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"No college can be greater than its faculty. Their bigness of mind, their wealth of knowledge, and their clearness of vision set the pace and determine the progress of the institution." The Royal Purple (K-State Yearbook), 1918

Executive Summary

The Faculty Compensation Task Force was charged to develop a long-range compensation improvement plan with specific targeted goals and strategies consistent with the K-State 2025 goals for competitive faculty compensation. Excellent faculty members are critical to K-State’s goal of becoming a top-50 public research university as defined by K-State 2025. In order to retain and attract high performing faculty, competitive salaries and compensation packages are essential. The fact that salary raises in recent history have been less than the APLU 3.3% per year average and that the average base salaries have routinely been lower than the peer average (regardless of the peer set to which they are compared) has put K-State in an uncompetitive position. In this report the task force recommends a strategy to increase base salaries that includes increments, enhancements, adjustments, and incentives as an interrelated set of tools, which include annual increases, promotional increases, and increases based on multi-year assessments of achievement. The proposed tools will enable K-State to achieve the peer mean average salary by FY2018 if solutions are initiated in FY2014 and a commitment to base merit increases is maintained until FY2018.

K-State Mean Average Faculty Salaries Each Year (bars) Relative to Peer Mean (line) for All Ranks Projected to 2018 Based on Task Force Recommendations.
Introduction

Despite the fact that K-State saw stagnation in faculty salaries over the past three years, faculty members have maintained quality performances in their research, instruction, and service. In the Princeton Review, August 2012, K-State was ranked No. 2 for great campus and community relations; No. 4 for the best quality of life; No. 8 for the happiest students; No. 12 in best-run colleges.¹ Making these rankings put the institution among the top 15 percent of the nation’s 2,500 four-year colleges and three international colleges. Also this year, K-State was listed as one of the top undergraduate schools in the nation, offering excellent academics, generous financial aid and/or relatively low cost of attendance.² Individual faculty members and numerous academic units have also been recognized for their contributions to scholarship and society. The hallmarks of the greatness of K-State are the various local, regional, national and international awards and recognized accomplishments by faculty as well as the guidance and contribution to student success.

These accomplishments, however, do not happen fortuitously. They come about by careful and the conscientious recruitment of very smart, creative, and innovative professionals and investment of time and tangible resources in their mentorship, training, and support, especially for early career faculty, to transform them into accomplished performers. The formation of faculty’s “bigness of mind” and “wealth of knowledge” and the production of such recognizable results defines the return on the investment the institution gets from its retention and recruitment of great faculty.

Faculty Senate and the University Administration recognize the risk associated with the loss of faculty as a result of K-State’s uncompetitive salary position. K-State’s competitiveness among its identified peers in retaining and attracting high performing faculty is critical to securing and sustaining its recognition as a top-50 public research university.

Charge and Scope

In September, 2012, President Schulz announced the formation of a faculty compensation task force comprising ten members—four appointed by Faculty Senate and four by Administration plus two administrators to serve as resource people. The members are:

- Vincent Amanor-Boadu, associate professor, agricultural economics
- Peter Dorhout, dean, arts and sciences
- Jennifer Gehrt, director, human resources services
- Mo Hosni, professor, mechanical and nuclear engineering
- Julia Keen, associate professor, architectural engineering and construction science (chair)
- Virginia Moxley, dean, human ecology
- Stephanie Rolley, department head, landscape architecture and regional and community planning
- Brian Spooner, division head, biology

---


Resource people:
- Cindy Bontrager, interim vice president for finance and administration
- Brian Niehoff, associate provost for institutional effectiveness

The charge given to the task force was to develop a long-range compensation (specifically salary) improvement plan with specific targeted goals and strategies over a number of years consistent with the K-State 2025 goals for competitive faculty compensation.

The salary comparison data were generated by the Office of Institutional Research at Oklahoma State University. Ten institutions are required in order for the OSU office to generate salary comparison data. The Administration selected the 10 peer institutions for comparison, which included the seven peers for K-State 2025 (Auburn University, Clemson University, Colorado State University, Iowa State University, Oklahoma State University, Oregon State University, and North Carolina State University) plus three additional land grant institutions that are closest in comparison to K-State (Louisiana State University, University of Massachusetts- Amherst, and Washington State University). Unfortunately, OSU is not able to provide historical trend analysis for these 10 peer institutions without financial expense and the investment of significant time. It was the decision of the task force to use the OSU data on these 10 peers for current values, and use data from the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) for historical data when making comparisons. The differences in data sets are that the APLU set includes many more institutions with the total number varying by year depending on which schools chose to report their salaries (FY2012 data included 113 institutions), and uses a different definition of faculty compared to the OSU data. Nonetheless, for the purposes of the task force report, these APLU data were considered acceptable to examine trends over the past 10 years for comparison.

Although obvious that salaries at K-State need to be improved to be competitive with our peers, the charge to develop a long-range salary improvement plan was quickly recognized by the task force as being a complex issue. A priority of both the University Administration and Faculty Senate was to have this report completed in as short a time frame as possible so that salary improvement strategies could be implemented as soon as fall 2013. With the goal of completing a report in just over two months, the task force determined that the scope must be defined to allow this to be a manageable task for which the comparative data were available. Therefore, it was a conscious decision to limit the recommendations of this report to the following:

- Address only 9-month base salaries, not full compensation packages
  - Compensation beyond salaries is a complex equation, very difficult to attain information, and challenging to compare by non-HR professionals.

- Make recommendations at the University level instead of the college or department level
  - The 10 peer institutions can only be considered peers at the University level, because many departments do not consider this group as peer institutions.

- Include only full time instructional faculty on the K-State Manhattan Campus
  - The numbers used in this report reflect the budget implications on the Manhattan Campus, as budgets for Salina and Olathe are handled differently. The data used for comparison are limited to 9-month appointments and 12-month faculty converted to 9-months. Thus, positions such as academic services, library, extension and others who do not fit the definition of full time instructional faculty are not included.
The intent of the task force was to develop tools and strategies that could be implemented for all faculty appointments as defined in section C10 of the University Handbook.

**Working Principles**

The task force approached the responsibility of developing a long-range salary improvement plan by first defining the principles to guide the decision making process. These principles are:

- We respect units’ flexibility and shared governance. Our recommendations will allow individual units to capitalize on all opportunities to increase faculty salaries to competitive levels by rewarding top performers, by supporting promotions, making equity adjustments, and providing annual salary adjustments for all faculty who are performing at or above expectations.
- The need for salary increases is urgent. We will recommend that the University identify sufficient funds to “close the gap” in salaries with 10 peers in the next three years. We will recommend that the University plan to close the gap with aspirational peers by 2025.
- It is imperative to generate broad support for increasing faculty salaries to competitive levels. We will recommend that a position statement be developed for use with legislators, students, and Kansans about the value of a great faculty to the University and to the State.
- Retention of outstanding faculty is vital to achieving K-State 2025. We will recommend strategies that are proactive in terms of faculty retention, rather than reactive (so salary increases are based on merit rather than solely on threat of departure).
- Every member of the team contributes toward reaching the goals of K-State 2025. All faculty salaries matter in attaining benchmarks.

The task force completed the following steps in creating the recommendations introduced in the remainder of the report.

- Establish goals for closing the gap with 10 peers by 2018
- Created a toolbox of strategies including merit and promotion increases, salary enhancements and equity adjustments
- Analyzed how past practices have impacted the income earning potential of individual K-State faculty
- Recommended a salary data management/benchmarking systems to track future improvement and progress toward the goals set

**Imperative for a Solution**

There exists a documented disparity between the mean average salaries paid to K-State faculty and their counterparts in the 10 peer institutions. The mean average salary for all ranks, at K-State for FY2011-2012 is $78,310 compared to a mean average of $86,958 and a median of $86,480 for the peer institutions (Table 1). These differences are maintained at all ranks with the exception of the median of instructor level, where K-State’s mean average salary is estimated at about 3% higher than the median salary of the peers. K-State is at the bottom of the mean average salary rankings for both assistant and associate professors and 8th (of 11) for full professors. The overall ranking is 10th out of eleven. These relatively low mean average salaries create incentives for accomplished K-State faculty to become susceptible to advances from other institutions that offer more competitive salaries.

It is this risk of losing these potential critical contributors to the institution in its aspirations towards
K-State 2025 that demands that a careful risk management strategy be developed to minimize the losses. Although the literature shows that salary is not the sole variable defining the attractiveness of any job, there is evidence that salary satisfaction is an antecedent to job satisfaction. Furthermore, salaries’ tangibility makes them strong comparative instruments, visible points of contention, and palpable tools for establishing appreciation and measuring self-worth.

Table 1: Comparison of K-State Faculty Salaries with 10 Peer Institutions by Rank (FY2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Assistants</th>
<th>Instructors ‡</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Peers</td>
<td>$109,196</td>
<td>$79,920</td>
<td>$70,025</td>
<td>$37,758</td>
<td>$86,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median of Peers</td>
<td>$107,408</td>
<td>$78,321</td>
<td>$69,836</td>
<td>$44,417</td>
<td>$86,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State Mean</td>
<td>$104,384</td>
<td>$73,628</td>
<td>$64,418</td>
<td>$46,274</td>
<td>$78,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Two of the peer institutions reported zero mean average salary for instructors.

Figure 1 shows the extent to which the mean average K-State faculty salary by rank compares to the mean average and median salaries of the peers. Overall, K-State salaries are at 90.1% of the peers’ mean average and 90.6% of the peers’ median. Thus, the salaries of K-State faculty members are about 10% below the mean average of their peers and about 9.4% below the median of the peers. These differences form the foundation of the principles and tools that drove the discussions presented in this report.

Figure 1: K-State Mean Average Faculty Salaries Relative to Peers’ Mean and Median by Rank

---


As observed above, the lower salary ranking at K-State creates risks for the institution that some faculty may seek better compensation. Figure 2 shows the 10-year distribution of ranked faculty who have left K-State and the stated reasons they provided in their exit interviews. The majority (52%) of faculty who left K-State indicated salary or an offering of a position by another institution as the primary reason for separation (which would most probably have a superior salary accompaniment). By comparison, 28% of faculty who left indicated family or personal reasons for their departure, with 19% for retirement.

Figure 2: Distribution of Faculty Leaving K-State between 2001 and 2012 by Reason*
*Does not include Library faculty.
Source: Planning and Analysis, Kansas State University

A further evaluation of the data shows that half of those leaving for salary reasons were at the assistant professor rank, with associate and full professors accounting for 30% and 20%, respectively. While not apparent in these data, if we assume that the assistant professors left after they have built a portfolio of marketable scholarship, K-State loses the investments it has made in their professional development as teachers and scholars and the recruiting institutions benefit from our investments without incurring those very investment costs. Likewise, K-State’s investment in faculty startup packages and recruitment costs is lost as well. The investment cost (and the loss) is much higher for those who leave the institution at the associate and full professor ranks because the institution has made longer-term investments in them.5

The challenge of keeping up with peers, even when assistant professors are hired in at salaries that might be competitive, is exacerbated further by the institution’s annual and promotional enhancement formulas. At K-State, the promotional increase to a full professor is 11% of the university mean average faculty salary, while the promotion to associate professor is 8%. Because these percentages are based on low base salary mean averages in comparison to the peers, our promotion increases may lag as well. Consequently, K-State faculty will continue to lag behind their peers in mean average

5 It is fair to recognize that some proportion of those leaving were low performers whose departure opened up the possibility to replace them with superior performers. In this case, their departure was not really a loss but a cut in the institution’s losses.
salary over time because some of these peers will provide significantly larger promotional salary increases.

**Example of Salary Trajectory**

Charting the salary trajectory of a professor who has dedicated the majority of his or her career to K-State, with “exemplary” to “exceeds expectations” annual performance evaluations, illustrates the true cost of lagging salaries and inadequate merit increases. A detailed spreadsheet illustrating this example may be found in Appendix 3. Beginning at the mean average assistant professor salary of $40,063 in 1996, this individual was provided merit increases most years. For a brief period of time, a Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement was provided as well as small promotion salary increases. In FY2013, after 18 years of service, the faculty member will likely be eligible for a Professorial Performance Award. The outcome of 18 years of dedicated service at the end of FY2013 is a salary of $84,677, $15,448 less than the FY2011 mean average salary of a K-State professor reported in the June 2011 Report on the Status of Faculty Salaries at K-State prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis (http://www.k-state.edu/pa/statinfo/reports/faculty/salary11/table1.pdf). Without benefit of salary negotiations that come with moving to a different institution, their salary is well below the mean average, although their performance has been high. Most striking in this illustration is the difference between the total Merit Increase this individual has received ($27,664) and the total Cost of Living Adjustment that would have been received in other employment situations ($25,987). Thus, the total career salary increased above basic cost of living increases was only $1,676.

**Targets and Tools**

The values used in each of the suggested tools below were selected to reach the following Targets:

- By 2015, the mean average salary of K-State faculty will be equal to or exceed 95% of the median salary level (by rank and discipline) of the peer institutions.
- By 2018, the mean average salary of K-State faculty will be equal to or exceed the median salary level (by rank and discipline) of the peer institutions.
- By 2021, the mean average salary of K-State faculty will be equal to or exceed the median salary level (by rank and discipline) of a yet-to-be-determined group of aspirational peers.

These targets were based on the Faculty Senate Salary Benchmarks presented on May 8, 2012 (Appendix 1) but modified to reflect the change in institutional peers used for comparison as well as the time that has elapsed since their development.

The goal of improving faculty salaries is critical to achieving the goal of being recognized as a top-50 public research university by 2025, and requires approaches that involve annual merit-based initiatives, consistent merit-based proactive retention initiatives, merit-based equity and compression initiatives, and significant increases in the salary increments commensurate with promotions in faculty rank. The task force recognizes that making progress in closing the salary gap with our peer institutions, in the short term, and moving toward salaries consistent with those of our aspirational peers by 2025, will require the hiring of new faculty at competitive salaries followed by opportunities for annual salary increases that exceed those of our peer groups. Detailed discussions of each of the tools presented below are provided in Appendix 2.

December 2012
There is an $8,170 difference between the mean average K-State faculty member salary and the median salary of our peer group (based on 2011-2012 data). We have a short term benchmark goal that, by 2018, the mean average salary of K-State faculty will be equal to or exceed the median salary of the peer group, knowing that the peer institutions will not hold their salary increases in check to wait for us. Using those data, we need to infuse approximately $8.2M into faculty base salaries over the next two years, and then continue these increases as we move toward aspirational peers.

The strategies we are proposing include increments, enhancements, adjustments, and incentives as an interrelated set of tools, which include annual increases, promotional increases, and increases based on multi-year assessments of achievement.

- We propose an increase in the percent increase in base salary that accompanies promotion to associate professor and to professor from 8% and 11%, respectively, of the mean average salary of all faculty, to an increase that is 15% of the mean average salary, with each promotion. Based on the annual mean average number of promotions, this initiative would increase the total mean average annual cost of promotions by about $250,000. We also recommend adding the current difference between the new and old percentages to those promoted during the past 5 fiscal years and have met or exceeded expectations annually, to address the instantaneous compression that would otherwise occur. This one-time additional cost to the base is estimated at approximately $1.25M.

- We recommend an annual mean average faculty salary increase of 5%, which is delivered in two ways: a 2% increase pool of funds and a 3% increase pool of funds. The 2% base merit increase will go to all faculty members who “meet expectations” in their annual evaluation. The 3% mean average additional high merit increases will go to faculty members who “exceed expectations” in their annual evaluation. These high merit increases will be made available, on the basis of the unit total salary base, for unit head recommendations to the dean. These increases can range from 1% to in excess of 3%, based on the evaluation and total funds available to the unit. The first year of funding would require approximately $3.6M.

- We are recommending establishing/reactivating a Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement Program that provides $3,000 base increases to faculty members on a merit driven proactive retention basis. The program has the capacity to provide awards to 20-25% of faculty members in each department/unit, on an annual basis. This tool should be used, particularly in the first two years, to address faculty members who have achieved over the most recent 3-4 year period of time, when annual merit salary increases were not available. This program would maximally require $750,000 per year.

- We are also proposing the establishment of an equity and compression pool of funds, which would cost $600,000-800,000 per year, to address individual and group salary inequities that exist for non-merit reasons or for significant disparities with appropriate peers.

The effectiveness of the suggested tools to achieve these targets was confirmed by conducting a re-analysis using the hypothetical faculty member from the case example above, which may be found in Appendix 4. The salary values for this faculty member were based on the mean average salary for K-State at different levels of promotion – newly hired assistant professor, current assistant professor, current associate professor, and current professor. Recognizing that not all faculty members perform at the same level, the hypothetical faculty member has been modeled for his or her career progression and related salary compensation at the three different performance levels – exemplary performance,
exceeds expectations, and meets expectations. It is important to note that these models are not to be referenced as a flawless indicator of salary progression as there are many assumptions made for multiple variables. The model does however provide an illustration of the magnitude of impact possible through the adoption of these recommended tools.

**Benchmarking and Ongoing Review**

The University Office of Planning and Analysis has provided annual reports, and maintains a database of faculty salaries and total compensation dating back to 1999 (Faculty Senate Report: [http://www.k-state.edu/pa/statinfo/reports/faculty/salfringe.htm](http://www.k-state.edu/pa/statinfo/reports/faculty/salfringe.htm)) comparing salaries and total compensation across 133 APLU institutions, the Big 12, 50 Land Grant Institutions, and Regents’ Peer institutions. These reports are valuable in their own rights and confirm the perspective that K-State faculty have been compensated below the average of nearly any comparative database (see, for example, [http://www.k-state.edu/pa/statinfo/reports/faculty/salary11/table1.pdf](http://www.k-state.edu/pa/statinfo/reports/faculty/salary11/table1.pdf)).

Given the Principles and Scope by which this task force has operated, continual evaluations and assessments to gauge progress towards parity with our peer set of institutions is imperative. The task force also recognized that the 10 peers selected for the present analysis offer good comparators for K-State, but they may not be appropriate at the disciplinary or departmental level. In particular, some disciplines at K-State may offer terminal graduate degrees, while some peer institutions do not, and vice versa. Therefore, data from APLU, Oklahoma State, or other national salary surveys at the disciplinary or departmental level, need to be tracked consistently and reported so that deans and department heads may make decisions about salaries in the appropriate contexts.

Several new assessments or presentations of data that would be of value to K-State faculty and administrators and would complement current report include 1) tracking annual salary and benefit increases at peer institutions, 2) discipline or programmatic salary changes as a function of time for the 10 peers, 3) time-since-terminal-degree versus salary plots for all faculty (by department), and 4) an analysis of salary by department that evaluates the correlation of the time-since-terminal-degree versus salary data by gender or ethnicity.

- **Tracking annual salary and benefit increases at peer institutions.** The overall merit or inflationary salary pool for each peer institution, reported for all faculty levels, would enable K-State to track how peers are adjusting faculty compensation each year. As K-State seeks to enhance its profile as a top-50 public research university and achieve a goal of salaries at or above the peer mean average, it must exceed its peers’ investments in faculty compensation. Therefore, tracking and reporting annual compensation pool increases by our peers will be invaluable to making our case to the Regents and the Legislature for greater salary pool resources. A sample table for such a report for APLU mean averages is shown in Table 2.

- **Discipline or Program-based salary changes as a function of time for the 10 peers**

- **Time-since-terminal-degree versus salary by discipline.** This analysis provides a critical perspective on the salary stability of a department or program. Salary inversion and compression are obvious at first glance, as are “outliers” – faculty who are not keeping up with their departmental or program peers for salary. The Task Force selected “time-since-terminal-degree” as an appropriate norm rather than “time-at-K-State”, since some faculty members are hired from other institutions. The “time-since-terminal-degree” comparator is something that many disciplines consider in their salary surveys.
As a tool for the Provost, deans, and department heads, further analysis of these data should identify faculty whose salaries are greater than one standard deviation from the linear regression of all salaries illustrated in Figure 3.

Table 2. Total Salary Increases for K-State Compared to APLU Mean Average Percentage Increases over time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KSU Mean Salary</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>APLU Mean Salary</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$78,410</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$93,594</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$75,859</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>$91,899</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$76,238</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$91,488</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$75,802</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>$90,302</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$72,724</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$86,458</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$69,136</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>$83,485</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$67,402</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$80,433</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$63,219</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$77,954</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>$61,665</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>$74,399</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on APLU salary data.

- **Analysis by department/program of correlation coefficient, r, for salaries reported.**
  Programs that show a correlation coefficient $r < 0.5$ should provide an explanation for the deviation in its annual salary recommendations. These analyses should be for internal university use only, due to the personal nature of the data.

Figure 3: Plot of time-since-terminal-degree with salary for a sample K-State department
Recommendations and Additional Items Needing to be Addressed

The task force has demonstrated the need for immediate investment by the University in faculty salaries in order to be competitive as an institution by attracting and retaining excellent faculty. Continual annual investment will also be required to achieve the goals of being recognized as a top-50 public research university by 2025. The task force recommends that a 5-year initial commitment be made to the strategies defined in this report. At the end of five years, the plan should be reassessed utilizing the annual benchmarking reports to determine if modifications should be made to reach the long term targets defined in this report.

One recommendation that will require a change of culture is to adopt a philosophy of proactive rather than reactive retention. At the Faculty Senate Spring Forum with the President and the Provost, the opinion was shared by Administration that the only way to attain a raise at the University was if a faculty member “had an offer from another university”. This reactive approach has many negative implications – 1) faculty are investing time into researching and interviewing for jobs rather than devoting this time to their research, teaching, and service at K-State; 2) faculty who would have otherwise been content at K-State have explored opportunities elsewhere that became attractive and instigated their leaving; 3) it diminishes morale since salary increases do not correlate to performance; 4) it becomes contagious as colleagues see the opportunity and the results. The task force believes that this mechanism for salary increases should be minimized or eliminated, and that the University should invest these dollars into a proactive retention policy for excellent faculty.

Due to the limitations of this report, it is expected that additional task forces be established to look at items that are beyond its scope, such as: disciplinary disadvantage and peer disadvantage of specific colleges and departments; compensation beyond salary; issues of faculty who do not fit the definition of full time instructional faculty - academic services, library, extension, etc.; and salary increase opportunities beyond the base salary - 12 to 9 month conversions, professorships, research incentives, etc.
Appendix 1 – Faculty Senate Salary Benchmarks presented on May 8, 2012

By 2015, salaries of K-State faculty and unclassified staff will be equal to or exceed 85% of the median salary level of faculty (according to rank and academic discipline) and unclassified staff (according to title) at land grant institutions ranked among the top 50 public research institutions.

By 2018, salaries of K-State faculty and unclassified staff will be equal to or exceed 90% of the median salary level of faculty (according to rank and academic discipline) and unclassified staff (according to title) at land grant institutions ranked among the top 50 public research institutions.

By 2021, salaries of K-State faculty and unclassified staff will be equal to or exceed 95% of the median salary level of faculty (according to rank and academic discipline) and unclassified staff (according to title) at land grant institutions ranked among the top 50 public research institutions.

By 2025, salaries of K-State faculty and unclassified staff will be equal to or exceed the median salary level of faculty (according to rank and academic discipline) and unclassified staff (according to title) at land grant institutions ranked among the top 50 public research institutions.

**K-State salaries, on average, are currently at 77.5% of the median for faculty and unclassified staff at land grant institutions ranked among the top 50 research institutions.

Benchmarking Principles:

1. Purpose. Compensation benchmarks are standards by which progress toward salary goals can be judged. These salary benchmarks are based on the overall goal of K-State 2025—that K-State becomes a top 50 public research university by 2025. Many of the themes, activities, and outcomes of K-State 2025 depend upon retaining and recruiting a “highly talented, diverse workforce.” This set of benchmarks is focused on this purpose; not on other issues related to compensation (e.g., merit, compression, equity).

2. Clear, Measurable, and Flexible. Compensation benchmarks should be clear and measurable. This set of benchmarks compares the total compensation of like groups (e.g., assistant professors of history) using data from objective sources (i.e., AAUP and CUPAHR). How additional resources are distributed among those groups (e.g., across the board, merit, or some other way) will be decided when additional resources become available.

3. Reasonable and Graduated. Salary benchmarks should be reasonable and realistic given the current status of salaries and the goals, themes, activities, and outcomes of K-State 2025. FSLC believes these salary benchmarks are reasonable and graduated given our current context.

4. Comparison Groups and Data Sources. This set of salary benchmarks is based on the median salaries of like groups at land grant institutions—the institutions that most closely resemble K-State and its mission. AAUP data will be used to compare faculty salaries. CUPA-HR data will be used to compare unclassified salaries where appropriate.

1 K-State 2025 Theme 5: Faculty and Staff Strategic Action Plan.
Appendix 2 – Tools to Increase KSU Faculty Salaries

1. Increase the increments received for promotion to associate professor and to professor. The current increases are based on the mean average faculty salary, including instructors, which for FY2013 was essentially $72,000* (FY2012 mean average), and are 8% ($5,760) for promotion to associate professor and 11% ($7,920) for promotion to professor.

Proposal: increase the promotional percentage to 15% of the mean average faculty salary for each promotion, whether to associate professor or professor. If the mean average salary was, like last year, $72,000*, the promotional increase would be $10,800. The cost to the institution, over the current cost, would be $5,050 more, each, for promotion to associate professor, and $2,894 more, each, for promotion to professor. The total number of promotions for the past 5 fiscal years was 295, ranging from 41-71, with an average of 59. Assuming an annual average of 60 promotions (split at 35 to associate and 25 to professor), the increased total cost to the institution would be $176,750 (for associate) plus $72,350 (for full) or $249,100 per year.

1a. It is imperative to backfill promotions. Individuals who were promoted in the past 5 years become dramatically compressed by the change in promotional increment. Therefore, increases should be applied to promotions that were received in FY 09, 10, 11, 12, and 13, if the individuals have annually received met or exceeds expectations in their evaluations since that promotion. The maximum number will be less than 300, as some have left the University since promotion. Assuming 2/3 were promoted to associate professor and 1/3 were promoted to professor, the total backfill cost would be $(200 \times $5,000 = $1M) + (100 \times $2,900 = $290K) = $1.29M. Such promotional increase corrections would redress compression created by the change in promotional increment.

Collectively, these changes would require $1.54M into the base, the first year of implementation, and ~$0.25M per year thereafter.

1b. Consider changing the basis for the mean average annual salary. The current calculation uses the budgeted faculty salaries, including regular instructors. Since instructors are not eligible, currently, for promotion, including their salaries in the mean average for determining promotional increments artificially decreases the basis for determination of promotion increment amounts.

2. Proposal: Establish an annual 5% faculty salary increase pool (that is as percent of total faculty salaries), distributed, per usual, to units, based on total unclassified, budgeted salaries of that unit, and deliver this increase as a 2%, across the board base-merit increase, and a 3% high merit-based increase pool. The standard should be that the across the board (base merit) increase is applied to all faculty members who, subject to their effort distribution, meet expectations in their annual evaluations. Additionally, high merit raises should be delivered, on a merit basis, to faculty members who, subject to their effort distribution, exceed expectations in their annual evaluations. Evaluation-based differentiation will result in these additional increases ranging from approximately 1% to in excess of 3%. Assuming 1000 faculty members, at an average of $72,000* per year salary, the total annual cost for the first year would be $3.6M.

3. Proposal: Establish/reactivate a Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement (TFSE) Program. The program, as formulated a decade ago, was designed to provide department heads with TFSE awards to annually reach 20-25% of their tenured/tenure track faculty members with $2,500 base increases. The criterion for the awards was merit-based proactive retention. This tool was quite effective, and should be reactivated. However, a decade later, the amount per award should be $3,000. TFSE
awards are, by their nature, made on the basis of multi-year accomplishment and are particularly relevant, given the paucity of salary increases over a four year period of time. **Assuming a total tenured/tenure track faculty number of 1,000, the annual cost would be $600K to $750K.**

4. **Proposal:** Establish an equity and compression pool of funds, which require a meritorious justification, to address salary within ranks, in departments, that exist for non-merit reasons (race, color, ethnic or national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, age, ancestry, disability, military status, or veteran status). **Heads will address this pool for individual faculty members though request recommendations to the appropriate dean.** This pool will also allow deans to address inequity issues of entire units or disciplines that are dramatically below “absolute” or “true” peer units/disciplines at other institutions. **Deans will address this pool for entire unit corrections in consultation with the Provost and Deans Council.** A reasonable target pool for both individual and whole unit equity corrections would be **$600-800K per year.**

This collection of possible initiatives would require approximately $6.7M in year 1, followed by approximately $5.4M per year on a recurring basis, with annual increases to numbers 1 and 2 of 5%, and likely decreases in number 4.

It is worth noting that the FY2013 Main Campus General Use Allocations (Budget) includes a **State General Fund Appropriation** of $102,538,863 (block funding) and a **General Fees Fund (Tuition Revenue)** of $177,502,487. Assuming no help from the State, a 5% increase in tuition revenue alone would generate $8,875,024 in additional funds. A 5-year commitment to 5% increases per year, without help from the State, would support these proposals, and provide resources to grow our faculty numbers. More from the State would allow for decreases in tuition increase needs in those years.

*The $72,000 mean average salary, used in this report for FY2012 (AY11-12) promotion increases for FY2013, differs from the $78,000 KSU mean average salary (Oklahoma State database) because the KSU promotional raise mean average salary includes library and extension faculty, who are not included in the Oklahoma State University database.*
Appendix 3 – Example of Salary Trajectory

The description supporting the salary trajectory example can be found on page 7 of the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 1st year</td>
<td>40,063</td>
<td>41,468</td>
<td>41,984</td>
<td>43,423</td>
<td>45,810</td>
<td>47,405</td>
<td>53,152</td>
<td>54,348</td>
<td>54,348</td>
<td>55,438</td>
<td>56,707</td>
<td>63,438</td>
<td>71,726</td>
<td>74,954</td>
<td>77,952</td>
<td>77,952</td>
<td>78,927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 2nd year</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 3rd year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 4th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 5th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 6th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 7th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 8th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 9th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 10th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 11th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 12th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 13th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 14th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 15th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 16th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 17th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 18th year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comparison of the cost of living adjustments received in other employment situations to the Merit Increases received:

**COLA** = 1,162, 371, 546, 1,086, 1,962, 2,231, 1,382, 761, 1,141, 1,497, 2,489, 2,061, 1,850, 4,347, 0, 0, 2,806, 3,342, 29,987

**COLA - Actual Merit Increase** = 240, -352, 924, 602, 633, 1,564, -186, -761, -54, 1,275, 143, 444, 1,578, -1,349, 0, 0, -1,832, -2,342, 1,676

**COLA Source: Social Security Administration**

[Included as a point of reference, Kansas State faculty do not receive a cost of living adjustment]

**Salary = KSU average assistant professor salary used for starting salary世界的K-state.edu/facsen/facsenrate/2012/documents/D41012Attachment50115statusFacultySalariesreport.pdf**

**TOOLS**

1) INCREASES

a. Merit Increase of 3% to faculty members who exceed expectations

Annual Merit Salary Evaluations: http://www.k-state.edu/budget/striclassified%20percent%20increase.pdf


b. Promotion Increase

2) ENHANCEMENTS

a. Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement of $2,500 adjustment noted when available

b. Professorial Performance Award increase of $5,750

3) ADJUSTMENTS

a. Equity and compression pool with meritorious justification to address non-merit reasons
Appendix 4 – Examples Illustrating the Impact of Recommended Tools on Faculty Salaries

Appendix 3 of this report demonstrates the inadequate performance of faculty compensation tools to the salary trajectory of a typical high performing K-State professor over their career span. Using the same format, the following models exhibit the potential positive impact of the proposed faculty salary compensation tools on faculty at various stages of their career:

- a current professor, Figure A4.1
- an associate professor promoted to professor in FY2014, Figure A4.2
- an assistant professor promoted to associate in FY2014, Figure A4.3
- an assistant professor newly hired in FY2014, Figure A4.4

For each of these situations, faculty salary increases and enhancements are applied to hypothetical faculty whose annual performance is evaluated as: exemplary, exceeds expectations and meets expectations.

The tools applied to each are:

- Increases: Base Merit Increase, Merit Increase and Promotion
- Enhancements: Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement and Professorial Performance Award

Additionally, each exhibit includes a model of the salary trajectory of a comparable individual at the average of our peer institutions.

The potential trajectory of the salaries in these models demonstrates the impact of strategic employment of faculty compensation tools across the spectrum of faculty careers and performance.
Figure A4.1: Trajectory of a Current Professor Moving Forward

RSU EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Base Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Targeted for Salary Enhancement</th>
<th>Professional Performance Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSU EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Base Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Targeted for Salary Enhancement</th>
<th>Professional Performance Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSU MEETS EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Base Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Targeted for Salary Enhancement</th>
<th>Professional Performance Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEER AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
<th>Estimate Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>119,799</td>
<td>108.303</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>119,799</td>
<td>108.303</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>119,799</td>
<td>108.303</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>119,799</td>
<td>108.303</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Salary

**Salary =

1) INCREASES

a. Base Merit Increase of 2% to all faculty who 'meet expectations' in their annual evaluation

b. Merit Increase of 3% to faculty members who 'exceeded expectations'

AMOUNTS/SALARY INCREASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Base Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model suggests that 2% of the average merit increase is the exemplary performance model, 10% of the increase in the exemplary expectations model, and 10% of the increase in the merit expectations model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Base Merit</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) PROMOTION

a. Promotion increase of 5% of average salary; $90,000 for professors of this analysis, for promotion to associate professor, and at professor

b. Baseline Promotion Increase for the FY 06, 07, 08, and 09 $1,000 for promotion to associate professor and $2,000 for promotion to professor

2) ENHANCEMENTS

a. Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement of $2,000 for merit-based provisional retention, reaching 20-25% of the tenure-track/tenured faculty

Prior to FY2013, $2,000 adjustment noted when available. FY2013 forward, $1,000 applied equally critical to retain

b. Professional Performance Award Increase of existing program to 5-7.5% of average of all salaries at full time faculty, for eligible faculty Professors prior to FY2013

3) ADJUSTMENTS

a. Equity and compliance with peer institutions' justification to address non-mean reasons
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### Figure A4.2: Trajectory of an Associate Professor Promoted to Professor in FY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>6th year</td>
<td>7th year</td>
<td>8th year</td>
<td>9th year</td>
<td>10th year</td>
<td>11th year</td>
<td>12th year</td>
<td>13th year</td>
<td>14th year</td>
<td>15th year</td>
<td>16th year</td>
<td>17th year</td>
<td>18th year</td>
<td>19th year</td>
<td>20th year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>1st July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### KSU EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE

| Salary* | 52,081 | 52,081 | 52,081 | 57,776 | 60,022 | 63,749 | 70,640 | 74,031 | 74,031 | 71,142 | 76,943 | 70,646 | 95,178 | 59,957 | 107,814 | 113,338 | 118,975 | 130,697 | 140,231 | 147,243 |
| Merit Increase | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Promotion | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

#### KSU EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

| Salary* | 52,081 | 52,081 | 52,081 | 55,206 | 60,822 | 63,746 | 70,640 | 74,031 | 74,031 | 71,142 | 76,943 | 70,646 | 95,178 | 93,837 | 107,934 | 113,338 | 118,975 | 130,697 | 140,231 | 147,243 |
| Merit Increase | 0.0% | 2,000 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Professional Performance Award | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

#### KSU MEETS EXPECTATIONS

| Salary* | 52,081 | 52,081 | 52,081 | 53,123 | 58,779 | 60,981 | 63,827 | 68,640 | 72,430 | 72,430 | 75,390 | 79,049 | 80,572 | 97,633 | 102,534 | 107,934 | 113,338 | 118,975 | 130,697 | 140,231 |
| Merit Increase | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Professional Performance Award | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

#### Peer Average

| Average Increase | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

**Salary += adjusted salary after promotion

---

* Salary = GSU average assistant professor salary used for starting salary
** Salary += peer average assistant professor salary used for starting salary, Old data

### TOOLS

**Notes:**

- Salary = GSU average assistant professor salary used for starting salary
- Salary += peer average assistant professor salary used for starting salary, Old data

### INCREASES

- Merit Increase of 5% for faculty members who "exceed expectations"

### Adjustments

- Equity and compression pool with meritous justification to address non-merit reasons

---

**Figure A4.2: Trajectory of an Associate Professor Promoted to Professor in FY2014**

**Figure A4.2: Trajectory of an Associate Professor Promoted to Professor in FY2014**

---

December 2012
Figure A4.3: Trajectory of an Assistant Professor Promoted to Professor in FY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 1st year</td>
<td>After 2nd year</td>
<td>After 3rd year</td>
<td>After 4th year</td>
<td>After 5th year</td>
<td>After 6th year</td>
<td>After 7th year</td>
<td>After 8th year</td>
<td>After 9th year</td>
<td>After 10th year</td>
<td>After 11th year</td>
<td>After 12th year</td>
<td>After 13th year</td>
<td>After 14th year</td>
<td>After 15th year</td>
<td>After 16th year</td>
<td>After 17th year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KSU EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE**

- **Salary**
  - Base Merit Increase: 0%
  - Merit Increase: 2.952%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Salary with Merit Increases: 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457
  - Salary with Merit and Promotion: 0%
  - Professional Performance Award: 0%
  - Salary with Merit, Promotion, and Professional Performance Award: 0%

- **Annual Merit and Promotion**
  - Base Merit: 0%
  - Merit: 2.952%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Annual Merit and Promotion: 0%

**KSU EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS**

- **Salary**
  - Base Merit Increase: 0%
  - Merit Increase: 2.960%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Salary with Merit Increases: 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457
  - Salary with Merit and Promotion: 0%
  - Professional Performance Award: 0%
  - Salary with Merit, Promotion, and Professional Performance Award: 0%

- **Annual Merit and Promotion**
  - Base Merit: 0%
  - Merit: 2.960%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Annual Merit and Promotion: 0%

**PEER AVERAGE**

- **Salary**
  - Base Merit Increase: 0%
  - Merit Increase: 2.547%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Salary with Merit Increases: 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457, 64,457
  - Salary with Merit and Promotion: 0%
  - Professional Performance Award: 0%
  - Salary with Merit, Promotion, and Professional Performance Award: 0%

- **Annual Merit and Promotion**
  - Base Merit: 0%
  - Merit: 2.547%
  - Promotion: 0%
  - Annual Merit and Promotion: 0%

NOTES:

*Salary* = KSU average assistant professor salary used for starting salary (http://www.k-state.edu/bocam/comp/2012/documents/092012Attachment2StatusFacultySalariesreport.pdf)

Peer average assistant professor salary used for starting salary (Gsu data)

1) **INCREASES**
   a. Base Merit Increase of 2% to all faculty who meet expectations in their annual evaluation
   b. Merit increase of 3% to faculty members who exceed expectations
   c. Promotion increase of 2% to faculty members who exceed expectations
   d. Base MERIT increase in FY2010, 2011, and 2012 (10, 15, and $1,000 for promotion to associate professor and $2000 for promotion to professor)

2) **ENHANCEMENTS**
   a. Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement of $5,000 for merit-based promotion retention, reaching 20-25% of the tenure-track/faculty
   b. Professional Performance Award increase of existing program to $5,750, 8% of average of all salaries of full time faculty, for eligible Professors prior to FY2013

3) **ADJUSTMENTS**
   a. Equity and compression pool with meritorious justification to address non-m erit reasons
### KSU EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>68,445</td>
<td>75,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Merit Increase 1,300 1,369 1,501 1.581 1.695 1.813 2.125 2.238 2.416 2.544 2.679 2.881 3.250

Merit Increase 2,145 2,259 2,477 2,626 2,747 2,953 3,506 3,692 3,987 4,198 4,431 4,756 0

Promotion 0 0 0 0 0 0 10,800 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Typical Increases 68,445 72,073 79,051 83,241 87,653 104,258 111,889 117,819 127,223 133,966 141,046 152,501 165,751

Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement 0 3,000 0 0 3,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Total Salary with Additional Enhancements 68,445 75,073 79,051 83,241 90,653 107,258 111,889 120,819 127,223 133,966 141,046 152,501 165,751

### KSU EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>68,445</td>
<td>72,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Merit Increase 1,300 1,369 1,441 1,518 1,595 1,695 1,988 2,094 2,105 2,321 2,444 2,574 2,926

Merit Increase 2,145 2,259 2,378 2,504 2,637 2,777 3,181 3,454 3,637 3,830 4,031 4,287 0

Promotion 0 0 0 0 0 10,800 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Typical Increases 68,445 72,073 79,051 83,241 84,150 91,418 104,679 110,227 116,069 122,221 128,696 141,212 149,248

Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Professors Performance Award 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Additional Enhancements 68,445 72,073 79,051 83,241 90,653 108,179 114,907 121,416 127,223 133,966 141,046 152,501 165,751

### KSU MEETS EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>67,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Merit Increase 1,300 1,369 1,353 1,380 1,407 1,435 1,680 1,714 1,748 1,783 1,818 1,855 2,108

Merit Increase 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Promotion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Typical Increases 68,300 67,626 68,979 70,358 71,705 84,051 85,681 87,394 89,142 90,925 92,743 94,591 96,708

Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Professors Performance Award 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Additional Enhancements 68,300 67,626 68,979 70,358 71,705 84,051 85,681 87,394 89,142 90,925 92,743 94,591 96,708

### PEER AVERAGE

**Peer Salary**

24,723 21,189 20,739 20,367 20,085 19,887 19,496 20,046 20,610 21,197 21,783 22,380 22,987

Average Increase 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Estimate Promotion 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Salary with Typical Increases 77,189 79,766 82,967 85,085 87,893 101,594 104,946 108,410 111,987 115,683 119,500 123,444 127,487

### NOTES

*Salary = KSU average assistant professor salary used for starting salary
**Salary = Peer average assistant professor salary used for starting salary*

**TOOL**

1) INCREASES

a. Base Merit Increase of 2% to all faculty who "meet expectations" in their annual evaluation
b. Merit Increase of 3% to faculty members who "exceed expectations"

2) ENHANCEMENTS

a. Targeted Faculty Salary Enhancement of $3,000 for merit-based proactive retention, reaching 20-25% of the tenure-track/hured faculty
b. Professors Performance Award Increase of existing program to $5,750, 8% of average of all salaries of full time faculty, for eligible Professors prior to FY2013

3) ADJUSTMENTS

a. Equity and compression pool with meritorious justification to address non-merit reasons