

Report on Faculty Compensation
Faculty Compensation Ad Hoc Committee
Faculty Senate, Truman State University
Final Report, August 2000

List of Tables	2
Executive Summary.....	3
I. Introduction.....	3
a. Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Similar Schools	4
b. Nature of the University	4
c. Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Staff.....	5
d. General Salary Trends, Non-Academic Sector	5
II. Summary of Method	6
III. Findings:	7
A. Schools and Salary.....	7
Notes To Tables Based on (AAUP) Data:.....	8
B. Benefits.....	10
C. Merit Pay / Release Time	11
D. Summer teaching pay.....	11
IV. Conclusions	12
APPENDIX.....	14
Notes to Tables Based on (CUPA) Data	30
Faculty Load Report Guidelines	35

List of Tables

Table 1. Comparison Schools: Faculty Salaries & Total Compensation Packages, by Rank, 1997-99

Table 2. Truman Rank Against 11 Comparison Institutions by Faculty Rank in Salary and Compensation -- Not Adjusted for Cost of Living

Table 3. Average Institutional Cost of Fringe Benefits per Faculty Member in Dollars and As a Percentage of Average Salary, by Category and Itemized Benefits

Table 4. Medical/Dental Plans: 9/10 Month Contracts, Expenditures--1998

Table 5. Faculty Summer Pay Calculation per Three-Credit Hour Course

Table A1. Comparison Schools on Selected Criteria

Table A2. Potential Comparison Schools Considered but Excluded

Table A3. Selected Private and Missouri Public Schools on Comparison Criteria (information only)

Table A4. Selected Private and Missouri Public Schools by Faculty Salaries and

Table A5. Salary and Compensation of Comparison Schools Ordered by All Ranks

Table A6. Comparison Institutions, Average Faculty Salary by Rank,

Table A7. Average Salary and Compensation Levels, Category IIA and Academic Rank, All and West North Central Region, 1999-2000 (dollars, in thousands)

Table A8. *U.S. News* 25 Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, Alpha by State Faculty Salaries by Rank; Total Compensation by All Ranks, 1999

Table A9. Top 15 Missouri Schools of Higher Education by Average Salary, All Ranks, 1999

Table A10. Comparative Salary Data from Truman's Office of the VPAA

Table A11. Percent Increase in Salary for Continuing Faculty,

Table A12. Number of Faculty by Rank, by Comparison Universities

Table A13. Weighted Average Salaries, by Rank, by Comparison Universities

Table A14. Faculty Summer Pay (Per Course) As a Percent of Academic Year Salary Data for 1996/97 Academic Year

Table A15. In-State and Out-of-State Tuition Rates Ranked with Comparative Schools

Table A16. Comparison of KCOM and Truman Benefits on Selected Criteria

Table A17. Portion of Southwest Missouri State Salary Equity Adjustment Document, Rev.

Table A18. Compensation and Classification, with Selected Wage/Salary Ranges Mizzou, Rolla and Truman -- 1999/00 and 2000/01

Table A19. A Comparison of Salary Factors Using CUPA Data

Executive Summary

For the purpose of comparing Truman State University's compensation (salary and benefits) structure to other institutions of higher education, 11 comparison schools were identified based on a number of criteria. For the purpose of examining Truman's summer pay structure, a number of other public universities in Missouri were surveyed, as well as the 11 designated comparison schools. Some considerations of merit pay were included in the appendix of this report, although the issue was not thoroughly investigated. (It is noted that questions of merit pay quickly initiate discussions of faculty load, roles, and responsibilities).

The comparison school group, as identified, consists of eight COPLAC universities (Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges and universities), and three other.

Data collected suggest that Truman's faculty compensation package--salary and benefits--lags behind the average of comparable schools. This appears to be true at all ranks, although most notably at the rank of full professor. Regardless of rank, evidence based on some measures, as presented below, indicate that this lag may be substantial.

In all comparisons regarding summer pay, Truman is positioned firmly at the bottom of the scale.

I. Introduction

The members of the Truman Faculty Compensation Ad Hoc Committee would like to thank the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to conduct this study and are pleased to issue this report. We were charged with:

- determining comparison schools
- gathering information on the pay structure at these schools, including salary and benefits
- researching merit pay structures at these and other institutions
- researching summer salary structures at these and other institutions

We have largely fulfilled these charges, with the following exceptions. Extensive information on salary structures of comparison schools—narrowly defined and more broadly construed—were collected; however, opportunities to supplement salaries through internal grants were not identified. Comparative data on Truman's benefits package are provided; however, an extensive and detailed comparison of benefit packages with similar institutions was ultimately beyond our capacity due to limitations in professional (human resources) expertise and time constraints. Information on merit pay structures at comparison and other institutions was not collected; however, some sample criteria by which some other universities determine faculty merit pay are included in this report. Finally, information on current summer teaching policies and summer pay schedules at comparison and other schools not gathered in the spring have been collected for this final report. The table reporting comparative summer salary data at selected Midwest public schools (gathered and reported by Professor David Gruber in 1997) has been moved to the appendix.

The issue of faculty compensation must be evaluated in various contexts. At a minimum such contexts would include four considerations: a) faculty compensation compared with other similar schools, b) the nature of the university charter, mission, reputation and academic aspirations c) the comparative salary schedules of other university staff (e.g., executive, administrative, technical, clerical, other support) relative both to internal staff hierarchy and external horizontal comparisons and d) competitive regional and national salary trends for professionals with postgraduate training employed outside of academia. While this report makes a substantive contribution to an understanding of the first context, we on the committee would respectfully suggest that members of Faculty Senate might include consideration of the other three contexts in subsequent deliberation.

a. Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Similar Schools

Addressed below.

b. Nature of the University

As most students and employees are well aware, Truman University is Missouri's designated public liberal arts and sciences university, with highly selective admission and an institutional commitment to excellence. A recognized element of this excellence is high-quality faculty. One explicit goal of *Affirming the Promise* (1997-2007)¹, is to "recruit and retain diverse faculty with impressive academic credentials, solid experience in the liberal arts and sciences, dedication to the support and cultivation of student progress, and a strong commitment to continuing scholarly and professional development" (p. 60). To underscore the importance of this point, *Affirming the Promise* goes on to describe the anticipated result of this faculty recruitment and retention goal in some detail:

To recruit new, full-time, tenure-track faculty who have outstanding professional qualifications earned at leading institutions and a strong background in the liberal arts and sciences; specific indicators shall include the following: (a) percentage of new faculty who earned an undergraduate degree at Bacculaureate I (as defined by Carnegie Classification) or comparable liberal arts institution; (b) percentage of new faculty who exhibited significant breadth in undergraduate education outside the major field of study; (c) percentage of new faculty who earned academic honors as an undergraduate, e.g., cum laude or higher, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, other general honors, or honors recognition in the major; (d) percentage of new faculty who earned academic honors as a graduate student or a practicing professional, e.g., teacher of the year; and (e) a listing of the graduate institutions at which new faculty earned their terminal degrees. A specific database for these measures is under development (p. 61).

But Truman is more than a collection of aspirations. The quality of its existing faculty is reflected in the institution's high academic ratings. Truman enjoys a regional and even national reputation across several education-related domains. This fact makes the selection of a comparison group of similar institutions particularly challenging. In terms of university mission the 17 member institutions of the Council On Public Liberal Arts Colleges and universities (COPLAC) would be a logical comparison group; however, as discussed below, these schools vary widely on certain key comparison criteria—and very few enjoy the academic reputation of Truman. The difficulty of selecting comparison institutions is exemplified by the fact that university administration maintains (at least until recently) six different lists of "Comparison Groupings For Truman State University."²

This effort is complicated even further by Truman's supportive institutional value of affordability (*Affirming*, pp. 5, 12-13) and its commitment to a lean administrative and staffing structure in conjunction with its emphasis on institutional quality. Just as "higher education in Missouri has, historically, functioned in the context of two competing values" (pro-education yet anti-tax, see *Affirming*, p. 67), so Truman University's commitment to maximum quality at minimum cost also constitutes a fundamental tension. To the matter at hand, this committee has attempted under our charge to establish a reasonable comparison group of educational institutions that is realistic and, we feel, relatively conservative given Truman's academic quality and emphasis on excellence in faculty.

¹ *Affirming the Promise, An Agenda for Excellence in the 21st Century: University Master Plan 1997-2007*. Truman State University.

² From Truman's office of Institutional Research: *U.S. News* Twenty-five Best National Liberal Arts Colleges; *U.S. News* Fifteen Best Midwestern Universities; Council On Public Liberal Arts Colleges; *Money* Magazine Top Ten National Best Buys; *Money* Magazine Top Ten Highly Selective Best Buys; Selective Private Bacculaureate I Colleges (Enrollment Greater Than 1,900 and Academic Level 1 or 2 Per *Money* magazine).

c. Faculty Compensation Relative to Other Staff

In this context it is worth noting that different university staffing levels experience proportionately different compensation scales when compared with similar positions at other Missouri state universities. Likewise, different university staffing levels at Truman (e.g., executive, administrative, technical, clerical, other support) have experienced disproportionate increases in salary relative to other levels. Certainly faculty salaries at Truman have shown significant recent increases. But preliminary analysis reveals that while faculty saw (actual) salaries increase about 25 percent over the past ten years, Truman administrative personnel have seen about a 35 percent increase. While a more detailed look at these comparisons are relevant to consideration of faculty compensation at Truman, the issue of compensation “fairness and adequacy internally” was specifically excluded from this committee’s charge and will not be further considered in this study. Incidental data related to this issue may be presented to Faculty Senate separately by some members of this committee, independent the committee and of this report.

d. General Salary Trends, Non-Academic Sector

In the larger context of faculty compensation, it is appropriate to note a few general economic trends. While no single institution has influence over these trends, an awareness of them can at least enlighten discussion. In the current issue of *Academe* (March-April, 2000) an article by Prof. Linda Bell, chair of the Economics department of Haverford College, offers a sophisticated statistical analysis of current compensation packages at institutions of higher education. Based on a well-known annual survey by American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the article summarizes related data gathered from over 1,700 participating institutions. Bell highlights “the persistent and widening gap between salaries at public and private institutions, between faculty at research institutions and those at other types of institutions, and between women and men” (p. 21). With the first two discrepancies, at least, she concludes that most salary differences are probably a function of an institution’s ability to pay. Of even greater relevance here is the conclusion that, despite recent sustained growth in real salaries, faculty “are losing ground in relative terms to the many professionals who are cashing in on talents not dissimilar to our own in private-sector, non-academic jobs” (p. 13). For this analysis the author looked at data from the *Current Population Survey* (CPS) produced by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for the years 1997 and 1985. Bell calculates that whereas faculty could expect to earn about 13.8 percent less than other highly educated professionals in 1985, by 1997 the disadvantage had nearly doubled to roughly 24 percent (p. 15). After certain statistical controls were entered into the equation (demographic variables that affect earnings), the adjusted difference in pay was even wider: 23 percent in 1985, which rose to 32 percent in 1997. As for the recent national gains in faculty salaries in real terms, Bell points out that faculty salaries are actually lower, relatively, than they were in 1972. Bell declares that this concern over relatively lower, and declining, faculty income is not merely a personal one. She points out (to paraphrase freely) that economists have shown that people’s career decisions lag behind salary trends, often by many years. Deterioration in the relative salary position of faculty therefore raises a troubling question about the future of quality higher education in this country. “Could the growing opportunity cost of an academic career,” she asks, “end up discouraging future generations of brilliant students from pursuing [the profession]” (Bell, p. 13). Coincidentally, a news item which may shed some light on the answer appeared the same week the *Academe* article was published. In the April 20 *Kansas City Star*, Mara Rose Williams reported on the nationwide K-12 teacher shortage. Over the next 10 years the nation will look for about 2.5 million teachers. For highly desirable teachers, some school districts are already offering \$5,000 signing bonuses. According to the article, Missouri will need to hire about 10,000 teachers this year, Kansas about 1,200. The assistant director of Career and Employment Services at the University of Kansas stated that “There is no way we will be able to meet demand, no way.” The relevant observation to this study was made by Ken Bungent from the Kansas Board of Education, when he said (quoting the article) “the problem is not that universities and colleges are not preparing enough educators. *It’s that too many graduates are opting to work in the corporate arena*” (p. A12, emphasis added).

Again, it is beyond the capacity of Truman or even the state of Missouri to counter such national trends in faculty compensation. The information is offered here to help fit the local issue into a larger context.

II. Summary of Method

The first step was to determine the schools that were most comparable to Truman. The committee used the following criteria:

- Student enrollment, and the nature and extent of any postgraduate academic programs;
- Percentage of undergraduate student body graduating within the top 10 percent and top 25 percent of their high school class;
- SAT and ACT scores.
- Percentage graduating within six years;
- Student to faculty ratio; and
- Percentage of full-time faculty;

The most important of these were enrollment, ratio, and percentage of full-time faculty. Also considered was the Carnegie category of the institution. Schools not in Category IIA (like Truman) or IIB were automatically excluded. (These categories are defined below.) Using these criteria, the committee began by examining other Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges and universities (COPLAC) schools, since this association--of which Truman is a member--features medium-sized schools with a largely undergraduate liberal arts and sciences mission. We then examined extensive reports from *Peterson's* in order to identify additional schools similar to Truman on these criteria. Over several meetings the committee examined potential comparison schools and narrowed the list to eleven public universities. For information only, the committee selected three private universities to which Truman is sometimes compared academically, as well as four other Missouri schools for purposes of general reference. Also for information only, the committee reports the names of schools considered or discussed that were not included on the final comparison list. The Truman Faculty Senate approved the committee's selection at its meeting on March 16, 2000.

The committee utilized three sources of faculty salary and compensation data: (a) an annual survey conducted by the American Association for University Professors (AAUP), (b) the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), and, to a limited extent, the National Center for Education Statistics IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System). The AAUP conducts a yearly survey of faculty salaries and issues an annual report on the economic status of the profession in April. Table 1 presents some of these data from 1997, 1998, and 1999. For each institution, average salaries are reported for professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and a weighted average for all ranks at the institution as a whole. These data do not, however, account for the wide variation between disciplines in salaries and overall compensation. We therefore also include data at the conclusion of the Appendix from CUPA's annual report on faculty salaries, which is broken down by discipline and level. We have picked the disciplines reported by CUPA that seemed to best reflect disciplines at Truman, although inevitably there are differences. CUPA's report also includes the percentage of each faculty for each level in each discipline (FAC Mix). CUPA reports separate data for schools whose faculty are represented in collective bargaining, those whose faculty is not represented in collective bargaining, and combined data. IPEDS data are available on the Web at <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/index.html>

The committee was not able to pursue the issue of merit pay in detail, but a sample faculty load report from the Florida Institute of Technology is provided in the Appendix. Regarding faculty merit and load--and the related issue of faculty release time--several Web sites could prove helpful. These include Sonoma State University (Faculty Merit Increases Criteria and Procedures) at <http://www.sonoma.edu/UAffairs/policies/facultymerit.htm>, and the University of Scranton (Faculty Affairs Council), at <http://academic.scranton.edu/organization/fac/>.

III. Findings:

The findings of this committee are presented primarily in tabular format under four headings based on our charge: (a) Identification of comparative schools and their salary scales; (b) benefit packages; (c) merit pay structures; (d) summer teaching pay. Again, lack of time and expertise precluded a thorough examination of benefit packages.

A. Schools and Salary

For clarity, much of the information in this report is presented in tabular format. To aid readability of the narrative portion of this report, most of those tables are positioned in the Appendix. For the list of comparison schools on selected criteria, see Table A1. For a list of potential comparison schools considered by rejected, see Table A2. For information purposes only a short list of selected private and Missouri public schools is itemized by comparison criteria in Table A3. Again for information purposes only, salary and compensation data of these schools are presented in Table A4. Table 1 below summarizes similar data for Truman and the comparison schools.

**Table 1. Comparison Schools: Faculty Salaries & Total Compensation Packages, by Rank, 1997-99
With U.S. News & World Report Rankings, 1999**

(As Reported by Participating Institutions. Source: AAUP's *Academe*,
March-April issue, 1998, 99 & 00)

	U.S. News Ranking	CAT	Salary					Compensation Package				
			PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
COPLAC												
CA-Sonoma State	97	I/A	66.9	53.0	44.3		60.7	82.6	66.5	56.0		75.2
	98	Regional	67.3	52.6	43.2		59.6	75.2	59.1	48.5		66.6
	99	West, 21	71.5	56.8	45.4		63.3	87.8	70.7	57.0		77.8
MD-St. Mary's	97	I/B	60.2	47.4	40.4	37.3	44.6	74.3	59.0	50.7	47.1	55.7
	98	National, LAS	70.0	54.7	40.3		53.0	86.8	68.2	50.2		66.0
	99	Second Tier	72.4	55.5	41.1		54.4	89.7	69.3	51.8		68.0
MN-UM-Morris	97	I/B	62.5	47.0	38.6	34.7	45.5	81.1	62.5	52.3	47.6	60.6
	98	National Univ.	64.9	49.4	37.8	34.3	46.7	84.6	65.9	51.9	47.7	62.7
	99	Second Tier	67.2	51.4	38.7	35.9	48.5	88.7	69.6	54.3	50.9	66.1
MO-TRUMAN	97	I/A	56.6	45.9	37.2	29.5	43.6	68.7	56.6	46.4	37.7	53.9
	98	Regional	58.7	48.8	39.2	31.0	45.6	73.1	61.2	49.6	39.8	57.3
	99	Midwest, 9	62.0	50.6	39.7	32.6	47.6	76.8	63.0	50.0	41.5	59.4
NC-UNC-Asheville	97	I/B	61.9	48.8	36.5		47.0	74.5	59.2	44.6		57.0
	98	National LAS	64.2	49.4	37.2		48.9	77.1	59.8	45.4		59.1
	99	Fourth Tier	65.2	49.9	38.8		49.9	77.5	59.9	46.9		59.8
NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	97	I/A	74.7	60.0	47.2		58.6	94.1	75.7	59.5		73.8
	98	Regional	77.2	61.9	48.5		60.5	98.6	79.0	61.9		77.2
	99	North, 8	78.1	62.4	47.5		59.4	102.2	81.6	62.2		77.8
NY-SUNY-Geneseo	97	I/A	55.6	44.3	36.1	33.6	43.3	71.3	57.1	45.4	41.8	55.2
	98	Regional	58.2	47.2	38.7	34.6	45.8	74.8	60.5	48.7	43.2	58.3
	99	North, 8	59.7	48.6	40.2	35.2	47.1	77.2	62.8	50.3	42.8	60.1
SC-College of Charleston	97	I/A	56.1	46.8	37.4	30.3	43.8	68.5	57.7	46.5	38.2	54.0
	98	Regional	57.4	46.8	38.2	31.5	44.5	70.4	58.0	47.8	39.8	55.3
	99	South, 11	60.9	49.7	40.1	33.8	47.4	74.3	61.2	49.9	42.6	58.5
VA-Mary Washington	97	I/B	57.1	45.7	37.0		46.2	69.9	56.6	46.4		57.2
	98	Regional	62.1	49.2	40.0		50.1	76.5	61.2	50.5		62.3
	99	South, 5	Not reported									
Non-COPLAC												
KY-Murray State	97	I/A	54.4	45.6	37.8		43.5	69.9	59.0	49.4		56.0
	98	Regional	57.0	48.2	40.1		45.4	73.7	62.8	52.6		59.2
	99	South, 29	60.8	50.1	41.4		47.4	77.6	64.7	53.7		61.1
MN-Winona State	97		-									
	98	Reg. Mid-West	60.0	48.1	41.2	31.4	50.4	75.6	60.6	52.0	39.6	63.5
	99	Second Tier	Not reported									
WI-Lacrosse	97	I/A	56.5	47.2	42.3		47.9	71.8	30.7	54.9		61.5
	98	Regional	58.0	49.2	43.7		49.2	74.3	63.8	52.3		62.7
	99	Midwest, 23	60.8	51.7	45.1		51.0	77.3	66.5	53.6		64.3

Notes To Tables Based on (AAUP) Data:

(American Association of University Professors)

(From *Academe*, March-April 2000, p. 37)

Instructional Faculty. The instructional faculty is defined as those members of the instructional-research staff who are employed on a full-time basis and whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research. Institutions are asked to exclude (a) instructional faculty who are employed to teach less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions; (b) instructional faculty in preclinical and clinical medicine; (c) instructional faculty who are employed on a part-time basis; (d) administrative officers with titles such as dean of students, librarian, registrar, coach, and the like, even though they may devote part of their time to classroom instruction and may have faculty

status; (e) undergraduate or graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses, but have titles such as teaching assistant, teaching fellow, and the like; (f) faculty on leave without pay; and (g) replacement for faculty on sabbatical leave.

Salary. This figure represents the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration. Where faculty members are given duties for eleven or twelve months, salary is converted to a standard academic -year basis by applying a factor of 9/11 or 81.8 percent or by the official factor used in a publicly announced formula which is reflected in a footnote to the appendix tables of this report.

Compensation. Compensation represents salary plus major fringe benefits.

Category IIA (Comprehensive Institutions). These institutions are characterized by diverse postbaccalaureate programs (including first professional), but do not engage in significant doctoral-level education. Specifically, this category includes institutions not considered specialized schools in which the number of doctoral-level degrees granted is fewer than thirty or in which fewer than three unrelated disciplines are offered. In addition, these institutions must grant a minimum of thirty postbaccalaureate degrees and either grant degrees in three or more postbaccalaureate programs or, alternatively, have an interdisciplinary program at the postbaccalaureate level.

Category IIB (General Baccalaureate). These institutions are characterized by their primary emphasis on general undergraduate baccalaureate-level education. These institutions are not significantly engaged in postbaccalaureate education. Included in this category are institutions which are not considered specialized and in which the number of postbaccalaureate degrees granted is fewer than thirty or in which fewer than three postbaccalaureate-level programs are offered and which either (a) grant baccalaureate degrees in three or more program areas, or (b) offer a baccalaureate program in interdisciplinary studies.

Table 2. Truman Rank Against 11 Comparison Institutions by Faculty Rank in Salary and Compensation -- Not Adjusted for Cost of Living
(Source of Data: AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

	Salary				
	PR	AQ	AI	IN	AR
Truman Rank	7	6	10	-	9
	Compensation Package				
	PR	AQ	AI	IN	AR
Truman Rank	9	7	10	-	11

Table 2, above, shows Truman’s relative position to the 11 comparison schools by academic rank in terms of salary and compensation. For a complete listing of these schools by salary and compensation by rank, see Table A5. For this information adjusted by cost-of-living (COL) see Table A6. That said it should be observed that although Truman faculty salaries and compensation do not compare favorably to all Category IIA universities nationwide, these measures do compare very favorably to Category IIA schools in the West North Central region (see Table A7). Aside from American Association for University Professors, the College and University Personnel Association, and Category IIA classifications there is another way to compare Truman with peer universities—a way that takes into account this school’s drive for academic quality and outstanding faculty. This alternative involves making an institutional commitment to being competitive at some

level with institutions of higher education well known for excellence. Truman's *Master Plan* takes this approach where it states the goal of increasing the salaries of full-time, regular assistant and associate professors at Truman to at least 90 percent of the average for nationally ranked liberal arts colleges and increase full professors to at least 80 percent of the comparable national average ("provided sufficient mission enhancement funds are available"). Using the administration-provided list of *U.S. News*' 25 Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, Truman fell about 10 percent short of those goals in 1999 (see Table A8).

Table A9, a list of the top 15 Missouri schools of higher education by average salary (all ranks) is offered for information purposes.

Finally there are offered here several sets of data from CUPA which shed additional light on the salary structure of Truman faculty compared nationally and to ten comparison institutions (College of Charleston, College of New Jersey, Murray State University, Sonoma State University, St. Mary's College of Maryland, SUNY College at Geneseo, University of Minnesota-Morris, UNC at Asheville, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, and Winona State University). (See also Table A19.)

B. Benefits

Table 3, below, is provided for information purposes. It may require additional explanation from Truman's Office of Institutional Research.

Table 3. Average Institutional Cost of Fringe Benefits per Faculty Member in Dollars and As a Percentage of Average Salary, by Category and Itemized Benefits

(AAUP Data, from *Academe*, March-April, 2000, p. 31; Truman Data from David Rector)

	IN DOLLARS		AS A PERCENTAGE OF SALARY	
	IIA	TRUMAN	IIA	TRUMAN
Retirement	4,822	5,666	9.0	11.9
Medical Insurance	3,354	2,262	6.3	4.8
Disability	154	63	0.3	0.1
Tuition	334	136	0.6	0.3
Dental Insurance	209		0.4	
Social Security	3,576	3,639	6.7	7.7
Unemployment	84		0.2	
Group Life	164	66	0.3	0.1
Worker's Comp.	244		0.5	
Benefits in Kind	140		0.3	
All Combined	13,081	11,834	24.5	24.9

Major Fringe Benefits. In general, the major fringe benefits include those where the institution (or state) makes a definite payment of a specified amount on behalf of and for the benefit of the individual faculty member. The major benefits include (a) social security (rate effective January 1998); (b) retirement contribution, regardless of the plan's vesting provision; (c) medical insurance; (d) dental insurance; (e) group life insurance; (f) disability income protection; (g) unemployment compensation; (h) workers' compensation; (i) tuition for faculty dependents (both waivers and remission are included); and (j) other benefits in kind with cash alternatives (for the most part, these include benefits such as moving expenses, housing, cafeteria plans or cash options to certain benefits, bonuses, and the like).

Comparative data from IPEDS regarding Truman's Medical/Dental plan also suggests that faculty benefits at Truman are relatively low (Table 4).

Table 4. Medical/Dental Plans: 9/10 Month Contracts, Expenditures--1998

From the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
 (Faculty Salaries Data: Fringe benefits of full-time instructional faculty(SAL98_B))

Institution Name	Total \$	Participants	Average \$
THE COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY	2,111,998	322	6,559
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-MORRIS	695,742	114	6,103
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE	1,739,486	337	5,162
WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY	1,163,452	280	4,155
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY	861,507	215	4,007
SUNY COLLEGE AT GENESEO	778,416	226	3,444
MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY	1,066,611	318	3,354
MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE	538,614	161	3,345
SAINT MARYS COLLEGE OF MARYLAND	332,472	111	2,995
COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON	904,912	368	2,459
TRUMAN STATE UNIVERSITY	829,150	350	2,369
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE	279,335	161	1,735

C. Merit Pay / Release Time

Models for merit pay in higher education exist. Members of the committee regret they were not able to pursue details of successful merit pay structures at other universities. The committee did some cursory, preliminary investigation of these models and concluded (a) merit pay is possible and may be desirable, however, (b) the institution of merit pay at Truman would take strong leadership and a significant commitment of administration time and energy. As mentioned above, Regarding faculty merit and load--and the related issue of faculty release time--several Web sites could prove helpful. These include Sonoma State University (Faculty Merit Increases Criteria and Procedures) at <http://www.sonoma.edu/UAffairs/policies/facultymerit.htm>, and the University of Scranton (Faculty Affairs Council), at <http://academic.scranton.edu/organization/fac/>.

D. Summer teaching pay

Faculty salary compensation for summer teaching at Truman is the lowest offered by either set of comparison schools examined. Compensation by percentage is half what the University of Missouri system offers, and 50% less than the typical summer salary percentage offered by the comparison schools (see Table 5 below; see also Table A14).

Table 5. Faculty Summer Pay Calculation per Three-Credit Hour Course

Data for 1999/00 Academic Year

Compiled by Prof. Gary Jones, Truman State University, July, 2000 (gjones@truman.edu)

Sources of Information Available on Request

COPLAC

CA-Sonoma State	Flat rates by rank	Varies--See URL address below. E.g., for enrollment of 20: AI = \$3375; AO = \$4254; PR = \$4458 Generally, compensation for 1 month summer work max = 1/9th
MD-St. Mary's	Flat rates by rank	Director is out of town. Call the Provost sometime...
MN-UM-Morris	9%	Of base annual salary per previous academic year;
NC-UNC-Asheville	Flat rates by rank	(In=2220; AI=2280; AO=2550; PR=2925, per 3-hr course)
NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	6.25%	or 5.25% without Ph.D.
NY-SUNY-Geneseo	Flat rate, \$2400	Per 3-hour course
SC-College of Charleston	7.50%	Of 9-month salary; or \$83 per semester hr per student Summer cap is 22.5% of 9-month salary (with few exceptions)
VA-Mary Washington	7.20%	Of base salary; guaranteed. If course is listed, it is taught.
Other		
KY-Murray State	7.50%	
MN-Winona State	6.75%	-> with \$2,877 minimum
WI-Lacrosse	Not Obtained	

Selected MO Schools

(Information only)

MO-Mizzou	11%	Of 9-month base pay; maximum
MO-UMKC	10%	
MO-Rolla	10%	20% maximum compensation in the summer (via John Mulchan)
MO-UMSL	10%	Of base salary for regular faculty; flat rates for adjuncts and lecturers
MO-Missouri Western	8.57%	Equated hour load X (1/7) X (20%) [or .02857 per credit hour taught]
MO-Southeast	8.25%	Of 9-month salary
MO-Missouri Southern	8.25%	Of base salary
MO-Central	7.50%	For Part-time faculty, 6.75%
MO-Southwest	7.50%	Of 9-month base salary
MO-Northwest	7.50%	Of annual (academic year) salary
MO-TRUMAN	5%	

Relevant WEB Sites:

Cal State Salary Schedule	http://www.calstate.edu/hrpims/salary.htm
Cal State Summer Pay	http://www.calstate.edu/hrpims/Salary/SCH2357-19991029_PL9904.pdf
U of M - Rolla	http://www.umar.edu/~chanc/policy/ii14.htm

IV. Conclusions

Truman's faculty compensation package lags behind that of comparable institutions as identified by this committee. Based on calculations provided by the VPAA's office, Truman also remains slightly short of its Master Plan goals for salary of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. Whether considered substantial or slight, this lag does not seem to be improving, despite recent raises (Tables A10). Nor do continuing faculty do not seem to be faring well against some comparable institutions (Table A11)

The subject of employee benefits is extremely complex. Data presented above, although somewhat selective, suggests that Truman is not keeping pace with comparable universities in this realm. While Truman's retirement plan appears solid, other aspects of compensation appear weak. This is in part a function of revenue, of course (see Table A15), but it is also a matter of will and dedication to the hiring and retention of quality faculty in a competitive market. A tentative comparison of aspects of Truman's benefit package with KCOM's is provided in the appendix (Table A16).

Although at the margins of this committee's charge, this report also includes data that suggest Truman's wage-earning staff is also somewhat underpaid compared to a couple other state universities (Table A18). As noted above, this does not seem to be the case with administration compensation at Truman. Southwest Missouri State has attacked the issue of compensation by establishing a Salary Equity Adjustment plan (a small sample of which is shown in Table A17). Central Missouri and Northwest Missouri have also recently implemented new compensation calculation systems.

If Truman is serious about evaluating the state of its institutional benefits package then consideration might be given to calling in the experts. Some firms experienced in higher education compensation analysis are suggested on CUPA's Web site, specifically at:

<http://www.cupahr.org/HRsolution/providers.html>

The market is competitive. If Truman cannot remain competitive in terms of faculty salaries and total compensation packages, the talent may go elsewhere.

APPENDIX

Table A1. Comparison Schools on Selected Criteria

(Source: Peterson's Guide)

<u>Public Schools</u>	Undergraduates (Graduate Students)	Student:Faculty Ratio	UG Faculty (% fulltime)	6-year Graduation Rate	(Average) SAT Verbal Middle 50%*	(Average) SAT Math Middle 50%*	(Average) ACT Middle 50%*	Top 10% of HS Class	Top 25% of HS Class
College of New Jersey	5853 (858)	14:1	626 (52%)	80%	(607) 560-660	(620) 580-670		59%	92%
University of Charleston	8876 (0)	18:1	671 (68%)	52%	(576) 530-620	(563) 520-600	(25) 22-28	27%	58%
Mary Washington	3596 (36)	18:1	242 (73%)	74%	550-650	550-630		44%	82%
University of Minnesota- Morris	1919 (0)	16:1	120 (100%)	63%	(550) 520-650	(570) 540-690	(24) 22-28	45%	76%
Murray State University	7347 (1556)	16:1	481 (77%)				(23)	30%	64%
University of North Carolina - Asheville	2760 (40)	11:1	287 (56%)	52%	510-630	520-620	21-26	25%	66%
Sonoma State University	5856 (1147)	19:1	520 (49%)	45%	(522) 500-599	(523) 500-599		25%	55%
St Mary's of Maryland	1539 (0)	13:1	173 (65%)	374%	(621) 580-680	(616) 570-660		48%	80%
SUNY - Geneseo	5197 (300)	19:1	334 (75%)	77%	(600) 560-640	(604) 570-620	(26) 24-28	48%	92%
Truman State University	5967 (354)	16:1	396 (90%)	64%	(614) 560-670	(610) 560-670	25-30	45%	81%
Winona State University	6138 (615)	21:1	350 (93%)		(530)	(560)	(23) 21-25	20%	45%
University of Wisconsin- La Crosse	8324 (682)	20:1	478 (75%)	51%			(24) 22-26	23%	62%

Table A2. Potential Comparison Schools Considered but Excluded

(Source: Peterson's Guide)

Sample of Rejected Schools	Undergraduates (Graduate Students)	Student:Faculty Ratio	UG Faculty (% fulltime)	6-year Graduation Rate	(Average) SAT Verbal Middle 50%*	(Average) SAT Math Middle 50%*	(Average) ACT Middle 50%*	Top 10% of HS Class	Top 25% of HS Class
Truman State University	5967 (354)	16:1	396 (90%)	64%	(614) 560-670	(610) 560-670	25-30	45%	81%
Bemidji State University	3714 (214)	20:1	151 (98%)	37%			(22) 18-23	10%	50%
Evergreen	3711 (262)	12:1	173 (88%)		530-650	490-600			
Fort Lewis	4128 (0)	20:1	276 (78%)		(490)	-490	-21	8%	22%
Grinnell	1299 (0)	10:1	154 (87%)	86%	630-730	630 - 710	28-31	68%	94%
Henderson	3089 (422)	18:1	229 (60%)		(490) 460-570	(550) 480-560	(21) 19-24	17%	44%
Humbolt State University	6534 (941)	18:1	543 (57%)		480-580	470-590	20-25		
Keene	3785 (1206)	16:1	346 (51%)	48%	440-540	440-530		3%	15%
Montevallo	2686 (447)	16:1	209 (65%)				(22) 18-23	19%	51%
New College of Florida	618 (0)	11:1	56 (100%)	66%	650-740	600-680	27-31	56%	84%
Ramapo	4087 (154)	16:1	292 (51%)	41%	460-560	460-570		11%	38%
Richard Stockton College of NJ	5566 (262)	17:1	340 (61%)	57%	540-600	560-640		25%	64%
University of North Florida	8687 (1706)	17:1	645 (60%)		530-600	490-600	20-23	18%	53%
Western Kentucky	12185 (2169)		913 (61%)	40%			(21) 18-23	34%	64%

Table A3. Selected Private and Missouri Public Schools on Comparison Criteria (information only)

(Source: Peterson's Guide)

<u>Private Schools</u>	Under-graduates (Graduate Students)	Student: Faculty Ratio	UG Faculty (% fulltime)	6-year Graduation Rate	(Average) SAT Verbal Middle 50%*	(Average) SAT Math Middle 50%*	(Average) ACT Middle 50%*	Top 10% of HS Class	Top 25% of HS Class
Bradley	4850 (940)	14:1	476 (66%)		500-650	570-660	23-28	31%	61%
DePauw	2201 (0)	12:1	221 (76%)	77%	540-640	550-660	25-29	47%	80%
Gustavus Adolphus	2527 (0)	13:1	224 (75%)	77%	(600) 540-660	(616) 560-670	(26) 23-29	38%	71%
<u>Missouri Schools</u>									
Central Missouri	8461 (1895)	17:1	499 (85%)	38%			(22) 19-24	15%	41%
Missouri Southern	5370 (0)	27:1	283 (79%)	27%			17-24	14%	38%
Northwest Missouri	4992 (1099)	27:1	259 (88%)				(22) 18-23	10%	36%
Southeast Missouri	7058(1044)	19:1	378 (100%)				(23) 19-23	17%	45%
Truman State University	5967 (354)	16:1	396 (90%)	64%	(614) 560-670	(610) 560-670	25-30	45%	81%

Table A4. Selected Private and Missouri Public Schools by Faculty Salaries and Total Compensation Packages, by Rank, 1997-99 (information only)

(As Reported by Participating Institutions. Source: AAUP's *Academe*, March-April issue, 1998, 1999 & 2000)

	CAT	Salary						Compensation Package				
		PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	
MO-TRUMAN	97 IIA	56.6	45.9	37.2	29.5	43.6	68.7	56.6	46.4	37.7	53.9	
	98	58.7	48.8	39.2	31.0	45.6	73.1	61.2	49.6	39.8	57.3	
	99	62.0	50.6	39.7	32.6	47.6	76.8	63.0	50.0	41.5	59.4	
Selected Privates--information only												
IL-Bradley	97 IIA	64.1	51.7	40.3	30.9	48.5	77.3	62.2	48.5	35.0	58.4	
	98	65.3	53.8	43.0	32.3	50.9	78.3	65.0	52.0	35.7	61.2	
	99	67.1	53.8	44.2	33.5	51.9	81.3	66.2	53.1	37.5	62.8	
IN-DePauw	97 IIB	59.4	48.9	38.1		50.9	75.2	63.6			66.2	
	98	61.7	50.5	39.9		53.1	78.0	64.5	51.7		67.7	
	99	66.0	53.4	43.3		55.6	84.3	68.8	55.2		71.1	
MN-Gustavus Adolphus	97 IIB	56.6	46.6	38.9	35.6	46.7	64.9	56.5	47.7	44.6	57.2	
	98	60.2	48.5	40.9	36.0	48.9	74.6	58.5	49.5	44.3	59.6	
	99	61.1	49.9	42.3	37.2	50.2	76.5	60.9	52.2	47.3	62.2	
Selected Missouri Schools--information only												
MO-Central	97 IIA	58.5	50.0	42.2	30.7	49.3	71.3	61.3	52.1	38.5	60.5	
	98	59.9	51.2	43.0	30.9	50.7	74.3	64.0	54.0	39.5	63.2	
	99	61.6	52.1	43.4	31.6	50.9	76.4	65.0	54.5	40.3	63.6	
MO-Southeast	97 IIB	54.1	44.1	37.8	33.6	42.9	66.1	54.1	46.7	41.9	52.8	
	98	-										
	99	61.1	50.1	40.6	32.5	48.9	75.0	61.8	50.5	40.8	60.4	
MO-Missouri Southern	97 IIB	57.9	48.6	39.6	32.2	47.2	70.5	59.5	48.9	40.1	57.8	
	98	54.1	45.7	38.2	34.7	43.9	67.4	57.3	48.2	44.0	55.1	
	99	57.7	46.5	38.7	35.5	44.9	71.7	58.2	48.9	45.1	56.3	
MO-Northwest	97 IIA	58.8	45.7	38.4	29.5	43.2	71.5	55.9	47.3	36.8	53.2	
	98	60.2	47.3	39.4	30.2	44.0	74.3	58.8	49.2	38.1	54.9	
	99	62.8	49.2	41.3	33.2	44.9	77.2	61.0	51.5	41.7	55.7	

Table A5. Salary and Compensation of Comparison Schools Ordered by All Ranks
(AAUP, *Academe*, March-April issue, 2000)

				Salary				
		CAT		PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
1	CA-Sonoma State	99	IIA	71.5	56.8	45.4		63.3
2	NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	99	IIA	78.1	62.4	47.5	-	59.4
3	MD-St. Mary's	99	IIB	72.4	55.5	41.1	-	54.4
4	WI-Lacrosse	99	IIA	60.8	51.7	45.1	-	51.0
5	MN-Winona State	*98	IIB	60.0	48.1	41.2	31.4	50.4
6	VA-Mary Washington	*98	IIB	62.1	49.2	40.0	-	50.1
7	NC-UNC-Asheville	99	IIB	65.2	49.9	38.8	-	49.9
8	MN-UM-Morris	99	IIB	67.2	51.4	38.7	35.9	48.5
9	MO-TRUMAN	99	IIA	62.0	50.6	39.7	32.6	47.6
10	KY-Murray State	99	IIA	60.8	50.1	41.4	-	47.4
11	SC-College of Charleston	99	IIA	60.9	49.7	40.1	33.8	47.4
12	NY-SUNY-Geneseo	99	IIA	59.7	48.6	40.2	35.2	47.1

* 1999 data not available

				Compensation Package				
				PR	AO	AI	IN	AR
1	NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	99	IIA	102.2	81.6	62.2	-	77.8
2	CA-Sonoma State	99	IIA	87.8	70.7	57.0		77.8
3	MD-St. Mary's	99	IIB	89.7	69.3	51.8	-	68.0
4	MN-UM-Morris	99	IIB	88.7	69.6	54.3	50.9	66.1
5	WI-Lacrosse	99	IIA	77.3	66.5	53.6	-	64.3
6	MN-Winona State	*98	IIB	75.6	60.6	52.0	39.6	63.5
7	VA-Mary Washington	*98	IIB	76.5	61.2	50.5	-	62.3
8	KY-Murray State	99	IIA	77.6	64.7	53.7	-	61.1
9	NY-SUNY-Geneseo	99	IIA	77.2	62.8	50.3	42.8	60.1
10	NC-UNC-Asheville	99	IIB	77.5	59.9	46.9	-	59.8
11	MO-TRUMAN	99	IIA	76.8	63.0	50.0	41.5	59.4
12	SC-College of Charleston	99	IIA	74.3	61.2	49.9	42.6	58.5

* 1999 data not available

Table A6. Comparison Institutions, Average Faculty Salary by Rank, Adjusted for Cost of Living

(Salaries in Thousands; Source: AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

Average Salary of Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	78.1	70.3
2) KY - Murray State	60.8	63.2
3) MN - UM - Morris	67.2	62.5
4) MO - Truman	62.0	62.0
5) MD - St. Mary's	72.4	61.5
6) WI - La Crosse	60.8	57.2
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	65.2	56.1
8) SC - College of Charleston	60.9	49.3
9) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	59.7	49.0
10) CA - Sonoma State	71.5	46.5
VA - Mary Washington		
MN - Winona State		

Average Salary of Associate Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	62.4	56.2
2) KY - Murray State	50.1	52.1
3) MO - Truman	50.6	50.6
4) WI - La Crosse	51.7	48.6
5) MN - UM - Morris	51.4	47.8
6) MD - St. Mary's	55.5	47.2
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	49.9	42.9
8) SC - College of Charleston	49.7	40.3
9) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	48.6	39.9
10) CA - Sonoma State	56.8	36.9
VA - Mary Washington		
MN - Winona State		

Average Salary of Assistant Professors		
	Actual	COL
1) KY - Murray State	41.4	43.1
2) NJ - College of NJ (Trenton)	47.5	42.8
3) WI - La Crosse	45.1	42.4
4) MO - Truman	39.7	39.7
5) MN - UM - Morris	38.7	36.0
6) MD - St. Mary's	41.1	34.9
7) NC - UNC - Asheville	38.8	33.4
8) NY - SUNY - Geneseo	40.2	33.0
9) SC - College of Charleston	40.1	32.5
10) CA - Sonoma State	45.4	29.5
11) VA - Mary Washington		
12) MN - Winona State		

Cost of Living Factors:

- Trenton NJ (.90)
- St Mary's MD (.85)
- Asheville NC (.86)
- Morris MN (.93)
- Charleston SC (.81)
- Murray KY (1.04)
- LaCrosse WI (.94)
- Sonoma CA (.65)
- Geneseo NY (not available, used Rochester .82)

Source: Homefair.com Cost Index

Table A7. Average Salary and Compensation Levels, Category IIA and Academic Rank, All and West North Central Region, 1999-2000 (dollars, in thousands)

(Source: AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

PUBLIC Category IIA (Comprehensive)	SALARY	<i>Truman</i>	COMPENSATION	<i>Truman</i>
Professor	66.7	62.0	81.9	76.8
Associate	53.1	50.6	66.2	63.0
Assistant	43.4	39.7	54.3	50.0
Instructor	33.2	32.6	42.0	41.5
Lecturer	30.8	-	39.0	-
No Rank	38.4	-	42.3	-
Combined	53.0	47.6	65.5	59.4

Average Salary by Region, Category, and Academic Rank, 1999-2000 (dollars, in thousands)

WEST NORTH CENTRAL * Category IIA (Comprehensive)	SALARY	<i>Truman</i>
Professor	61.8	62.0
Associate	50.7	50.6
Assistant	41.4	39.7
Instructor	33.9	32.6
Lecturer	28.3	-
No Rank	33.4	-
Combined	49.4	47.6

* Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota

**Table A8. U.S. News 25 Best National Liberal Arts Colleges, Alpha by State
Faculty Salaries by Rank; Total Compensation by All Ranks, 1999**

(Source: Colleges, *U.S. News & World Report*; List from Truman's office of Institutional Research)
(Source of Salaries, AAUP's *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

	State	CAT	Faculty Salaries by Rank					Total Comp
			PR	AO	AI	IN	AR	AR
Claremont McKenna	CA	IIB	90.5	61.8	48.8		70.7	86.1
Pomona	CA	IIB	88.7	66.1	55.6		72.2	88.8
Trinity	CT	IIB	89.4	64.6	46.4		67.5	85.2
Wesleyan	CT	IIA	87.8	60.4	49.4		73.0	91.7
Grinnell	IA	IIB	86.3	63.1	47.0	42.7	64.6	80.9
Amherst	MA	IIB	92.8	64.7	52.8		79.9	100.8
College of the Holy Cross	MA	IIB	81.4	60.7	47.1		62.7	78.0
Mount Holyoke	MA	IIB	84.6	60.7	49.3		69.0	85.6
Smith	MA	IIA	89.8	63.1	49.9	40.7	73.3	94.3
Wellesley	MA	IIB	95.4	68.2	53.9		78.0	100.8
Williams	MA	IIB	93.7	65.1	53.0		73.8	93.2
Bates	ME	IIB	80.6	57.9	45.3		62.7	78.9
Bowdoin	ME	IIB	89.8	64.7	48.7	43.1	65.5	82.6
Colby	ME	IIB	91.2	61.5	47.6		68.1	83.4
Carlton	MN	IIB	79.6	59.5	47.7		66.5	86.9
Macalester	MN	IIB	80.1	60.3	45.2	37.5	61.2	75.6
Davidson	NC	IIB	76.3	54.1	44.1		61.6	80.8
Colgate	NY	IIB	90.1	67.4	49.7		69.4	87.4
Hamilton	NY	IIB	80.2	61.0	46.9	42.4	64.7	83.1
Vassar	NY	IIB	85.5	61.6	47.6	40.8	62.8	80.3
Oberlin	OH	IIB	77.5	59.9	46.2	40.7	64.4	83.5
Bryn Mawr	PA	IIA	85.6	61.7	48.6		65.2	82.4
Haverford	PA	IIB	82.6	61.6	48.3		63.6	88.0
Swarthmore	PA	IIB	94.2	66.4	51.6	45.4	74.7	93.1
Washington and Lee	VA	IIB	82.9	56.5	46.6		68.8	85.6
Middlebury	VT	IIB	<u>88.3</u>	<u>63.2</u>	<u>50.4</u>	<u>45.3</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>84.0</u>
<u>Crude Average</u>			86.3	62.1	48.8	42.1	68.1	86.2
Truman's Goal (PR*80%) ¹			69.1					
Truman's Goal (AO*90%) ¹				55.9				
Truman's Goal (AI*90%) ¹					43.9			
<u>Truman's Actual, 1999</u>			62.0	50.6	39.7	32.6	47.6	59.4
Difference, 1999			<u>-\$7,074.0</u>	<u>-\$5,332.0</u>	<u>-\$4,182.0</u>			
Percent of Goal			89.8%	90.5%	90.5%			

¹ *Affirming the Promise*, p. 63

**Table A9. Top 15 Missouri Schools of Higher Education
by Average Salary, All Ranks, 1999**
(Source, AAUP, *Academe*, March-April, 2000)

	CAT	AR (thousands)	Average Salary Quintile (in category, by rank)		
			PR	AO	AI
1 Washington University **	I	83.5	1	2	1
2 UM - Rolla	I	69.0	3	2	2
3 UM - Columbia	I	62.3	3	3	4
4 UM - KC	I	59.3	4	4	4
5 SLU	I	59.0	3	4	4
6 UM - SL **	I	59.0	4	4	5
7 STL CC - Florissant (2-yr)**	III	54.2	1	1	1
8 STL CC - Forest Park (2-yr)	III	53.0	1	1	1
9 STL CC - Meramec (2-yr)	III	52.8	1	1	1
STL College of Pharmacy *	IIB	50.1	-	-	-
10 Webster University **	IIA	50.0	3	4	4
11 Southwest Missouri Nazarene Theological Seminary *	IIA	49.9	3	3	3
	IIA	49.0	-	-	-
12 Southeast Missouri	IIA	48.9	3	3	4
13 Truman State University	IIA	47.6	3	3	4
14 Rockhurst College **	IIB	47.5	2	2	3
15 William Jewel College **	IIB	47.5	3	3	2

* Not comparable due to mission

** No Instructor salary reported

Note: No Cost of Living Adjustments

Table A10. Comparative Salary Data from Truman's Office of the VPAA

<p align="center">Table 1 Comparative Salary Data Summary AAUP Salary Surveys, 1996-97 and 1998-99</p> <p align="center">Full-time Faculty, Nine-month Contracts</p> <p align="center">Truman Salaries by Rank as a Percentage of Various Comparison Groups (Excluding All Missouri Public Institutions)</p>						
Comparison Group	Professor		Associate		Assistant	
	1996-97	1998-99	1996-97	1998-99	1996-97	1998-99
U.S. News Twenty-five Best National Liberal Arts Institutions	72.3%	70.5%	82.4%	81.5%	84.4%	84.4%
U.S. News Top Fifteen Midwestern Universities	92.3%	92.0%	94.6%	97.6%	93.8%	95.1%
Money Magazine Top Ten Best Buys -- National	72.2%	71.3%	81.4%	81.1%	79.3%	77.9%
Money Magazine Top Ten Best Buys -- Highly Selective	78.3%	76.8%	87.6%	87.1%	84.4%	84.3%
Thirty-one Selective Private Liberal Arts Institutions -- Enrollment Greater than 1,900	78.7%	77.7%	87.5%	87.2%	88.6%	88.8%
COPLAC Institutions	99.2%	98.1%	102.0%	100.7%	101.6%	99.3%
Average Comparison Group Salary by Rank -- Excluding Missouri Master's Level	\$68,520	\$73,513	\$51,520	\$55,085	\$41,989	\$44,698
Truman Salaries by Rank	\$55,500	\$58,700	\$45,700	\$48,800	\$37,000	\$39,200
Truman Salaries by Rank as a Percentage of All Groups	81.0%	79.9%	88.7%	88.6%	88.1%	87.7%

Version: July 5, 1999

Table A11. Percent Increase in Salary for Continuing Faculty,
AAUP Salary Survey, 1999-2000 Academic Year

University	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Instr.	AR
College of Charleston	6.96	7.18	7.08	8.13	7.15
St. Mary's Coil.of Maryland	7.63	5.67	6.86	3.86	6.75
Univ. of N.C. at Asheville	5.35	5.76	5.77	6.68	5.60
Murray State University	5.43	5.42	5.47	4.97	5.43
SUNY College at Geneseo	4.55	5.46	5.90	6.10	5.33
<i>Truman State Univ.</i>	5.40	5.30	5.10	4.50	5.22
Sonoma State University	-	-	-	-	-
Trenton State College	-	-	-	-	-
Univ. Minnesota-Morris	-	-	-	-	-
Winona State University	-	-	-	-	-

Table A12. Number of Faculty by Rank, by Comparison Universities

AAUP 1999-00 Salary Survey

University	Prof.	%	Assoc.	%	Asst.	%	Instr	%	All Ranks
College of Charleston	107	0.26	117	0.28	139	0.34	51	0.12	414
<i>Truman State Univ.</i>	73	0.20	127	0.35	136	0.38	26	0.07	362
Trenton State College	81	0.25	97	0.30	148	0.45	2	0.01	328
Murray State University	102	0.33	92	0.30	110	0.36	5	0.02	309
Sonoma State University	144	0.59	47	0.19	51	0.21	1	0.00	243
SUNY College at Geneseo	55	0.24	79	0.35	80	0.35	14	0.06	228
Univ. of N.C. at Asheville	47	0.34	43	0.31	45	0.33	2	0.01	137
St. Mary's Coll.of Md	35	0.30	32	0.28	46	0.40	3	0.03	116
Univ. Minnesota-Morris	25	0.22	32	0.29	46	0.41	9	0.08	112
Winona State University	-		-		-		-		-

Table A13. Weighted Average Salaries, by Rank, by Comparison Universities

AAUP 1999-00 Salary Survey

University	Prof.	Assoc.	Assist.	Instr.	All Ranks
Sonoma State University	71,900	56,800	45,400	32,400	63,300
Trenton State College	78,100	62,400	47,500	42,700	59,400
St. Mary's Coll.of Maryland	72,400	55,500	41,100	38,400	54,400
Univ. of N.C. at Asheville	65,200	49,900	38,800	34,400	51,300
Murray State University	60,800	50,100	41,400	29,000	50,200
Univ. Minnesota-Morris	67,200	51,400	38,700	35,900	48,500
<i>Truman State Univ.</i>	62,000	50,600	39,700	32,600	47,500
SUNY College at Geneseo	59,700	48,600	40,200	35,200	47,500
College of Charleston	60,900	49,700	40,100	33,800	47,400
Winona State University	-	-	-	-	-
<i>* Arithmetic Average</i>	67,039	53,063	41,652	35,209	52,759
<i>* Weighted Average</i>	67,066	52,989	42,271	34,344	52,798
Weighted Avg minus Truman	5,066	2,389	2,571	1,744	5,298

* Arithmetic and Weighted Averages do not include the Requesting Institution

**Table A14. Faculty Summer Pay (Per Course) As a Percent of Academic Year Salary
Data for 1996/97 Academic Year**

Provided by Prof. David Gruber

School	Percent	Comment
*Truman State University	5.000	(1500-2500 for Adjuncts)
*Northwest Missouri State University	7.500	prorated if less than five students
*Southeast Missouri State University	8.250	
*Southwest Missouri State University	7.500	
^Central Missouri State University	7.500	
^St. Louis University	9.000	prorated for fewer than 10 students
^University of Missouri-Columbia	--	\$3500 per course, minimum enrollment required
^University of Missouri-St. Louis	10.000	minimum enrollment required
^Washington University	--	Asst. Prof: \$2550, Assoc.:\$3000, Prof.: \$3550
^College of the Ozarks	--	\$1200-\$1500 per course
*Arkansas State University	6.944	
*Henderson State	5.000	
*University of Arkansas, Little Rock	7.500	prorated for some part time faculty
*University of Central Arkansas	6.000	prorated
*Nicholls State (LA)	8.640	re-evaluating
*Southeastern Louisiana	7.300	
*Alcorn State (MS)	5.600	
*Delta State (MS)	--	\$1500/course, prorated if < 8 students
*East Central Oklahoma	4.000	prorated
*Northeastern OK A&M	8.250	investigating possibility of flat rate
*Southeastern Oklahoma	7.500	
*Southwestern Oklahoma	7.500	
*Austin Peay (TN)	9.375	
*Tennessee Tech	9.375	
*University of TN-Chattanooga	9.375	
*University of TN-Martin	9.375	prorated in exceptional cases
Illinois State University	11.111	1/9 of annual salary

*Information from a survey conducted by the Faculty Senate of the University of Central Arkansas.

^Information gathered from the "MOAAUP," the AAUP Missouri Conference listserve.

Table A15. In-State and Out-of-State Tuition Rates Ranked with Comparative Schools
 (Source: Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 1999)

Comparison Schools	Tuition	Rank	Tuition	Rank	Ratio	Rank	Endowment	Rank
	Out-of-State	(High -low)	In-State	(High -low)	Out/In	(High -low)	(Millions)	(High -low)
NC-UNC-Asheville	8300	7	1900	12	4.4	1	12.0	5
CA-Sonoma State	8000	8	2100	11	3.8	2	24.0	1
WI-Lacrosse	9800	2	3200	8	3.1	3	-	12
KY-Murray State	6400	10	2400	10	2.7	4	12.0	5
VA-Mary Washington	9100	4	3600	5	2.5	5	19.6	3
NY-SUNY-Geneseo	9000	5	4100	4	2.2	6	5.3	8
MN-Winona State	6100	11	3000	9	2.0	7	2.4	10
SC-College of Charleston	6900	9	3400	6	2.0	7	21.0	2
MN-UM-Morris	9500	3	5100	3	1.9	9	-	12
MO-TRUMAN	6000	12	3400	6	1.8	10	9.8	7
MD-St. Mary's	11900	1	7200	1	1.7	11	19.0	4
NJ-College of NJ (Trenton)	8400	6	5300	2	1.6	12	3.4	9

Selected MO Schools	Tuition	Rank	Tuition	Rank	Ratio	Rank	Endowment	Rank
	Out-of-State	(High -low)	In-State	(High -low)	Out/In	(High -low)	(Millions)	(High -low)
(Information only)								
MO-Mizzou	12100	4	4400	4	2.8	1	305	1
MO-UMKC	12200	2	4500	2	2.7	2	122	2
MO-Rolla	12200	2	4500	2	2.7	2	49	3
MO-UMSL	12300	1	4600	1	2.7	2	22	4
MO-Central	4400	11	2200	11	2.0	5	1.3	7
MO-Missouri Southern	4500	10	2300	10	2.0	5	-	11
MO-Southwest	6400	5	3400	5	1.9	7	-	11
MO-Southeast	5600	7	3100	7	1.8	8	8.8	6
MO-Missouri Western	4800	9	2700	9	1.8	8	-	11
MO-TRUMAN	6000	6	3400	6	1.8	8	9.8	5
MO-Northwest	5200	8	3100	8	1.7	11	-	11

Table A16. Comparison of KCOM and Truman Benefits on Selected Criteria
(Compiled by Prof. Dan Mandell)

Health Benefits	KCOM		KCOM		Truman		Truman Hi	
	PPO Prov.	Non-Network	PPO Prov.	Non-Network	PPO Prov.	Non-Network	Deduct PPO	Deduct Non-NW
Calendar Year Deductible	Single \$300 Family \$600	Single \$300 Family \$600	Single \$500 Family \$1000	Single \$500 Family \$1000	Single \$250 Family \$500	Single \$250 Family \$500	Single \$1,000 Family \$2,000	Single \$1,000 Family \$2,000
ER deductible					\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50
KCOM "Co-Insurance"	90% to \$5,000	60% to \$5,000	80% to \$7,500	60% to \$7,500	80% to \$1,000	50% to \$3,000	80% to \$4,000	50% to \$12,000
Truman: % payable after deductible, to limit	single, \$10,000 family	single, \$10,000 family	single, \$15,000 family	single, \$15,000 family	single, \$2,000 family	single, \$6,000 family	single, \$8,000 family	single, \$24,000 family
Physician Office Visits, including certain related services and tests	After \$10 copay plan pays 100%	After \$10 copay plan pays 60%	After \$15 copay plan pays 100%	After calendar yr deductible, plan pays 60%	As above	As above	As above	As above
Child Wellness Care (to age 19) including routine physical exams, immuniz., and necessary testing	100% to max of \$300/calendar year (+all immun. birth to age 5)	100% to max of \$300/calendar year (+all immun. birth to age 5)	100% to max of \$300/calendar year (+all immun. birth to age 5)	100% to max of \$300/calendar year (+all immun. birth to age 5)				
Adult Wellness Care								
Routine Physical Exam "Wellness screening"	100% (one per yr)	not covered	100% (one per yr)	not covered	As above	As above	As above	As above
Routine Gyne. Exam	100% (one per yr)	not covered	100% (one per yr)	not covered	As above	As above	As above	As above
Routine Mamm., Pap, etc. Mammogram	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%/yr* to \$85	100%/yr* to \$85	100%/yr* to \$85	100%/yr* to \$85
Pap Smear					100%/yr to \$20	100%/yr to \$20	100%/yr to \$20	100%/yr to \$20
PSA Blood Test					After 50, 100% to \$90	After 50, 100% to \$90	After 50, 100% to \$90	After 50, 100% to \$90
Pharmacy								
charge per prescription		\$8		\$8				
Truman: mail order generic						\$20> for generic		\$20> for generic
Truman: mail order preferred brand						\$30> for preferred brand		\$30> for preferred brand
Truman: mail order nonpreferred						\$50> for nonpreferred		\$50> for nonpreferred
Truman: retail generic						20%, \$75 max per presc.		20%, \$75 max per presc.
Truman: retail preferred brand						30%, \$75 max per presc.		30%, \$75 max per presc.
Truman: retail nonpreferred						50%		50%
premium for individual		\$30.05		\$30.05		\$0		\$0
Combined Lifetime Max		\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000
Total Premium employee		\$277.43		\$247.38				
Premium charge to employee		\$30.00		\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00
Total Premium empl, spouse, child								
Premium charge to employee								
Total Premium employee + family		\$705.18		\$628.81				
Premium charge to employee		\$239.24		\$162.87				

Table A17. Portion of Southwest Missouri State Salary Equity Adjustment Document, Rev. 2
(Full Document Available on the Web at Southwest Missouri State URL)

Discipline	N=	100% Professor			
		SMSU Mean 1998- 1999	CUPA Mean 1997- 1998	Difference	Cost to move to CUPA mean at 100%
Arts and Letters					
ART AND DESIGN	10	\$57,085.70	\$59,075.00	(\$1,989.30)	\$19,893.00
COMMUNICATION/MASS MEDIA	9	\$59,450.67	\$61,158.00	(\$1,707.33)	\$15,366.00
ENGLISH	11	\$54,683.00	\$62,912.00	(\$8,229.00)	\$90,519.00
MODERN & CLASSICAL LANG	4	\$58,130.25	\$64,674.00	(\$6,543.75)	\$26,175.00
MUSIC	6	\$56,084.00	\$58,262.00	(\$2,178.00)	\$13,068.00
THEATRE & DANCE	1	\$56,742.00	\$60,045.00	(\$3,303.00)	\$3,303.00
Business Administration					
COMPUTER INFO SYSTEMS	3	\$70,761.33	\$78,729.00	(\$7,967.67)	\$23,903.00
FINANCE AND GEN BUSINESS	6	\$69,429.50	\$78,729.00	(\$9,299.50)	\$55,797.00
MANAGEMENT	7	\$73,038.43	\$72,288.00	\$750.43	\$0.00
MARKETING & QUANT ANALYS	7	\$70,005.00	\$74,557.00	(\$4,552.00)	\$31,864.00
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY	12	\$78,350.08	\$75,355.00	\$2,995.08	\$0.00

Table A18. Compensation and Classification, with Selected Wage/Salary Ranges
Mizzou, Rolla and Truman – 1999/00 and 2000/01

	1999/2000 2000/2001	Min Min	6-Mo 25th %	2-Yr Midpt	4-Yr 75th %	Max Max	Max Annual	COL adjusted (x .92)
ADMIN AIDE	Mizzou 99/00	6.30	6.55	6.80	7.06	9.88		
M53	Mizzou 00/01	6.68	7.48	8.28	9.08	9.88	\$20,550	\$18,906.37
	Rolla 00/01	6.49	7.27	8.05	8.83	9.61	\$19,989	
8240 SR CLERK TYPIST	Mizzou 99/00	6.71	6.98	7.25	7.52	10.57		
M054	Mizzou 00/01	7.12	7.99	8.85	9.71	10.57	\$21,986	\$20,226.75
	Rolla 00/01	6.9	7.75	8.59	9.44	10.28	\$21,382	
8230 SR CLERK	Mizzou 99/00	7.14	7.43	7.71	8.00	11.36		
M055	Mizzou 00/01	7.58	8.53	9.47	10.42	11.36	\$23,629	\$21,738.50
	Rolla 00/01	7.34	8.26	9.18	10.1	11.02	\$22,922	
5020 HOUSEKEEPER	Mizzou 99/00	7.14	7.43	7.71	8.00	11.36		
M055	Mizzou 00/01	7.58	8.53	9.47	10.42	11.36	\$23,629	\$21,738.50
	Truman 99/00	7.77	8.10	8.40	8.70	-	\$17,472	
	Truman 00/01	7.77	8.16	8.56	8.96	-	\$17,805	
	Rolla 00/01	7.34	8.26	9.18	10.1	11.02	\$22,922	
8614 SR SECRETARY	Mizzou 99/00	8.08	8.40	8.73	9.05	13.05		
M057	Mizzou 00/01	8.57	9.69	10.81	11.93	13.05	\$27,144	\$24,972.48
	Rolla 00/01	8.32	9.4	10.48	11.56	12.64	\$26,291	
	Truman 99/00	7.78	8.10	8.40	8.70	9.15	\$19,032	
	Truman 00/01	7.78	8.16	8.56	8.96	?	\$17,805	
9662 WORD PROCESS OPR III	Mizzou 99/00	8.08	8.40	8.73	9.05	13.05		
M057	Mizzou 00/01	8.57	9.69	10.81	11.93	13.05	\$27,144	\$24,972.48
	Rolla 00/01	8.32	9.4	10.48	11.56	12.64	\$26,291	
ADMIN ASSISTANT	Mizzou 99/00	9.23	9.60	9.97	10.34	15.13	\$31,470	
M59	Mizzou 00/01	9.79	11.13	12.46	13.8	15.13	\$31,470	\$28,952.77
	Rolla 00/01	9.5	10.78	12.05	13.33	14.6	\$30,368	
3190 CUSTODIAN *	Mizzou 99/00	7.59	7.88	8.30	8.87	9.31		
H010	Mizzou 00/01	8.39	9.11	9.43	9.72	10.21	\$21,237	\$19,537.86
	Truman 99/00	7.77	8.10	8.40	8.70	-	\$17,472	
	Truman 00/01	7.77	8.16	8.56	8.96	-	\$17,805	
	Rolla 00/01	8.40	9.10	9.44	9.72	10.21	\$21,237	
4780 GROUNDS KEEPER	Mizzou 99/00	8.18	8.92	9.19	9.52	10.00		
H11	Mizzou 00/01	8.51	9.28	9.56	9.90	10.40	\$21,632	\$19,901.44
	Truman 99/00	8.08	8.41	8.71	9.01	-	\$18,741	
	Truman 00/01	8.08	8.48	8.88	9.28	-	\$19,302	
	Rolla 00/01	8.50	9.26	9.55	9.89	10.38	\$21,590	
6385 MOVER	Mizzou 99/00	8.92	9.79	10.31	10.84	11.38		
H18	Mizzou 00/01	9.28	10.18	10.72	11.27	11.83	\$24,606	\$22,637.89
	Truman 99/00	7.92	8.25	8.55	8.85	-	\$18,408	
	Truman 00/01	7.92	8.32	8.72	9.12	-	\$18,970	
	Rolla 00/01	9.26	10.14	10.72	11.25	11.81	\$24,565	
5510 LABORER II	Mizzou 99/00	9.07	9.89	10.47	10.98	11.53		
H19	Mizzou 00/01	9.43	10.29	10.89	11.42	11.99	\$24,939	\$22,944.06
	Truman 99/00	7.92	8.25	8.55	8.85	-	\$18,408	
	Truman 00/01	7.92	8.32	8.72	9.12	-	\$18,970	
	Rolla 00/01	9.44	10.26	10.87	11.41	11.98	\$24,918	
4790 GROUNDS KEEPER II	Mizzou 99/00	9.33	10.35	10.91	11.44	12.01		
H021	Mizzou 00/01	9.70	10.76	11.35	11.90	12.50	\$26,000	\$23,920.00
	Truman 99/00	7.77	8.10	8.40	8.70	-	\$17,472	
	Truman 00/01	8.08	8.48	8.88	9.28	-	\$18,470	
	Rolla 00/01	9.70	10.77	11.33	11.89	12.48	\$25,958	

Notes to Tables Based on (CUPA) Data

(College and University Personnel Association; Name changed to CUPA-HR on July 1, 2000)

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Salary - based on a 9- or 10-month academic year salary of full-time faculty only. Does not reflect salaries of any faculty members teaching less than 51 percent of time. Salary for summer academic work, fringe benefits and prerequisites are not included in the salary data. Salary data are current as of October 1, 1997.

Average Salary - based on the survey information with the assumption that all employees are full-time. The average salary displayed is a weighted average of all faculty salaries 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 - the percentage of faculty in a given Discipline/Major Field who hold a given academic rank. For example, the FAC Mix factor of 33.9 percent for associate professor in the Discipline/Major Field of Business Management and Administrative Services/Accounting means that 33.9 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 in the selected peer group. For example, a Salary Factor of 1.36 for assistant professor of Business Management and Administrative Services/Accounting means that the salary is 36 percent higher than the average salary of all assistant professors of all institutions that participated in the survey.

Rank - the data are arrayed among the following academic ranks: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, New Assistant Professor and Instructor. The rank of "Lecturer" is not included in the survey.

Table A19. A Comparison of Salary Factors Using CUPA Data

Provided by Prof. Kevin Easley

The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) reports obtained by the Faculty Compensation Committee contain listings of *salary factors*, a term defined as follows.

Salary Factor : We will define this term by example. Consider the group of ten public institutions which the compensation committee have identified as "peer" institutions for Truman. Select an academic discipline and an academic rank within that discipline; for example, associate professor of communications. From the CUPA salary tables for the comparison group, obtain the average salary of all associate professors of communications from the ten schools in our comparison group; this figure is seen to be \$49,312. Next, determine the average salary of all associate professors represented in the comparison group; this average is taken over all academic disciplines and over all ten schools in the comparison group. The average salary of all associate professors in our group of ten peer schools is \$52,295. The **Salary Factor** for the group of Associate Professors of Communications is defined to be the ratio $49,312/52,295 = 0.94$, indicating that the average salary for associate professors of communications equals 94% of the average salary of all associate professors within the comparison group.

It is clear that a salary factor represents one statistic which is largely independent of variations in cost of living from region to region. Nevertheless, some caution is called for when making direct comparisons of salary factors. It is possible that Universities A and B pay identical salaries across all liberal arts disciplines and yet still exhibit significantly different salary factors for each of these disciplines. For example, if the only difference between the schools is that University A possesses a medical school and University B does not, then each salary factor from a liberal arts discipline at A would probably appear significantly lower than its counterpart from B. Direct comparison of salary factors is clearly meaningful only when such variations have been filtered out of the comparison group.

Legend for the Table of Salary Factors

The following page contains a table of salary factors for three groups: (i) the group of **all** 374 institutions which participated in the 1998-99 CUPA general survey³; (ii) the group of ten “**peer**” institutions⁴ identified by the Faculty Compensation Committee (the rationale is given elsewhere in this report); and (iii) **Truman State University**, considered individually. Each of these three salary factors is presented for 24 academic disciplines. It must be noted that the salary factors for Truman University and the ten peer institutions have been obtained from 1999-2000 CUPA data, while the general CUPA data for all 374 participating institutions date from 1998-99. The 1999-2000 data for the 374 CUPA participants was unavailable at the time this document was prepared.

The traditional academic ranks of full/associate/assistant professor are listed in the table. The fourth column, entitled **New Assistant Professor**, contains data for the subset of assistant professors who were hired for the first time during the fall semester of the year of the salary survey.

An empty cell in the table indicates no reporting faculty from that rank and discipline. Also, some of the cells represent data from extremely small numbers of faculty,; these numbers are not included in this table since they are present in the CUPA source documents .

[For additional information regarding these calculations, please contact Dr. Kevin Easley, Math and Computer Science, keasley@truman.edu]

³ This group includes universities of all tiers and categories, and does not consist solely of institutions which are comparable to Truman in mission and size.

⁴ The College of New Jersey, SUNY-Geneseo, UNC-Asheville, The College of Charleston, St. Mary’s of Maryland, Univ. of Wisconsin-La Crosse, Winona State Univ., Univ. Minnesota-Morris, Murray State Univ., Sonoma State Univ.

Salary Factors

Sources: CUPA General Survey of 1998-99

CUPA Special Report of 1999-2000

See Preceding Page for Explanations

Discipline	Rank	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	New Asst. Professor
Agricultural Business and Production	All	1.03	1	0.99	1.02
	Peer	0.93	0.98	0.95	
	Truman	0.96	1.03	0.91	
Communications	All	0.89	0.93	0.93	0.91
	Peer	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.98
	Truman		0.88	0.87	0.87
Computer Sciences	All	1.11	1.16	1.22	1.29
	Peer	1.09	1.2	1.22	1.24
	Truman	1.04	1.12	1.27	
Education	All	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.93
	Peer	1	1.03	0.95	0.9
	Truman	0.98	0.94	1	
English Language and Literature	All	0.93	0.92	0.89	0.87
	Peer	0.97	0.89	0.96	0.93
	Truman	0.86	0.89	0.94	0.94
Foreign Languages and Literatures	All	0.96	0.91	0.9	0.87
	Peer	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.92
	Truman	0.86	0.89	0.94	0.94
Biology, General	All	0.98	0.95	0.97	0.94
	Peer	1.02	0.97	0.99	1.02
	Truman	0.98	0.92	0.9	0.89
Mathematics	All	0.99	0.97	0.96	0.94
	Peer	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.96
	Truman	1	1.03	0.97	1.02
Philosophy and Religion	All	0.96	0.93	0.87	0.86
	Peer	0.91	0.96	0.89	0.9
	Truman	0.93	0.9	0.84	0.85
Chemistry	All	0.99	0.96	0.96	0.95
	Peer	1.02	0.99	0.91	0.96
	Truman	0.91	0.98	0.87	0.9
Physics	All	1.03	0.99	1.01	0.98
	Peer	1.02	1.03	0.98	0.89
	Truman		1.03	0.93	0.85

	Rank	Associate	Assistant	New Asst.	
		Professor	Professor	Professor	
Psychology	All	0.97	0.94	0.94	0.94
	Peer	1	0.98	0.93	0.9
	Truman	0.98	0.85	0.96	0.81
Criminal Justice and Corrections	All	0.9	0.93	0.94	
	Peer	1.16	1.18	1.17	
	Truman	0.88		0.97	
Economics	All	1.04	1.08	1.14	1.15
	Peer	1.02	1.09	1.16	1.21
	Truman	1.03	1.06	0.99	
Geography	All	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.94
	Peer	0.87	0.96	0.96	1.11
	Truman		0.82	0.83	
History	All	0.92	0.92	0.89	0.87
	Peer	0.96	0.98	0.88	0.82
	Truman		0.92	0.87	0.86
Political Science and Government	All	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.92
	Peer	0.96	0.99	0.95	0.94
	Truman	0.95	0.89	0.92	
Sociology	All	0.9	0.92	0.92	0.91
	Peer	0.95	0.89	0.95	0.89
	Truman	0.94	0.91		
Drama/Theater Arts	All	0.86	0.89	0.87	0.84
	Peer	0.92	0.83	1.01	0.9
	Truman		0.94	0.8	0.89
Fine Arts and Art Studies	All	0.85	0.88	0.88	0.88
	Peer	0.94	1	0.9	0.96
	Truman	0.96	0.83	0.83	0.87
Music	All	0.85	0.87	0.87	0.86
	Peer	0.94	0.97	0.98	0.96
	Truman	0.98	0.93	0.89	0.87
Speech Pathology and Audiology	All	0.9	0.92	0.96	1.02
	Peer	0.99	0.98	1.19	
	Truman	0.88	0.98	1.08	
Nursing (R.N. Training)	All	0.89	0.98	0.98	0.99
	Peer	1.03	1.04	1.1	1.11
	Truman	1.01	0.97	0.98	0.93
Business Administration	All	1.07	1.18	1.29	1.31
	Peer	1.1	1.21	1.33	1.43
	Truman	1.08	1.3	1.41	
Accounting	All	1.12	1.26	1.38	1.49
	Peer	1.13	1.24	1.41	
	Truman	1.2	1.37	1.3	

**College and University Personnel Association (CUPA)
National Faculty Salary Survey
1998-1999 (All Institutions)**
Revised 5/2/00

[Separate Spreadsheet File: CUPA NATL SALARY SURVEY_MAY_3
9 pages]

Please refer to the May 12 Compensation Committee Report, or contact Dr. Dan Mandell, chair for a copy of this appendix document.

**College and University Personnel Association (CUPA)
Faculty Salary Survey, Comparison Schools, 2000**
Revised 5/2/00

[Separate Spreadsheet File: cupa peer salary survey_may_9
4 pages]

Please refer to the May 12 Compensation Committee Report, or contact Dr. Dan Mandell, chair for a copy of this appendix document.

**College and University Personnel Association (CUPA)
Faculty Salary Study of 10 Public Institutions Selected as a Salary Group**

[Hardcopy; FAX
12 pages]

Please refer to the May 12 Compensation Committee Report, or contact Dr. Dan Mandell, chair for a copy of this appendix document.

**College and University Personnel Association (CUPA)
Faculty Salary Study of the (Average-Salary Ranking) of Truman State University Compared to 10 Public Universities Within Discipline by Academic Rank**

[Hardcopy; FAX
5 pages]

Please refer to the May 12 Compensation Committee Report, or contact Dr. Dan Mandell, chair for a copy of this appendix document.

Faculty Load Report Guidelines

(In Connection with the Issue of Merit Pay)

Sample Form, Florida Institute of Technology

Introduction

These guidelines describe a procedure for the equitable and reasonable assignment of faculty responsibilities, including classroom instruction, academic advising, committee membership, guidance of student organizations, research, and service to the university. A minimum work assignment for each full-time faculty member at Florida Tech, as prescribed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, is 15 academic credits or the equivalent, per semester.

A Load Report (which must be submitted early in the semester) establishes the responsibilities of that faculty member for that semester. It is an agreement between the faculty member and the university as to what the faculty member's responsibilities and goals are and the time allotted for their accomplishment. Consideration of the quality of the productivity and achievement of these goals is made during the faculty members evaluation at the end of the academic year.

Purpose

The purpose of the guidelines is to give general instructions as to how reports should be filled in; however, alterations may be made when this is necessary to properly account for the faculty member's efforts. All activities which are part of the faculty member's responsibility with respect to the University are to be included in the report.

General Instructions

On the front of each report the appropriate numbers are to be filled in. On the reverse side, specific details concerning the numbers should be included, e.g., course numbers, credit hours, enrollment, names and contract numbers of research grants, names of committees and hours spent.

In general, both the faculty member and the faculty member's academic unit head should be in agreement with the Faculty Load Report and both should sign it to indicate this agreement. The guidelines give specific suggestions as to appropriate credit for various types of activities. When deviations from the suggested credit occur, the academic unit head, with the approval of the academic dean, may approve modifications of these numbers.

Specific Instructions

- A. Teaching and advising
 - 1. Undergraduate courses

Credit received by a faculty member for teaching an undergraduate lecture course is equal to the semester credit for that course.

2. Undergraduate courses with large enrollments

If it can be demonstrated that the teacher will expend substantial additional time and effort on a class with large enrollment, then additional credit may be allowed after consideration of such variables as additional preparation, the increase in number of papers, projects, problems, and tests to be evaluated, and assistance rendered by students, staff members, or other faculty members.

If it is determined that additional credit is warranted, the faculty member may be given 1 1/3 times the usual credit for classes with 30 to 50 students, 1 2/3 times the usual credit for classes with 51 to 70, and 2 times the usual credit for classes with more than 70 students.

Because of the unique situation in Freshman and Sophomore English writing courses and Engineering design courses, the faculty member will be given 0.15 credit hours for each student in the class beyond 20.

3. Undergraduate courses with low enrollments.

If a faculty member is directed by the academic unit head to teach a course with low enrollment, then the faculty member will receive full credit irrespective of the enrollment. If a faculty member requests to teach a course with low enrollment, then for each class having fewer than 7 students enrolled, claim 1 credit for 1 to 3 students and 2 credits for 4 to 6 students.

4. Graduate Courses

Faculty members assigned to the teaching of a graduate course may claim 1 1/3 credits for each hour of course credit, provided 5 or more graduate students are actually enrolled in the 5000 or 6000 level course. This also applies to 4000/5000 (dual numbered) level courses. The class is treated as an independent study course, with respect to credits granted, if fewer than 5 graduate students are enrolled. However, if a faculty member is directed by his/her academic unit head to teach a course with low enrollment, then the faculty member should receive full credit irrespective of the enrollment.

5. Independent Study Courses

Courses which do not lend themselves to traditional classroom or laboratory methods, but which must be taught in an individual, tutorial, or consultative manner may be credited to the faculty member on the basis of 0.2 credits for each student-credit-hour produced up to the maximum credit hours that would be awarded if it were a regular class. This includes graduate research.

6. Courses with contact hours in excess of credit hours

In general, two contact laboratory hours shall be equated to one credit hour; however, consideration should be given to the amount of preparation required for the laboratory and to the amount of time required to evaluate the students' laboratory work and the credit adjusted accordingly.

7. Thesis and dissertation supervision

Credit for supervision of a thesis or dissertation can be granted to a faculty member only if he or she has been assigned official responsibility for a student registered in a thesis or dissertation course.

For the supervision of theses and/or dissertations, .20 credits will be assigned for each student-credit-hour produced. When the student is not officially registered for thesis or dissertation credit, only the guidelines in item 10 (below) apply.

8. Team teaching

In general, credit will be shared equally by faculty members who teach courses as a team; if three faculty members teach one three-credit-hour course, each will be credited with one credit for the course.

It is recognized that, in some cases, team teaching requires a great deal more planning and coordination than traditional methods; therefore, academic unit heads may, with the approval of the academic dean, recommend additional credit for faculty members who expend extraordinary efforts at such activity.

9. Teaching a course for the first time

New faculty members who are requested by their academic unit head to develop, restructure or teach a new course for the first time, may receive up to double credit. A new faculty member is an Assistant Professor who has been at Florida Tech for less than three years. Other faculty may claim 1 additional credit provided 7 or more students are enrolled in the class and they were requested by their supervisor to develop and teach the course.

10. Advising and counseling

It is recognized that every faculty member who teaches will spend some time other than in the classroom or laboratory answering students' questions, listening to their concerns, etc.; however, when a significant number of students are officially assigned to a faculty member as academic advisees, credit will be granted for advising. In general, the faculty member will receive 0.10 credit for each student assigned. Advising credit is not awarded for a graduate student enrolled in thesis or dissertation.

B. Research and professional development

Included in this category are pure and applied research, creative writing, textbook writing, artistic productions, and other scholarly and creative endeavors related to the faculty member's area of interest, expertise, and responsibility to the university.

In general, research can be divided into two categories:

1. Sponsored research

Sponsored research includes the conduct and administration of university related research efforts that are funded by outside agencies. The amount of credit to be recorded for sponsored research is determined by the official documentation associated with the work and by consultation between the faculty member and his/her academic unit head. If the funding does not include any portion of the faculty member's salary, credit is granted on the basis of the level of effort, not to exceed three credits. If outside funding includes a portion of the faculty member's 9 months salary, e.g., 20%, credit is granted proportionally (0.2 x 15 credits, or 3 credits).

2. Department research

Department research includes all other research and scholarly activities not covered under sponsored research. This may include, but is not limited to the following: unfunded research (often for collection of preliminary data used for proposal preparation), proposal preparation, manuscript (journal article, book chapter, book, etc.) preparation, presentations at professional meetings and conferences. Documentation of academic unit research accomplishments and scholarly activities performed, is required and will be used as an evaluation benchmark at the end of the term.

The amount of credit to be recorded for departmental research and scholarly activity is to be established in consultation between the faculty member and his or her unit supervisor at the beginning of the semester. The total credits awarded is not to exceed three.

C. University Service

Credit for university service can be granted when such service is an accepted responsibility of the university. This category includes (but is not limited to) service on a thesis or dissertation committee (not as chairperson), advisor for a student group, university committee assignments, work with professional associations, governmental agencies, educational systems or institutions, businesses and industrial organizations, and health services. Examples of service include membership on national committees, service on study sections of funding agencies, review of manuscripts for journals and proposal review for funding agencies. It does not include mere membership in, appearances before, or ordinary personal involvement with professional organizations, civic clubs, church groups, etc., nor does it include any kind of service for which extra compensation is received.

If the academic unit head agrees that a faculty member's service to a recognized group is an accepted university responsibility, credit may be allowed, but the total is not to exceed three.

D. Administration

In general, this category pertains to faculty who, in addition to regular faculty responsibilities, are assigned additional administrative duties that include (but are not limited to) program chairs, administrative assistants, or coordinators or directors of programs. Credits allotted to a faculty member with administrative duties will be arrived at in consultation with the faculty member's supervisor.

FACULTY LOAD REPORT

Faculty _____

Department/Academic Unit: _____

Term: _____

<u>Duties</u>	<u>Teaching Load Equivalent</u>
A. Teaching and Advising	
1. Undergraduate courses	_____
2. Undergraduate courses with large enrollment	_____
3. Undergraduate courses with low enrollments	_____
4. Graduate courses	_____
6. Courses with contact hours in excess of credit hours	_____
7. Thesis and dissertation supervision	_____
8. Team teaching	_____
9. Teaching a course for the first time	_____
10. Advising and counseling	_____
Subtotal	_____
B. Research	
1. Sponsored research	_____
2. Department research (maximum 3 credits)	_____
Subtotal	_____
C. University Service (maximum 3 credits)	_____
D. Administration	_____
TOTAL	_____

Faculty

Date

Unit Head

Date

(Note: Place details concerning courses taught, enrollment, adjustment to standard credit assigned, contracts, grants, committees, hours spent, number of advisees, etc., on reverse side of this form.)

Faculty Load Report Worksheet

A. Teaching:

Course No.	Course Title	Sect . No.	Enrol l- ment	TA	Lab Hrs. (y/n)	Cred it Hrs.	Adjuste d Credit

(In adjusted credit column, indicate adjustment made (in parenthesis) by using the following modifiers: (2) large enrollment; (3) graduate course; (4) independent study; (5) contact hours in excess of credit hours; (6) thesis and dissertation supervision; (7) team teaching; (8) teaching a course for the first time.)

Advising and Counseling: _____ Adjusted Credit

Advisees: _____ x 0.10 = _____

B. Research and professional development:

1. Sponsored research

Grant No.	Title	Amount (\$)	Green card (y/n/%)	Hrs./Wk	Adjuste d Credit

2. Department Research and Scholarly Activity

Description of Activity	Hrs./Wk.	Adj. Cr.

C. University Service:

Description of Activity	Hrs./Wk.	Adj. Cr.

Use extra sheet if more space is required!