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## ABSTRACT

Salary data for full-time faculty in 21 selected disciplines were collected through the 1981-1982 National Pilot Faculty Salary Survey conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). Data by discipline and rank were collected for over 39,000 faculty members at 204 AASCU institutions. The statistics on salary include: average, high, and low salary, the percentage of faculty in a given discipline who hold a given academic .rank, and the ratio of the average salary to the total average salary of all institutions. The following academic ranks are covered: professor, associate prof'essor, assistant professor, new assistant professor, and instructor. Discipline areas are as follows: biological sciences, business and management, communications, computer and information sciences, education, special education, vocational and technical education, engineering, fine and applied arts, foreign languages, home economics, English, library science, mathematics, physical sciences, psychology, economics, history, geography, political science and government, and sociology. A inst of participating institutions is appended. (SW)
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## introduction

## The Background

The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) is dedicated to supporting human resource professionals associated with higher education around the world by disseminating current theory, methodology, and research results on personnel issues.

In 1974, the CUPA Board of Directors proposed establishing a survey of faculty compensation (page 1, CUPA Wingspread Conference, March 1977; and September 1977, Chairman's Report). The CUPA Faculty and Staff Relations Council took responsibility for planning, developing, and conducting a pilot model of faculty salaries by discipline and by rank. In 1980, the Council developed a pilot faculty salary questionnaire, along with rationale, instructions, and definitions. They sent the questionnaire to 13 diverse CUPA colleges and universities who critiqued it. A review of the respondents' comments indicated that a model already in use by Oklahoma State tog gather similar data best met survey needs. The results of the critique process were submitted by the Council to the CUPA Board of Directors for approval. Once the Board granted permission, CUPA representatives met with appropriate officials at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) to request that. AASCU members participate in a full survey effort.

The following papers by the CUPA Faculty and Staff Relations Council. further document this development process:

1. Facuity Compensation Study: The Background and the Need 15 January 1980
2. Faculty Compensation Study: The Pilot Model Operationalization 14 March 1980
3. Faculty Compensation Study: The Pilot Model Effectualization 30 June 1980
4. Recommendations Toward a Faculty Compensation Study 15 July 1980

As a result, AASCU and CUPA agreed to work cooperatively with Appalachian State University, which took responsibility for the input of all data on computer tape. M. L. Gilliam, from Oklahoma State University, tabulated the results.

## The Need

Current data on faculty compensation are presently being collected each year by the National Center for Education Statistics. These data, however, are not collected at the level of detail required to answer basic questions pertaining to variances in salaries between and among disciplines. What are missing are data about salary at different ranks and within specific disciplines for different types of institutions. The need to address problems of salary administration with respect to postsecondary faculty in different disciplines motivated the decision to conduct this study.

Such comparative information can be useful to the postsecondary administratior in at least two ways. The communty of postsecondary institutions may be thought of as an academic marketplace. Faculty and administrators negotiate remuneration for services of teaching and other responsibilities to be rendered. In this marketplace, a faculty member
needs to know what to request, based on the salaries of her or his peers. The administrator needs to know how much to pay for quality without committing more than she or he gan justify for the budget.

Detailed salary information is also useful in long-range budgetary planning. Applying estimates of changes in costs, such as the Consumer Price Index or the Higher Education Price Index, to faculty salaries will enable a postsecondary administrator to project future faculty costs. This survey demonstrates a method for collecting the detailed data that administrators can apply in their decision-making. Based on the data collected, the user can assess faculty salaries at her or his institution in relation to the marketplace as a whole.

## SURVEY RESULTS

## Methodology

This AASCU/CUPA 1981-82 National Pilot Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline and Rank collected and tabulated full-time salary data for faculty in 21 selected disciplines. The CUPA Faculty and Staff Relations Council selected a basic set of disciplines that would be most common among the institutions to be surveyed. These were chosen from among the disciplines defined by the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) Taxonomy or by A Classification of Instructional Programs; 1981 (see Appendix A). Data for over 39,000 faculty members in these disciplines at 204 AASCU institutions (see Appendix B) were collected and tabulated in the survey.

## Analysis of Data

To organize the data and permit comparisons between disciplines and by rank's, the Council selected the following variables: average salary, high salary, low salary, and number of faculty for a given rank and discipline. The variables and other terms arrived at in the tabulation of the data are defined below.

NOTE: Users of this survey may find the category "New Assistant Professor" especially useful in making new hiring decisions since most new faculty in açademe are hired at this rank.

## Definition of Terms

SALARY--based on a $n i n e$ or ten month academic year salary. Salary for summer academic work, fringe benefits, and perquisites are not included in the salary data. AVERAGE SALARY--based on the survey information with the assumption that all employees were full-time. The average salary displayed is an average of all faculty reported for a given rank and discipline.

HIGH SALARY-the highest salary for any full-time individual of the defined group for which the information is reported. LOW SALARY--the lowest salary for any full-time individual. of the defined group for which the information is reported. FAC MIX PCT--the percentage of faculty in a given discipline/ major field who hold a given academic rank. For example, a FAC MIX PCT factor of .36 for assqciate professor implies that 36 percent of the faculty in that discipline/major field hold the rank of associate professor. SALARY FACTOR--for a given rank of a given discipline/major: field, the ratio of the average salary to the total average salary of all institutions. For example, a SALARY FACTOR of 1.10 for assistant professors of mathematics implies告" that the average salary for assistant professors of mathematics is 10 percent higher than the average salary of all assistant professors of all institutions. NUM--the number of faculty members whose salaries were included to compute the average salary.


- N/IS-the number of institutions that have reported salary data for a given academic rank and discipline/major field.
: PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS--the number of institutions responding to the survey questionnaire.

NEW ASST PROF-the grouping of assistant professors who were hired for the first time in the Fall of 1981. All, information for this group was included'in the ASST PROF group for reporting purposes. This group is used mainly for new hiring information.

The goal of the pilot survey effort and the report was to disciuss the development process and to demonstrate the utility of the effort. Therefore, an overall analysis has not been undertaken.

However, it is important to illustrate the type of analyses posible using the data presently available. The following table shows the comparative potential of the data for two disciplines: Business and Management and Communications.

oisciplime: nustuess t managenent majon fielo: gusimess t mamaeneat

| avemage salaty | 32441 | 1125 | 185 | 27313 | 1412 | 185 | 22755 | 1553 | 186 | 22182 | 278 | 109 | 17631 | 658 | 139 | 25992 | 1768183 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| higy salary | 6s893 |  |  | 4218 |  |  | 32430 |  |  | 32000 |  |  | 31610 |  |  | 69955 |  |
| lov salay | 14000 |  |  | 16000 |  |  | 13956 |  |  | 16350 |  |  | 8000 |  |  | 6000 |  |
| fac mix Pet | 0.26 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.16 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| salary factor | 1.07 |  |  | 1.09 |  |  | 1.10 |  |  | 1.16 |  |  | 1.07 |  |  | 1.06 |  |

otscipline: communtentions major fielo: commuicailoms

| AYERACE SALARY | 30298 | 297 | 99 | 26477 | 355 | 112 | 20031 | 452 | 128 | 11348 | 63 | 33 | 18228 | 178 | 77 | 22334 | 1253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIGA SALARY | 44550 |  |  | 31515 |  |  | 33723 |  |  | $23000$ |  |  | 28542 |  |  | 46550 |  |
| LOU SALARY | 15000 |  |  | 11072 |  |  | 16182 |  |  | 16500 |  |  | $10100^{4}$ |  |  | 10100 |  |
| PAC HIE PSt | 0.21 |  |  | 0.21 |  |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.16 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| galary facton | 0.98 |  |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.37 |  |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.91 |  |  | 0.82 |  |

1. Size of the Sample. The user should note the size of the sample on which each percentage or dol.lar value is based. The smaller the number in the group, the greater the effect of extreme scores on a descriptive statistic such as the average.

The Business and Management results were computed for a larger number of participating institutions and a larger number of faculty than were the Communications results.

|  | NUMF | N/IS |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| B \&M | 4746 | 193 |
| C | 1253 | 148 |

2. Average Salary. The average salary for every rank in Business and Managenent is higher than that in Communications:

|  | Prof | ASSOCP | ASSTP | NASSTP | IN | AR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B\&M | 32841 | 27313 | 22755 | 22972 | 17621 | 25792 |
| C | 30296 | 24477 | 20031 | 18746 | 16226 | 22934 |

3. High and Low Salaries. In general, the high and low salpries are higher in Business and Management than in Communications. An examination of each rank value, however, reveals much variation within ranks.

High Salary

|  | Prof | ASSOCP | ASSTP | NASSTP | IN | AR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B\&A | 69995 | 42816 | 32830 | 32000 | 31410 | 69995 |
| C. | 44550 | 36515 | 33723 | 23000 | 29542 | 44550 |

Low Salary

| B\&M | 18000 | 16000 | 13956 | 14350 | 6000 | 6000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | 15000 | 18072 | 14182 | 14500 | 10100 | 10100 |

4. Faculty Mix Percentage. The two disciplines seem similar when compared on the basis of faculty mix percentage, which refers to the percentage of faculty in a given discipline who hold a given rank. For example, 24 percent of all faculty in Business and Management hold the rank of Professor, compared with 21 percent of those in Communications.

|  | Prof | ASSOCP | ASSTP | NASSTP | IN | AR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B\&M | .24 | .30 | .33 | .06 | .14 | 1.00 |
|  | .21 | .28 | .36 | .03 | . .14 | 1.00 |

5. Salary Factor. This variable permits comparisons between the average salary of a facülty member in a given rank and the average salary of all faculty members of that rank in all reporting institutions. A constant number- -100 percent-represents the average salary of all: faculty in that rank for all reporting institutions. The following data show that for every rank, Business and Management faculty salary is higher than the average salary, while Communications
faculty salary is consistently lower, For example, in Business and Management the average salary of an associate professor is 9 percent $\overrightarrow{a b o v e ~ t h e ~ a v e r a g e ~ s a l a r y ~ o f ~ a l l ~ a s s o c i a t e ~ p r o f e s s o r s ~ a t ~ a l l ~ r e p o r t i n g ~}$ institutions.

|  | Prof | ASSOCP | ASSTP | NASSTP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B8M | 1.07 | 1.09 | 1.10 | 1.16 |
| C | .99 | . .98 | .97 | .93 |


| IN | AR |
| :---: | :---: |
| .1 .07 | 1.04 |
| .98 | .92 |
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## DISCIPLINE: 8IOLOGICAL SCIENCES

MAJOR FIELD: 8IOLOGICAL SCIEMCES

| .average Salary | 30129 | 1098 | 183 | 24378 | 819 | 186 | 20219 | 587 | 173 | 18418 | 69 | 51 | 16110 | 88 | 50 | 25591 | 2592 | 197 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIGH SALARY | 55833 |  |  | 33539 |  |  | 30000 |  |  | 30000 |  |  | 21100 |  |  | 55833 |  |  |
| LOU SALARY | 18000 |  |  | 15500 |  |  | 11628 |  |  | 12015 |  |  | 8028 |  |  | 8028 |  |  |
| FAC MIX PCT | 0.42 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.23 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| SALARY FACTOR | 0.98 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.93 | \% |  | 0.98 |  |  | 1.03 |  |  |

DISCIPLIME: BUSIMESS \& MAMAGEMEMT
$\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$

| average salary | 32841 | 1125 | 164 | 27313 | 1412 | 185 | 22755 | 1553 | 184 | 22972 | 276 | 109 | 17621 | 656 = 139 | 25792 | 4746 | 193 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIGH SALARY | 69995 |  |  | 42816 |  |  | 32830 |  |  | 32000 |  |  | 31410 |  | 69995 |  |  |
| LOU SALARY | 18000 |  |  | 16000 |  |  | 13956 |  |  | 14350 |  |  | 6000 |  | 6000 | . |  |
| FAC MIX PCT | 0.24 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.06 |  |  | 0.14 |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| SALARY factor | 1.07 |  |  | 1.09 |  |  | 1.10 |  |  | 1.16 |  |  | 1.07 |  | 1.04 |  |  |


| average salary | 30296 | 267 | 99 | 24477 | 355 | 112 | 20031 | 452 | 126 | 18346.. | 43 | 33 | 16226 | 179 | 77 | 22934 | 1253 | 148 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| high salary | 44550 |  |  | 36515 |  |  | 33723 |  |  | 23000 |  |  | 29542 |  |  | 44550 |  |  |
| LOW SALARY | 15000 |  |  | 18072 |  |  | 14182 |  |  | 14500 |  |  | 10100 |  |  | 10100 |  | . |
| FAC MIX PCT | 0.21 |  |  | 0.28 |  |  | 0.36 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| SALARY FACTOR | . 0.99 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 0.93 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |
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PROFESSOR
SALARY NUM M/IS
$\qquad$

| ASST PROF |
| :---: |
| SALARY MUM M/IS |

MEW ASST PROF
Salary mum M/IS
$\qquad$

ALL RANKS
SALARY MUM M/IS $\qquad$

DISCIPLIME: EDUCATIOM
major field: vocational and techiical education


DISCIPLIME: EMGIMEERIMG MAJOR FIELD: EMGIMEERIMG

| average salary | 32835 | 468 | 56 | 26918. | 504 | 63 | 22427 | 357 | 58 | 22331 | 53 | 26 | 17465 | 84 | 34 | 27181 | 1413 | 67 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| high salary | 50000 |  |  | 38287 |  |  | 30000 |  |  | 30000 |  |  | 28000 |  |  | 50000 |  |  |
| LOM SALARY | 16316 |  |  | 18207 |  |  | 14950 |  |  | 14950 |  |  | 10000 |  |  | 10000 |  |  |
| FAC MIX PCT | 0.33 |  |  | 0.36 | , |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.06 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| SALARY FACTOR | 1.07 |  |  | 1.08 |  |  | 1.08 |  |  | 1.13 |  |  | 1.06 |  |  | 1.09 |  |  |

DISCIPLIME: FIME \& APPLIED ARIS
major field: fime $\varepsilon$ applied arts

| average salary | 29519 | 1179 | 152 | 23795 | 1370 | 175 | 19630 | 1378 | 172 | 18101 | 158 | 68 | 16542 | 377 | 111 | 23394 | 4304 | 179 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HIGH SALARY | 48273 |  |  | 36409 |  |  | 31241 |  |  | 26942 |  |  | 28572 |  |  | 48273 |  |  |
| LOU SALARY | 20597 |  |  | 15820 |  |  | 10050 |  |  | 12500 |  |  | 7783 |  |  | 7783 |  |  |
| FAC MIX PCT | 0.27 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| SALARY factor | 0.96 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | . 0.95 | $\checkmark$ |  | 0.92 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.94 |  |  |




FACULTY SALARY SURYEY


31
fACULTY SALARY SURVEY


## APPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE USE

The results of this national faculty pilot survey indicate that both the data retrieval and the data analysis methodologies are workable and replicable. The sample for this survey was large enough- $\mathbf{3 9}, 000$ - to allow preliminary conclusions about the differences and similarities of faculty salaries between disciplines. At the same time, the data from this survey are somewhat limited in their applicability. The participating institutions were of one specific type: public colleges and universities that grant primarily baccalaureate degrees. Therefore, conclusions can be drawn only about this group of institutions.

The survey collected data on 21 of the many disciplines included in the HEGIS Taxonomy and A Classification of Instructional Programs. Because of the financial considerations in most postsecondary institutions, data about more disciplines would probably be more helpful in long-range planning.

Finally, other factors affect salary in the academic marketplace, such as base salary upon initial appointment (except for the category "New Assistant Professor" as of Fall 1981), degrees held (especially terminal degrees) sex, race, years of service in rank(s) at the current institution, years of prior service in rank(s) at other institutions, competencies in lieu of the terminal degree, and merit and/or across-theboard raises.

The goal of next year's effort will be to survey different types of institutions and to increase the number of disciplines surveyed. In addition, the survey will include size measure of institutions and other variables to facilitate comparative studfes tailored to the needs of specific institutions. No longer a pilot, the next survey can be established as a permanent source of comparative information for faculty and administrators in the academic marketplace.

APPENDIX A

## LIST OF SELECTED DISCIPLINES*

TABLE 1 ALL DISCIPLINE AVERAGES ALL MAJOR FIELDS
TABLE 2 DISCIPLINE: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES-26. (0400) MAJOR FIELD: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
TABLE 3 DISCIPLINE: BUSINESS \& MANAGEMENT-06. (0500) MAJOR FIELD: BUSINESS \& MANAGEMENT
TABLE $4 \cdot$ DISCIPLINE: COMMUNICATIONS-09. (0600) MAJOR FIELD: COMMUNICATIONS
TABLE 5 DISCIPLINE: COMPUTER \& INFO SCIENCES-11: (0700) MAJOR FIELD: COMPUTER \& INFO SCIENCES
TABLE 6 DISCIPLINE: EDUCATION
MAJOR FIELD: EDUGATION-13.1202 (0802)
TABLE 7 DISCIPLINE: EDUCATION MAJOR FIELD: SPECIAL EDUCATION, GENERAL--13.1001 (0808)
TABLE 8 DISCIPLINE: EDUCATION MAJOR FIELD: VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION 13.1309 (0839)
TABLE 9 DISCIPLINE: ENGINEERING--14. (0900) MAJOR FIELD: ENGINEERING
TABLE 10 DISCIPLINE: FINE \& APPLIED ARTS - 50. (1000) MAJOR FIELD: FINE \& APPLIED ARTS
TABLE 11 DISCIPLINE: FOREIGN LANGUAGES-16. (1100) MAJOR FIELD: FOREIGN LANGUAGES
TABLE 12 DISCIPLINE: HOME ECONOMICS--19. (1300) MAJOR FIELD: HOME ECONOMICS
TABLE 13 DISCIPLINE: LETTERS MAJOR FIELD: ENGLISH, GENERAL-23.0101 (1501)
TABLE 14 DISCIPLINE: LIBRARY SCIENCE-25. (1600) MAJOR FIELD: LIBRARY SCIENCE

*The numbers after the selected disciplines are "crosswalks" between the New Classification (A Classification of Instructional Programs, National Center for Education Statistics, 1981) and the HEGIS Taxonomy. The numbers immediately after each dash are those of the New Classification and those in parenthesis are of the HEGIS Tàxonomy. Both sets of numbers refer to the same discipline, of course.

## LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTİTUTIONS

Adams State College
Alcorn State University
Angelo State University Appalachian State University
Augusta College
Austin Peay State University
Ball State University
Bemidji State University
Black Hills State College
Boise Stat $f$ University
Bowie State College
California State College of Pennsylvania

California State College at Fullerton

California State College at Stanislaus
California State University at Dominguez Hills
California State University at Hayward
Cameron University
Castleton State College
Central Michigan University
Central Missouri State University
Central Washington University
Chadron State College
Chicago State University
Christopher Newport College
Cleveland State University
College of Charleston

College of the Virgin Islainds
Columbus College
Concord College
Coppin State College
Corpus Christi State University
Delta State University
East Central Oklahoma State University

East Stroudsburg State College
East Tennessee State University
East Texas State Univerisity at Texarkana

Eastern Illinois Unịversity
Eastern Montana College
Eastern New Mexico University
Eastern Oregon State College
Eastern Washington University
Edinboro State College
Emporia State University
Fairmont State College
Fayetteville State University
Fitchburg State College,
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
Florida International University
Fort Hays State University
Francis Marion College
Frostburg State College
George Mason University
Georgia College

Georgia Southern College
Georgia State University
Grambling State Universiry
Grand Valley State Colleges
Henderson State University
Idaho State University
Illinois State University
Indiana Sttate University
Indiana State Üniversity at Evansville

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

James Madison University
John Jay College of Criminal Justice at City University of New York

Kearney State College
Keene State College
Kent State University
Lake Superior State College
Lamar University
Lander College
Livingston University
Lock Haven State College
Longwood College
Louisiana State University at Shreveport

Louisiana Tech University
Lyndon State College
Mansfield State College
Marshall University
Mayville State College
McNeese State University Memphis State University
Mesa College

Metropolitan State Collpge
Middle Tennessee State University
Midwestern State University
Millersville State College
Mississippi Valley State University $\dagger$
Missouri Southern State College
Missouri Westèrn State College
Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology
Morehead State University
Murray State University
New Jersey Institute of Technolog
North Adams State Cologe-
North Texas State University Northeast Louisiana University Northeastern Illinois University Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University

- Northern Kentucky ${ }^{*}$ University

Northern Michigan University
Northern Montana College
Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Oakland University
Old Dominion University'
Oregon Institute of Techinology
Pembroke State University
Peru State College
Plymouth State College
Portland State University
Potsdam College of Arts and Science
Radford University .
Ramapo College of New Jersey
Rhöde Island College
Salisbury State College
Savannah State College
Shepherd College
${ }_{4}$ Slippery Rock State College
Sonoma State University
Woutheast Missouri State University
Southern Arkansas University
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Southern Oregon State College
Southwest Missouri
State University
Southwest Stiate University (MN)
Southwest Texas State University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
St. Cloud State University
St. Mary's College of Maryland
Stephen F. Austin State University
State University of New York College at Brockport
State University of New York College at Buffalo
State University of New York College at Cortland
State University of New York College at Fredonia
State University" of New York College at New Paltz
State University of New York College of Tech at Utica/Rome
Tennessee Technological University
Texas A \& I University
Texas A \& M University at Galveston
Towson State University

Trenton State Colleger
University of Akron
Uṇiyersity of Alabama in Huntsilile

University of Arkansas at Monticello

University of Baltimore
University of Central Florida
University of Colorado
University of Colorado at Denver

University of The District of Columbia

University of Guam
University of Houston at Clear Lake City
University of Houston Downtown College

University of Houston Victoria Campus

University of Lowell
University of Maryland at Baltimore County
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nevada at Las Vegas

University of New Orleans
University of North Alabama
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

University of Northern Colorado
University of Northern Lowa
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

University of Science and Arts of Oklahorna
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University of South Carolina at Aiken

University of South Carolina at Spartenburg
University of South Dakota at Springfield

University of South Florida
University of Southern Colorado
University of Southern Maine
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Southwestern Louisiana

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

University of Tennessee . .at Martin

University of Texas at Dallas

University of Texas of the Permian Basis

University of Texas at Tyler
University of West Florida
University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire

University of Wisconsin at Lacrosse

University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh

University of Wisconsin at Parkside

Unikersity of Wisconsin at Stout

University of South Carolina Coastal Carolina College

Valdosta State College
Washburn University of Topeka

Weber State Collega
West Chester State College (PA)
West Georgia College
West.Liberty State College
Western Carolina University
Western Connedticut State College
Western Illinois University
Western Kentucky University
Western New Mexico University
Western Oregon State College
Westfield State College
Wichita State University
Winona State University
Winston-Salem State University
Winthrop Colkege
Worcéster State College
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