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The Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty is appointed from time to time by the Dean of Yale College to study and evaluate various aspects of Yale compensation, and to report its findings and conclusions to the Yale faculty. Since 1979, committees chaired by professors Schultz, Nordhaus, Rodin, Rae, Mostow, and Cameron have deliberated and reported to the faculty. The current committee has chosen to concentrate on faculty salaries, maternity leave, and child care.

Faculty Salaries in Arts and Sciences

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences consists of 317 full professors, 28 tenured associate professors, 77 untenured associate professors, and 167 assistant professors. The most important part of faculty compensation is faculty salaries. Since different faculty have different tastes, normally the most efficient method of improving faculty compensation is to raise faculty salaries. Needless to say, Yale cannot recruit competitively unless it maintains competitive salaries. We report that recently Yale salaries have sharply increased, but so have our major competitors'. We have not been provided sufficiently precise information to decide whether or not Yale exactly keeps pace with its competition. We can say, however, that this is certainly not the time for Yale to slacken its efforts.

A striking fact revealed in table 1 is that Yale salaries, measured in "real" (i.e., inflation adjusted) dollars, are today, even after a decade of increases, lower than they were in 1969-70. This underscores a profound, though well-known problem in academics. Professors are not paid very well. During the last 20 years professional salaries, at least at the high end, have risen dramatically. (For the country as a whole, salaries in real terms are not much higher now than they were in 1970.) A young partner in her late 30's at one of the ten or so leading law firms in New York, a position of roughly comparable experience to a young full professor at Yale, could expect to earn $500,000 to $1 million per year, instead of the $70,000 she might make at Yale. A Wall Street investment banker who became a partner or managing director could expect twice as much as the young lawyer, and at a younger age. There can be no doubt that universities have lost a substantial number of potentially first-rate teachers and researchers to the lure of such dramatically different salaries.

As table 1 indicates, over the long term Yale salaries have moved cyclically, rising in the 1960's, falling in the 1970's, and rising again in the 1980's. The precipitous salary swings of 25% in real terms evident in table 1 are surprising, especially given the enormous university endowment. In fact, the Yale endowment has followed roughly the same pattern as salaries, shrinking, in real terms, by 50% from 1968 to 1979, and then rising steadily until by 1987 (and still in 1988, after the stock market crash) it had surpassed the old 1968 level. It is not exactly clear to us how the university chooses the aggregate level of salaries; how
closely, for example, it is (or should) be tied to the level of the endowment. The wide swings in salaries suggest that there might have been substantial changes in the supply of professors, and also that the faculty labor market allows professors to move easily from one school to another, forcing salaries to go up and down under competitive pressures. Another hypothesis that might explain some of the variation in real income is the sudden changes in inflation that have bedeviled the economy. Starting in the late 60's with the Vietnam war, and continuing through two OPEC episodes in the 1970's the rate of inflation was much higher than in the 60's or 80's. Part of the swift decline in salaries beginning in 1969 and the rapid increase beginning in 1982 might be explained by unanticipated changes in inflation. But it is clear that by the middle 70's the university had deliberately chosen a path of reduced real earnings, and that by the middle 1980's until today the administration has deliberately chosen an aggressive tack of increasing real salaries. Together with a large plant renewal program, and increasingly uncertain grant support, this has placed a significant burden on the university budget.

Since 1979-80 Yale salaries at all levels have moved steadily higher. As table 2 suggests, compared to many of the Big Ten and other state schools, Yale has pulled far ahead. Even Berkeley, despite the apparent preeminence of its faculty, has not quite kept the pace. But compared to Yale's most similar rivals, Harvard, Stanford, and Princeton, Yale has not done so well. Thinking of the three of them as one aggregate, Table 2 suggests that between 1979 and 1984, Yale went from near equality to approximately 5% behind. Since that time Yale has made up some ground, but it appears clear that Yale must maintain its aggressive approach if it is to keep up with its traditional rivals. Princeton, in particular, has made impressive progress, and if the additional monies they are spending are being directed to the most mobile faculty, it would seem inevitable that they are scoring successes at Yale's expense.

As previous CESOF committees have noted, the AAUP data from which table 2 is derived is not perfectly representative of arts and sciences since it includes all the professional schools except medicine. Harvard, with its huge business school and law school is especially misrepresented. For the first time in recent memory, the administration made available to this committee salary data from just the faculty of arts and sciences at Harvard, Stanford, and Princeton, though to be sure all three schools were lumped together to preserve confidentiality. The data did seem to confirm the longstanding administration claim that the Yale disadvantage in the second half of the 1980's is somewhat less than table 2 indicates. On the other hand, there seems no reason to doubt that Princeton has indeed made important headway, and that only by constant vigilance can Yale keep from falling into fourth place.

Of course Yale's competitiveness is affected not only by the total wage bill, but also by how it is divided. Since we have absolutely no information on this matter, we cannot offer any judgement. We remark that other universities, such as Stanford, regularly distribute information containing average salaries across divisions (such as social sciences), by rank (assistant professor
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etc), and by years in rank (5 or 10 etc). It would be very interesting, and perhaps very useful, if our committee were permitted to compare salaries between Yale and say Stanford at such a more detailed (but still anonymous) level to identify any sources of significant competitive imbalance.

Maternity Leave and Child Care

The increasing participation of women in the workplace, and especially on the Yale faculty, requires a reassessment of Yale's position on family benefits. Currently the faculty of arts and sciences employs 22 female full professors, 8 tenured associate professors, 24 nontenured associate professors, and 55 assistant professors. To keep abreast of our competition in the short run in recruitment, to foster a reputation of fairness and generosity, especially to women faculty members, and to keep pace with changing social attitudes to the family, Yale must formulate a policy with regard to maternity leave and day care. Yale has already acknowledged this need, for example in the recent appointment of a part time day care coordinator, and through a plan to publicize its maternity leave policy.

This committee has considered some of the complicated issues connected to maternity leave and day care. In what follows we recommend a more comprehensive maternity leave plan than the administration has so far endorsed, and we make some suggestions about day care.

Maternity Leave

Yale must establish an unambiguous, workable, and widely publicized maternity leave policy. In our interviews with Yale faculty members we found that many of the faculty are unaware that Yale currently does have a maternity leave policy, perhaps because that policy is not clearly articulated in any official document. All the faculty mothers we spoke to had been obliged to negotiate their cases with their chairmen, and the outcomes that were described to us were very different, even when the medical histories and their normal responsibilities seemed similar. Equal cases were not treated equally. The need to negotiate such a vital issue under conditions of uncertainty and perceived resistance caused resentment among the faculty mothers, which was made all the worse when they found out how differently they had been treated. Junior faculty especially felt that they might be jeopardizing their careers if they appeared too aggressive, and this further increased their anxiety. The decision communicated to us by Chip Long, to print Yale's official policy in the faculty handbook, is a welcome step in making Yale's policy public.

We find the current Yale policy, of 4-6 weeks paid leave, and additional unpaid leave in case of medical complications, to be inadequate. Such a policy may be appropriate for the business community, but we believe that due to the special nature of teaching and scholarly standards of promotion, it is unworkable for the Yale faculty, and as a result it is likely, even when it becomes public, to provoke the same complicated negotiations as have befuddled the previous practice.
Interrupting a clerical job, or sales job, or even most professional jobs for 6 weeks can be done with little cost if there is enough advance warning, as happens all the time with vacations. On the other hand, replacing a Yale professor for 6 weeks in the middle of a 13 week semester course compromises the integrity of the entire course, from the point of view of the students, the professor, and the replacement. For many courses, especially at the graduate level, there are no qualified assistants who could temporarily take over the course, and only a few faculty, if any, who could step into the breach for 6 weeks, and then only at the cost of seriously disrupting their own schedules. The confusion which such an extended absence in the semester creates has often been resolved in practice either by granting the mother very little relief, or by granting her a complete reduction of teaching for that semester.

We therefore recommend that Yale adopt a uniform policy of granting full relief from teaching responsibilities for an entire semester to a mother who gives birth. The mother and her chairman would choose the semester, which normally would include the time of birth (although in case of a summer birth, she would be entitled to take off either the previous spring or following fall from teaching). The mother would, however, participate in her other responsibilities as fully as possible, in keeping with the timing of the birth. For example, if the birth occurred early in the semester, she might carry the normal load of graduate oral exams, or reading of senior essays, etc. No matter what the timing of the birth, she might continue to supervise her PhD students, or laboratory.

We have recommended a semester's relief from teaching because, as we have argued, shorter periods are often unworkable. In cases where the negotiations between chairman and mother are satisfactorily decided, the reduction is often close to a semester's relief anyway. Our uniform policy recommendation eliminates much of the often stressful negotiation that untenured mothers must now confront, and replaces it with the relatively simple task which all faculty face of deciding which is the appropriate committee assignment.

Our first policy recommendation distinguishes the responsibilities of teaching semester courses from the more easily compartmentalized tasks of the clerical staff. A full semester's leave from all responsibility, effectively a 4 1/2 month paid leave, does not make such a distinction, and once faculty mothers are granted paid leaves it is hard to see what arguments could be mustered against granting the same leave to all Yale employee mothers. We do not wish to endorse Yale's policy with regard to those outside the faculty, for our charter is to represent the faculty's interests, but we emphasize the special character of the teaching profession.

Just as it must be recognized that giving birth impedes the ability of a woman to teach effectively, so it must be recognized that nine months of pregnancy, child birth, nurturing and feeding a newborn baby, and integrating a child into a family have a profound effect on a woman's ability to do research. Yet the Yale policy takes no notice of this at all. We believe that the effect
on scholarly output is more enduring than the effects on teaching,
and weighs more heavily on the minds of our faculty mothers,
especially when their promotion is at risk.

We propose therefore, that the tenure clock be stopped for a
full year for each of up to two pregnancies. In general this will
mean extending the contract for one year per birth. We believe
that a full year corresponds roughly to the lost scholarly output,
and that a shorter extension (of say a semester per birth) is not
only too brief to be fully compensatory, but also complicates the
timing of job search in case of a negative decision. The current
policy of non-extension makes it almost impossible for a mother of
two to meet the scholarly standard that applies to the rest of the
faculty. In humanities departments which unofficially require two
books for tenure, a mother of two children would be much less
likely to arrive at a tenure threshold. To try to obtain an
unbiased judgement, a lower and also qualitatively different
standard would have to be applied, drastically increasing the
chances of an incorrect decision, and tainting the process with the
spectre of a double standard. Yale owes the tenure delay to its
faculty mothers so that they may be judged fairly, and Yale owes
the delay to itself so that it may choose correctly.

We recognize full well that all benefits must be judged
against their costs, and maternity relief from teaching bears a
cost, which we shall shortly estimate. Many groups deserve
attention and support. Cases can (and have, in front of our
committee) been made for paternity leave and for adoption leave,
and for nurturing old parents leave. While we recognize the
possibility that paternity leave may become comparable to maternity
leave, we believe that there is a particularly compelling case to
be made for maternity support. Clearly the sheer physical toll is
greatest on the biological mother, who also bears the largest share
of infant care responsibility, and in the short run at least, when
the fraction of faculty that bear children is quite small, the cost
is also small.

To get some idea of an upper bound on the potential cost to
the university, let us suppose that through splendid recruitment
and a reputation for hospitality to woman scholars, the female
faculty grows to 150. Further, suppose that half are junior
faculty who stay an average of six years, during which they have
an average of one birth, and the other half are senior faculty, who
are at Yale an average of 25 years, during which they have an
average of 2 children. (Compared to the current Yale faculty, we
have essentially added 45 tenured women, and slightly exaggerated
their fertility). This works out to an average of \((75)(1/6) +
(75)(1/12.5) = 18.5\) babies per year. Figuring the cost of hiring
an instructor for one semester to take over the teaching duties of
the mother at $10,000, the cost comes to $185,000 per year. Nor
do the low benefits paid to instructors add much to their cost.
The total cost is thus approximately equal to two tenured positions
across the whole of arts and sciences.

Needless to say, at many points in the above calculation we
overestimated costs. In the academic year 1988-89, there were, as
far as we can tell, no more than nine births to faculty mothers,
which works out to a teaching replacement cost of $90,000, or
approximately a single senior position across the whole of arts and sciences. Moreover, the cost of the program we recommend should be compared to the cost of the current program. Figuring 6 weeks full leave at full pay works out on average in the negotiation between mother and chairman to a half load teaching reduction for one semester, half the above projected costs would be borne by the university anyway. Thus at an additional cost of one junior position across all of arts and sciences, or at an additional cost of one senior position, even if the number of women faculty increases to 150, Yale can treat its faculty mothers fairly, signalling to them and to its competition Yale's farsightedness and generosity in first adopting a policy that will inevitably be taken up elsewhere in the near future.

Stopping the tenure clock by extending contracts for a year has a financially negligible effect, since it involves no diminution in faculty responsibility. The costs from slightly slowing the rate at which new faculty pass through the system is also minor. The benefits of stopping the tenure clock for faculty pregnancies seems overwhelmingly greater than the costs, and indeed most of the leading universities are moving, or have already moved, in this direction.

Child Care

The benefits from child care, but unfortunately also the costs, are potentially enormous. As our committee began to explore this issue, it quickly became clear to us that the problems surrounding child care are both extremely complex and emotionally loaded.

Our committee has come to three broad conclusions: first, that we are not now, nor could we have expected to be, in a position to make a firm recommendation about the right day care policy; second, that a systematic investigation of the issue by a committee with the resources to conduct a rigorous examination of the facts is merited at this time; third, that the first step in such an investigation should concentrate on gathering data and should call upon the energy and interest of students in the professional schools and possibly also the college.

To get some idea of the range of choices from which a comprehensive day care policy would have to choose, consider these possibilities. At one end of the spectrum, Yale could administer day care centers, providing the space and hiring the staff to run them and a director to coordinate them, while passing on all the costs to the parents in membership fees. At the other extreme, Yale could subsidize the cost of using day care, but leave it to parents to find child care centers outside of Yale. Or Yale could both administer and subsidize, or perhaps contribute a modest amount in both dimensions, for example by providing on campus space without charge while leaving the child support services in the hands of outsiders. Or Yale could do nothing, leaving it to the parents to negotiate day care in the private sector just as they negotiate for housing. If Yale does play a role in child care, it must decide how large a community to serve: faculty, students,
staff, employees more generally, the neighboring community etc. If Yale does decide to subsidize child care, it must decide how much, and whom to help. Administering day care but charging full cost, for example, would have the effect of restricting day care to a fraction of the Yale community, which might or might not be desirable. Evidently it is beyond the intended scope and resources of this committee to sort through all the alternative policies to make a firm recommendation on how Yale should proceed with day care.

Nevertheless, the committee feels it is important to reconsider Yale's position on child care at this time. Changes in demographics, and in family life, appear to have increased the need for high quality care for faculty children. The growth of the two career family and the single parent household have reduced the amount of parental time at home during the day. This directly affects not only women faculty, who comprise an increasing fraction of the faculty, but also male faculty who assume an increasing share of child care responsibilities. Moreover, in keeping with the changing age distribution of the nation, the Yale faculty is also likely in the near future to have a higher fraction of parents with small children than it has in the past.

What's in it for Yale?

We see at least five potential advantages to formulating a comprehensive day care policy.

In many interviews with various Yale faculty a keen, even passionate interest was expressed in child support organized by Yale. These faculty at least claimed it mattered to them.

Throughout the business community, in congress, and across the world there has been a rapid growth in day care discussion and facilities.

While it is too early to be sure, it seems clear that the major benefit to Yale as a university from a comprehensive faculty child care program derives from the advantages it would bring in recruiting and retaining faculty. The first two considerations suggest that faculty might take day care into account in their choice of jobs, and that our competition is raising the stakes. A commitment to affirmative action, including extra efforts to recruit women faculty, is highly pertinent in this context. However, we stress that child care is not only an issue for women faculty, but also for male faculty, because of the dual career family. Indeed the greater proportion of male faculty makes it likely that the effects on male recruitment will be larger than the effects on female recruitment.

Another benefit to the university from establishing a faculty child care program is the faculty time saved that could be put into service to the university. While it is true for every job that child care creates a competing time demand, the flexibility of academic hours makes it easier, and therefore more likely, that faculty time will be diverted during the day from the office to the home.

Finally, by providing a day care center near their employees'
offices that operates at suitable hours, the university offers faculty a benefit other child-care arrangements cannot easily match. In this dimension at least, Yale can provide day care at a lower cost than it can be provided elsewhere.

We recognize that even a sharply rising value to child care does not automatically imply that Yale should increase its support. The cost of child care has risen considerably as well. One reason is the very fact that demand has increased throughout society. Another factor is liability -- liability laws have extended their reach, making it ever riskier for an institution with substantial assets to place itself in a responsible position. Also, while our committee's charge is limited to the status of the faculty, it seems likely that any new child care policy for the faculty will have effects on negotiations with other interest groups at Yale. These consequences need to be considered in advance, too. Finally, it is sometimes the case that attention to a particular need creates the psychological presumption that action will be taken, even when it is not called for. It is understandable that the Yale administration views the child care question as potentially explosive.

In light of these potential costs, the committee does not see its role at this time as an advocate for those on the faculty who desire increased child care support, however strong their needs may be. Rather, we point to the possibility, which can only be substantiated by further analysis, that there may be large mutual gains from a comprehensive child care policy. We subscribe to a basic principle. Until it can be demonstrated that the long-term expected benefits to Yale from a new child care policy are greater than the expected long-term costs, there should be no presumption that any change is desirable.

This basic principle is motivated by two considerations. First, it is very unlikely that the Yale administration will go along with any change that implies a long-term loss for Yale; presumably, it is against the fiduciary obligations of the administration to do otherwise. Second, it is easy to get so emotional about the issues that one overlooks the costs, and perhaps even more easily the various alternatives to Yale's direct involvement.

Suggested course of action

Our committee is unanimous in the view that a rigorous investigation of the merits and costs of child care at Yale is appropriate. We feel that a well formulated policy could give Yale an important competitive edge in its battle to recruit faculty, and that the failure to consider such a policy may lead to an important competitive disadvantage.

Having begun an investigation ourselves, we are only too aware that the investigation itself can be costly. It is necessary first of all to calculate the number of children that would be involved, among all the different interest groups, to find out more about the opinions and needs of these relevant interest groups, to estimate the costs of providing the services, both if hired by Yale or if
franchised to some private organization, to estimate the opportunity costs of the space, to identify all the potential alternatives, to investigate the legal dimensions of the problem etc. It appears that in the past these daunting tasks have stopped all well-intentioned efforts at the outset. We suggest that Yale can get farther by taking smaller steps.

As a first step, we recommend that a small committee of faculty (such as ours, but with only day care on its agenda) be appointed to direct a preliminary study of the data by a group of SOM students, perhaps joined by a group of Law students and undergraduates. There is reason to believe that SOM students in particular would be interested in such an enterprise, especially because of the school's public policy/non-profit orientation. Moreover, many of the students have practical experience in this type of planning and many intend to go into jobs for which participation in such a study would be valuable. The law students too might find participation useful, and one or two undergraduates writing senior essays on child care could also make a useful contribution.

The investigation would begin in earnest in the fall of 1990, and report back to the university, preferably by the beginning of the spring semester, certainly no later than by the end of the spring 1991. The investigation will provide a much clearer idea of the parameters of the problem (including facts about needs, costs etc), and also a list of options that appear most reasonable.

For the Committee,

John D. Geanakoplos, Chair

Members:
Bengt Holmstrom
Patricia Joplin
Brian Skinner
Long Term History of Yale Faculty Salaries (in Constant Dollars)

Source: AAUP Survey. Adjusted for inflation using CPI-U.
University Wide  
Table 3-  
Yale Faculty Salary by Rank, and Salary  
at Selected Institutions as a Percentage of Yale's  
1979-80 to 1988-89  
(From AAUP Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>HARVARD</th>
<th>CHICAGO</th>
<th>PRINCETON</th>
<th>STANFORD</th>
<th>COLUMBIA</th>
<th>BROWN</th>
<th>ROCHESTER</th>
<th>M.I.T.</th>
<th>MICHIGAN</th>
<th>WISCONSIN-MADISON</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA-SYRACUSE</th>
<th>BERKELEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>105.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>HARVARD</th>
<th>CHICAGO</th>
<th>PRINCETON</th>
<th>STANFORD</th>
<th>COLUMBIA</th>
<th>BROWN</th>
<th>ROCHESTER</th>
<th>M.I.T.</th>
<th>MICHIGAN</th>
<th>WISCONSIN-MADISON</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA-SYRACUSE</th>
<th>BERKELEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>109.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

**Yale Faculty of Arts and Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$55,439</td>
<td>$59,607</td>
<td>$63,355</td>
<td>$67,361</td>
<td>$71,877</td>
<td>$75,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor - Tenured</td>
<td>$37,435</td>
<td>$39,157</td>
<td>$41,917</td>
<td>$44,258</td>
<td>$47,539</td>
<td>$52,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor - Term</td>
<td>$30,776</td>
<td>$32,769</td>
<td>$34,711</td>
<td>$37,302</td>
<td>$39,368</td>
<td>$44,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$26,587</td>
<td>$28,496</td>
<td>$30,175</td>
<td>$32,140</td>
<td>$33,923</td>
<td>$36,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year-to-year percentage change**

| Professor                        | 7.1% | 7.5% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 6.7% | 5.2% |
| Associate Professor - Tenured    | 12.7% | 4.6% | 7.0% | 5.6% | 7.4% | 10.5% |
| Associate Professor - Term       | 5.8% | 6.5% | 5.9% | 7.5% | 5.5% | 11.8% |
| Assistant Professor              | 6.6% | 7.2% | 5.9% | 6.5% | 5.5% | 7.7% |