

## **FACULTY**

by

Timothy W. Sineath

Following the pattern of previous reports, data on faculty included in this report appear in two parts. Data in Part I have been compiled from a form submitted to this writer, on a confidential basis, by the chair, dean or director of 54 of the 57 library and information science education programs accredited by the American Library Association (ALA) on January 1, 1996. Hereafter, these schools will be referred to as ALA schools. Also included in Part I in past years has been a compilation of similar data provided by library education programs that are not accredited by the American Library Association. Because of the lack of response of schools in this category, no information is included this year in Part I.

Part II of the faculty section of this report has been compiled from information provided by 56 of the ALA schools (California - Berkeley has requested exemption from reporting for 96/97) and by two non-ALA schools in response to the faculty section of the general questionnaire prepared for the Association for Library and Information Science Education. The schools are listed in the tables, where appropriate, thus resulting in a total of 57 ALA-accredited schools

Part I of the faculty section is based upon data reported by the participating schools as of January 1, 1996. Part II, however provides information that pertained to the schools during the fiscal year 1995-96 (July 1, 1995 to June 30, 1996). In requesting the data appearing in Part I, each dean and director was assured that there would be complete confidentiality of the information supplied. Thus, in this part of the report, neither individual faculty members nor individual schools are linked to specific data that pertains to information on salary, gender, race, age, or any other category covered. However, confidentiality was not promised on the information supplied on the faculty portion of the ALISE questionnaire, and individual schools are identified by name in the tables found in Part II.

### **PART I**

This is the twenty-fourth survey of faculty salaries and related data pertaining to library and information science education in this series. The first ten were compiled and reported by Russell E. Bidlack, Dean Emeritus of the School of Information and Library Studies at the University of Michigan. The next three surveys were compiled by Gary Purcell of the University of Tennessee. This is the eleventh compilation by this writer. The format followed in the report is basically the same as that used in previous years. The format has been retained in order to help ensure comparability of data from year to year. Data were provided by the chief executive officers of 54 of the 57 schools accredited by ALA on January 1, 1997. Last year 55 of 57 (includes California - Berkeley) schools meeting this criteria reported.

This is the eighteenth successive year that non-ALA schools have been included in the survey. In the past, these schools were identified as ALISE associate institutional member schools but with the discontinuation of the distinction between institutional member and associate institutional member

## Faculty

schools, new terminology is used to distinguish between the two sets of schools. This year there were no non-ALA schools included in Part I of the survey; no school reported last year.

The chief executive officers of all of the schools are referred to in this report as deans and directors for the sake of convenience even though some hold other titles. Each dean or director was requested to provide specific information about each full-time faculty member, (including the dean or director) who held employed status in the school as of January 1, 1997. The categories of information requested were: (1) titles and/or academic rank; (2) annual salary amount; (3) whether appointed for the fiscal or academic year; (4) whether or not tenured; (5) sex; (6) highest degree earned; (7) discipline of highest degree; (8) ethnic origin (except Canadian schools); (9) age category (by five-year groupings); (10) year of appointment to the school's full-time faculty; and (11) year of appointment to present rank in the school in which currently employed. These categories are the same as used for the past several years.

As in the previous editions benefits were not reported as part of the salaries, and stipends for summer teaching, extension teaching, or other over-load compensations were also excluded. Faculty members on sabbatical leave on January 1, 1997 are included in the analysis, although they had been omitted prior to 1987.

The 57 ALA schools to which questionnaires were sent this year are located at the following institutions: Alabama; Albany, Alberta; Arizona; British Columbia; Buffalo, California - Berkeley; California - Los Angeles; Catholic; Clarion; Clark Atlanta; Dalhousie; Drexel; Emporia; Florida State; Hawaii; Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Kent State; Kentucky; Long Island; Louisiana State; Maryland; McGill; Michigan; Missouri; Montréal; North Carolina Central; North Carolina - Chapel Hill, North Carolina - Greensboro; North Texas; Oklahoma; Pittsburgh; Pratt; Puerto Rico; Queens; Rhode Island; Rosary; Rutgers; St. John's; San Jose; Simmons; South Carolina; South Florida; Southern Connecticut; Southern Mississippi; Syracuse; Tennessee; Texas; Texas Woman's; Toronto; Washington; Wayne State; Western Ontario; Wisconsin - Madison; and Wisconsin - Milwaukee. Hawaii, Montréal, and Southern Connecticut did not respond to Part I. All schools responded to Part II. (For schools not reporting, data available from other sources was used when available and appropriate.)

## Faculty Size

The number of full-time faculty members at the 54 reporting ALA schools including deans and directors, totaled 590.5, down from 601 last year. This represents one less school and does not include positions unfilled at the time the report was submitted. Four schools listed a total of five positions vacated during the year and are not counted in the 590.5 figure. In addition, the total would increase to 623.5 if Hawaii, Montréal, and Southern Connecticut (based on 1995-96 figures) were added. The average size increases to 11.07 if vacant funded positions are included. Although 623.5 is probably as accurate count of faculty, the base number used for most of the analyses that follows will be 590.5, since this figure is the total of the faculty of the reporting schools. The base number for some analyses may be less depending on the number of persons reported in a given category of the questionnaire. The number of full-time faculty in the 54 schools ranged from a low of 5 in three schools to a high of 30 in one school. The average faculty size (excluding reported unfilled positions) was 10.9 which is the same as last year's figure. There appears to be a leveling in the average size of faculty. It has varied from a high of 11.66 persons in 1973-74 to a low of 9.7 in 1985-86, a difference of just under 2 faculty members. Table I-1 shows the average number of faculty members from 1974 to 1997, and illustrates a steady decline in average faculty size through 1986. Since 1987-88, the average size has increased by approximately one position. The 1996-97 average size is 1.2 faculty larger than the 1986 low of 9.7.

**Table I-1**  
**Average Faculty Size, ALA Schools**  
**1973-74 To 1996-97**

Year	Number of Schools Reporting	Average Number of Full-Time Faculty
1973-74	53	11.66
1974-75	59	11.32
1975-76	62	11.24
1976-77	64	11.05
1977-78	64	10.69
1978-79	67	10.67
1979-80	67	10.66
1980-81	69	10.46
1981-82	69	10.23
1982-83	68	10.00
1983-84	66	9.97
1984-85	66	9.85
1986-87	57	10.03
1987-88	55	10.21
1988-89	55	11.10
1989-90	58	10.60
1990-91	57	10.73
1991-92	59	10.85
1992-93	58	10.86
1993-94	56	11.12
1994-95	56	11.03
1995-96	55	10.90
1996-97	54	10.93

Table I-2 shows the variation in the number of full-time faculty on January 1, 1997 among the 54 schools reporting. This table shows that 20 (37 percent) of the 54 ALA schools had full-time faculties of nine or fewer persons, including the dean or director. This represents a drop in last year's number of 21 (38.8 percent). In the three years prior to 1987-88, more than half of the schools had a faculty of nine or less. During 1987-88, the percentage with nine or fewer had dropped to 46 percent; during 1988-89, the percentage had dropped to 45 percent (n=55), and in 1989-90, the percentage (n=58) had risen to 55.2 percent. In 1990-91, the number of schools with nine or fewer had dropped to 27 (45 percent) schools. In 1991-92, and in 1992-93, the number grew slightly to 30 (50.8 and 51.7 percent respectively). In 1993-94, the number dropped to 27 (49.1 percent). The most common faculty size (i.e., the size of the largest number of schools) in 1994-95 has grown to 11 with 7 schools reporting faculty of this size; nine faculty had remained the most common faculty size since 1986. In 1996-97, the most common size has decreased to ten. However, Table I-2 shows a wide range in the number of schools among the sizes indicated.

**Table I-2**  
**Variation in the Number of Full-Time Faculty, Including Deans and Directors**  
**Per School Among ALA Schools, January 1, 1997**

Number of Full-Time Faculty	Number of Schools	Percent of Total (54)
5	3	5.5
6	4	7.4
7	6	11.1
8	3	5.5
9	4	7.4
10	9	16.6
11	5	9.2
12	5	9.2
13	5	9.2
14	2	3.7
15	4	7.4
16	1	1.8
21	1	1.9
24	1	1.9
30	1	1.9

Of the 590.5 full-time faculty, including the deans and directors, on January 1, 1997, in the 54 reporting ALA schools, 309 (51.2 percent) are males, 294 (49.3) are females. An examination of Table I-3 shows that although this is virtually the same ratio as in 1995, there has again been a slight increase in the percentage of female faculty members. The 1996-97 ratio of female to male faculty members is now the highest of any years in the time period from 1976 to the present, and it has increased each year for the last decade. Nevertheless, the ratio has changed very little during the entire time period. In 1976, with 62 schools reporting, the percentage of female faculty members was 41.5 and in 1997, with 54 schools reporting, the percentage was 50.2--a change of 9.0 percent. At least in terms of the total number of faculty, a nearly 1:1 ratio of males and females exists.

**Table I-3**  
**Male-Female Ratio of Full-Time Faculty, ALA Schools**  
**1975-76 To 1996-97**

Year	Number of Schools	Total Full-Time Faculty	Percent of Males	Percent of Females
1975-76	62	697	58.5	41.0
1976-77	64	707	59.0	41.0
1977-78	64	684	59.2	40.8
1978-79	67	715	58.6	41.4

(Table continues)

Table I-3 (cont.)

Year	Number of Schools	Total Full-Time Faculty	Percent of Males	Percent of Females
1979-80	67	714	58.8	41.2
1980-81	69	722	58.3	41.7
1981-82	69	706	56.8	43.2
1982-83	68	680	58.1	41.9
1983-84	66	658	57.8	42.2
1984-85	66	650	57.7	42.3
1985-86	62	603	56.6	43.4
1986-87	57	572	55.2	44.7
1987-88	55	562	54.6	45.3
1988-89	55	572	53.3	46.6
1989-90	58	615	53.6	46.4
1990-91	57	612	53.0	47.0
1991-92	59	638	52.5	47.5
1992-93	58	630	51.9	48.1
1993-94	58	644	50.5	49.5
1994-95	57	622	50.8	49.2
1995-96	55	608	50.7	49.3
1996-97	54	590.5	49.5	50.5

Table 1-4 reports the 1996-97 male/female ratio by rank in comparison with that of 1995-96. The table also shows the current year in contrast to that of ten years ago: 1986-1987. Because the number of schools reporting as ALA schools has changed somewhat from year to year, it is the percentage rather than the actual number of faculty members that is of primary significance in this table. In 1986-87, 44.8 percent of the faculty in all ranks (including deans and directors) were women. In 1994-95, that number had increased to 49.2 percent, a 4.4 percent increase in the ratio of female to male faculty members. In 1995-96 the percentage has dropped by only .4. In 1996-97, the percentage difference has increased slightly to 50.2. In the past, there have been larger changes at specific academic ranks. The rank at which the most significant increases in the number of females has been typically at the assistant professor level. In 1996-97 there was an increase in the percentage of female to male of 5.8 over 1995-96.

At the associate professor level, the increases occurring each year since 1988-89, follow three years of decreases in the ratio of female to male faculty at this rank. It is difficult to know to what the decline should be attributed. In an earlier edition, Purcell speculated that the decline might be due in part to a slight but steady increase in the number of female professors and that many of the female assistant professors might have been in the field too brief a time period to yet be ready for promotion. This explanation could be valid because the number of female faculty members holding the rank of professor has increased even though there has been a substantial drop in the total number of faculty members in all schools combined. The 1988-89, 1989-90, 1990-91, and 1991-92 increases appear to reverse the decline in previous years first noted by Purcell. However, there was a decline of .8 percent in 1992-93 female associate professors and a larger decline of 2 percent in 1993-94. The 1994-95 figure shows a 2.3 percent

## Faculty

decrease of female associate professors. The 1995-96 figure shows a 1.0 percent decrease, but the 1996-97 percentage has increased by 1.9.

At the professor level the percentage of females had increased from 24.6 percent in 1988-89 to 26.0 percent in 1989-90. It has been noted even though this may have been an actual increase of six female professors, it was more likely a result of three additional schools reporting in 1989-90 over the previous year. In 1990-91, the percentage of females rose .6 percent. In 1991-92, with all schools included, the percentage of females dropped 2.7 percent. In 1992-93, with 58 schools reporting, the percentage grew from 28.9 to 30. The 1993-94 figures from 55 reporting schools show an increase in the percentage of females from 30.0 to 31.7. In 1994-95, that percentage dropped to 28.9. The 33.3 percent in 1995-96 is an increase of 4.4 over the previous year. The 34.5 percent in 1996-97 is an increase of 1.9 over last year.

When comparing the percentage of female to male deans and directors in 1983-84 (25.8 percent) to that in 1993-94 (50.8 percent), it is evident that there has been a substantial increase in both the number and percentage of female deans and directors. In 1980-81, there were 14 female deans and directors; in 1986-87, 1987-88, and 1988-89 there were 23; and in 1989-90 the number had increased to 24. In 1990-91 the number decreased to 21 female deans, but increased to 24 in 1991-92. The direction of this increase had been encouraging in that it continued to move in the direction of more equitable representation of women in administrative posts in library and information science education. In fact in 1993-94, there is one more female dean/director than male. However, in 1994-95, there are 5 more male deans than female, and in 1995-96, there are 11 more male than female deans. On 1996-97, there are 19 more male than female deans. Four of this number can be accounted for by one vacancy (Missouri) and three male acting heads of schools that had female heads during 1995-96 (Tennessee, Washington, and Western Ontario).

**Table I-4**  
**Changes in Male-Female Ratio of Full-Time Faculty**

**1986-87 (57 schools, 575 Full-Time Faculty)**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>
Deans & Directors	* 60	37 (61.6%)	23 (38.3%)
Professors	154	108 (70.1%)	46 (29.8%)
Associate Professors	179	106 (59.2%)	73 (40.7%)
Assistant Professors	149	56 (37.5%)	93 (62.4%)
Instructors	13	3 (23.0%)	10 (76.9%)
Lecturers	15	7 (46.6%)	8 (53.3%)
No academic rank	** 5	0 (0.0%)	5(100.0%)
<b>Full-Time Faculty</b>	<b>* 575</b>	<b>371 (55.1%)</b>	<b>258 (44.8%)</b>

**1995-96 (55 schools, 603 Full-Time Faculty)**

Rank	Number	Males	Females
Deans & Directors	* 57	34 (59.6%)	23 (40.4%)
Professors	141	94 (66.6%)	47 (33.3%)
Associate Professors	201	102 (50.7%)	99 (49.3%)
Assistant Professors	166	66 (39.8%)	100 (60.2%)
Instructors	15	4 (26.6%)	11 (73.3%)
Lecturers	** 23	9 (39.1%)	14 (60.8%)
<b>Full-Time Faculty</b>	* <b>603</b>	<b>309 (51.2%)</b>	<b>294 (48.8%)</b>

**1996-97 (55 Schools, 590.5 Full-Time Faculty)**

Rank	Number	Males	Females
Deans & Directors	* 55	37 (67.3%)	18 (32.7%)
Professors	142	93 (65.5%)	49 (34.5%)
Associate Professors	192.5	94 (48.9%)	98.5(51.2%)
Assistant Professors	165	58 (35.2%)	107 (64.8%)
Instructors	18	6 (33.3%)	12 (66.6%)
Lecturers	** 18	6 (33.3%)	12 (66.6%)
<b>Full-Time Faculty</b>	* <b>590.5</b>	<b>294 (49.8%)</b>	<b>296.5 (50.2%)</b>

\* Includes Deans of schools not reporting.

\*\* Includes persons not holding academic rank, or for whom academic rank was not reported, but who are still considered by their schools as full-time faculty members.

**Deans and Directors**

Among the 54 ALA schools reporting, there were 15 changes in appointments of executive officers between January 1, 1996 and January 1, 1997. This represents a change in leadership of 26.3 percent, this number is a higher percentage of changes than the previously reported high figure of 17.5 in 1994-95. A review of the number of changes in the past few years provides a context for the extent of change in leadership in library and information science education that occurred in 1985-86. In 1980-81 there were nine new appointments (13 percent), in 1981-82, the number of new executive officer appointments was 10 (14.5 percent), in 1982-83 the number was 15 (22 percent), in 1983-84, the number was 9 (13.6 percent), and in 1984-85, the number was 11 (16.7 percent). During 1985-86, there were 11 new executive officers appointed on a permanent basis, and 6 appointed on an acting or temporary basis (if one also includes the temporary appointment to replace the dean who was on sabbatical). Thus, more than one out of four schools appointed new or acting executive officers during 1985-86. In 1986-87, the number of changes (6) was much more in line with those of previous years, and in 1987-88, the number increased by 3 to a total of 11 changes. In 1988-89, 9 changes in executive officers occurred; in 1989-90, 4 occurred; in 1990-91, 8 occurred; in 1991-92, 6 occurred, in 1992-93, 5 occurred, 1993-94, 9 changes occurred, 10 changes occurred in 1994-95, and in 1995-96, 8 changes occurred. The current year had 15 new executive officers. For the five-year period from 1992-93 to 1996-97, 47 schools (82.4 percent of existing schools) have had new executive officers.

## Faculty

Of the 13 "new" deans and directors in 1996-97, there are 6 in acting or interim status and 2 vacant. Of the seven regular appointments, 5 are male and 2 are female.

Following is a list of the schools with new executive officers in 1996-97: Alberta (Acting Director), Clarion (Chair), Clark Atlanta (Acting Dean), Iowa (Director), Kent State (Director), NC Greensboro (Chair), North Texas (Dean), Puerto Rico (Director), Rosary (Dean), San Jose (Interim Director), Tennessee (Interim Director), Washington (Acting Director), and Western Ontario (Acting Dean).

The breakdown of the administrative titles of the executive officers of the 57 ALA Schools on January 1, 1997 is reported in Table I-5. This breakdown includes the acting deans or directors.

**Table I-5**  
**Titles of Heads of ALA Schools, January 1, 1997**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Dean	26	45.6
Acting or Interim Dean/Director/Chair	6	10.5
Director	18	31.6
Chair	5	8.8
Vacant	2	3.6

Of the five sitting deans and directors (and persons holding the title of chair), including those holding acting or temporary status, 43 (78.1 percent) held the rank of professor. This is a slight decrease of .8 percent over 1995-96. Of the deans and directors, 30 are males (69.7 percent) and 13 (30.3 percent) are females. Twelve held the rank of associate professor, and of these, 7 (58.3 percent) are males and 5 (41.7 percent) are females. All 12 (100 percent) of those holding the associate professor rank held tenure at the time of the report.

Of the 37 males who were executive officers of ALA schools on January 1, 1997, 37 (100 percent) had earned doctorates. Of the 18 female executive officers, 16 (88.9 percent) had earned doctorates. The executive officers who did not hold the doctorate, holds at least the master's degree in library and information science.

Considering the entire population of deans and directors of ALA schools on January 1, 1997, 53 (96.4 percent) held an earned doctorate. This percentage has varied little over the last several years.

Of the 53 doctorates held by deans and directors, 33 (62.3 percent) were in the library and information sciences. This is a decrease of one in the actual number from last year, but because of the base from 56 to 53 there was an increase of 2.3 in the percentage of those holding doctorates in the field. Six of the new deans (including interims) hold doctorates in fields other than library and information sciences.

Table I-6 shows the disciplines of the doctorates held by the deans and directors of the ALA schools.

**Table I-6**  
**Disciplines of the Doctorates Held by 55 Heads of ALA Schools**  
**January 1, 1997**

Disciplines	Number
Library and Information Sciences	31
American Literature	1
American Studies	1
Communications	5
Computer Science	1
Economics	1
Education	3
French Literature	1
History	2
Humanities	1
Law	1
Philosophy	1
Political Science	1
Sociology	1

US Schools were asked to indicate the ethnic origin of deans and directors. Of the 49 deans and directors of ALA schools located in the US, 42 are white and 7 are from minority ethnic origins, one less than the number from minority ethnic origins reported last year. Of the 7 who were from minority origins, 4 are Black, 2 are Hispanic, and 1 is Asian or Pacific Islander.

### Age

Schools were asked to report the age of the faculty and the deans and directors. This information for heads of the 52 schools is displayed in Table I-7 by five-year categories. This table includes all reporting executive officers serving as of January 1, 1997, including those in an acting capacity.

**Table I-7**  
**Age Categories of Heads of ALA Schools, January 1, 1997**

Age Grouping	Number	Percent
65+	5	8.7
60-64	5	8.7
55-59	12	21.1
50-54	12	21.1
45-49	15	26.3
40-44	3	5.3

(Table continues)

**Table I-7 (cont.)**

<b>Age Grouping</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Not Reported	5	8.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	

This table shows that 34 (59.6 percent) of the executive officers of the 57 schools were 50 years of age or older on January 1, 1997. This is a smaller percentage than the 68.4 percent of last year as well as those figures reported in the last several years. For 1993, the percentage was 63.7; for 1992, the percentage was 66.1; for 1991, it was 66.1; for 1990 it was 63.3. Ten (17.5 percent) of the deans and directors who held regular appointments were 60 years of age or older as of January 1, 1997. The number was 12 for last year (21.0 percent), but has varied little over recent years. When acting or temporary appointments are excluded little difference in the relative percentages in the age group occurs. (Table I-7-a that has reported ages of only permanent heads is, then unnecessary and is again being omitted from this edition of the report.)

Table I-7-b shows this distribution by gender and indicates that the number of male deans and directors 60 years of age or older is one more than that of female deans. This, again, is a decrease in the percentage of deans and directors over 60 as reported last year. In 1984 through 1990 increases were noted, but in 1983 it was reported that due to the policies in existence in most colleges and universities that require persons holding administrative posts to vacate these positions at age 65, 21.4 percent of the executive officers in 1983 could be expected to retire as deans or directors within five years. This wave of retirements had taken place, and as is evident from the data in Tables I-7 and I-7-b, this category has slightly decreased. The number of deans and directors that are in the 50-54 age category may indicate that another wave of retirements will begin in ten years.

**Table I-7-b  
Age Categories of 52 Heads of ALA Schools  
Divided by Gender, January 1, 1997**

<b>Age Grouping</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>
65+	3	2
60-64	3	2
55-59	9	3
50-54	9	3
45-49	10	5
40-44	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>

**Salaries**

Salary figures as of January 1, 1997 were reported for 51 of the 57 deans and directors of ALA schools. Hawaii, Montréal, and Southern Connecticut did not respond to the survey. Of the 54 respondents, Pittsburgh will not release the Dean's salary and Alabama and Missouri reported vacant positions. Of the deans and directors, 44 hold fiscal year (11 or 12 month) appointments. Of those

holding fiscal year appointments, 28 are male and 16 are female. One female and six males hold academic year appointments.

The first year in which a salary of \$60,000 or above for deans and directors was reported occurred in 1982. In 1983, the level of \$70,000 or above was reported. In the 1984 report, the high salary for deans and directors was an academic year salary at a Canadian school, and, at \$74,550, did not break the \$80,000 barrier. For 1985, the high salary is for a fiscal year appointment in a US school and the figure was \$79,000, so again, the \$80,000 barrier was not breached. The \$80,000 salary barrier was broken in 1986, with two people reporting salaries above \$80,000. In 1988, 3 Deans, all with fiscal year appointments reported salaries that exceed \$90,000; the high salary reported was \$97,100. The 1987 salary data show that for 1986-87, 14 deans or directors had salaries that exceed \$70,000. This was an increase of 5 over the previous year. In 1988, 17 deans or directors earned more than \$70,000 - an increase of 5 over last year. The number of deans and directors with salaries over the \$70,000 figure increased by 5.8 percent over 1987, and several other deans and directors had salaries near \$70,000. In 1989, 5 deans and directors reported salaries in excess of \$90,000, with the highest reported salary being \$110,400. Twenty-two deans and directors reported salaries above \$70,000 - a 29 percent increase in this number over 1988; 4 were in Canadian schools. In 1989-90, 9 deans and directors reported salaries above \$90,000, with the highest salary being \$112,667. Twenty-six deans and directors reported salaries above \$70,000; 5 were in Canadian schools. Twelve deans and directors reported salaries above \$90,000 in 1990-91, the highest being \$120,000. For the year 1991-92, 16 deans and directors reported salaries above \$90,000, with highest being over \$117,000. Twenty-three salaries above \$80,000 were reported. Four salaries in this category were in Canadian schools, but the five highest salaries in 1991-92 (all over \$100,000) were of deans and directors of US schools.

In 1992-93, 17 deans and directors reported salaries above \$90,000, with the highest being over \$142,000. Twenty-six salaries were above \$80,000. Six salaries in this category were in Canadian schools, and 4 of the 5 highest salaries (all over \$100,000) were of deans and directors of US schools.

Sixteen deans and directors reported salaries above \$90,000 in 1993-94, with the highest being above 150,000. Twenty-seven salaries above \$80,000 were reported. Five salaries in this category were in Canadian schools, and 7 of the 8 salaries over \$100,000 were of deans and directors in US schools.

In 1994-95, nine deans and directors reported salaries of \$100,000 or above with the highest over \$150,000. Seven in this category are in US schools. Eighteen schools report executive salaries in the range of \$80,000 to \$99,999.

In 1995-96, 14 deans and directors reported salaries of \$100,000 or more with the highest being over \$170,000. Thirteen in this category are in US schools. Thirteen schools report executive salaries in the range of \$80,000 to \$99,999.

In 1996-97, six deans and directors reported salaries of \$120,000 or more with the highest being over \$180,000. All in this category are in US schools. Ten schools reported executive salaries in the range of \$100,000 to \$117,000

In previous years, the issue of the difference between salaries paid in Canadian schools and schools located in the US has been discussed. The question has always been whether the exchange rate between the two currencies should be factored in when comparing salaries. Canadian salaries traditionally have been higher than those in the US, and the exchange rate has continued to change. The exchange rate is currently approximately \$0.76 US to \$1.00 Canadian. Some have commented that the exchange rate should be used as a control variable leading to an equalization of salary data. However, as

## Faculty

noted in previous volumes of this study, if Canadian cost-of-living differences are considered, it would be equally appropriate to apply cost-of-living differences to various cities and regions of the US, thus making the reporting procedure impossibly complicated and not any more meaningful. Other methods exist to compare cost-of-living and the Canadian US exchange rate. Therefore the method of dealing with this problem is to call the reader's attention to the fluctuating exchange rate and, in some instances, to provide separate tables for US and Canadian schools. This solution has been used in each of the preceding years of the report, and will be this year also. To make a change at this point would result in a lack of comparability of the data over time.

The salaries of the 44 deans and directors reporting fiscal year salaries (including those in an acting capacity) ranged from a high of over \$180,000 to a low of \$45,000. The mean salary for the 44 deans and directors with a fiscal year appointment was \$90,033 (median \$84,108). Eliminating the deans and directors of the six reporting Canadian schools (fiscal year) from the analysis, the mean salary of the remaining 38 deans and directors of US schools who had fiscal year appointments on January 1, 1997, was \$92,785 (median \$88,080). The mean salary for Canadian deans and directors was \$72,604 (median \$73,693).

An analysis of the deans and directors that received their salaries on an academic year basis shows a range from a high of \$128,388, to a low of \$52,700. The mean for deans and directors on academic year appointments was \$77,933 (median \$67,100). All of the reported academic year salaries were in US schools.

Of the 44 deans and directors who had fiscal year appointments on January 1, 1997 and who reported their salaries, (including acting persons), 29 are males and 15 are females. For the 29 males, the mean salary was \$91,339 (median \$87,822). This is an increase in the mean salary of male deans and directors of \$1,252, above January 1, 1996, for an increase of 1.4 percent. For the 15 female deans and directors who hold fiscal year appointments, the mean salary on January 1, 1997 was \$87,500 (median \$80,985), for an decrease of \$874 (1.0 percent). The mean salary increase of male deans and directors is \$2,126 more than that of their female counterparts. This increase compares with a difference in favor of males of \$1,713 in 1995/96, a difference in favor of females of \$1,713 in 1994-95, in favor of males of \$7,837 in 1993-94, of \$4,991 in 1992-93, \$8,472 in 1991-92, of \$8,118 in 1989-90; of \$9,578 in 1988/89; \$8,321 in 1987/88; of \$7,009 in 1986/87; of \$7,692 in 1986; \$11,253 in 1985; of \$6,674 in 1984; and of \$7,302 reported for 1983. The five year average (1992-95 to 1996-97) salary differential is \$4,023. Table I-7-c shows the mean salaries of deans and directors from 1979-80 to 1996-97.

The salary differential between male and female deans and directors has been clearly evident each year. That differential had dropped in 1990-91, however, to a relatively insignificant amount. In 1991-92, it rose again to earlier levels, but dropped again in 1992-93. It was up again in 1993-94. For the first time the average salary for female deans and directors in 1994-95 is higher than that of the male counterparts, but drops below males in 1995-96 and again in 1996-97.

Salary differentials have also been evident when one compares them in rank order. The gap between male and female salaries has been narrowing, however, from 1987-88 to 1990-91: in 1988-89, 8 out of 10 of the highest salaries were received by males; in 1989-90, it had dropped to 7 out of 10 (probably it would have been 6 out of 10 if all schools had reported); and in 1990-91 and 1991-92, 6 out of the 10 highest salaries are received by men. In 1992-93, the top ten salaries are evenly divided between males and females. Three of the 10 lowest salaries are received by men. In 1993-94, 6 of the 10 highest are received by women. The top three reported salaries are for men. In 1994-95 and 1995-96, again, 6 of the 10 highest salaries are received by women. In 1996-97, 4 of the highest salaries are received by men. The top three reported salaries are for men.

**Table I-7-c**  
**Average Salaries of Deans and Directors with Fiscal Year Appointments**  
**1979-80 To 1996-97**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Males and Females</b>
1979-80	58	\$40,713	\$35,234	\$39,485
1980-81	58	\$43,799	\$37,622	\$42,628
1981-82	61	\$47,367	\$40,830	\$45,653
1982-83	59	\$50,509	\$43,207	\$48,405
1983-84		\$53,134	\$46,460	\$51,261
1984-85		\$56,947	\$45,694	\$53,793
1985-86		\$59,683	\$51,991	\$56,622
1986-87	52	\$63,231	\$56,222	\$61,247
1987-88	49	\$68,488	\$60,167	\$65,336
1988-89	48	\$73,163	\$63,585	\$69,172
1989-90	51	\$77,036	\$68,918	\$73,852
1990-91	50	\$77,165	\$75,409	\$76,532
1991-92	50	\$82,840	\$73,840	\$78,754
1992-93	51	\$84,132	\$79,141	\$82,077
1993-94	43	\$88,026	\$80,189	\$84,270
1994-95	44	\$86,205	\$87,941	\$86,969
1995-96	47	\$90,087	\$88,374	\$89,405
1996-97	44	\$91,339	\$87,500	\$90,033

An analysis of this table shows that for the reporting 47 deans with fiscal year appointments (including acting deans and heads of Canadian schools), the percentage of increase in the average salary shown here, was .7 percent, down from the increase of 2.8 percent last year. However, this figure is not meaningful because of changes in the actual persons holding deanships from year to year. The percentages indicate only the approximate salary improvements for the positions of deans and directors rather than improvements for individuals. The meaning of this increase is further eroded by the difference in actual schools represented in the two years.

Table I-8 indicates the length of administrative service in the schools where they presently serve, of the 55 deans and directors with regular and acting appointments. As the table shows, on January 1, 1997, five deans and directors had held their administrative positions for ten years or more. This represents approximately 9 percent of the deans. At the other end of the longevity spectrum, 26 deans and directors have been appointed to their present position since 1994, a period of only three years and 40 (70.2 percent) have served for five years or less. This is further evidence of a great deal of change in library and information science education leadership and indicates a high rate of turnover among executive officers in the education programs in the US and Canada. From all indications this is a continuing trend in higher education administration generally.

**Table I-8  
Year of Appointment of the Heads of ALA Schools with  
Regular and Interim Appointments on January 1, 1997**

Year	Number	Year	Number
1970	1	1984	1
1971	0	1985	0
1972	0	1986	4
1973	0	1987	1
1974	0	1988	0
1975	0	1989	1
1976	0	1990	4
1977	0	1991	5
1978	0	1992	4
1979	1	1993	5
1980	0	1994	7
1981	0	1995	6
1982	1	1996	13
1983	1		

#### Assistant/Associate Deans

Meaningful data regarding the full-time faculty who assist the executive officer in administering the school is difficult to obtain because major differences exist from one school to another. In most instances these faculty members carry out the administrative responsibilities, but have reduced teaching loads. However, some do not teach, but devote their entire time to administrative responsibilities. Also, the administrative roles, as well as the rewards for this service, differ widely both in terms of academic rank and salary. As in earlier reports, this group of faculty is identified here as "associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors." Only those who are considered faculty as well as have administrative roles are included. Of the 55 ALA schools that reported for 1996-97, 11 had full-time faculty serving as associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors. This is a decrease of three over 1995-96. Three of the 11 schools have two or more faculty members with such appointments, for a total of ten individuals. Of the 18 associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors in 1996-97, three were newly appointed to this post during the year under review.

In 1995-96, 14 (of 55) schools had such positions, whereas in previous years the numbers were as follows: in 1994-95, 18 (of 57); in 1993-94, 22 (of 59); in 1992-93 and 1991-92, 19 (out of 52); 1990-91, 16 (out of 52); 1989-90, 18 (out of 59); 1988-89, 19 (out of 55); 1987-88, 19 (out of 52); 1986-87, 18 (out of 57); 1985-86, 22; 1984-85, 21; 1983-84, 23 schools (out of 66); in 1982-83, 25 schools (out of 68); in 1981-82, 28 schools (out of 69); and in 1980-81, 34 schools (out of 69). Thus in 1980-81, nearly half of the schools had one or more associate (assistant, etc.) deans or directors. In recent years, both the number and the percentage of schools with full-time associate or assistant deans (directors, etc.) has decreased. It is possible that one factor that accounts for the decline is the elimination of this post as a means for schools to cut back on expenditures. However, it is also possible that as some schools

decrease in faculty size, the central administration of the universities consider the position to be less important and hence eliminate the position.

**Table I-9**  
**Faculty Holding Administrative Titles, 1996-97**

<b>Title and Rank</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>Associate Dean/Director</b>	
Professor	2
Associate Professor	5
Assistant Professor	0
Lecturer	1
<b>Assistant Dean/Director</b>	
Professor	0
Associate Professor	1
Assistant Professor	2
Lecturer	2
<b>Chair (Assistant, Associate, and other titles)</b>	
Professor	1
Associate Professor	1
Assistant Professor	2
Lecturer	1

It should be noted that this report includes only full-time faculty members serving in positions as associate or assistant deans (directors, etc.). A number of schools have individuals (support staff) other than full-time faculty who serve as administrative assistants to the dean or director.

Of the 18 associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors, 5 (28.0 percent) are males and 13 (72.0 percent) are females. Compared to 1995-96, the representation of females in this group has again increased in percentage. In 1986-87 there were exactly twice the number of males (24) as females (12) in the associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors group. 1993-94 was the first year, since 1987-88, that the majority were males.

Of the 18 individuals being considered here, 12 (3 males and 9 females) had fiscal year appointments, while 6 (2 males and 4 females) had academic year appointments.

For the 12 with fiscal year appointments, the high salary was \$93,628 (a male with rank of professor), the low was \$43,000 (a male with rank of lecturer). The mean salary for the males was \$66,089 while for the nine females the mean was \$62,984. The fiscal year mean for males and females combined was \$63,727.

For the six associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors holding academic year appointments (2 male and 4 female), the high salary was \$71,239 (a male with rank of associate), the low was \$45,000 (a female with rank of associate). The mean salary for the 4 females was \$59,213; the mean salary for the 2 males was \$59,093. The mean salary for all associate and assistant deans and directors holding academic year appointments for 1996-97 was \$59,174.

## Faculty

The salaries of full-time faculty who serve as associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors are usually determined to a greater degree by their academic rank than by their administrative titles and responsibilities. Most also have some teaching responsibilities. As a result, the above computations are likely to vary greatly from year to year. As a consequence of this, the persons who hold these positions are included in the tables that follow under their academic rank.

### New Faculty Appointments

Between January 1, 1996 and January 1, 1997, exclusive of deans and directors, 54 new full-time regular faculty members were appointed. Prior to this year, the number of new appointments peaked in 1987-88 with 58 (10.3 percent) and had been declining each of the four successive years, but 1993-94 set a new record. 1994-95 had dropped by 13 positions. 1995-96 had dropped another 3 positions. 1996-97 has increased by 6 positions. Table I-10 provides a basis for comparing the annual number of new faculty appointments over the past 15 years. In earlier reports, this table counted deans and directors, including those with acting or interim status, even when appointed from within their own faculties. However, since a marked increase of acting or interim deans and directors tended to skew the figures, this table has been recalculated for the previous years to exclude all deans and directors in the new appointment columns. Deans and directors are included in the total full-time faculty count.

**Table I-10**  
**Ratio of New Faculty Appointments Exclusive of Deans and Directors to Total Faculty**  
**1980-96**

Year	Number of Schools	Total Full-Time Faculty	New Appointments	Percent of Appointments
1980	69	653	48	7.4
1981	69	637	55	8.6
1982	68	613	47	7.7
1983	66	656	47	7.2
1984	66	650	39	6.0
1985	62	602	48	8.0
1986	57 of 60	572	56	9.8
1987	55 of 60	562	58	10.3
1988	55 of 60	572	56	9.8
1989	58 of 61	615	50	8.1
1990	57 of 59	612	46	7.5
1991	56 of 59	608	44	7.2

(Table continues)

Table I-10 (cont.)

Year	Number of Schools	Total Full-Time Faculty	New Appointments	Percent of Appointments
1992	57 of 58	630	39	6.3
1993	55 of 59	644	64	9.9
1994	56 of 57	622	51	8.2
1995	55 of 57	601	48	7.9
1996	55 of 57	590.5	54	9.1

### Characteristics

The following table shows the sex of the new faculty members appointed to full-time regular positions in the various faculty ranks between January 1, 1996 and January 1, 1997, in ALA schools.

**Table I-11**  
**Rank and Sex of 54 New Faculty**  
**Exclusive of Deans and Directors**  
**Appointed Between January 1, 1996 and January 1, 1997**

Rank	Males	Females	Total
Professor	2	1	3
Associate Professor	2	4	6
Assistant Professor	11	20	31
Instructor	5	3	8
Lecturer	2	4	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>54</b>

All three of the new appointment at the professor level received an academic year appointment. All had an earned doctorate; and 2 were granted tenure. The age categories are: one each from 45-49, 50-54, and 55-59.

Of the six new associate professors who were not deans or directors, 4 received academic year appointments; all held earned doctorates. Their age categories are: 1 from 30-34; 3 from 45-49; 1 from 50-54; and 1 from 55-59.

Because the most common rank at which new faculty members are appointed is that of assistant professor, the salaries paid this group along with other characteristics, are always of particular interest. There were 31 new assistant professors appointed to permanent positions in 1996-97. This compares with 31 last year; 29 in 1994-95; 40 in 1993-94; 19 in 1992-93; 28 in 1991-92; 34 in 1990-91; 34 in 1989-90; 38 in 1988-89; 43 in 1987-88; 29 in 1986-87; 32 in 1985-86; 27 in 1984-85; 25 in 1983-84; 29 in 1982-83 and 1981-82 and 28 in 1980-81. These figures show that the number has fluctuated over the past few years, but has varied only slightly until 1987-88 which showed a 48 percent increase over 1986-

## Faculty

87. However, the total of new appointments at all ranks in 1996-97 has decreased. Of the 31 new assistant professors appointed in 1996-97, 11 are male (35.5 percent) and 20 are female (64.5 percent).

Among the 31 new assistant professors, 27 had completed their doctorates by January 1997. The disciplines of the 27 new assistant professors with earned doctorates are distributed into the following fields:

Library and Information Sciences	17	Instructional Technology	1
Engineering	2	Political Science	1
Communication	1	No Designation	1
Education	4		

Of the 31 new assistant professors in 1996-97, one was in a Canadian School. Of those in the US, 26 are White; 1 is Black; 3 are Asian or Pacific Islander; and 1 is Hispanic. Age categories were provided as follows:

30-34	5
35-40	3
40-44	8
45-49	9
50-54	5
Undesignated	1

## **Salaries**

Salaries reported for the 31 new assistant professors appointed in 1996-97 ranged from a high of \$59,000 to a low of \$32,000. The mean salary for 29 persons with an academic year appointment (which included no Canadian appointments) was \$40,806 and the median was \$40,000.

The mean salary for the 11 males appointed for the academic year to the rank of assistant professor in 1996-97 was \$43,045 (median \$41,000). For the 18 females appointed as assistant professors for the academic year, the mean salary was \$39,326 (median \$38,500). Contrasted with the 1995-96 difference of \$7,576 in favor of males, the 1996-97 difference is only \$3,719 in favor of males. When academic and fiscal year salaries are combined, the mean for females increases to \$39,741; the female disadvantage decreases to \$3,304. It should be noted that 3 of the 4 persons appointed that did not have a doctoral degree were female.

Table I-11-a shows the mean beginning salaries for assistant professors with academic year appointments since 1977-78. During those years, women have out-distanced their male colleagues' average salary in 1978-79, 1979-80, 1985-86, in 1989-90 and in 1991-92. In the total number of these academic year appointments, 518, women have accounted for 325 (62.8 percent) while men have accounted for 193 (37.2 percent).

**Table I-11-a**  
**New Assistant Professors – Academic Year Appointments**  
**1977-78 To 1996-97**

Year	Total Number	Mean for Males	Mean for Females	Mean for All	Percentage of Income
1977-78	23	\$15,386 (10)	\$14,907 (13)	\$15,115	0.09
1978-79	30	\$16,188 (16)	\$17,241 (14)	\$16,679	10.35
1979-80	18	\$17,065 (6)	\$17,445 (12)	\$17,319	3.84
1980-81	25	\$19,928 (8)	\$18,777 (17)	\$19,146	10.55
1981-82	22	\$20,854 (9)	\$20,270 (13)	\$20,509	7.12
1982-83	22	\$23,335 (8)	\$21,604 (14)	\$22,233	8.40
1983-84	19	\$24,170 (8)	\$21,335 (11)	\$23,722	6.70
1984-85	24	\$25,277 (9)	\$23,748 (15)	\$24,321	2.50
1985-86	24	\$26,000 (7)	\$26,946 (17)	\$26,732	9.91
1986-87	29	\$28,290 (11)	\$26,399 (18)	\$27,183	1.69
1987-88	31	\$29,365 (13)	\$28,895 (18)	\$29,092	7.02
1988-89	33	\$33,015 (13)	\$30,317 (20)	\$31,380	7.86
1989-90	32	\$30,699 (10)	\$32,990 (22)	\$32,448	3.40
1990-91	27	\$35,679 (8)	\$33,149 (19)	\$33,899	4.47
1991-92	21	\$33,652 (8)	\$34,915 (13)	\$34,434	1.58
1992-93	17	\$34,625 (8)	\$34,592 (9)	\$34,608	0.50
1993-94	38	\$41,067 (14)	\$36,248 (24)	\$38,023	9.80
1994-95	27	\$39,501 (8)	\$39,028 (19)	\$39,168	3.01
1995-96	27	\$45,126 (8)	\$37,550 (19)	\$39,795	1.60
1996-97	29	\$43,045 (11)	\$39,326 (18)	\$40,806	2.54

There were two new fiscal year appointments at the assistant professor rank. Because the number of new appointments in this category has always been small, no effort has been made in the past to tabulate these data by gender or salary. During the past 24 years, only 82 fiscal year appointments have been made at the assistant professor level, as compared to 518 appointed for the academic year.

**Table I-12**  
**Distribution of Salaries for 29 New Assistant Professors**  
**1996-97**

Academic Year Salary	Appointments Gender	Academic Year Salary	Appointments Gender
\$32,000	1F	\$40,380	1F
\$35,000	1M, 2F	\$40,500	1M, 1F
\$35,500	2F	\$41,000	1M
\$36,000	1F	\$44,000	1F

(Table continues)

Faculty

Table I-12 (cont.)

Academic Year Salary	Appointments Gender	Academic Year Salary	Appointments Gender
\$37,000	2F	\$45,000	4M, 3F
\$38,000	1M, 1F	\$48,000	1F
\$39,000	1F	\$59,000	1M
\$40,000	2M, 1F		

**New Associate and Professor Salaries**

Six new appointments were made at the associate professor rank. 4 are female and 2 are male; 5 had academic year appointments. The 5 academic year appointments had a mean salary of \$45,350 (median \$40,700). The female mean salary was \$46,467 (median \$41,400). The male mean salary was \$36,900 (median \$36,900). One female and one male had fiscal year appointments.

There were also three new appointments at the rank of professor: 2 males and 1 female with academic year appointments. The mean salary was \$84,267 (median \$90,000).

There were 8 full-time instructors appointed during 1996-97 among the 54 reporting ALA schools. Seven had academic year appointments. The mean salary of the academic year appointments was \$31,929 (median \$33,500).

There were six full-time lecturers appointed during 1996-97 among the 54 reporting ALA schools. Four are female and two are male; three have academic year appointments and three have fiscal year appointments. The average salary for the three academic appointments was \$34,833 (median \$36,000). The average salary for the three fiscal year appointments was \$22,610 (median \$13,915).

**All Faculty**

**Salaries**

The following table enables one to compare 1996-97 mean and median salaries at each rank with those of a year earlier (1995-96). Salary figures do not include Hawaii, Montréal nor Southern Connecticut, which did not report. In addition, Pittsburgh withheld the Dean's Salary; and South Carolina did not provide salary data for one professor and one associate professor (both fiscal year appointments). In 1996-97, a total of 587 salaries (including deans and directors) were reported. In 1995-96, there were 597 salaries reported. In 1994-1995, a total of 616 salaries were reported. In 1993-94, a total of 566 salaries were reported. In 1992-93, 600 salaries were reported. In 1991-92, a total of 542 salaries were reported; in 1990-91, there were 593 salaries reported; in 1989-90 there were 615; in 1988-89, 550; in 1987-88, 552; 1986-87 there were 572; in 1985-86 there were 603. The highest number of salaries (687) was reported in 1981-82.

**Table I-13**  
**Faculty Salaries, ALA Schools**  
**1995-96 and 1996-97**

Rank	Term	1995-96		1996-97	
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Deans & Directors	FY	\$89,405	\$87,812	\$90,033	\$84,108
	AY	\$66,153	\$57,856	\$77,933	\$67,100
Professors	FY	\$73,166	\$71,332	\$76,323	\$73,648
	AY	\$66,253	\$62,784	\$67,637	\$65,004
Associate Professor	FY	\$62,305	\$63,476	\$63,177	\$60,212
	AY	\$50,403	\$47,605	\$50,562	\$48,536
Assistant Professor	FY	\$51,254	\$55,595	\$51,222	\$50,894
	AY	\$40,518	\$39,380	\$41,705	\$40,405
Instructors	FY	\$49,828	\$45,577	\$58,385	\$64,957
	AY	\$43,233	\$35,000	\$34,358	\$35,565
Lecturers	FY	\$46,310	\$45,000	\$42,482	\$42,500
	AY	\$31,606	\$38,722	\$42,244	\$37,250

The mean and median salaries shown above in Table I-13 have been based on all salaries reported without regard to region. Furthermore, no attempt has been made to compute the exchange rate between the Canadian dollar and the US dollars. Since Canadian university salaries are often higher than those in the US, and there are geographical differences in the US as well, Table I-13-a is intended to show average salaries by region and for Canadian schools. The regions used are those used by ALA's Committee on Accreditation in its semi-annual listing of accredited programs. As noted above, Hawaii, Montréal and Southern Connecticut were not included in its respective region because salaries were not provided. The number of faculty salaries included is shown in parentheses in each category. In those instances where only one salary fits into a given category, the salary is not reported in order to protect the privacy of the individuals to whom the salaries apply.

**Northeast:** Albany, Buffalo, Catholic, Clarion, Drexel, Long Island, Maryland, Pittsburgh, Pratt, Queens, Rhode Island, Rutgers, St. John's, Simmons, and Syracuse. (15 of 16 schools reporting)

**Southeast:** Alabama, Clark Atlanta, Florida State, Kentucky, Louisiana State, North Carolina, North Carolina Central, North Carolina - Greensboro, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Florida, Southern Mississippi, and Tennessee. (All 13 schools reporting)

**Midwest:** Emporia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kent State, Michigan, Missouri, Rosary, Wayne State, Wisconsin - Madison, and Wisconsin - Milwaukee. (All schools reporting)

**Southwest:** Arizona, North Texas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Texas Woman's. (All 5 schools reporting)

**West:** California - Berkeley, California - Los Angeles., San Jose, and Washington. (4 of 5 schools reporting)

Faculty

**Canada:** Alberta, British Columbia, Dalhousie, McGill, Toronto, and Western Ontario. (6 of 7 schools reporting)

**Table I-13-a**  
**Mean Salary for Faculty of ALA Schools Divided by Region**  
**1996-97**

**Fiscal Year Mean Salaries**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Deans &amp; Directors</b>	<b>Professors</b>	<b>Associate Professors</b>	<b>Assistant Professors</b>
Northeast	\$94,128 (12)	\$78,382 (8)	\$62,561 (11)	\$50,209 (3)
Southeast	\$85,818 (11)	\$60,884 (4)	\$51,829 (5)	\$31,044 (2)
Midwest	\$98,886 (10)	(1)	\$64,633 (4)	(1)
Southwest	\$91,261 (5)	(1)	(1)	(0)
West	\$90,015 (2)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Canada*	\$72,604 (6)	\$81,118 (8)	\$66,208 (20)	\$53,923 (18)

\* Canadian dollars

**Academic Year Mean Salaries**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Deans &amp; Directors</b>	<b>Professors</b>	<b>Associate Professors</b>	<b>Assistant Professors</b>
Northeast	\$60,355 (2)	\$72,319 (40)	\$54,727 (60.5)	\$45,533 (38)
Southeast	(1)	\$61,861 (29)	\$45,795 (35)	\$39,130 (33)
Midwest	(1)	\$68,182 (22)	\$49,674 (36)	\$40,770 (38)
Southwest	(0)	\$64,338 (12)	\$44,876 (11)	\$38,043 (23)
West	\$87,500 (2)	\$68,198 (14)	\$51,415 (11)	\$43,941 (9)
Canada	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

The following table shows the difference between mean salaries in the schools in the US and those of Canada. In evaluating these figures it is important to remember that the difference in exchange rate between the US and the Canadian dollars on January 1, 1997 was \$.76 US to \$1.00 Canadian.

**Table I-13-b**  
**Average Salaries Among Schools of Library and Information Science in the U.S.**  
**Compared to Average Salaries Among Schools of Library and Information Science in Canada**  
**1996-97**

**Fiscal Year Average Salaries**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Deans &amp; Directors</b>	<b>Professors</b>	<b>Associate Professors</b>	<b>Assistant Professors</b>
US	\$90,033 (40)	\$73,582 (14)	\$60,289 (21)	\$43,118 (6)
Canada*	\$72,604 (6)	\$81,118 (8)	\$66,208 (20)	\$53,923 (18)

### Academic Year Average Salaries

Country	Deans & Directors	Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors
US	\$77,993 (7)	\$67,637 (117)	\$50,562 (153.5)	\$41,705 (141)
Canada*	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

\* Canadian dollars

Improvements in the mean faculty salary in 1996-97 over 1995-96 at each rank are shown in Table I-14. It should be kept in mind, however, that promotions, resignations, retirements, and new appointments in 1996-97 results in a different group of people being compared for these two years. Because actual names of faculty members are not provided by the schools, it is not possible to separate the continuing faculty in a given rank from those entering that rank. The results of these limitations mean that the improvement in salary is for the incumbents of each rank at a given time and do not reflect individual salary improvement.

**Table I-14**  
**Improvement in Average Salaries for Faculty in ALA Schools**  
**Between 1995-96 and 1996-97**

Rank	Term	Number in 1995-96	Number in 996-97	Improvement in Mean Salary	Percent of Mean Salary
Deans and Directors	FY	47	46	\$628	0.7
	AY	7	7	\$11,780	17.8
Professors	FY	25	22	\$43,157	4.3
	AY	112	117	\$1,384	2.1
Associate Professors	FY	45	41	\$812	1.3
	AY	150.5	153.5	\$159	0.3
Assistant Professors	FY	28	24	-\$32	-0.06
	AY	142	141	\$1,187	2.9
Instructors	FY	6	5	\$8,557	17.2
	AY	17	12	-\$8,875	-20.5
Lecturers	FY	13	10	-\$3,828	-8.2
	AY	10	8	\$10,638	33.6

In reading the following table, one should keep in mind that the small number of faculty holding the instructor and lecturer rank, and the small number of deans and directors holding an academic year appointment, may detract from the significance of those particular percentages.

**Table I-14-a**  
**Percentage of Salary Improvement by Rank Among ALA Schools Over 5 Years**  
**1992-93 To 1996-97**

Rank	Term	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1994-95	1995-96	Total
Deans & Directors	FY	4.2	2.7	3.2	3.1	0.7	13.9
	AY	3.3	13.3	6.2	-2.2	17.8	38.4
Professors	FY	11.3	5.9	-7.1	4.0	4.3	18.4
	AY	-10.3	1.3	5.4	3.1	2.1	1.6
Associate Professors	FY	4.3	-4.1	2.2	2.2	1.3	5.9
	AY	1.8	4.7	4.5	3.1	0.3	14.4
Assistant Professors	FY	6.4	0.4	1.7	-0.8	-0.06	-0.1
	AY	0.1	4.0	10.8	-4.6	2.9	13.2
Instructors	FY	11.7	-10.2	11.8	7.3	17.2	37.8
	AY	3.3	0.8	5.3	21.1	-20.5	10.0
Lecturers	FY	-2.3	-----	-12.7	14.9	-8.2	-18.3
	AY	4.7	-2.1	8.7	-13.5	33.6	31.3

Table 15 enables one to compare the mean salaries in each faculty rank for males and females. Male salaries exceed female salaries in all ranks with both fiscal and academic appointments. The amount of difference ranges from \$1,387 academic year associate professor to \$5,008 (fiscal year professors). The average difference among all ranks with fiscal year appointments is \$3852 in favor of males; academic year appointments of \$2,012 in favor of male salaries. To the degree that having an earned doctorate influences initial salaries, it may be worth noting that of the faculty without the doctorate, 63 percent and female and 37 percent are male.

**Table I-15**  
**Male and Female Salaries in ALA Schools on January 1, 1997**  
**Fiscal Year Appointments, 1996-97**

Rank	No. of Males	Average Salary of Males	No. of Females	Average Salary of Females
Deans & Directors	29	\$91,339	15	\$87,500
Professors	9	\$79,117	13	\$74,109
Associate Professors	16	\$65,471	25	\$61,902
Assistant Professors	6	\$53,485	18	\$50,467

### Academic Year Appointments, 1996 -97

Rank	No. of Males	Average Salary of Males	No. of Females	Average Salary of Females
Deans & Directors	6	\$79,808	1	
Professors	82	\$68,569	35	\$66,212
Associate Professors	76.5	\$50,853	75	\$49,466
Assistant Professors	54	\$43,182	87	\$40,891

### Ethnic Background

The schools in the United States were again asked to provide ethnic data for their full-time faculty. Forty-eight schools that responded to the survey provided this information listed in Table I-17. Information on the deans and directors is from 48 schools. (533 of 591 faculty) Care should be taken when comparing year to year percentages because the base number of faculty varies each year.

**Table I-17**  
**Ethnic Background of Full-Time Faculty in ALA Schools in the U.S.**  
**January 1, 1997**

Rank	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Island	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Deans & Directors	0	1	3	2	42	48
Professors	0	5	6	4	19	134
Associate Professors	2	7	7	2	154	172
Assistant Professors	1	16	16	4	110	147
Instructors	0	0	0	0	16	16
Lecturers	0	0	2	0	14	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>533</b>
<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>85.4</b>	

### Age

The table that follows provides age category data for the full-time faculty with academic rank in all ALA schools except Hawaii, Montréal, North Carolina - Greensboro, and Southern Connecticut. It has been noted in earlier reports that the average age of the faculty has been increasing. However, in 1989 and 1990 (32.1 and 32.2 percent respectively) of the faculty were reported as 55 or older. This is a decrease of approximately 1.3 and 1.4 percent over each of the previous two years in the number of faculty in these age groups. The 1990-91 data show a 2.0 percent increase (34.2) over 1989-90; the 1991-92 data show a slight drop (.7 percent); and the 1992-93 data show a slight drop of .1 percent in the number of faculty 55 years and older. In 1994-95, number of faculty 55 years and older has dropped to 30.6 percent. That percentage is the same for 1995-96. The 1996-97 percentage of faculty 55 years and older has increased slightly to 31.7 percent. As noted above, comparisons can only be tentative given differences in base numbers resulting from incomplete reporting.

**Table I-18**  
**Age Categories of Full-Time Faculty**  
**On January 1, 1997 in ALA Schools**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>25-29</b>	<b>30-34</b>	<b>35-39</b>	<b>40-44</b>	<b>45-49</b>	<b>50-54</b>	<b>55-59</b>	<b>60-64</b>	<b>65-</b>	<b>Total</b>
Deans & Directors	0	0	0	3	16	13	11	4	5	52
Professors	0	0	0	5	15	29	46	30	15	140
Associate Profs.	0	2	6	27	48	59	28	21	6	197
Assistant Profs.	0	15	21	43	44	27	10	2	2	164
Instructors	2	0	1	4	9	1	0	1	0	18
Lecturers	1	0	2	2	4	3	3	1	2	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>589</b>
<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	

### Year of Initial Appointment and Rank

Each of the 54 reporting ALA schools responded to the request for the date of initial appointment of each current faculty member to its full-time faculty. In Table I-19, the data shown represent that initial appointment year for each of the faculty members where academic rank was reported, who were employed on January 1, 1997. Nearly two-thirds (60.13 percent) of the reporting ALA schools have been appointed in the last ten years (1986-87 through 1996-97).

**Table I-19**  
**Year of Initial Appointment of Full-Time Faculty at Their Present ALA School**

Year	Deans & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
1959			1										1
1960					1								1
1961													
1962					1								1
1963													
1964			1										1
1965													
1966			1		1								2
1967	1		1			1							3
1968			2										2
1969	2		2	1		1							6
1970	1		9	1	2								13
1971			6	2	5	1	1						15
1972	1		2		3	1					1		8
1973			1	3	1								5
1974			7	3	1	3							15
1975		1		1	1	3							6
1976	1		7	3									11
1977	1		7	5	5	2							20
1978			3	1	3								7
1979	1		3	2		1		1					8
1980	1		1	1	3	1		1					8
1981	1	1	2	4	3	2	1		1				15
1982	1		2	2	5	3							13
1983	2	1	2	2	1	4	2	1					15

(Table continues)

Table I-19 (cont.)

Year	Deans & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
1984			4	2	3	4							13
1985		1	4	1	4	6		2					18
1986	3	2	6	4	5	6		1	1	1			29
1987	2		4	3	7	15	1		1		2		35
1988	2		1	1	9	13	2				1		29
1989	2	2	3	3	6	6		1					23
1990	1		1		8	7	1	5			1		24
1991	2	2	2	2	1	1	4	9		1		1	25
1992	3		1			3	10	9					26
1993	1	3	1		7	4	9	20				1	46
1994	1	3		1	3	6	9	13	1	1		1	39
1995	3	1	3		1	3	9	23		2	2	2	49
1996	2		2	1	5	5	12	19	5	3	2	4	60

In the following table, the year is given for the appointment or promotion of each of the full-time faculty members holding academic rank to his/her present academic rank in the school where he/she holds a position. In this listing, deans and directors have been distributed according to their faculty ranks.

**Table I-20**  
**Year of Appointment or Promotion of Full-Time Faculty**  
**To Their Present Rank in Their Respective School**

Year	Professors		Assoc. Profs.		Asst. Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
1962											1
1965											
1966	1										1
1968				1							1
1969	1			1							1
1970	1										2
1971	2										2
1972	1										1
1973	2		1								3
1974	2		2	1							5
1975	4										4
1976	2		2								4
1977	4		3	1						1	9
1978	1			1	1						3
1979	4	1		2		1					8
1980	3	2	2	3		1					11
1981	3		2	2		1		1			9
1982			4	3							7
1983	6	1	4	2							13
1984	6	1	4			1					12
1985	3	3	1								7
1986	10	3	2	2				1	1		19
1987	4	6	4	2	1			1			18
1988	6		4	7	2	1				2	22
1989	7	5	5	4		1					22
1990	4	3	5	9	1	3			1		26
1991	8	10	5	8	3	9		1		2	46
1992	6	2	4	10	7	9					38
1993	3	5	13	15	9	15				1	61
1994	5	8	7	10	8	16	1	1	1	1	58
1995	11	9	7	16	13	27		2	2	2	89
1996	12	4	10	11	14	23	5	3	2	5	89

Faculty

**Promotions**

Among the full-time faculty in the 54 ALA schools participating in the 1996-97 study, there were 35 promotions within the professorial ranks. This compares with 35 last year. As the following table suggests, the 1992-93 and 1993-94 rates of promotion fell slightly below the 1990-91 rate (26.6 and 6.6 percent respectively). The 1994-95 and 1995-96 rates have increased slightly each year over the previous one by 14.3 percent and 9.3 percent respectively. The 1996-97 rate has dropped by 20 percent over the previous year.

**Table I-21  
Faculty Promotions in ALA Schools  
1992-93 To 1996-97**

Rank to Which Promoted	1992-93		1993-94		1994-95		1995-96		1996-97	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Professors	2	2	3	3	9	4	3	5	6	3
Associate Profs.	5	8	11	8	4	6	6	12	8	7
Assistant Profs.	1	4	1	2	2	7	5	4	3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>

**Table I-21-a  
Number of Years as Full-Time Faculty Member in Their  
Respective Schools of the Individuals  
Promoted in 1996-97**

Rank	Number of Years	Number of Persons	
		M	F
Professors	7	2	
	9		1
	10	1	
	11	1	
	12	1	
	13		1
	17		1
Associate Professors	22	1	
	2		1
	3	1	
	6	5	3
	7		2
	8	2	1

(Table continues)

Table I-21-a (cont.)

Rank	Number of Years	Number of Persons	
		M	F
Assistant Professors	2	2	
	3		1
	4	1	

### Doctorates

The number of earned doctorates held on January 1, 1997 for the faculty population of 589 (including Deans and Directors) was 535 (90.8 percent). This is a slight increase in the percentage from last year, as shown in Table I-22a. Of the 535 faculty members holding the doctorate, 374 (69.9 percent) had their degree in the library and information sciences (Including information systems and technology, information transfer, and information resource management); 161 faculty members had doctorates in other fields; and 21 were not designated. Table I-22a indicates the percentage of faculty members by gender holding doctorates.

Data on the number of faculty with earned doctorates have been collected since 1977. The following table shows the steady growth of its percentage over these years to 1990-91. During that time period the percentage of total faculty members who hold the doctorate has increased from 61.8 percent to 85.6 percent; the percentage dropped to 82.9 during 1991-92, but has increased to 85.7 percent in 1992-93 and to 87.7 percent in 1993-94. The 1994-95 percentage is only slightly lower. The 1995-96 average has increased by 2 percent. The rate of increase in females and males holding the doctorate is approximately equal. However, the percentage of male faculty members that have completed the doctorate remains higher than that of their female counterparts. This gap had been reduced substantially in the years since 1988-89, and remained somewhat constant since with a 3.9 percentage difference in the current year.

**Table I-22-a**  
**Percentage of Full-Time Faculty in ALA Schools with Earned Doctorates**  
**1977 To 1996-97**

Year	Percent of Males With Earned Doctorates	Percent of Females With Earned Doctorates	Percent Total Faculty With Earned Doctorates
1977	69.3	50.9	61.8
1978	73.6	53.0	65.2
1979	75.4	55.4	67.0
1980	76.7	56.8	68.5
1981	77.1	61.3	70.8
1982	78.1	63.0	71.5
1983	81.0	63.0	71.5
1984	82.3	70.1	77.1

(Table continues)

Table I-22-a (cont.)

Year	Percent of Males With Earned Doctorates	Percent of Females With Earned Doctorates	Percent Total Faculty With Earned Doctorates
1985	80.0	74.9	77.9
1986	82.6	75.9	79.9
1987	85.3	77.1	81.6
1988	86.5	79.2	83.2
1988-89	86.5	85.0	85.8
1989-90	83.7	82.3	83.0
1990-91	86.5	84.7	85.6
1991-92	84.4	81.2	82.9
1992-93	86.6	85.4	85.7
1993-94	89.6	85.8	87.7
1994-95	90.5	86.6	87.1
1995-96	90.9	87.1	89.1
1996-97	92.8	88.9	90.8

Table I-23 provides a listing of the disciplines other than the library and information sciences and technologies in which 161 faculty members held doctorates on January 1, 1997. While deans were asked to be precise in identifying these disciplines as they completed the questionnaire, the responses often were not clear, and the instructions were frequently given varying interpretations. The fields other than library science, information sciences, and library/information science are quite varied, as has been the case in the past. For example, in the field of education, numerous specific sub-fields are identified, some of which might be the same discipline or degree with a slightly different name. Because of the wide variation, the doctorates in fields other than library and/or information sciences are identified by discipline.

**Table I-23**  
**Earned Doctorates Outside Library and Information Sciences**  
**Held by 172 Full-Time Faculty in ALA Schools on January 1, 1997**

Discipline	Number	Discipline	Number
Adult Education	2	Interdisciplinary	2
American Civilization/Studies	2	Instructional Technology	5
Anthropology	2	Law	4
Archival Studies	2	Linguistics	1
Astronomy	1	Literature	2
Book Arts/ History of Printing	1	Mathematics	1
Business/Management	1	Musicology	1
Communications	11	Philosophy	5
Computer Science	13	Physics	3

(Table continues)

Table I-23 (cont.)

Discipline	Number	Discipline	Number
Economics	3	Political Science	5
Education	34	Psychology	6
Engineering	11	Public Administration	2
Engineering and Public Policy	2	Reading	1
English	3	Roman Studies	1
Folklore/Myth	1	Social Studies Information	2
French Literature	1	Sociology	2
Geography	1	Social Work	1
Health	1	Statistics	1
History	15	Zoology	1
Humanities	1	Undesignated	21

While 90.8 percent of the full-time faculty teaching in 54 ALA schools had completed doctoral degrees prior to January 1, 1997, the percentage of faculty within individual schools holding the doctorate varied considerably, from a low of 50.0 percent to a high of 100 percent in 22 schools. Forty-nine schools (90.7 percent) of the 54 reporting have faculties of which at least 75 percent hold the doctorate.

**Table I-24**  
**Percentage of Faculty Having Doctorates in ALA Schools**  
**January 1, 1997**

Percentage	Number of Schools
100	22
95-99	0
90-94	8
85-89	7
80-84	9
75-79	3
70-74	4
65-69	0
60-64	0
55-59	0
50-54	1

### **Tenure**

Of the 590 full-time faculty in the 54 ALA schools that reported on their faculty, 63.6 percent of the faculty were reported as having tenure on January 1, 1997. (Those with "security of appointment"

Faculty

have been included in the count). Information on tenure has been collected since 1977, and is reported in Table I-25. As can be seen from this table, the percent of the total faculty who are tenured had risen over the three years prior to 1992-93. However, 1993/94 and 1994/95 show a slight drop in percentage. The data show that approximately 3 out of 5 faculty members held tenure in 1996/97.

**Table I-25**  
**Percentage of Tenured Faculty Among ALA Schools**  
**1976-77 To 1996-97**

Year	Percent of Tenured Faculty
1976-77	58.4
1977-78	60.0
1978-79	62.1
1979-80	64.8
1980-81	66.3
1981-82	65.0
1982-83	66.3
1983-84	67.8
1984-85	64.2
1985-86	68.0
1986-87	67.0
1987-88	65.5
1988-89	62.2
1989-90	62.4
1990-91	62.9
1991-92	64.4
1992-93	65.2
1993-93	63.0
1994-95	63.6
1995-96	63.6
1996-97	63.6

Five schools reported having an all-tenured faculty in 1993-94; that figure dropped to 4 in 1994/95 and remains at that figure for 1995-96. In 1996-97, the figure has dropped to 4. Prior years are as follows: 1992-93 (6); 1991-92 (2); 1990-91(2); 1989-90 (2); 1988-89 (3); 1987-88 (3); 1986-87 (5); 1985-86 (4); 1984-85 (11); and 1983-84 (11). Only one school reported less than 25 percent tenured faculty; eight schools have less than 50 percent; and 14 schools have tenured faculties of 75 percent or higher. The following table shows the variation among the 54 schools that reported tenure data.

**Table I-26**  
**Percentage of Tenured Faculty Among ALA Schools**  
**January 1, 1997**

Percent of Tenured Faculty	Number of Schools
100	1
90-94	3
85-89	2
80-84	3
75-79	5
70-74	7
65-69	6
60-64	8
55-59	3
50-54	7
45-49	3
40-44	2
35-39	1
30-34	
25-29	1
20-24	1

The following table shows tenure status by rank and sex of the faculty members holding academic rank and included in this study. It should be understood, of course, that deans and directors shown with tenure enjoy that tenure as faculty members, not as their schools' executive officers.

**Table I-26-a**  
**Tenure Status by Rank and Gender Among ALA Schools**  
**January 1, 1997**

Rank	w/Tenure		Total	w/o Tenure		Total
	M	F		M	F	
Deans & Directors	35	16	51	0	2	2
Professors	90	49	139	3	0	3
Associate Professors	86	83	169	8	16	24
Assistant Professors	6	10	16	52	97	149
Instructors	0	2	2	6	8	14
Lecturers	0	0	0	6	14	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>212</b>

Tables showing regional differences in faculty size and sex (Tables I-26b and I-26c) were included in the 1983 report and the report for 1978-79. However, it is not necessary to provide these

## Faculty

particular data each year and so they will not be included in this year's report. The table that appeared in the 1984 report as Table I-26d, showing regional differences in average salaries, has been shifted to the section following Table I-13.

In the table that follows, individual faculty salaries (including those for 50 deans and directors) were reported by 54 of the ALA schools. Hawaii, Montréal and Southern Connecticut did not respond, and some salaries were not reported from South Carolina and Clark Atlanta. Pittsburgh will not report the salary of the Dean. The salaries are distributed by rank in increments of \$1,000 (except where there are large gaps between salaries). The salaries for associate (assistant, etc.) deans and directors have been entered according to their faculty ranks.

**Table I-27**  
**Salaries of Full-Time Faculty in ALA Schools**  
**January 1, 1997**

Amounts	Dean & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers	
	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY
\$180,000 - \$180,999	1											
\$145,000 - \$145,999	1											
\$135,000 - \$135,999	1											
\$130,000 - \$130,999	1	1										
\$128,000 - \$128,999	1	1										
\$124,000 - \$124,999	1			1								
\$117,000 - \$117,999	1											
\$113,000 - \$113,999	1											
\$112,000 - \$112,999	1											
\$111,000 - \$111,999	1											
\$110,000 - \$110,999	1											
\$107,000 - \$107,999												
\$106,000 - \$106,999												
\$105,000 - \$105,999	1											
\$104,000 - \$104,999	1			2								
\$102,000 - \$102,999				1								
\$101,000 - \$101,999	1	1										
\$100,000 - \$100,999	2											
\$99,000 - \$99,999				1								
\$98,000 - \$98,999												
\$97,000 - \$97,999	1			1								
\$96,000 - \$96,999				1								
\$95,000 - \$95,999	1											
\$94,000 - \$94,999												

(Table continues)

Table I-27 (cont.)

Amounts	Dean & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers	
	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY
\$93,000 - \$93,999	1		3									
\$92,000 - \$92,999	2			1								
\$91,000 - \$91,999	1										1	
\$90,000 - \$90,999			2	2								
\$89,000 - \$89,999												
\$88,000 - \$88,999			1	3								
\$87,000 - \$87,999	1		1									
\$86,000 - \$86,999				1								
\$85,000 - \$85,999					1							
\$84,000 - \$84,999	1											
\$83,000 - \$83,999	2			1			1					
\$82,000 - \$82,999				3								
\$81,000 - \$81,999	1			1	1							
\$80,000 - \$80,999	1		1	1								
\$79,000 - \$79,999	2											
\$78,000 - \$78,999												
\$77,000 - \$77,999	1		1	2	3							
\$76,000 - \$76,999	1			3								
\$75,000 - \$75,999	1			3	1		1					
\$74,000 - \$74,999	1		2	3	1							
\$73,000 - \$73,999				2	2							
\$72,000 - \$72,999	2		2									
\$71,000 - \$71,999	1		3	2	2	4						
\$70,000 - \$70,999			1	4		3						
\$69,000 - \$69,999			1	2	2		1					

(Table continues)

Table I-27 (cont.)

Amounts	Dean & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers	
	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY
\$53,000 - \$53,999				2		5	4	1				
\$52,000 - \$52,999		1	1	2		9	1	2			1	
\$68,000 - \$68,999	1	1	1	3		2			1			
\$67,000 - \$67,999	1	1		2	2							
\$66,000 - \$66,999		1	1	4	1	2						
\$65,000 - \$65,999		1	2	9	1		1					1
\$64,000 - \$64,999			1	3	1	3			1			
\$63,000 - \$63,999				4	2	2						
\$62,000 - \$62,999	1			4	2	1						
\$61,000 - \$61,999	1	1	2	1	2	2	1					
\$60,000 - \$60,999	1		1	4	2	4			1			
\$59,000 - \$59,999				4	2	3	1	2				
\$58,000 - \$58,999				2	3	5		1				
\$57,000 - \$57,999				5		3	1	2			1	
\$56,000 - \$56,999				4		10		1			1	
\$55,000 - \$55,999				4	1	2		1				1
\$54,000 - \$54,999				2		3	1	1				
\$51,000 - \$51,999				1	1	4	1	1				
\$50,000 - \$50,999				2		6	2				1	
\$49,000 - \$49,999				3		5	2	1				
\$48,000 - \$48,999		1		1	1	12	1	1				
\$47,000 - \$47,999						6		2				
\$46,000 - \$46,999				1		11	1	1				
\$45,000 - \$45,999	1					10	2	13			2	
\$44,000 - \$44,999			1			9	1	6				

(Table continues)

Table I-27 (cont.)

Amounts	Dean & Directors		Professors		Associate Profs.		Assistant Profs.		Instructors		Lecturers	
	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY	FY	AY
\$43,000 - \$43,999						8	1	4				1
\$42,000 - \$42,999				1		3		4		1		
\$41,000 - \$41,999						3	1	10				
\$40,000 - \$40,999						5		17	1			2
\$39,000 - \$39,999						4		14		1		
\$38,000 - \$38,999						3		21				1
\$37,000 - \$37,999						1		9		1		
\$36,000 - \$36,999						1		8		2		1
\$35,000 - \$35,999						1		8		4		
\$34,000 - \$34,999								1	2			
\$33,000 - \$33,999												2
\$32,000 - \$32,999									1			
\$31,000 - \$31,999												
\$30,000 - \$30,999									1			1
\$29,000 - \$29,999												
\$28,000 - \$28,999												1
\$27,000 - \$27,999								1				
\$26,000 - \$26,999									2			
\$25,000 - \$25,999									1			
\$24,000 - \$24,999						1						
\$13,000 - \$13,999												2

## PART II

This is the eighteenth year that the survey of library and information science faculty has included data provided in response to the general questionnaire distributed by the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE). Data reported in Part II have been obtained from this questionnaire. Data reported in Part I of this report have been presented with the understanding that the writer would not link specific data with any single school. However, schools that respond to the ALISE questionnaire, leading to the information reported in Part II do so with the understanding that they will be identified with the information that they submit.

In past years, it is usual that fewer schools have responded to the ALISE general questionnaire than to the confidential faculty salary survey that is sent separately. This year is at variance with that pattern. A total of 56 of the 56 schools (California - Berkeley not included) responded and are identified among the ALA schools in tables in Part II.

The section that reports on non-ALA schools will be included even though there were only two responding school: Kutztown and Sam Houston. The ALA schools are identified in Table I-42, so they will not be repeated here.

It is important to note that the data reported in Part II cover 1995-96, the year previous to the salary data reported in Part I (1996-97). This means that frequently the data will not be in agreement for a given school for the two time periods. However, the data are taken from the forms as reported by the schools.

The analysis that follows reports the responses to the questions as asked on the ALISE general questionnaire. In those instances where data were not reported by a school, the notation "not reported" is indicated. However, unless the school specifically stated on its questionnaire that there are no data to report, the absence of data is of course ambiguous. It could mean that there are no data to report for the question or it could mean that the school did not respond to the question.

### **Academic Calendar and Full-Time Faculty**

The first question in the faculty section of the ALISE questionnaire asks schools to indicate the type of calendar in use (i.e., semester, quarter, trimester, etc.) These responses are reported in Tables I-41. (Type of academic year is also provided in summary form in Table III-1.) Because of the differences in calendars, only fall term faculty data have comparative value, since this is the only term that all schools have in common regardless of type of calendar. An example will illustrate this. Some schools call it the spring term or semester; others call it winter term. Also, it appears that some schools that have two summer sessions have labeled one as spring and the other as summer.

The second question asked the schools to indicate the number of full-time faculty for the previous academic year. The answers to the second question have also been included in Tables I-41. The full-time faculty data reported here are for the academic year prior to that reported in Part I. In the following table, 56 ALA schools reported a total of 602 faculty members for the fall 1995 semester for an average of 10.75 per school. The total reported for 1994-95 with 53 schools reporting was 591 for an average of 11.2 per school. These figures do not include the 43 vacant positions reported for the same time period.

Faculty

**Table I-41  
Full-Time Faculty in 56 ALA Schools, 1995-96**

School	Academic Calendar	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
Alabama	Semester	12		12	3
Albany	Semester	11		11	
Alberta	Semester	7	6	6	5
Arizona	Semester	4		4	
British Columbia	Semester	11	11	11	11
Buffalo	Semester	11		11	3
California – Berkeley	-----				
California – Los Angeles	Quarter	12	12	12	1
Catholic	Semester	9		9	5
Clarion	Semester	7		7	6
Clark Atlanta	Semester	7		7	7
Dalhousie	Semester	4		4	
Drexel	Quarter	11	11	11	11
Emporia	Semester	11		10	9
Florida State	Semester	11		10	8
Hawaii	Semester	7.5	7.5	6.5	5.5
Illinois	Semester	14		13	4
Indiana	Semester	23		22	16
Iowa	Semester	6		5	3
Kent State	Semester	11		12	11
Kentucky	Semester	10		10	10
Long Island	Trimester	9		9	9
Louisiana State	Semester	10		9	7
Maryland	Semester	12		12	8
McGill	Semester	8	8		
Michigan	Semester	16	16	16	16
Missouri	Semester	6	7		4
Montréal	Semester	12	12		
North Carolina Central	Semester	9		9	3
North Carolina - Chapel Hill	Semester	16		15	4
North Carolina - Greensboro	Semester	5		4	4
North Texas	Semester	12		13	11
Oklahoma	Semester	10		10	5
Pittsburgh (LS)	Trimester	17		17	5
(IS)		13		12	9
Pratt	Semester	7		9	9

(Table continues)

Table I-41 (cont.)

School	Academic Calendar	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
Puerto Rico	Semester	9		6	3
Queens	Semester	5		5	2
Rhode Island	Semester	6		6	4
Rosary	Semester	8		7	4
Rutgers	Semester	15		15	
St. John's	Semester	6		6	2
San Jose	Semester	14.5		15.5	4.5
Simmons	Semester	11		13	8
South Carolina	Semester	11		11	9
South Florida	Semester	7	7	7	4
Southern Connecticut	Semester	10		10	5
Southern Mississippi	Semester	6		6	
Syracuse	Semester	19		19	
Tennessee	Semester	14		13	5
Texas	Semester	18		18	10
Texas Woman's	Semester	10		10	10
Toronto	Semester	13		13	
Washington	Quarter	10	10	10	5
Wayne State	Semester	12	12	5	4
Western Ontario	Trimester	16	16	16	
Wisconsin – Madison	Semester	10		10	10
Wisconsin – Milwaukee	Semester	10		10	1

**Table I-42**  
**Full-Time Faculty in 2 Non-ALA Schools, 1995-96**

School	Academic Calendar	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
Kutztown	Semester	3	3	3	3
Sam Houston	Semester	5		5	5

Adjunct, clinical, or other than full-time "regular" faculty are playing increasingly important roles in the teaching effort of the schools. The information reported in Table I-43 indicates that 493.5 persons taught courses during the fall 1995 term in 55 of the 56 schools. This represents an estimated FTE of 158, bringing the total faculty force to approximately 759.8 (1,096 persons). It is also interesting to note that in terms of individuals (not FTE), part-time faculty make up about 45 percent of the total.

Faculty

**Table I-43  
Part-Time Faculty in 56 ALA Schools, 1995-96**

School	Fall		Winter		Spring		Summer	
	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE
Alabama	5	1.40			7	1.60	14	8.00
Albany	7	1.40			13	3.00	12	6.50
Alberta	4	1.60	6	2.40	2	1.00	3	1.30
Arizona	3	0.75			2	0.50		
British Columbia	4	1.30	3	0.60	3	0.60	2	0.20
Buffalo	5	1.25			4	1.00	3	1.50
California – Berkeley	-----							
California – Los Angeles	2	12.20	1	0.11	9	0.99	1	0.11
Catholic	24	4.80			4	4.20	17	3.40
Clarion	1	0.33						
Clark Atlanta	2	0.66			2	0.66	1	0.33
Dalhousie	6				3			
Drexel	23	2.21	28	2.58	25	2.58	24	1.75
Emporia	14	5.74			17	7.00	18	6.62
Florida State	5	1.25			7	1.75	8	2.00
Hawaii	3	1.00			5	1.60	6	2.00
Illinois	15	7.50			14	7.00	9	6.00
Indiana	24	2.50			29	12.50	28	12.5
Iowa	2	1.25			5	3.25	4	2.00
Kent State	5	1.25			7	2.00	7	3.50
Kentucky	13	1.63			14	1.75	17	2.13
Long Island	11	2.75			13	3.25	24	5.50
Louisiana State					1	0.25	1	0.25
Maryland	6	1.20			11	2.20	6	0.60
McGill	5	1.25	4	1.00				
Michigan	12	3.25	13	3.65	4	2.00	3	2.00
Missouri	7	1.75	5	1.25			8	4.83
Montréal	14	3.50	13	3.25				
NC Central	3	1.00			4	1.00	4	2.50
NC Chapel Hill	8	2.00			14	3.50	6	1.50
NC Greensboro	10	3.22			15	4.50	8	2.13
North Texas	14	3.50			16	4.00	10	5.00
Oklahoma	6	1.20			3	0.40	4	1.00
Pittsburgh (LS)	2	1.00			6	3.00	10	5.00
(IS)	9	4.50			3	1.20	3	1.20
Pratt	15	2.50			12	2.00	8	1.33

(Table continues)

Table I-43 (cont.)

School	Fall		Winter		Spring		Summer	
	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE
Puerto Rico	6	0.50			3	0.25	2	0.17
Queens	7	2.30			13	4.30	5	2.50
Rhode Island	7	11.00			10	16.00	5	8.00
Rosary	29.5	11.50	22	7.50	5	2.50	25	8.50
Rutgers	11	1.38			17	2.13	10	1.25
St. John's	10	3.33			9	3.00	2	1.00
San Jose	30	6.00			30	6.00	16	3.20
Simmons	9	3.00			10	3.30	13	4.30
South Carolina	2	1.00			3	1.50	2	1.00
South Florida	8	2.70	10	3.30	12	4.00	11	3.70
Southern Connecticut					1	0.33	1	0.33
Southern Mississippi	1	0.33			2	0.67	3	1.33
Syracuse	15	3.00			11	2.20		
Tennessee	7	1.60			7	1.40	2	0.60
Texas	9	4.50			10	5.00	10	5.00
Texas Woman's	8	3.00			8	3.30	12	4.67
Toronto	12	3.00			8	2.00	2	0.50
Washington	3	1.00	3	1.00	3	1.00	3	1.50
Wayne State	15	3.00	8	2.67	2	0.67	3	1.00
Western Ontario	6	2.00	4	1.33	6	2.00		
Wisconsin - Madison	4	1.40			3	1.10		
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	10	4.90			16	4.70	14	5.40

**Table I-44**  
**Part-Time Faculty in 2 Non-ALA Schools, 1995-96**

School	Fall		Winter		Spring		Summer	
	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE	No.	FTE
Kutztown	0		0		0		0	
Sam Houston	3	0.33			4	0.33	5	0.50

### **Salary Improvement**

The fourth question on the faculty section of the ALISE questionnaire asks for the average percentage of salary improvement for full-time faculty in 1995-96. This was followed by the fifth question, which asked the basis on which improvements in faculty salaries were made. The responses to these questions have been tabulated in Tables I-45 and I-46 respectively.

## Faculty

Among the ALA schools that provided data on the percentage of salary improvement, one school reported salary decrease for the second year (across the board cut of 1.9 percent). One of the 7 schools reporting zero increases has done so for the second year in a row. The improvement ranged from a low of .75 percent to a high of 8.85 percent, with an average of 3.4 percent for the 46 schools reporting an increase. Thirteen schools reported increases of less than 3 percent. Sixteen schools reported 3 percent and 15 reporting in the 4 to 6 percent range. Two schools reported 7-8 percent increases.

**Table I-45**  
**Average Percentage of and Basis for Salary Improvement for**  
**Full-Time Faculty in ALA Schools in 1995-96**

School	Percent of Improvement	Basis for Improvement
Alabama	0.00	
Albany	1.00	Merit
Alberta	6.00	Merit
Arizona	2.00	Merit
British Columbia	3.18	Merit, across the board, career progress
Buffalo	1.00	Merit, to achieve equity
California – Berkeley	-----	
California – Los Angeles	5.00	Cost-of-living
Catholic	3.00	Merit
Clarion	6.00	Union contract
Clark Atlanta	0.00	
Dalhousie	1.00	Merit
Drexel	2.70	Merit
Emporia	3.34	Merit, to achieve equity
Florida State	2.70	Union contract , across the board, discretionary
Hawaii	0.00	
Illinois	3.00	Merit, to achieve equity
Indiana	3.92	Merit, cost-of-living
Iowa	3.10	Merit, to achieve equity
Kent State	4.54	Union contract, Merit
Kentucky	3.00	Merit, cost-of-living
Long Island	5.00	Union contract
Louisiana State	3.00	Merit, cost-of-living, to achieve equality
Maryland	2.57	Cost-of-living, retention
McGill	1.00	Merit North Carolina
Michigan	4.41	Merit, to achieve equity, promotion
Missouri	5.50	Merit
Montréal	0.00	Union contract
North Carolina Central	2.50	Merit

(Table continues)

Table I-45 (cont.)

School	Percent of Improvement	Basis for Improvement
North Carolina - Chapel Hill	2.00	Merit, to achieve equity
North Carolina - Greensboro	5.00	Merit, to achieve equity, teaching effectiveness
North Texas	8.85	Merit, to achieve equity
Oklahoma	2.00	Across the board, promotion
Pittsburgh	0.00	
Pratt	3.50	Union contract
Puerto Rico	6.00	Across the board
Queens	4.00	Union contract
Rhode Island	3.00	Union contract
Rosary	5.80	Across the board
Rutgers	0.00	
St. John's	6.16	Union contract, merit, across the board
San Jose	2.30	Merit, across the board
Simmons	2.00	Merit, across the board
South Carolina	3.50	Merit, to achieve equity
South Florida	3.00	Union contract, merit, across the board, to achieve equity, outstanding teacher
Southern Connecticut	5.50	Union contract
Southern Mississippi	2.00	Merit, to achieve equity
Syracuse	2.70	Merit, to achieve equity, tenure/promotion
Tennessee	0.00	
Texas	3.00	Merit
Texas Woman's	3.00	Merit
Toronto	0.00	
Washington	4.00	Merit, cost-of-living, to achieve equity
Wayne State	2.97	Union contract, merit, across the board, to achieve equity, cost-of-living
Western Ontario	-1.90	Reduction
Wisconsin - Madison	0.75	Merit
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	1.20	Merit, to achieve equity

Of the non-ALA schools, Kutztown reported an increase of 5 percent and Sam Houston, an increase of 1.0 percent.

### **Faculty Replacements**

The reports of previous years note that it is common to replace senior faculty members who retire, resign, or die, with individuals at lower ranks than had been held by those being replaced. This

## Faculty

practice has been followed for many years, but as funding becomes more limited, and other reasons there is strong motivation for its continuation. Question 6 on the questionnaire was designed to provide specific data to demonstrate whether or not this has happened. Table I-47 reports the results of Question 6 which asks how many full-time faculty replacements (resulting from resignations, retirements, etc.) were made during 1995-96. Schools were also asked to indicate the rank of the individual(s) who was/were replaced and the rank of the replacement(s). In 1995-96 a total of 37 faculty replacements were made in 24 schools of which 19 were at a lower rank; 13 at the same rank; and 3 at a higher rank; and one was not designated.

**Table I-47**  
**Faculty Replacement Appointments Made**  
**Among ALA Schools in 1995-96**

School	Replacement Data
Alabama	One associate replaced by one assistant
Catholic	One assistant replaced one assistant; one associate replace by an assistant
Drexel	Two assistants replaced by one assistant and one lecturer
Emporia	One assistant replaced by one assistant; one professor replaced by one associate, one professor replaced by one assistant
Hawaii	One professor replaced by one assistant
Illinois	One professor replaced by one associate; one associate replaced by one lecturer; one assistant replaced by one assistant
Indiana	One professor replaced by one professor; one assistant replaced by one lecturer
Kent State	One professor replaced by one professor
Long Island	One associate replaced by one assistant
Louisiana State	One professor and one associate replaced by two assistants
Michigan	One assistant replaced by one associate; one professor replaced by one professor
Missouri	One professor replaced by one associate
North Texas	One professor replaced by one associate; two assistants replaced by two assistants
Puerto Rico	One professor replaced by one associate; one transfer
St. John's	One professor replaced by one associate
San Jose	One assistant replaced by one professor
South Florida	One instructor replaced by one assistant
Southern Connecticut	One assistant replaced by one assistant
Southern Mississippi	One associate replaced by one assistant
Syracuse	One assistant replaced by one assistant
Tennessee	One associate replaced by one assistant
Texas Woman's	One assistant replaced by one lecturer
Toronto	One professor replaced by one assistant
Wayne State	One associate replaced by one lecturer

### Unfilled Faculty Positions

The seventh question on the questionnaire asks schools to indicate if there were unfilled, full-time positions, for which funding was available, during 1995-96. Schools were also asked to indicate the rank and the reason the position was not filled during 1995-96. The intent of this question is to identify the total number of full-time unfilled faculty positions in the schools. If funds were used on a temporary basis for other purposes such as employment of part-time persons, but with the budget line remaining open, this was interpreted to be an unfilled faculty position.

In Table I-47-a, 43 unfilled full-time faculty positions are reported for 25 ALA schools for 1995-96. The explanations for these vacancies have been given from the data reported by the schools to indicate the reasons the positions are vacant. Last year's report indicated that there were 30.5 vacancies despite the availability of funding for the positions. The previous year there were 21 vacancies. Data suggest a leveling in the number of unfilled positions. The explanations provided by the schools indicate that slightly more unfilled openings are, as in the past, at the rank of assistant professor. However, a wide distribution of vacancies among the ranks was reported: assistant (13), associate (4), professor (12) and undesignated (14). Also, as in the past, the reasons for unfilled positions vary. However, the majority of the schools reporting unfilled positions indicate a somewhat even distribution among three reasons: budget constraints, including freezes or lack of sufficient salaries to adequately fund positions; lack of success in getting appropriate candidates; or that searches were in progress or completed. A few schools chose to use vacant position salaries for alternative uses. Finally, in a few schools, unrelated, local conditions may be reflected.

Of the 2 reporting non-ALA schools no vacancies were reported.

**Table I-47-a**  
**Unfilled, Funded, Full-Time Faculty Positions**  
**Among ALA Schools in 1995-96**

School	Number	Reasons Position was not Filled
Alabama	1	Professor – Resignation
Alberta	1	Associate – disability – replace in 1996-97
California - Los Angeles	1	Undesignated rank – Search in 1996-97
Clark Atlanta	2	Undesignated ranks – Search not authorized
Dalhousie	1	Associate – Retirement “buy-out” not filled for another year
Drexel	4	Professor - Unable to find qualified candidates Associate – Unable to find qualified candidates
Emporia	2	Undesignated rank – Resigned or retired late in year
Florida State	3.5	Professor - To be replaced in 1996-97 Professor - To be replaced in 1996-97 Professor - Frozen in 1995-96 Assistant - To be replaced in 1996-97
Hawaii	2	Professor - Hiring freeze Associate - Hiring freeze
Long Island	2	Undesignated ranks – unsuccessful searches

(Table continues)

Table I-47-a (cont.)

School	Number	Reasons Position was not Filled
Louisiana State	1	Professor - Left in mid-year and filled in 1996-97
Maryland	1	Undesignated rank – Search in progress to be filled in 1996-97
Missouri	2.5	Assistant - Recruitment underway Assistant - Recruitment pending approval
Montréal	1	Professor - Budget constraints
North Carolina Central	2	Assistant - Unfilled by choice Professor - To be replace in 1996-97
North Carolina - Greensboro	3	Professor - Mid-year retirement Assistant - Search during 1995-96 Assistant - On disability leave
North Texas	2	Professor - Not filled pending new Dean Assistant - Not filled pending new Dean
Pittsburgh	1	-----
Pratt	1	Assistant/Associate - Search complete
Puerto Rico	2	Assistant - Unfilled to hire visiting Assistant - Unfilled to hire part-time
Rosary	2	Undesignated ranks - Search in progress
South Carolina	2	Undesignated ranks - Search in progress
Syracuse	1	Assistant - New position
Texas	1	Professor - Not fully funded
Western Ontario	1	Assistant – Unsuccessful search

Of the non-ALA schools, Sam Houston reported 2 vacant assistant professorships that were unfilled due to unsuccessful searches.

### **Positions Lost**

Question 7 on the questionnaire seeks to identify full-time faculty positions that were temporarily unfilled in 1995-1996, but for which funding has been available. However, Question 8 asks the schools to indicate whether faculty positions had actually been lost in 1995-96. This includes those instances where replacements could not be appointed either because faculty positions assigned to the school by the parent institution had been reduced in number or because limitations of the school's budget simply required that the number of full-time faculty be reduced. Three schools reported a loss of 2.5 positions.

This year's number is down from the level of last year. It also is a sharp drop from the 17 schools that reported a loss of 21 faculty positions in 1982-83. It is also down from 1983-84 when 8 schools reported a loss of 7.5 positions. Thus the trend apparent in previous years has slowed. While a number of schools cannot hire new faculty due to budget constraints fewer have actually lost the faculty line, than had been the case in recent years.

**Table I-47-b**  
**Full-Time Faculty Positions Lost in 1995-96 Among ALA Schools**

Schools	Positions Lost
Alabama	One undesignated rank – While not technically lost, so under-funded, considered lost
Albany	One professor
Alberta	One professor
Clarion	One associate
Kent State	One professor
Maryland	One assistant
Queens	One associate
Rhode Island	One associate One professor
St. John's	One assistant
Wisconsin - Madison	One professor

### New Faculty Positions

Question 9 on the questionnaire asks schools whether additional (new) faculty positions, with new funding, had been created in the schools in 1995-96. As shown in Table I-47-c, ten schools reported a total of 12 new positions, one more than were lost by the 11 schools noted in the previous table. Last year 9 schools reported 12.5 new positions and the previous year nine schools reported 13 new positions. Thus, 1995-96 new positions is similar in number to those of the previous few years.

**Table I-47-c**  
**New Full-Time Faculty Positions Created and Funded in 1995-96**  
**Among ALA Schools**

Schools	Positions Created and Funded
Buffalo	One undesignated rank
Drexel	Two undesignated rank
Florida State	One undesignated rank
Indiana	One undesignated rank
Michigan	Member and rank undesignated
Oklahoma	One temporary visiting assistant
Pratt	Two undesignated rank
Syracuse	One undesignated rank
Tennessee	One undesignated rank
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	One assistant

### Benefits

Schools were asked to report the value of their institution's fringe benefits for faculty in terms of salary percentage, i.e., the worth of the contributions of the institution to benefits such as retirement, health insurance, etc., beyond the actual salaries paid. This percentage is often required in making grant

Faculty

proposals that will include faculty salaries, and it is often taken into account by applicants for faculty appointments as they compute the total compensation that an offer includes. Schools reported an average percentage of approximately 25.3 percent (range of 16 to 47) for 1995-96. A few schools show variation in the percentage over the last five years. During 1995-96, 12 schools reported an increase over 1994-95, and nine schools reported a decrease for the same period. It continues to be apparent that some of the wide disparity in these percentages, as reported by the deans and directors results from differing methods of computing this percentage.

**Table I-48**  
**Percentage Value in Relationship to Faculty Salaries of Benefits**  
**Among ALA Schools, 1991-92 To 1995-96**

School	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
Alabama	29.00	29.00	29.00	30.33	30.33
Albany	28.96	28.61	30.50	27.41	28.08
Alberta	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Arizona	18.90	19.70	18.70	17.40	18.90
British Columbia	13.00	13.00	17-25	16-20	16-20
Buffalo	29.50	30.00	31.00	31.00	31.00
California - Berkeley	19.00	19.00	18.50	-----	-----
California - Los Angeles	-----	18.50	-----	19.00	17.00
Catholic	18.38	19.00	19.00	19.00	19.00
Clarion	33.00	27.00	27.00	20.00	36.00
Clark Atlanta	26.29	7.40	26.41	26.41	26.41
Dalhousie	10.00	10.00	10.10	-----	10.10
Drexel	21.30	25.00	26.00	26.00	26.00
Emporia	18.75 + 350.00	19.18 + Medical	20.00 + Medical	21.00 + Medical	26.91 + Medical
Florida State	24.94	25.70 + Medical	25.61 + Medical	25.40 + Medical	25.61
Hawaii	28.32	32.00	32.00	32.00	30.00
Illinois	20.94	21.67	25.05	22.89	22.09
Indiana	32.00	33.00	33.00	33.00	33.00
Iowa	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00
Kent State	28.00	26.50	23.00	28.00	28.00
Kentucky	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
Long Island		31.20	31.20	31.20	32.60
Louisiana State	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.50
Maryland	46.00	45.80	45.80	46.00	47.32
McGill	19.50	19.50	19.50	19.50	19.50
Michigan	22.00	22.00	22.00	25.00	25.00

(Table continues)

Table I-48 (cont.)

School	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
Missouri	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Montréal	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00	23.00
NC Central	25.00	25.00	25.00	28.00	28.00
NC Chapel Hill	19.00	19.00	19.00	19.00	19.00
NC Greensboro	19.39	19.39	19.39	28.00	28.00
North Texas	23.00 + \$1800 Medical	23.00 + Medical	23.00 + Medical	23.00 + Medical	23.00 + Medical
Oklahoma	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	25.00
Pittsburgh	32.00	34.50	33.00	35.00	31.60
Pratt	28.50	28.50	32.20	32.20	33.52
Puerto Rico	-----	14.00 + Health	21.65 + Medical	23.20 + Medical	23.20 + Medical
Queens	25.00	25.00	25.00	-----	25.00
Rhode Island	26.60	26.60	20.30	-----	22.00
Rosary	20.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	20.00
Rutgers	29.00	29.00	32.00	29.00	29.00
St. John's	25.00	25.00	25.00	30.00	30.00
San Jose	27.00	33.00	33.00	33.00	30.00
Simmons	24.35	24.35	24.35	32.00	24.00
South Carolina	23.00	23.00	18.15	18.15	18.10
South Florida	28.00	-----	18.00	18.00	28.80
Southern Connecticut	45.56	28.27	40.00	39.25	40.01
Southern Mississippi	27.00	23.00	22.00	22.00	-----
Syracuse	33.00	33.00	36.00	36.10	35.20
Tennessee	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00
Texas	26.70	26.70	26.70	27.00	27.00
Texas Woman's	21.00	21.00	21.00	25.00	25.00
Toronto	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00
Washington	21.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
Wayne State	21.50	21.50	22.40	23.50	23.20
Western Ontario	20.00	20.90	23.50	23.50	23.50
Wisconsin - Madison	26.00	31.00	31.00	30.50	31.40
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	26.80	28.00	-----	30.00	31.10

### Professional Travel

Questions 11 and 12 of the questionnaire pertain to funding for professional travel. Question 11 asks for the number of faculty, including the dean or director, who received travel funds in 1995-96. Question 12 asks for the total amount of funding for professional travel used by the school's faculty in

Faculty

1995-96, exclusive of travel to teach in extension, workshops, etc. It was noted in this question that dollars spent by the institution on professional travel should be included regardless of whether or not they were actually included in the school's budget.

It is apparent from Table I-49 that the amount of funding for faculty travel continues to vary greatly among schools. The differences have been noted since the survey began, and in most instances, the relationship of travel budgets of individual schools to each other has changed very little. For 1995-96, the range among the 53 ALA schools that have travel funds, was from a low of \$0 to a high of \$120,057 (median: \$9,653). For individual faculty members who received travel funds, the average varied from a reported low of \$150 to a high of \$6,029 (median: \$1,114). For the same period a total of 480 faculty members were reported as having received travel funds. They shared a total of \$ 845,054 in travel money amounting to an average of \$1,761 per person. The average per school for the 53 reporting amounts for individuals was \$15,944 in 1995-96 as compared with \$15,810 per school in 1994-95. It is difficult to know if these figures are meaningful since schools are not consistent as to whether or not data on such expenditures as recruitment, accreditation visits or visiting faculty have been excluded. The questionnaire asks that these data not be included when reporting travel for faculty, but it is likely that expenditures for these purposes may have been reported along with faculty travel. It would appear, however, from these data that expenditures for travel continue to increase slightly after a period of decrease.

**Table I-49  
Support for Faculty Travel in 1995-96 for ALA Schools**

School	No. of Faculty (Include Exec. Off.) Received Travel Funding	Average Amount Received/Participating Faculty Member	Total Amount Funding Provided for Faculty Travel
Alabama	11	\$1,648	\$18,130
Albany	4	\$1,277	\$5,108
Alberta	7	\$725	\$5,080
Arizona	2	\$290	\$580
British Columbia	6	\$5,271	\$31,628
Buffalo	6	\$1,373	\$8,235
California - Berkeley	----	----	----
California - Los Angeles	0	\$0	\$0
Catholic	9	\$550	\$5,000
Clarion	9	\$936	* \$5,616
Clark Atlanta	4	\$939	\$3,755
Dalhousie	4	\$1,741	\$5,224
Drexel	5	\$5,140	\$25,700
Emporia	11	\$1,727	\$18,922
Florida State	10	\$965	\$9,653
Hawaii	0	\$0	\$0
Illinois	15	\$719	\$10,790

(Table continues)

Table I-49 (cont.)

School	No. of Faculty (Include Exec. Off.) Received Travel Funding	Average Amount Received/Participating Faculty Member	Total Amount Funding Provided for Faculty Travel
Indiana	24	\$1,000	* \$20,000
Iowa	4	\$150	* \$863
Kent State	10	\$759	\$7,595
Kentucky	8	\$1,750	\$12,000
Long Island	20	\$1,049	\$10,490
Louisiana State	10	\$762	\$7,622
Maryland	11	\$1,500	* \$21,495
McGill	4	\$1,636	\$6,543
Michigan	16	\$6,029	* \$120,571
Missouri	7	\$2,000	\$13,998
Montréal	6	\$1,270	\$7,618
North Carolina Central	6	\$2,044	\$12,262
North Carolina - Chapel Hill	18	\$1,525	\$24,401
North Carolina- Greensboro	5	\$500	\$2,500
North Texas	13	\$2,546	\$33,099
Oklahoma	10	\$2,653	\$26,528
Pittsburgh	33	\$2,719	\$89,740
Pratt	8	\$1,950	* \$17,553
Puerto Rico	6	\$1,543	\$9,261
Queens	3	\$300	\$950
Rhode Island	2	\$1,114	\$2,227
Rosary	7	\$1,206	* \$8,065
Rutgers	2	\$500	\$1,000
St. John's	5	\$821	\$4,103
San Jose	7	\$1,341	\$9,416
Simmons	11	\$450	* \$12,808
South Carolina	11	\$1,882	* \$20,703
South Florida	0	\$0	\$0
Southern Connecticut	11	\$898	* \$11,979
Southern Mississippi	----	\$1,277	\$6,384
Syracuse	18	\$2,361	\$42,500
Tennessee	14	\$1,958	\$27,412
Texas	19	\$1,903	\$36,157
Texas Woman's	8	\$1,625	\$14,630
Toronto	7	\$292	\$2,332

(Table continues)

Faculty

**Table I-49 (cont.)**

School	No. of Faculty (Include Exec. Off.) Received Travel Funding	Average Amount Received/Participating Faculty Member	Total Amount Funding Provided for Faculty Travel
Washington	7	\$1,355	\$11,401
Wayne State	11	\$1,254	\$14,908
Western Ontario	10	\$545	* \$6,970
Wisconsin - Madison	8	\$810	\$6,477
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	8	\$500	* \$6,000

\* Unexpended funds or possible error in calculation, or reporting .

Of the non - ALA schools, Kutztown reported 3 faculty receiving \$200 each. Sam Houston reported 5 faculty receiving \$500 each, but a budgeted amount for travel of \$7,500.

**Sabbatical Leave**

The 13th question on the faculty section of the questionnaire pertains to sabbatical leaves for faculty. A total of 28 schools granted funds for sabbatical or study leaves during 1995-96, compared to 26 in 1994-95. Details are provided in Table I-51 below. Four schools (Tennessee, Texas, Texas Woman's, and Washington) indicated that no such leaves are granted at their institutions.

**Table I-51  
ALA Schools Where Faculty Received Sabbatical or Study Leaves During 1995-96**

Schools	No. of Faculty	Length of Leave	Percent of Salary
Alabama	1	one semester	100
Albany	2	year	50
British Columbia	1	six months	75
California - Los Angeles	1	one year	0
Catholic	1	one semester	100
Dalhousie	1	six months	90
Illinois	1	one semester	100
Indiana	2	one year	50
Kent State	2	one semester	100
Kentucky	2	one semester	100
Louisiana State	1	one semester	100
Maryland	1	one year	100
McGill	1	one year	100

(Table continues)

Table I-51 (cont.)

Schools	No. of Faculty	Length of Leave	Percent of Salary
Michigan	2	one semester	100
Montréal	2	six months one year	90 90
North Carolina Central	1	one year	100
North Carolina - Chapel Hill	1	one year	100
North Texas	1	one semester	100
Pittsburgh	2	six months one year	100 100
Rutgers	1	one semester	100
St. John's	1	two semesters	50
Simmons	2	one year	50
Southern Connecticut	1	one semester	100
Southern Mississippi	1	one semester	100
Syracuse	2	one year one semester	50 100
Toronto	4	one year one year six months six months	100 82.5 82.5 82.5
Western Ontario	1	one year	82.5
Wisconsin - Madison	1	one semester	100

## Support Staff

The final question in the faculty section of the ALISE questionnaire pertains to the support staff available for the schools. The question was designed to separate part-time student employees of the school from regular, non-student support staff. Under each of these categories, the same group of subdivisions was given: (a) Administrative support; (b) Instructional support; (c) Research support; (d) Media services; (e) Library personnel; (f) Computer lab; (g) Other. The following definitions were provided for each subdivision:

- (a) Administrative Support — Secretarial and other assistance provided the dean, assistant dean, etc. in the administration of the school.
- (b) Instructional Support — Clerical and other assistance provided faculty members in their course preparation and classroom teaching.
- (c) Research Support — Secretarial and other support provided the faculty in their research activity.
- (d) Media Services — Assistance provided by media technicians, graphic artists, and others in the production and use of non-print media.

## Faculty

(e) Librarian Personnel — Librarians and library assistants who serve in the library science library, whether their salaries are paid from the library school's budget or from that of the central library.

(f) Computer Lab — Those persons who work in a computer laboratory operated by the school.

(g) Other — Any support staff beyond those listed above.

If a full-time person divides his/her time between two or more of the above categories, that individual appears in appropriate part-time categories.

Where obvious misinterpretations have been made by the schools, the liberty of making slight adjustments in the data supplied by them has been made. These have all involved moving fractions of staff time listed as full-time personnel where it seemed obvious that they were intended as FTE of part-time staff.

As shown in Table I-52, the total FTE of support staff (exclusive of students) as reported by the ALA schools, varied from a low of 1.0 to a high of 31.95 (median: 5.0). Because of the possible variation in the interpretation of the reporting of library staff and the varying types of support staff included under "other", meaningful comparison of the total FTE support staff among the schools is not possible. However, it is possible to compare data from some of the categories as shown in the table. An analysis of the data shows the following distribution of percentages for all schools reporting.

Administrative Support	50.7 percent (195.02 Staff)
Instructional Support	11.8 percent (45.6 Staff)
Research Support	8.6 percent (32.995 Staff)
Media Support	2.0 percent (7.83 Staff)
Library Personnel	11.9 percent (45.9 Staff)
Computer Lab Personnel	9.5 percent (36.48 Staff)
Other	5.4 percent (20.8 Staff)

"Other" includes professional development (3 schools); marketing/public relations (4 schools); placement (3 schools); conservation/preservation labs (2 schools); and publications, program coordinators, information technology coordinator, advising, and distance education (1 school each respectively).

Table I-54 provides similar information about part-time student support staff.

**Table I-52  
Support Staff Among ALA Schools, 1995-96**

Schools	Administrative		Instructional		Research		Media		Library		Comp Lab		Other		TOTAL
	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	
Alabama	1	1.0	1	0.3		0.2					1			0.5	<b>5.0</b>
Albany	1	1.2													<b>2.2</b>
Alberta	2	1.0													<b>3.0</b>
Arizona	3														<b>3.0</b>
British Columbia.	3		0.1								0.4			0.25	<b>3.75</b>
Buffalo	1	0.8										0.5			<b>2.3</b>
Cal. Berkeley															
Cal. LA	2		0.5						1.5						<b>4.0</b>
Catholic	3	0.5													<b>3.5</b>
Clarion	1	0.4	1												<b>2.4</b>
Clark Atlanta	2		1												<b>4.0</b>
Dalhousie	2	1.5		0.75	1							0.25			<b>5.5</b>
Drexel	9		1	0.5	3		1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5			<b>18.0</b>
Emporia	4		2				1								<b>7.0</b>
Florida State	3		1					0.5	2			0.5			<b>7.0</b>
Hawaii	2	2.0	1	1.0							.5	0.5			<b>7.0</b>
Illinois	5		1	0.5	6.67							1	8		<b>22.17</b>
Indiana	7								1		2				<b>10.0</b>
Iowa	1			0.5											<b>1.5</b>
Kent State	1	2.75		4.125		0.625									<b>8.5</b>
Kentucky	2.5		0.25		0.25						1				<b>4.0</b>
Long Island	4	0.5	1									0.7			<b>6.2</b>
Louisiana State	3								2		1				<b>6.0</b>
Maryland	2.5		0.5						1		1				<b>5.0</b>

(Table continues)

Table I-52 (cont.)

Schools	Administrative		Instructional		Research		Media		Library		Comp Lab		Other		TOTAL
	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	
McGill	2										1				3.0
Michigan	8	0.5	1		15	1.75	1				3	0.2	1	0.5	31.95
Missouri	2	1.75		1.0											4.75
Montréal	4		2						0.3		1				10.0
NC Central	1		1						3						5.0
NC Chapel Hill	4			0.75					2		1		1	0.75	9.5
NC Greensboro	1														1.0
North Texas	2	0.5	1								1			0.7	5.2
Oklahoma	3														3.0
Pittsburgh	12	1.4	7	0.3		0.5			4		4				29.2
Pratt	2														2.0
Puerto Rico	3		1						4						8.0
Queens	1														1.0
Rhode Island	1														1.0
Rosary	2	2.0													4.0
Rutgers	1	1.0						0.33			0.33		3		5.66
St. John's	2			0.5		0.5									3.0
San Jose	2	0.75									2				4.75
Simmons	7		1						2		2				12.0
South Carolina	5	1.0									2			0.5	8.5
South Florida	1	0.5													1.5
Southern Connecticut	0.5		0.5									0.5			1.5
Southern Mississippi	1														1.0
Syracuse	5		5		1		1								12.0
Tennessee	1		1		2.5						.5				5.0

(Table continues)

Table I-52 (cont.)

Schools	Administrative		Instructional		Research		Media		Library		Comp Lab		Other		TOTAL
	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	FT	FTE	
Texas	10								1		1		2	0.25	14.25
Texas Woman's	1														1.0
Toronto	6	1.5		1.5				0.5	8	0.8		0.5			18.8
Washington	2														2.0
Wayne State	1		1				2.0			0.33		0.1			4.33
Western Ontario	5	0.5							4	1.6	2				13.1
Wisconsin - Madison	4		1			1.25			1	1.17		0.5	1.0	1.35	11.27
Wisconsin - Milwaukee	4	1									1	1			7.0

Table I-54  
Use of Students As Part-Time Staff Among ALA Schools, 1995-96

Schools	Administrative Support FTE of Part-time	Instructional Support FTE of Part-time	Research Assist. FTE of Part-time	Media Services FTE of Part-time	Library Person. FTE of Part-time	Comp Lab Support FTE of Part-time	Other FTE of Part-time	TOTAL
Alabama	0.25	0.5	1.5	0.5	2.5	1.0	1.0	7.25
Albany	1.0	2.0	0.37			0.65		4.0
Alberta			0.33		0.33	0.5		1.16
Arizona	0.75							0.75
British Columbia			0.11		0.05	0.14	0.13	0.43
Buffalo	0.25			0.25		0.5		1.0
California - Berkeley	-----							
California - Los Angeles								0.0
Catholic	0.5		0.5		1.0	1.0	1.0	4.0
Clarion		0.5	2.0		0.25	1.25		4.0

(Table continues)

Table I-54 (cont.)

Schools	Administrative Support FTE of Part-time	Instructional Support FTE of Part-time	Research Assist. FTE of Part-time	Media Services FTE of Part-time	Library Person. FTE of Part-time	Comp Lab Support FTE of Part-time	Other FTE of Part-time	TOTAL
Clark Atlanta	2.0		2.0				3.0	<b>7.0</b>
Dalhousie			0.5			0.5		<b>1.0</b>
Drexel	2.0	0.5	0.5	1.5		2.0		<b>6.5</b>
Emporia	1.0		6.0	1.0		5.0	1.0	<b>14.0</b>
Florida State	3.85	0.9	7.88	0.98	9.75	2.93	3.38	<b>29.67</b>
Hawaii	1.0					1.0		<b>2.0</b>
Illinois	0.5	2.75	3.37			1.25	1.17	<b>9.04</b>
Indiana	1.0	0.5	0.4		1.0	3.0		<b>5.9</b>
Iowa		0.5	0.5			0.375		<b>1.375</b>
Kent State	1.0	1.875	1.25			1.375		<b>5.5</b>
Kentucky	0.3	0.15	0.1			0.75		<b>2.2</b>
Long Island	0.8	0.5						<b>1.3</b>
Louisiana State		2.0	1.6			1.6		<b>5.2</b>
Maryland		1.0	1.0	1.75	2.25	2.5		<b>8.5</b>
McGill		2.0				0.5		<b>2.5</b>
Michigan	0.25	0.5	17.85	1.0		6.5	0.25	<b>26.35</b>
Missouri			3.0					<b>3.0</b>
Montréal								<b>0.0</b>
NC Central					0.5	1.0	0.2	<b>1.5</b>
NC Chapel Hill	0.25	6.0	0.75		1.25	7.6		<b>15.85</b>
NC Greensboro	1.0	5.5	1.0					<b>7.5</b>
North Texas	1.0	7.5	1.5			3.0		<b>13.0</b>
Oklahoma	1.25	2.8	0.25			2.25		<b>6.55</b>
Pittsburgh	2.0	16.0	3.0		2.0	3.0		<b>26.0</b>

(Table continues)

Table I-54 (cont.)

Schools	Administrative Support FTE of Part-time	Instructional Support FTE of Part-time	Research Assist. FTE of Part-time	Media Services FTE of Part-time	Library Person. FTE of Part-time	Comp Lab Support FTE of Part-time	Other FTE of Part-time	TOTAL
Pratt	2.3	1.0	1.1			2.6		7.0
Puerto Rico			6.0			4.0		10.0
Queens	0.75					0.25		1.0
Rhode Island		1.5	0.5			1.5		3.5
Rosary								0.0
Rutgers	1.0	0.5	1.0			1.5		4.0
St. John's			2.5			0.5		3.0
San Jose	2.0	2.2			0.2	4.8		9.2
Simmons	1.0	0.6			1.0	0.6		3.2
South Carolina	2.25	3.75	0.25	1.0		1.0	1.0	9.0
South Florida	1.0					1.0		2.0
Southern Connecticut		1.0	1.0	1.0		2.0		5.0
Southern Mississippi	2.0	1.5	0.5			2.0		6.0
Syracuse	1.0	1.5	1.0					3.5
Tennessee		1.5	1.5			0.5		3.5
Texas	1.5	5.0	1.0	0.375	0.5	3.5	0.25	12.125
Texas Woman's	1.0	2.0			2.0	1.5		6.5
Toronto		0.3			2.1	1.7		4.1
Washington	0.66		2.0			2.0		4.66
Wayne State	2.25	3.5	4.25			1.5		11.5
Western Ontario			5.0		0.5	0.65		6.15
Wisconsin – Madison		0.5	1.0		3.0	0.5	0.5	5.5
Wisconsin – Milwaukee	1.0	1.0	0.75			1.5		4.25

