

**YOU GET YOURS, I'LL GET MINE:
A POLICY ANALYSIS OF FACULTY SALARIES
FOR THE PROFESSORATE IN OKLAHOMA**

TERENCE M. GARRETT
University of Texas Pan-American

GEOFFREY D. PETERSON
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

The authors demonstrate the importance of faculty salary remuneration as it reflects Oklahoma's commitment to higher education. The state has a history of poor compensation for faculty in general and institutions have wide variation in salaries within their own walls. The problem is exacerbated further by the discrepancies between salaries of faculty members at comparable institutions *doing similar work* despite the departments where they may be located. There are differences between the state's public flagship universities (i.e., the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University) and the smaller "regional" universities that are ostensibly designed to serve students primarily in more rural and accessible settings. The authors have limited their analysis to 'regional' universities in the state in order to provide a concise and parsimonious presentation and to compare institutions with similar missions. Finally, the authors will analyze higher education as it is presented locally and nationally by university administrators. The authors ask the rhetorical question: Are data sets presented to public policy makers truly reflective of the reality faced by the affected professorate? The authors conclude that the answer is "no." This paper is important

for administrators, faculty and potential faculty who may want to give further consideration to the higher education employment situation in Oklahoma.

There is a discrepancy in the salaries paid to the professorate in Oklahoma. This employment aspect may not be news to those who have been working in one of the state's institutions for any length of time. However, the degree to which there is a discrepancy between ranks, within universities, and across disciplines, may be surprising to faculty and university administrators alike and is worthy of scrutiny. Faculty remuneration and how it is distributed in public institutions has a direct bearing on how equitable the higher education system is. As part of its political culture, Oklahoma is a *low tax, low service* state. In order to begin to understand some of the complexity of how the professorate is valued in the state by its citizens, elected officials, and education administrators, we will be examining the pay structure of the regional universities in Oklahoma.

The primary question regarding faculty remuneration is "how equitable is the compensation based on comparable worth for teaching, scholarship and university service?" The question is difficult to answer in the sense that different numerical values, in terms of disparity of salaries, are placed on the type of services being rendered. Stone (1997, 176) notes that counting is political as it:

- 1) creates political communities;
- 2) creates the illusion that complex phenomena are simple, countable, and precisely defined; and,
- 3) bolsters the authority of those who count. Stone points to various rationales offered as to why there should or should not be differences in salary disparity. Included in her work are two basic social models: the market and the *polis*, based on the concept of the Greek word for city-state (Stone 1997, 17).

Administrators at universities may argue that "market forces" necessitate the change in salaries between a chemistry professor and a language arts professor, thus conveying implicitly a preference for Stone's market model. Using the *polis* model, faculty may argue for an inherently more equitable system of remuneration based on years of service and rank, regardless of the academic discipline of the professor. We believe that

the process of faculty salary budgeting is inherently a political process. As the demands of the market and the demands of the *polis* come into conflict, decisions are made to try to resolve these conflicts. These compromises are influenced by a variety of factors, but we believe it is the perceptions and world-views of individual administrators that drive the eventual compromise.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

The data for this survey were gathered from the Oklahoma Higher Board of Regents budgets for the regional universities for 1998-1999. These budgets were coded into computer form by Dr. Russell Jones at the University of Central Oklahoma, and he generously agreed to share the data with us. Additional data were gathered from the US Department of Education. For this project, we limited the dataset to full-time instructional faculty. Any university employee who had an administrative appointment in addition to an instructional appointment was dropped from the dataset.

In general, Oklahoma does not compare well nationally to other higher education systems. Data from the US Department of Education shows that Oklahoma ranks in the bottom 20% of all states in the nation in terms of faculty salaries. Compared to our neighbors, our average salaries are lower than all but Arkansas. Table 1 shows the breakdown of average salary for Oklahoma and all of the states that border Oklahoma.

This information is not news to anyone who studies Oklahoma education policy. Oklahoma has a long tradition of low tuition, low taxes, and thus low allocations for education. Although one can argue that the cost of living in Oklahoma is lower than in other regions of the nation, it is clear that we rank towards the bottom even within a region where the cost of living does not vary dramatically.

Overall budgetary data are not normally accurate measures of faculty salaries. Faculty salaries make up a relatively small portion of the overall university budget picture. Although some university administrators claim that 60% or more of their budgets go to "instructional" costs, the actual percentage spent on full-time faculty salaries is much lower. Table 2 shows the overall budgets for the 1998-

TABLE 1
Regional Salary Rankings
Statewide Averages

	All Ranks	Average Salary
Oklahoma	42 nd	\$46,754
Texas	29 th	\$50,381
Kansas	34 th	\$48,862
New Mexico	39 th	\$47,260
Colorado	22 nd	\$53,655
Missouri	28 th	\$50,960
Arkansas	48 th	\$44,311

1999 academic year for the ten universities within our study. It also shows the percentage of each budget spent for full-time faculty salaries in that same year.

TABLE 2
Percentage of 1998-1999 Overall University Budgets Spent
On Full-Time Faculty Salaries

University	Total Budget	Total of All Full Time Faculty Salaries	Percentage For Full Time Salaries
Langston	\$17,561,553.00	\$3,067,576.00	17.47%
Northwestern	\$13,295,814.00	\$2,769,350.00	20.83%
Panhandle	\$7,457,636.00	\$1,576,285.00	21.14%
Southeastern	\$22,615,851.00	\$5,762,561.00	25.48%
Southwestern	\$28,636,273.00	\$7,401,157.00	25.85%
Northeastern	\$41,473,309.00	\$10,771,814.00	25.97%
USAO	\$7,907,080.00	\$2,123,700.00	26.86%
Cameron	\$26,110,539.00	\$7,095,431.00	27.17%
East Central	\$21,752,978.00	\$5,920,335.00	27.22%
UCO	\$63,768,300.00	\$17,411,637.42	27.30%

Clearly most universities spend the vast bulk of their budgets elsewhere. Faculty salaries make up, on average, under 25% of a university's total expenditures.

While average salaries and expenditures are useful information at a superficial level, the focus of our research is on the disparities between the universities in the Oklahoma system and between the various disciplines. In order to examine this issue in more detail, we chose to examine the ten regional comprehensive universities in the state. These universities are all relatively comparable in terms of their missions and budgets. The schools in question compete for many of the same students, and most of them face similar problems in terms of budget allocations.

Across all of the universities in question, it is clear that there are some substantial discrepancies in faculty salaries. The difference between the highest-paying and lowest-paying universities is as much as 25% across disciplines. Table 3 summarizes the average salaries for all full-time faculty by rank and institution.

While these data show the distribution of salaries, it is also instructive to consider the salaries in terms of an ordinal rank ordering.

TABLE 3

Average Salaries of All Regional Universities By Rank

	Instructor	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof
Southwestern	\$30,654	\$40,718	\$48,349	\$54,759
Southeastern	\$32,711	\$39,070	\$47,150	\$53,178
East Central	\$33,854	\$38,599	\$44,651	\$50,800
UCO	\$37,045	\$43,433	\$47,852	\$55,701
Northeastern	\$35,721	\$42,629	\$44,816	\$55,016
Northwestern	\$30,913	\$38,238	\$44,080	\$52,092
Langston	\$38,143	\$37,546	\$44,113	\$45,478
Cameron	\$30,694	\$38,636	\$44,300	\$51,147
Panhandle	\$31,082	\$36,949	\$38,576	\$46,169

TABLE 4

Rank Ordering of All Regional Universities

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	2	1	1	1	1.25
Northeastern	3	2	5	2	3.00
Southwestern	7	3	2	3	3.75
Southeastern	5	4	3	4	4.00
East Central	4	6	4	6	5.00
Langston	1	7	7	10	6.25
Cameron	10	5	6	5	6.50
Northwestern	9	8	8	7	8.00
Univ. of S & A	6	10	9	8	8.25
Panhandle	8	9	10	9	9.00

Table 4 shows the ordinal ranks for each university at each level of employment. In addition, the table provides an overall average salary ranking for each institution.

Tables 3 and 4 show a fairly consistent pattern — universities that pay their assistant professors well also tend to pay their full professors well. While there are some exceptions to this, particularly when looking at instructor salaries, the overall pattern clearly shows that there are clear-cut discrepancies between ranks within any given university.

Although the patterns of overall averages are consistent across universities, all faculty realize that there are salary differences between departments. Some of the universities in the Oklahoma system use a pay-card system to create some level of salary equity across disciplines, while others leave the salary structure to the discretion of the higher administration. This inconsistency in policy has, over time, created some significant disparities in salary for faculty of equal rank in similar fields. Table 5 shows the differences between universities for faculty of similar rank in similar departments. The percentages in Table 5 reflect the difference between the lowest-paid faculty member and the highest-paid faculty member for each category across all ten regional institutions.

Not surprisingly, the differences are often dramatic. In some disciplines (such as education), some faculty with similar rank are paid more than twice as much as the lowest-paid person of similar rank. Even in the most equitable field, technology, the difference is over 25% at the assistant professor level, which equates to a dollar differential of more than \$10,000 for the 98-99 academic year. It is clear that the Oklahoma regional universities have wide variations in salaries across all of the categories. These variations appear to be independent of the institution or the discipline. Langston has some of the highest paid faculty and some of the lowest. The social sciences have some of the lowest paid faculty in the state and some of the best paid.

It appears clear that these differences are not a result of systematic discrimination or institutionally generated budget issues. It seems these differences are a result of the individual preferences of the university administrations towards particular disciplines. For example, Cameron University compares favorably in business faculty salaries (overall ranking of third among the ten schools), yet it ranks near the bottom in comparable salary for the humanities (eighth out of ten).

TABLE 5

**Lowest-Paid Faculty Member as a Percentage of
the Highest-Paid Faculty Member By Rank and Discipline**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full
Business	72%	57%	56%	66%
Education	55%	47%	51%	64%
Health Professionals	64%	66%	47%	74%
Humanities	50%	56%	43%	53%
Physical Sciences	77%	52%	79%	58%
Computer Sciences	70%	69%	82%	100%
Social Sciences	73%	69%	70%	70%
Technology/Applied	76%	73%	88%	89%
Physical Education	35%	64%	85%	63%
Mathematics	63%	63%	68%	70%
Music	78%	73%	77%	76%

Appendix 1 presents a series of tables with a breakdown of average salary by rank and university for each category. Although there is too much data in the tables to discuss each in detail, an examination of the tables shows the stark inconsistencies in faculty salaries across disciplines and universities. Table 6 presents some of the highlights from this data.

Further evidence of this can be seen by examining the average salaries for the various disciplines by rank. Table 7 shows the average salary for each discipline by rank across the ten institutions. What is most notable about this table is the lack of any clear “favored” programs state-wide. Even programs that one would expect to be exceptionally well-funded, such as business, are not substantially different from most other disciplines.

TABLE 6

Largest and Smallest Salary Ranges By Rank

Instructor-Largest	Instructor-Smallest
Physical Education	Music
\$28,800 (Langston)	\$29,964 (Cameron)
\$52,800 (Northeastern)	\$38,643 (Southeastern)
Assistant-Largest	Assistant-Smallest
Business	Music
\$32,241 (Panhandle)	\$33,044 (Cameron)
\$56,500 (Northeastern)	\$45,100 (Northeastern)
Associate-Largest	Associate-Smallest
Education	Physical Education
\$32,000 (Panhandle)	\$41,900 (Northeastern)
\$62,600 (Langston)	\$49,200 (UCO)
Full-Largest	Full-Smallest
Physical Sciences	Computer Sciences
\$33,605 (East Central)	\$54,639 (SWOSU)
\$58,131 (Cameron)	\$54,678 (UCO)

TABLE 7

Average Salaries By Discipline and Rank

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full
Business	\$ 34,009.30	\$ 44,699.17	\$ 48,187.05	\$ 53,700.42
Education	\$ 33,454.15	\$ 38,719.05	\$ 45,995.30	\$ 52,515.03
Health Professionals	\$ 34,006.21	\$ 43,288.57	\$ 43,223.17	\$ 64,241.00
Humanities	\$ 32,215.55	\$ 37,947.75	\$ 44,016.79	\$ 50,307.91
Physical Sciences	\$ 32,405.00	\$ 40,228.11	\$ 45,352.14	\$ 52,335.18
Computer Sciences	\$ 32,038.40	\$ 40,357.33	\$ 46,811.00	\$ 54,658.50
Social Sciences	\$ 34,625.50	\$ 38,022.91	\$ 43,823.36	\$ 52,482.05
Technology/Applied	\$ 34,486.69	\$ 40,362.69	\$ 46,052.50	\$ 53,547.67
Physical Education	\$ 36,734.50	\$ 41,382.79	\$ 44,873.33	\$ 51,937.00
Mathematics	\$ 31,857.54	\$ 39,100.07	\$ 45,090.21	\$ 50,803.88
Music	\$ 32,914.45	\$ 38,575.84	\$ 44,287.77	\$ 52,479.82

Overall, the evidence shows that no single program is clearly favored across all institutions, and the differences between institutions (see Table 3) are generally small. If the average salaries by institution are similar and the salaries by discipline are similar, what accounts for the dramatic differences in salaries for individual faculty members throughout the regional schools?

If these differences cannot be explained through systematic differences in institutions or disciplines, the logical conclusion to draw is that the differences are created by variations within institutions. For example, if university X pays its assistant professors in the social sciences only \$32,000 a year but pays assistants in the physical sciences \$46,000 a year, the average salary between the two departments is \$39,000 for assistant professors. In the same vein, if university X pays assistant professors in the social sciences \$32,000 a year and university Y pays them \$42,000 a year, the average salary for social science assistant professors appears to be \$37,000. The end result is that although social science faculty at university X are substantially underpaid relative to their discipline AND their institution, that underpayment may not be easily spotted by examining overall discipline or university-wide data.

DISCUSSION

Given the data available, it is clear there are substantial salary inequities across the regional universities in Oklahoma. It is possible, for example, for an assistant professor to increase his/her salary by over 30% simply by moving from one part of the state to the other. While it is safe to expect that certain differences will occur as universities are forced to specialize in certain areas, the long-term consequences are unclear.

If universities continue to create these inequities, it seems possible that the educational quality of the unequal fields will continue to grow. In the end, we may well see each of the regional schools specializing in a few disciplines and turning the others into service programs for the General Education requirements. There are indications this is occurring at some of the regional universities already, and it is safe to assume the trend will continue.

There are clearly a large number of questions we have been unable to answer. Given how time-bound are data pool is, an examination of the long-term trends in salaries is clearly warranted. Understanding the longitudinal trends is critical to finding the overall patterns in salary decisions by university administrations. In addition to longitudinal data, regional comparisons are also needed. It may be that all of the regional university systems are experiencing similar patterns, or it may be that Oklahoma is an anomaly — without solid regional comparisons, there is no way to know.

Faculty salaries are always a matter of contention between administrators and faculty. Faculty generally feel they are underpaid, while most administrators feel the pressure of budget cycles and multiple priorities. It is only through examining the overall trends and the political nature of the salary process that we can hope to find some middle ground in which both parties can come to an understanding. Faculty and administrators need to be aware of the rationalizations they use in justifying their claims whether market-based or political. Without an appreciation and understanding of these competing views regarding faculty remuneration, discrepancies and contentions will continue well into the future.

REFERENCES

- Markwood, Christopher L. 1998. The Constitutional and Cultural Context of Oklahoma Government, pp. 19-35 in *Oklahoma Government and Politics: An Introduction*, edited by C. L. Markwood. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Morgan, David R., Robert E. England, and George G. Humphreys 1991. *Oklahoma Politics & Policies: Governing the Sooner State*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Stone, Deborah. 1997. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

APPENDIX A

DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF SALARY, RANK, AND INSTITUTION

**Business Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	—	\$43,388	\$48,058	\$53,823	\$48,423
UCO	—	\$44,052	\$48,129	\$55,271	\$46,052
East Central	\$39,277	\$42,549	\$51,765	\$51,894	\$46,371
Southeastern	\$33,580	\$39,061	\$49,168	\$50,960	\$43,192
Northwestern	—	\$36,500	\$42,550	\$46,950	\$42,000
Northeastern	\$34,675	\$50,625	\$53,150	\$55,243	\$48,423
Langston	—	\$38,625	\$41,964	\$40,000	\$40,196
Cameron	\$35,004	\$47,737	\$52,101	\$52,653	\$46,874
Panhandle	\$28,560	\$32,241	\$36,832	—	\$32,544
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Business Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
Northeastern	3	1	1	2	1.75
UCO	—	2	5	1	2.67
Cameron	2	3	2	4	2.75
East Central	1	5	3	5	3.50
SWOSU	—	4	6	3	4.33
Southeastern	4	6	4	6	5.00
Northwestern	—	8	7	7	7.33
Langston	—	7	8	8	7.67
Panhandle	5	9	9	—	7.67
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Education Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$31,326	\$39,645	\$47,894	\$52,400	\$42,816
UCO	\$42,899	\$47,726	\$55,618	—	\$48,748
East Central	—	\$36,740	\$45,222	\$50,396	\$44,119
Southeastern	\$40,951	\$46,545	\$52,098	—	\$46,531
Northwestern	—	\$38,460	\$44,750	\$46,033	\$43,081
Northeastern	\$36,600	\$36,679	\$44,489	\$52,467	\$42,559
Langston	\$28,800	\$38,043	\$49,774	\$43,500	\$40,029
Cameron	\$32,869	\$36,872	\$44,697	\$49,668	\$41,027
Panhandle	—	—	\$36,251	—	\$36,251
Univ. of S & A	\$30,775	\$34,980	\$46,500	\$51,950	\$41,051

**Education Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	1	1	1	—	1.00
Southeastern	2	2	2	—	2.00
SWOSU	5	3	4	2	3.50
Northeastern	3	8	9	1	5.25
Langston	7	5	3	7	5.50
East Central	—	7	6	4	5.67
Northwestern	—	4	7	6	5.67
Cameron	4	6	8	5	5.75
Univ. of S & A	6	9	5	3	5.75
Panhandle	—	—	10	—	10.00

**Health Professionals Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$33,658	\$40,634	\$42,126	\$57,832	\$43,562
UCO	\$38,360	\$43,689	\$46,095	—	\$42,714
East Central	\$37,359	\$46,528	\$47,193	\$54,280	\$46,340
Southeastern	—	—	—	—	—
Northwestern	\$29,714	—	—	—	\$29,714
Northeastern	\$35,000	\$50,020	\$50,700	\$70,364	\$51,521
Langston	\$35,169	\$40,200	\$24,000	\$37,955	\$34,331
Cameron	—	—	—	—	—
Panhandle	\$31,473	—	—	—	\$31,473
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Health Professionals Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
Northeastern	4	1	1	1	1.75
East Central	2	2	2	3	2.25
UCO	1	3	3	—	2.33
SWOSU	5	4	4	2	3.75
Langston	3	5	5	4	4.25
Panhandle	6	—	—	—	6.00
Northwestern	7	—	—	—	7.00
Southeastern	—	—	—	—	—
Cameron	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Humanities Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$29,260	\$37,198	\$47,545	\$52,918	\$41,730
UCO	\$34,518	\$43,017	\$46,460	\$55,713	\$44,927
East Central	\$28,660	\$37,165	\$44,687	\$46,852	\$39,341
Southeastern	\$31,140	\$36,985	\$43,225	\$51,188	\$40,634
Northwestern	\$32,060	\$37,588	\$41,550	\$47,900	\$39,774
Northeastern	\$35,617	\$39,107	\$41,990	\$53,588	\$42,575
Langston	\$34,534	\$42,587	\$55,600	—	\$44,240
Cameron	\$29,496	\$35,326	\$42,446	\$47,120	\$38,597
Panhandle	\$32,015	\$34,627	\$38,921	\$42,432	\$36,999
Univ. of S & A	\$30,000	\$34,700	\$40,660	\$42,533	\$36,973

**Humanities Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
Langston	2	2	1	—	1.67
UCO	3	1	3	1	2.00
Northeastern	1	3	7	2	3.25
SWOSU	9	5	2	3	4.75
Northwestern	4	4	8	5	5.25
Southeastern	6	7	5	4	5.50
East Central	10	6	4	7	6.75
Cameron	8	8	6	6	7.00
Univ. of S & A	7	9	9	8	8.25
Panhandle	5	10	10	9	8.50

**Hard Sciences Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$30,508	\$38,946	\$47,261	\$54,083	\$42,699
UCO	\$30,990	\$42,786	\$47,724	\$54,813	\$44,078
East Central	—	\$39,763	\$42,972	\$44,057	\$42,264
Southeastern	—	\$38,978	\$44,590	\$53,690	\$45,753
Northwestern	—	\$36,267	\$41,000	\$48,500	\$41,922
Northeastern	\$37,000	\$42,183	\$45,025	\$50,243	\$43,613
Langston	—	—	\$42,495	\$42,055	\$42,275
Cameron	—	\$43,044	\$40,989	\$54,347	\$46,127
Panhandle	\$32,130	\$38,387	—	\$49,585	\$40,034
Univ. of S & A	\$31,500	\$33,600	\$43,500	—	\$36,200

**Hard Sciences Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	4	2	1	1	2.00
Northeastern	1	3	3	5	3.00
SWOSU	5	6	2	3	4.00
Cameron	—	1	9	2	4.00
Southeastern	—	5	4	4	4.33
Panhandle	2	7	—	6	5.00
Univ. of S & A	3	9	5	—	5.67
East Central	—	4	6	8	6.00
Northwestern	—	8	8	7	7.67
Langston	—	—	7	9	8.00

**Computer Sciences Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$30,899	\$45,000	\$48,121	\$54,639	\$44,665
UCO	—	\$41,656	\$47,133	\$54,678	\$47,822
East Central	\$28,000	\$37,085	—	—	\$32,543
Southeastern	\$33,515	\$37,917	—	—	\$35,716
Northwestern	\$33,100	\$39,500	—	—	\$36,300
Northeastern	\$39,500	\$49,500	—	—	\$44,500
Langston	—	—	\$46,200	—	\$46,200
Cameron	—	—	—	—	—
Panhandle	\$27,540	—	\$45,819	—	\$36,679
Univ. of S & A	\$29,900	\$37,400	—	—	\$33,650

**Computer Sciences Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
Northeastern	1	1	—	—	1.00
UCO	—	3	2	1	2.00
SWOSU	4	2	1	2	2.25
Langston	—	—	3	—	3.00
Southeastern	2	5	—	—	3.50
Northwestern	3	4	—	—	3.50
Panhandle	7	—	4	—	5.50
Univ. of S & A	5	6	—	—	5.50
East Central	6	7	—	—	6.50
Cameron	—	—	—	—	—

**Social Sciences Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$31,238	\$37,226	\$44,798	\$52,961	\$41,556
UCO	\$37,334	\$43,536	\$47,458	\$55,116	\$45,861
East Central	—	\$37,499	\$43,999	\$49,949	\$43,816
Southeastern	\$34,624	\$39,808	\$44,021	\$53,690	\$43,036
Northwestern	—	\$36,867	\$41,375	\$47,300	\$41,847
Northeastern	\$35,000	\$37,242	\$42,309	\$51,243	\$41,449
Langston	—	\$33,838	\$39,344	—	\$36,591
Cameron	\$32,346	\$36,023	\$42,830	\$50,526	\$40,431
Panhandle	\$31,306	\$37,461	\$38,965	—	\$35,911
Univ. of S & A	—	\$33,400	\$38,450	\$50,250	\$40,700

**Social Sciences Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	1	1	1	1	1.00
Southeastern	3	2	3	2	2.50
SWOSU	6	6	2	3	4.25
Northeastern	2	5	6	4	4.25
East Central	—	3	4	7	4.67
Cameron	4	9	5	5	5.75
Panhandle	5	4	9	—	6.00
Northwestern	—	7	7	8	7.33
Langston	—	8	8	—	8.00
Univ. of S & A	—	10	10	6	8.67

**Technology/Applied Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$40,170	\$43,460	—	\$50,415	\$44,682
UCO	\$32,000	—	—	\$53,991	\$42,995
East Central	—	—	—	—	—
Southeastern	\$34,766	\$35,445	\$47,775	\$53,690	\$42,919
Northwestern	—	—	—	—	—
Northeastern	\$35,100	\$41,650	\$42,100	\$54,600	\$43,363
Langston	—	—	—	—	—
Cameron	\$31,464	\$38,304	\$46,560	—	\$38,776
Panhandle	—	\$41,932	—	—	\$41,932
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Technology/Applied Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	1	1	—	4	2.00
Panhandle	—	2	—	—	2.00
Northeastern	2	3	3	1	2.25
UCO	4	—	—	2	3.00
Southeastern	3	5	1	3	3.00
Cameron	5	4	2	—	3.67
East Central	—	—	—	—	—
Northwestern	—	—	—	—	—
Langston	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of S & A	—	—	—	—	—

**Physical Education Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$33,040	\$42,319	—	\$51,495	\$42,285
UCO	\$39,123	\$46,609	\$47,100	\$55,788	\$47,155
East Central	\$34,791	\$40,947	—	\$36,477	\$37,405
Southeastern	\$32,164	\$42,088	—	\$51,545	\$41,932
Northwestern	—	\$35,000	\$43,000	\$51,150	\$43,050
Northeastern	\$41,900	\$35,100	\$41,900	\$58,300	\$44,300
Langston	\$48,797	\$32,837	\$46,332	—	\$42,655
Cameron	\$31,050	\$40,677	\$43,808	—	\$38,512
Panhandle	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of S & A	\$36,333	\$50,900	—	—	\$43,617

**Physical Education Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	3	2	1	2	2.00
Univ. of S & A	4	1	—	—	2.50
Northeastern	2	7	5	1	3.75
Langston	1	9	2	—	4.00
SWOSU	6	3	—	4	4.33
Southeastern	7	4	—	3	4.67
East Central	5	5	—	6	5.33
Northwestern	—	8	4	5	5.67
Cameron	8	6	3	—	5.67
Panhandle	—	—	—	—	—

**Mathematics Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$31,582	\$36,989	\$47,436	\$53,892	\$42,475
UCO	\$37,770	\$42,885	\$47,632	\$52,192	\$45,120
East Central	—	\$36,139	—	\$51,066	\$43,603
Southeastern	\$29,580	\$38,867	\$44,135	—	\$37,527
Northwestern	\$31,150	\$36,233	—	—	\$33,692
Northeastern	\$34,900	\$40,050	\$44,667	\$52,640	\$43,064
Langston	—	\$50,000	\$47,877	—	\$48,938
Cameron	\$26,628	\$32,028	\$41,612	\$52,956	\$38,306
Panhandle	\$31,689	—	\$39,523	—	\$35,606
Univ. of S & A	—	—	\$38,000	\$46,600	\$42,300

**Mathematics Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
Langston	—	1	1	—	1.00
UCO	1	2	2	4	2.25
Northeastern	2	3	4	3	3.00
SWOSU	4	5	3	1	3.25
Southeastern	6	4	5	—	5.00
Panhandle	3	—	7	—	5.00
Northwestern	5	6	—	—	5.50
Cameron	7	8	6	2	5.75
East Central	—	7	—	5	6.00
Univ. of S & A	—	—	8	6	7.00

**Music Faculty Salaries
Rank and Institution**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
SWOSU	\$30,799	\$38,676	\$48,277	\$53,037	\$42,697
UCO	\$32,370	\$40,796	\$45,990	\$55,344	\$43,625
East Central	\$30,750	\$34,848	\$45,726	\$51,004	\$40,582
Southeastern	\$38,643	\$37,465	\$45,273	\$53,008	\$43,597
Northwestern	—	\$38,700	\$43,250	—	\$40,975
Northeastern	\$36,150	\$39,950	\$41,900	\$48,800	\$41,700
Langston	—	—	—	—	—
Cameron	\$30,456	\$35,462	\$44,195	\$42,624	\$38,184
Panhandle	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of S & A	—	\$33,800	\$37,600	—	\$35,700

**Music Faculty Salaries
Ordinal Rankings**

	Instructor	Assistant	Associate	Full	Average
UCO	3	1	2	1	1.75
SWOSU	4	4	1	2	2.75
Southeastern	1	5	4	3	3.25
Northeastern	2	2	7	5	4.00
Northwestern	—	3	6	—	4.50
East Central	5	7	3	4	4.75
Cameron	6	6	5	6	5.75
Univ. of S & A	—	8	8	—	8.00
Langston	—	—	—	—	—
Panhandle	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX B

Department Combinations for Disciplinary Comparisons

- 1 Business
- 2 Education
- 3 Health Professionals
Pharmacy/Optometry/ Allied Health/ Health Information
Management/Nursing
- 4 Humanities
English/Foreign Languages/Theater/Philosophy/
Mass Communications/Humanities/Speech/Journalism
- 5 Physical Sciences
Biology/Chemistry/Physics
- 6 Computer Science
- 7 Social Sciences
Political Science/History/Criminal Justice/Sociology/Geography/
Psychology
- 8 Technology and Other Applied Programs
Funeral Services/Technology/Aeronautics
- 9 Physical Education
- 10 Mathematics
- 11 Music

