate of increase of 3.2, 3.1, 2.6, and 4.5 percent, respectively. An assessment of the last four years revealed an average salary increase of \$6,500, \$4,800, \$4,300, and \$5,200 and an average annual percentage rate increase of 3.3, 2.8, 3.2, and 4.5 percent for the same ranks.

It is also instructive to note that the average salary of the ranks of professor and associate at Luther have, on annual average, received nearly \$5,300—and \$4,100 more than their Wartburg counterparts. Conversely, the ranks of assistant and instructor at Wartburg have, on annual average, received nearly \$500 and \$5,375 more than their Luther counterparts. Moreover, the data indicate that the ranks of assistant and instructor at Wartburg have outpaced their Luther counterparts in each of the last four years while the ranks of professor and associate have been surpassed by their Luther counterparts for every year covered in this report.

**Table 7. Luther College: Annual Average Salary (in thousands), Annual Percentage Salary Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Salary as a Percentage of Salary at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

<i>Year/Rank</i>	<i>Professor</i>		<i>Associate Professor</i>		<i>Assistant Professor</i>		<i>Instructor</i>	
<b>2005-06</b> n=49/48/70/12	70.3 (3) 2.3%	<b>58</b> 67.6%	56.6 (3) 1.4%	<b>56</b> 80.5%	47.5 (3) 1.7%	<b>56</b> 83.9%	42.2 (2) 7.9%	<b>67</b> 88.8%
<b>2004-05</b> n=52/43/70/10	68.7 (3) 3.3%	<b>59</b> 68.0%	55.4 (3) 2.8%	<b>54</b> 80.6%	46.7 (2) 3.3%	<b>60</b> 84.3%	39.1 (3) 2.4%	<b>53</b> 83.7%
<b>2003-04</b> n=52/42/65/19	66.5 (2) 4.2%	<b>61</b> 68.0%	53.9 (2) 4.1%	<b>61</b> 81.1%	45.2 (2) 4.6%	<b>61</b> 83.9%	38.2 (3) 3.2%	<b>56</b> 84.5%
<b>2002-03</b> n=49/42/65/19	63.8 (3) 0.8%	<b>57</b> 67.7%	51.8 (3) 2.0%	<b>57</b> 81.2%	43.2 (3) 1.0%	<b>54</b> 83.4%	37.0 (3) 85.6%	<b>56</b>
<b>2001-02</b> n=48/47/55/24	63.3 (2) 5.0%	<b>66</b> 67.6%	50.8 (2) 2.2%	<b>63</b> 80.3%	42.8 (2) 5.9%	<b>61</b> 84.3%		
<b>2000-01</b> n=51/52/51/17	60.3 (2) 1.5%	<b>62</b> 67.0%	49.7 (2) 2.1%	<b>65</b> 82.4%	40.4 (3) 1.5%	<b>54</b> 81.3%		
<b>1999-00</b> n=55/42/43/8	59.4 (2) 3.1%	<b>67</b> 67.0%	48.7 (2) 7.0%	<b>70</b> 82.0%	39.8 (2) 2.1%	<b>64</b> 81.7%		
<b>1998-99</b> n=66/40/48/12	57.6 (2) 5.1%	<b>69</b> 67.7%	45.5 (2) 2.9%	<b>62</b> 79.0%	39.0 (2) 1.0%	<b>67</b> 85.7%		
<b><math>\bar{Y}</math></b> <b><math>\bar{Y}_{annual}</math></b>	63.7 3.2%	<b>(-9)</b> 67.6%	51.6 3.1%	<b>(-6)</b> 80.8%	43.1 2.6%	<b>(-11)</b> 83.6%	39.1 4.5%	<b>(+11)</b> 85.7%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years

Note: Salary equals "contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration."

*Italics*: Percent increase in average faculty member salary from year 1 to year 2.

**Rectangle Block**: Salary as a percent of salary at next highest rank.

**Gray Block**: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

**Green Block**: Assistant Professor salary as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

The data also indicate that salary compression between the ranks at Luther has not become increasingly problematic. For example, the associate rank has averaged 80.8% of the average salary of the professor rank moving from 79.0% in 1998-99 to 80.5% in 2005-06. This figure is considerably better when looking at the assistant rank, which has averaged 67.6% of the average salary of the professor rank—moving from 67.7% in 1998-99 to 67.6% in 2005-06. Finally, the assistant rank has averaged 83.6% of the average salary of the associate rank. The differences that exist between these rank-to-rank averages also highlight the differences between the two institutions in salary compression. For example, the assistant rank at Wartburg, on annual average, has a salary that is 74.3% that of the professor rank; at Luther the number is 67.7%. Similarly, the average annual salary of the assistant rank at Wartburg is 91.6% that of the associate rank while the comparable number at Luther is 83.6%. The same can be said of the instructor-to-assistant rank averages as the instructor rank at Wartburg, on annual average, is 95.7% of the assistant rank. At Luther it is only 85.7%. On a positive note, the compression figures for the associate-to-professor rank indicate that Wartburg (81.1%) and Luther (80.8%) are quite similar.

An assessment of average salary for similar ranks at other IIB institutions also gives rise to dramatic differences with the Wartburg data. While this information indicates only that the rank of professor lost an extensive amount of ground in percentile ranking, the Luther data in table 7 indicate that the ranks of professor (-9), associate (-6), and assistant (-11) have all lost ground when compared to the average salary of IIB institutions. Only the rank of instructor (+11) increased its percentile rank over the period studied. These figures indicate that, while average salary at Luther has been in relative decline to IIB institutions in general, the losses are spread considerably more evenly among the ranks of professor, associate, and assistant. Finally, it is worth noting that the percentile rank of the professor (+15.4 points) and

**Table 8. Luther College: Annual Average Compensation (in thousands), Annual Percentage Compensation Increases, Annual Percentile Rank, Compensation as a Percentage of Compensation at next Highest Rank, by Rank**

<i>Year/Rank</i>	<i>Professor</i>		<i>Associate Professor</i>		<i>Assistant Professor</i>		<i>Instructor</i>	
<b>2005-06</b> n=49/48/70/12	89.9 (3) 2.2%	<b>58</b> 71.0%	76.0 (2) 1.1%	<b>64</b> 84.5%	63.8 (2) 2.9%	<b>67</b> 83.9%	54.7 (2) 7.7%	<b>68</b> 85.7%
<b>2004-05</b> n=52/43/70/10	88.0 (2) 2.6%	<b>60</b> 70.5%	75.2 (2) 1.8%	<b>70</b> 85.5%	62.0 (2) 1.5%	<b>68</b> 82.4%	50.8 (2) 1.0%	<b>61</b> 81.9%
<b>2003-04</b> n=52/42/65/19	85.8 (2) 3.5%	<b>62</b> 68.9%	73.9 (2) 3.4%	<b>75</b> 86.1%	59.1 (2) 2.8%	<b>66</b> 80.0%	50.3 (2) 2.0%	<b>66</b> 85.1%
<b>2002-03</b> n=49/42/65/19	82.9 (2) 0.1%	<b>61</b> 69.4%	71.5 (2) 4.4%	<b>73</b> 86.2%	57.5 (2) 2.0%	<b>67</b> 80.4%	49.3 (2)	<b>70</b> 85.7%
<b>2001-02</b> n=48/47/55/24	82.8 (2) 4.9%	<b>72</b> 68.1%	68.5 (2) 4.6%	<b>76</b> 82.7%	56.4 (2) 3.4%	<b>75</b> 82.3%		
<b>2000-01</b> n=51/52/51/17	78.9 (2) 3.5%	<b>68</b> 66.7%	65.5 (2) 4.6%	<b>73</b> 83.0%	52.6 (2) 3.5%	<b>66</b> 80.3%		
<b>1999-00</b> n=55/42/43/8	76.2 (2) 3.8%	<b>72</b> 66.7%	62.6 (2) 6.6%	<b>73</b> 82.2%	50.8 (2) 2.8%	<b>69</b> 81.1%		
<b>1998-99</b> n=66/40/48/12	73.4 (2) 5.2%	<b>73</b> 67.3%	58.7 (2) 4.3%	<b>67</b> 80.0%	49.4 (2) 0.8%	<b>70</b> 84.2%		
<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b> annual	82.2 3.2%	<b>(-15)</b> 68.6%	69.0 3.9%	<b>(-3)</b> 83.8%	56.5 2.5%	<b>(-3)</b> 81.8%	51.3 3.6%	<b>(-2)</b> 84.6%

Source: AAUP Faculty Salary Survey, various years (Luther data)

Note: Compensation equals “salary plus institutional contributions to benefits.”

Italics: Percent increase in average faculty member compensation from year 1 to year 2.

Rectangle Block: Compensation as a percent of compensation at next highest rank.

Gray Block: Actual percentile rank compared to same rank at other IIB institutions.

Green Block: Assistant Professor compensation as a percentage of Full Professor.

(.): 1\* = 95<sup>th</sup> percentile; 1 = 80-94.9<sup>th</sup>; 2 = 60-79.9<sup>th</sup>; 3 = 40-59.9<sup>th</sup>; 4 = 20-39.9<sup>th</sup>; 5 = 0-19.9<sup>th</sup>

associate (+20.1 points) ranks are much higher than the average for Wartburg whereas the ranks of assistant (+3.9 points) and instructor (+25.8 points) at Wartburg are much higher than they are at Luther.

Table 8 provides compensation and related data over the 1998-06 period for Luther College. These data, which mostly mirror the data in table 7, depart from the patterns found in the Wartburg data. While total compensation increased for all ranks, the ranks of professor (\$16,500 vs. \$14,700) and associate (\$17,300 vs. \$16,900) at Luther fared better than their Wartburg counterparts while at Wartburg the ranks of assistant (\$16,900 vs. \$5,400) and instructor (\$7,200 vs. \$5,400) fared considerably better. Moreover, while the average annual percentage rate of increase in compensation for the ranks of professor (3.2 vs. 3.0 percent) and associate (3.9 vs. 3.4 percent) was lower at Wartburg, the percentage rate of increase for the ranks of assistant (4.5 vs. 2.5 percent) and instructor (3.9 vs. 3.6 percent) were much higher at Wartburg. This pattern is very similar to that revealed earlier in the data for IIB private church-related institutions and Wartburg benchmark institutions. As was the case with IIB private church-related institutions and Wartburg benchmark institutions, the assistant and instructor ranks at Wartburg outpaced the average annual compensation of their counterparts at Luther. Most notable was the instructor rank where the difference averaged \$7,000 annually. Conversely, the professor and associate ranks at Luther outpaced their Wartburg counterpart every year in the analysis by an annual average of \$4,500 and \$6,200, respectively.

Noticeably different from the Luther salary data, the compensation data indicate that the rank of professor has lost considerable ground (-15 percentile points) while the ranks of associate (-3), assistant (-3), and instructor (-2) didn't lose nearly as much. Comparatively, the loss at the professor rank was the same as the Wartburg counterpart although in 2005-06 the rank still stood at the 58<sup>th</sup> percentile compared to the 45<sup>th</sup> percentile at Wartburg. The percentile loss for the associate rank was similar between the two institutions, even though the Wartburg rank stood at the 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile and the Luther rank stood at the 64<sup>th</sup>. The radical departure occurs in the ranks of assistant and instructor: at Luther, in 2005-06, these ranks were at the 67<sup>th</sup> and 68<sup>th</sup> percentile as opposed to the same ranks at Wartburg, which stood at the 71<sup>st</sup> and 86<sup>th</sup> percentile, respectively.

**Summary**

Tables 9, 10, and 11 provide summary statistics of the information presented earlier. The data in table 9 make quite apparent that both the ranks of professor and associate at Wartburg have the lowest average salary of any of the comparison groups under study. Moreover, the differences are quite extreme. The ranks of assistant and instructor, however, compare much more favorably because they consistently outpace the comparison groups regardless of the time period studied. Of particular note is the fact that, as one moves from the largest comparison group (IIB private church-related institutions) to the smallest (Luther College), average salaries continually increase. Whereas the ranks of assistant and instructor at Wartburg follow this pattern, the ranks of professor and associate do not. Moreover, the average salaries of these two ranks are lower than the averages of all of the comparison groups regardless of the time period evaluated. Although this data doesn't address salary compression, it is important information to have in order to assess what steps need to be taken to remedy the chronic biases unmasked in this report. The total compensation data in

**Table 9. Summary of Salary Information, by Comparison Group and Rank**

<b>1998-06</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
<b>2002-06</b>				
<b>Wartburg College</b>	\$58,500	\$47,500	<b>\$43,500</b>	
	<i>\$61,700</i>	<i>\$50,900</i>	<b><i>\$46,500</i></b>	<b><i>\$44,500</i></b>
<b>II B, Private, Church-Related</b>	\$59,600	\$48,800	\$41,200	
	<i>\$63,500</i>	<i>\$52,100</i>	<i>\$44,000</i>	<i>\$37,000</i>
<b>Benchmark Institutions</b>	\$60,800	\$49,800	\$42,100	
	<i>\$64,100</i>	<i>\$52,100</i>	<i>\$44,500</i>	<i>\$38,000</i>
<b>Luther College</b>	\$63,700	\$51,600	\$43,100	
	<i>\$67,300</i>	<i>\$54,400</i>	<i>\$45,700</i>	<i>\$39,100</i>

**Table 10. Summary of Compensation Information, by Comparison Group and Rank**

<b>1998-06</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Associate</b>	<b>Assistant</b>	<b>Instructor</b>
<b>2002-06</b>				
<b>Wartburg College</b>	\$77,700 \$82,500	\$62,800 \$67,700	\$56,300 <b>\$60,700</b>	<b>\$58,300</b>
<b>II B, Private, Church-Related</b>	\$75,900 \$81,600	\$62,100 \$66,900	\$51,900 \$56,100	\$46,700
<b>Benchmark Institutions</b>	\$78,100 \$82,600	\$63,900 \$67,700	\$53,600 \$57,400	\$48,700
<b>Luther College</b>	\$82,200 \$86,700	\$69,000 \$74,200	\$56,500 \$60,600	\$51,300

**Table 11. Summary of Salary and Compensation Compression Percentages, by Comparison Group and Rank**

<b>Salary</b>	<b>Associate as % of Professor</b>	<b>Assistant as % of Associate</b>	<b>Instructor as % of Assistant</b>	<b>Assistant as % of Professor</b>	<b>Instructor as % of Professor</b>	<b>Instructor as % of Associate</b>
<b>Compensation</b>						
<b>Wartburg College</b>	81.8% 80.7%	<b>91.6%</b> <b>89.7%</b>	<b>95.7%</b> <b>96.0%</b>	<b>74.3%</b> 72.4%	<b>72.1%</b> 70.6%	<b>87.4%</b> <b>86.1%</b>
<b>II B, Private, Church-Related</b>	81.9% 81.8%	84.4% 83.6%	84.1% 83.2%	69.1% 68.4%	58.2% 57.2%	71.0% 69.8%
<b>Benchmark Institutions</b>	82.0% 81.7%	84.3% 83.7%	85.4% 84.9%	69.1% 68.4%	59.3% 59.0%	72.8% 71.6%
<b>Luther College</b>	80.8% 83.8%	83.6% 81.8%	85.7% 84.6%	67.6% 68.6%	58.1% 59.2%	71.9% 69.2%

table 10 mirror the salary data with only one notable exception. The ranks of professor and associate at Wartburg now find themselves somewhere between the averages of the largest comparison group and the set of Wartburg benchmark institutions.

The data in table 11 speak directly to what is obviously a problematic bias: salary and compensation compression between the faculty ranks at Wartburg College. One should note that the percentages, regardless of which rank comparisons one looks at, are very close to one another for the IIB private church-related institutions, benchmark institutions, and Luther College. For Wartburg, only the associate as a percentage of professor salary/compensation doesn't appear to be out of sync with that of the comparison groups. In brief, the data in table 11 clearly indicate that lower ranks at Wartburg College consume an increasingly larger percentage of the salary/compensation of the higher ranks. One should refer back to the comments regarding the data in tables 1 and 2 to see exactly how the salary/compensation compression problem has become an ever-increasing problem at Wartburg College, especially for the rank of professor.

What is to be done? Clearly, the data indicates that the rank of professor needs immediate attention to reverse the compression trend and bring salary/compensation levels up to par with the comparison groups based on percentile rankings and rank-to-rank compression norms, although to a lesser extent faculty and administration also need to focus on the associate rank. Increasing even more the attention that has been paid to the assistant and instructor ranks over the time periods reported here would only serve to further increase between-rank compression and further exacerbate the stark biases revealed in this report.

Several Wartburg College peer institutions have implemented a salary/compensation policy that attempts to ensure that all ranks are treated equally. They do this by targeting one percentile rank for all ranks to achieve. For example, Tim Schweizer, Professor of Management and member of the Faculty Interests Committee at Luther College, states that they seek to achieve one AAUP salary/compensation percentile rank for all of the ranks (personal communication). St. Olaf College, according to their 2003 Self Study Report for the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association and their Strategic Plan, targets the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for all faculty ranks. For over fifteen years Illinois Wesleyan University has targeted the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile for all ranks (see the IWU website for their impressive results). Augustana College, in their 2006 NCA Self Study Report, specifically targets the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile for AAUP IIB institutions. Central College targets the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile for all ranks. Even Loras College, according to its 2003-08 Strategic Plan, targets the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile for faculty salaries. While not targeting a specific AAUP percentile rank, Simpson College, according to its 2005 NCA Self Study Report, is committed to maintaining the median salary of a group of comparable competitor colleges. In sum, this is just a sampling of Wartburg College peer institutions, both old and new, that have implemented a percentile targeting approach. Many, as has been shown in the Luther College data, have been quite successful in maintaining equitable between-rank movements that do not significantly disadvantage any one rank. Given the glaring bias that the Wartburg College data reveal, it would make sense to implement quickly a uniform percentile targeting model whereby the relative inequity in salary/compensation at the professor and associate ranks can be effectively addressed and the strain of between-rank compression lessened.