

**Minutes**  
**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**January 14, 1997 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

Present: Anderson, Aramouni, Atkinson, Balk, Barkley, Bissey, Briggs, Brigham, Buchholz, Bussing, Clegg, Conrow, Deger, Dyer, Elkins, Fenton, Foster, Glasgow, Gould, Gray, Hagmann, Hamilton, Hansen, Harbstreit, Hassan, Hoag, J. Johnson, Jones, Klopfenstein, Kuhlman, Laughlin, Legg, Maes, May, McCulloh, Michie, Miller, Moeller, Molt, Pallett, Poresky, Rahman, Raub, Ross-Murray, Royse, Schroeder, Shultis, Smith, Taylor-Archer, White, Wilson, Woodward

Absent: Abbott, Aslin, Baker, Behnke, Benson, Charney, Chastain, DeBowes, Exdell, Feyerharm, Finland, Fritz, Higgins, Kassebaum, Krstic, Martin, Mathews, McNamara, Mosier, Niehoff, Oukrop, Peak, Pierzynski, Reeck, Ross, Smit, Stewart, Swanson, Wright, Zschoche

Proxies: Fjell, Lamond, Ottenheimer

Guests: William Eberle, Susan Scott

- I. President Balk called the meeting to order.
- II. Minutes of the meeting of December, 1996, were approved as distributed.
- III. Announcements

President Balk referred Faculty Senators to the announcements in the most recent minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting. He asked if there were any other announcements. Hearing none, he moved the meeting to Standing Committee Reports.

- IV. Standing Committee Reports
  - A. Academic Affairs -- Steve Harbstreit
    1. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of the following undergraduate Course and Curriculum changes. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion passed.
      - a. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Human Ecology September 13, 1996.
      - b. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Business Administration November 5, 1996.
      - c. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Arts and Sciences November 7, 1996.

- d. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Architecture, Planning and Design November 12, 1996 and as corrected with their November 21, 1996 memo replacing pages 18-23.
- e. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Education November 26, 1996. (Delete last 5 pages as per memo from Candace Bond dated Dec. 5, 1996)
- f. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the Salina College of Technology December 5, 1996.
- g. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes (599 & below) approved by the College of Human Ecology December 6, 1996.

2. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the Graduate Council November 5, 1996. Senator Gould seconded. The motion passed.

**CHANGE**

ASI 621 Dairy Cattle Management  
 ASI 802 Gametes, Fertilization and Pregnancy in Farm Animals  
 ASI 825 Stress Physiology of Livestock  
 SOCIO 861 Sociology of Deviance

**NEW**

CT 660 Apparel Design Production IV  
 CT 690 Apparel Design Production V  
 GRSC 825 Novel Processes and Uses of Renewable Biopolymers  
 IDH 725 Community Housing Assessment

**DROP**

ASI 606 Instrumental Analysis of Food and Agricultural Products  
 ASI 702 Animal Nutrition and Diet Formulation  
 ASI 750 Poultry Seminar

HACCP Course descriptions as approved by Graduate Council November 5, 1996.

ASI 690 Principles of HACCP  
 ASI 791 Advanced Application of HACCP  
 ASI 792 Advanced Principles of Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment  
 ASI 793 Validation of HACCP Plans  
 ASI 794 HACCP and Inspection  
 FN 690 Principles of HACCP  
 FN 789 Advanced Application of HACCP Principles in the Food Industry  
 FN 792 Advanced Principles of Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment  
 FN 793 Validation of HACCP Plans  
 FN 794 HACCP and Inspection

3. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the Graduate Council December 3, 1996. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion passed.

**CHANGE**

BAE 640 Instrumentation and Control for Biological Systems  
BAE 840 Measurement Systems  
FN 907 Food Dispersions

**NEW**

AGRON 780 Orientation to Field Crop Breeding  
ASI 907 Food Dispersions  
CIS 640 Software Testing Techniques  
CIS 645 Software Developing Environments

4. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of General Education proposals from the Colleges of Engineering and Human Ecology and courses approved by the General Education Implementation Task Force November 18, 1996. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion passed.

SPAN 161 Spanish I  
SPAN 162 Spanish II  
SPAN 261 Spanish III  
SPAN 263 Spanish IV

5. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of a change in the University Grading Policy which would discontinue the grades of "IX" and "NX" and replace them with the grade "F". Senator Foster seconded.

Senator Poresky asked whether the transcript would continue to show an "I" with a bar through it or simply the "F". Senator Foster responded that it would simply be a grade change to "F". Similarly, a passing grade will be substituted if the student successfully completes the work. Students receiving the grade "NR" should contact the instructor to receive a grade.

The motion passed.

6. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of additions to the May 1996 and October 1996 graduation lists. Senator Shultis seconded. The motion passed.

**B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Fadi Aramouni**

1. Senator Aramouni moved acceptance of the annual Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits report. **Attachment 1** Senator Johnson seconded the motion.

Senator Aramouni thanked the Ad Hoc Committee on Salaries and Fringe Benefits for their fine work, especially Bill Eberle, the chair, and also Ron Downey and his office for providing the data.

The motion passed.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning – Dennis Kuhlman

The committee did not meet during the vacation.

V. There was no old business.

VI. There was no new business.

VII. For the Good of the University

A. Senator Legg, referring to announcement III, 3, asked where the faculty from Denison would move. President Balk replied that the plan under discussion is to move the faculty to Lafene and the student health service to space in Mercy Hospital on Sunset (formerly Memorial Hospital). Chris Hansen, President of the Student Body, indicated that he has heard only positive reports about the proposed move of Lafene to the location on Sunset. President Balk could not answer questions regarding the source of funds for renovating space in Lafene or regarding replacement for classroom space which would be lost with the razing of Denison.

B. Senator Hamilton asked about the Board of Regents' actions with respect to community colleges (announcement III,1). President Balk explained that President Wefald opposed merging the community colleges with the Regents' schools because it could undermine funding for the universities. The Board's motion that coordination of community colleges be given to the Regents reflects President Wefald's position.

C. Senator Poresky asked when faculty members would have to leave the KSUVM system, where the software necessary for the move is, and where their material would be stored. Senator Smith said that the expectation is most faculty will be off the system by March, but some might remain until June.

Senator Bissey suggested inviting someone from Central Computing Services to talk to Faculty Senate. President Balk will invite Beth Unger.

D. Senator Rahman reported increased difficulty getting reimbursement from grant money through KSURF and inquired about the progress in restructuring the organization.

Senator Kuhlman indicated that nothing had changed in the structure of KSURF, except that there are now two faculty on the Board of Directors and he hopes to have a third appointed by April. He continued that changes in accounting processes are dictated by federal regulations, especially the National Science Foundation. FSCOUP has been monitoring changes at KSURF and an update is on the agenda for their next meeting.

- E. Senator Smith referred to news reports that the KU faculty was calling for a minimum 4% average salary increase for faculty and wondered why other Regents' schools did not join them. She also cited Governor Graves' statement in his State of the State report that personal income had increased 6.2% in Kansas last year and compared that to the faculty's 2% raise for half the year and the Governor's 3.5% proposal for next year. President Balk will discuss this with Larry Draper, Faculty Senate President from KU.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

# ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF FACULTY SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Prepared by the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee  
on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits  
of the Faculty Senate at  
Kansas State University  
December, 1996

## MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS SUBCOMMITTEE 1996-1997

---

Jeff Alger	Library
David Biller	Veterinary Clinical Sciences
Robert Borges	Agricultural Economics
William Eberle <sup>1</sup>	Agronomy
John Fritz	Agronomy
Ross Hightower	Management
Patrick Knight	Psychology
Richard LeBoeuf	Salina Engineering Technology
Fred Newton	University Counseling Services
Torgeir Norheim	Architecture
Garth Thompson	Mechanical Engineering
Pamela R. Turner	Family Studies and Human Services
Robert H. Zabel	Special Education

---

<sup>1</sup>Chair, Faculty Senate Salaries and Fringe Benefits Subcommittee.

## PREFACE

During the present fiscal year, 1935-36, the average salary of the entire college staff is only about \$2,300 a year. The average salary of professors is 22 per cent below, and that of associate professors 21.7 per cent below, the corresponding averages of the land-grant colleges of the forty-eight states.

This quotation from the Kansas State College Bulletin serves as a reminder that as much as some things (dollars of salary) change, other things (salaries compared to peers) remain the same. Sixty years later, KSU's average salary ranks 42nd out of the 50 Major Land Grant Universities (Table 5, p. 9). An increase of 14.5% is needed to reach the average salary of that comparison group.

The current report is based on the most recent, published salary data available (fiscal year 1996). The fringe benefit data were obtained by direct correspondence with officials at other schools and refers to current fringe benefits. With only a minor modification associated with the Big Twelve vs. Big Eight comparisons, like last year's report, salary comparisons are made with: 1) KSU peer institutions designated by the Regents, 2) other Big Twelve institutions, 3) National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and 4) the 50 major land grant universities. Regardless of the comparison group examined, the result is the same--KSU's salaries are far below average.

The final section of the report reviews the fringe benefit package of KSU faculty with that of our peers. Our fringe benefits are inferior, with the most pressing needs being in the area of retirement benefits and health care.

If Kansas State University is to provide quality programs, the State of Kansas must provide salary increases greater than our peers until salary equity is attained. We hope this report explains why enhanced funding for Kansas State University is necessary this year and will continue to be important in the future.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Status of Faculty Salaries at KSU

- Kansas State University's mission to the State of Kansas to provide high quality education, research, extension and service continues to be undermined by low faculty salaries.
- Average KSU salaries for FY (Fiscal Year) 96 need to be increased 15.8 percent to equal the average salary of the five peer institutions used by the Regents for comparison purposes. KSU salaries for FY 96 ranked sixth out of six peer institutions and were 24.3 percent below salaries at the highest peer institution (Table 1, p. 5). Rank-adjusted data show KSU ranked fifth out of six peer institutions.
- KSU salaries in FY 96 were, for the sixth consecutive year, the lowest in the Big Twelve (Table 2, p. 6). An increase of 18.1 percent is needed for KSU to reach the average salaries (FY 96) of the other Big Twelve universities, and 31.8 percent is needed to equal the average salary of the number one Big Twelve university (Table 2, p. 6).
- An increase of 19.9 percent would be needed for KSU salaries to equal the average salaries of other land grant and state universities in FY 96 (Table 3, p. 7). Even using the Regents' Rank Adjusted Method of calculation, an increase of 13.4 percent would be needed to reach this same level.
- KSU faculty salaries have decreased by 2.0 percent in constant dollars since 1970 (Table 4, p. 7).
- Average KSU faculty salaries ranked 42nd out of fifty land grant universities in FY 96 (Table 5, p. 9).

### Problems Created by Salary Deficiencies

- Reports from last year indicate that the recruitment of promising new faculty was difficult and morale of senior faculty was low, due to salary compression, and we remain a training center for junior faculty who leave for higher paying positions elsewhere.

### Status of Faculty Fringe Benefits at KSU

- KSU faculty rank near the bottom of the comparison group in nearly all benefit categories, especially when adjusted for benefit costs (Section III).



## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State of Kansas will need to provide three years of funding at a rate of approximately 5 percent per year above the average salary increases at peer universities to bring KSU salaries up to the average of the peer institutions and to move KSU into a competitive position with other land grant institutions. While we acknowledge the effort that the legislature made for FY 96 by appropriating a 3.5% average salary increase, this amount only kept the gap from widening. The small mid-year increase for FY 97 will quickly widen the gap again.
2. In addition to funding for merit increases, the State should provide additional funding for faculty promotions and to further address salary compression.
3. The State of Kansas must continue to commit itself to increasing funding for retirement benefits. In the coming fiscal year, we recommend an addition to the base retirement contribution of 1.5 percent from the State, to bring its total contribution to 10 percent.
4. Serious efforts must be made to address any remaining inequities in retirement benefits of extension faculty resulting from KSU's unique mission as a land grant university and its associated historical federal-state agreements which differ from Regents institutions. The recent changes implemented for new hires will eliminate the inequity for those employees but not for existing employees.
5. The change in procedure concerning the adoption of the health care program for state employees which began January 1, 1996, was certainly a step in the right direction. The subcommittee recommends that further efforts be made to increase coverage and reduce costs in order to bring that coverage and those costs in line with those of our peers.
6. The State of Kansas should offer more flexibility to Regents' employees by providing benefits under a fully flexible or total cafeteria plan.
7. Faculty and staff of the Kansas Regents' Institutions should be granted a waiver of tuition and fees and employees' spouses and children should have tuition waived at any Regents' Institution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	iv
I. STATUS OF FACULTY SALARIES AT KSU .....	1
A. Introduction .....	1
B. KSU Salaries Compared to Other Groups .....	1
Peer Institutions .....	1
Big Twelve Institutions .....	2
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) ..	3
Rank Adjusted Method of Calculating Average Salary .....	3
Constant Dollar .....	4
The 50 Major Land Grant Universities .....	4
Table 1 .....	5
Table 2 .....	6
Table 3 .....	7
Table 4 .....	8
Table 5 .....	9
II. PROBLEMS CREATED BY SALARY DEFICIENCIES .....	10
III. STATUS OF FACULTY FRINGE BENEFITS AT KSU .....	10
Table 6 .....	10
Table 7 .....	11

## I. STATUS OF FACULTY SALARIES AT KSU

### A. Introduction

Faculty salaries at Kansas State University increased an average of 3.6 percent in FY 96<sup>1</sup>; the deficit between KSU salaries and those of peer institutions remains large.

### B. KSU Salaries Compared to Other Groups

KSU salaries for FY 96 were not competitive when compared to those of other relevant university groups, including the:

- KSU peer institutions designated by the Regents;
- Big Twelve institutions;
- National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC);
- 50 major land grant universities.

Although the extent of KSU salary deficiencies differs with each comparison group, the conclusion is the same: **modest salary increases of the past four years have not solved the significant salary discrepancies. Despite a slight increase in FY 96 salaries, KSU remained in a weak competitive position for attracting and retaining quality faculty.**

#### Peer Institutions

The Kansas Board of Regents has designated five universities, selected because of their similarities in size, programs, and mission, as KSU peer institutions - Colorado State, Iowa State, North Carolina State, Oklahoma State, and Oregon State. Comparisons of salaries at KSU with these five universities are found in Table 1 (p. 5).

It should be noted that the **KSU peer institutions do not have especially high salaries. In fact, in FY 96 their average salary (\$55,654) was just slightly above the average for all 50 land grant institutions (\$54,531). Only three of the peer institutions were ranked among the top 25 (see Table 5, p. 9).**

KSU salary deficits relative to peers were at the second highest level of the last six years. **To equal the *average* salary of the peer universities, KSU would need to increase average salaries 15.8 percent. To equal salaries at the peer university with the *highest* salaries, KSU would need to increase salaries 24.3 percent (Table 1, p. 5).**

#### The Big Twelve Universities

Because KSU is now a member of the Big Twelve conference, it is appropriate that KSU be compared to the Big Twelve institutions. **KSU salaries rank last in the Big Twelve. They are 18.1 percent below the average of the other Big Twelve universities, and 31.8 percent below the top ranking university (Table 2, p.6).**

---

<sup>1</sup>Since salary comparison information for FY 97 will not be available until the spring of 1997, this report includes FY 96 data (listed in tables as 1995-96 academic year).

## National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

KSU faculty salaries are significantly deficient when compared to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). KSU is in direct competition with these 80 universities for the recruitment and retention of faculty. In FY 96, KSU salaries needed to be increased 19.9 percent to equal the average of NASULGC institutions (see Table 3, p. 7).

When salaries are compared according to academic rank, KSU salary deficits become markedly more pronounced at higher ranks. In FY 96, instructors' average salaries were slightly higher (2.3 percent) than the NASULGC average. However, average KSU salaries for assistant professors needed a 6.5 percent increase to equal the NASULGC averages, and for associate professors needed 10.9 percent. The discrepancy was most pronounced for KSU full professors whose salaries needed a 20.3 percent increase to equal the NASULGC average (see Table 3, p. 7).

### Rank Adjusted Method of Calculating Average Salary

For the past several years, the Kansas Board of Regents has used a Rank Adjusted (also referred to as Rank by Rank) method of calculating average salaries for comparison purposes. Differences in KSU salaries and those of 80 NASULGC Institutions using both methods are shown in Table 3 (p. 7). As a result of these different methods, discrepant sets of figures have been generated each time KSU salaries are compared with other universities. This has created some confusion among the media, general public, and others not familiar with how these two figures are derived.

Historically, this Subcommittee has used the *All Ranks* method of calculating average salaries of comparison universities. The *All Ranks* method simply divides total salary dollars by the total number of faculty (all ranks).

This subcommittee believes that the *All Ranks* method is the more appropriate measure for the following reasons:

1. The most direct method of *calculating* average salary is to divide total salary dollars by total number of faculty.
2. The Rank Adjusted method *estimates* average salaries by creating comparison university faculties that do not actually exist. This method calculates an average salary by rank taken from an existing university and creates an identically ranked faculty from KSU (or other Regents' Institution) to go with the salary figure.
3. The *estimated* average salary for comparison is consistently lower than the actual average because KSU has significantly fewer faculty in the highest rank and more faculty in the two lowest ranks than the NASULGC institutions.
4. The differences in faculty rank percentages at KSU and its comparison institutions are directly related to differences in salary structures. Younger faculty leave KSU for higher salaries at other institutions before promotion to higher rank, and KSU does not attract faculty at higher ranks due to its lower salaries. Not only are *real* salaries at KSU markedly lower in most academic ranks than at comparison universities, but so is the percent of faculty in the highest rank, which is then used to show a lower differential between average salaries.

It should be noted that whether the *All Ranks* or *Rank Adjusted* method of comparing average salaries is used, KSU salaries are markedly lower than those of comparison institutions.

## Constant Dollar

Constant dollar income of KSU faculty increased .92 percent in FY 96 over FY 95. However, in constant dollars, faculty salaries in FY 96 were 2.0 percent below FY 70 salaries (Table 4, p. 8).

## The 50 Major Land Grant Universities

Table 5 (p. 9) provides FY 96 salary (and compensation) figures for the 50 major land grant universities. In FY 96, KSU salaries were ranked 42nd out of the 50 Major Land Grant Universities, needing a 14.5 percent increase in order to equal the average. In total compensation (salaries *plus* fringe benefits), KSU ranked 40th, needing a 13.3 percent increase to equal the average.

Table 1  
Faculty Salaries at KSU Compared to Regent Peer Institutions<sup>a</sup>

Year	Overall Average Salary <sup>b</sup>			KSU Increment Needed to:		Rank Adjusted <sup>c</sup> Average Salary	KSU Increment Need To:		
	KSU Salary	Comparison Institutions	KSU Rank <sup>d</sup> Out of 6	Reach Average Salary	Tie Highest Salary	Comparison Institutions	KSU Rank Out of 6	Reach Average Salary	Tie Highest Salary
1989-90	\$39,135	\$44,471	5	13.6%	25.8%	\$41,627	6	6.4%	20.0%
1990-91	\$40,889	\$47,016	5	15.0%	27.5%	\$44,220	5	8.1%	20.7%
1991-92	\$41,515	\$47,804	6	15.1%	28.2%	\$46,070	6	11.0%	23.1%
1992-93	\$42,529	\$49,361	6	16.1%	26.9%	\$46,478	6	9.3%	19.7%
1993-94	\$43,989	\$50,724	6	15.3%	21.3%	\$48,056	5	9.2%	18.2%
1994-95	\$45,968	\$53,232	6	15.8%	26.0%	\$50,269	5	9.4%	17.6%
1995-96	\$47,645	\$55,654	6	15.8%	24.3%	\$50,633	5	6.3%	12.4%

Institution	Rank					
	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
Iowa State University	2	2	2	2	2	1
Kansas State University	5	6	6	6	6	6
Oklahoma State University	4	4	5	5	4	4
Colorado State University	3	3	3	3	3	3
North Carolina State University	1	1	1	1	1	2
Oregon State University	6	5	4	4	5	5

<sup>a</sup>This Table provides a comparison of average faculty salaries at KSU and its peer institutions including: Iowa State University, Oklahoma State University, Colorado State University, North Carolina State University and Oregon State University. Comparisons are made between the peer composite and KSU salaries based on average salary and rank by rank average salary (Board of Regents' method of calculating average salary for comparison).

<sup>b</sup>Average salary excluding fringe benefits.

<sup>c</sup>Rank Adjusted Average Salary is calculated by multiplying the overall average of peer salaries by rank x the distribution of KSU faculty by rank; these values estimate what the comparison institutions' average salaries would be if their distribution by professional rank were identical to KSU.

<sup>d</sup>A rank of 1 equals the highest.

Source: Data taken from American Association of University Professors, AAUP Bulletin, Vols. 76-81, 1990-1995.

Table 2

Faculty Salaries at KSU Compared to Big Eight or Big Twelve (after 1989-90) Institutions<sup>a</sup>

Year	Overall Average Salary <sup>b</sup>		KSU Rank <sup>d</sup> Out of 8 or 12	KSU Increment Needed to:		Rank Adjusted <sup>c</sup> Average Salary		KSU Increment Need To:	
	KSU Salary	Comparison Institutions		Reach Average Salary	Tie Highest Salary	Comparison Institutions	KSU Rank <sup>a</sup> Out of 8 or 12	Reach Average Salary	Tie Highest Salary
1984-85	\$30,690	\$31,896	7	3.9%	11.4%				
1985-86	\$32,074	\$33,779	8	5.3%	13.5%				
1986-87	\$32,994	\$35,096	8	6.4%	19.6%				
1987-88	\$32,818	\$37,434	8	14.1%	29.4%				
1988-89	\$36,365	\$40,042	8	10.1%	22.0%				
1989-90	\$39,135	\$43,419	8	10.9%	22.5%				
1990-91	\$40,889	\$47,797	12	16.9%	33.7%	\$44,775	12	9.5%	24.2%
1991-92	\$41,515	\$48,891	12	17.8%	31.6%	\$46,048	12	10.9%	21.9%
1992-93	\$42,529	\$50,438	12	18.6%	33.4%	\$46,850	12	10.2%	21.9%
1993-94	\$43,989	\$52,050	12	18.3%	35.0%	\$48,474	11	10.2%	23.4%
1994-95	\$45,698	\$53,684	12	17.5%	32.2%	\$48,629	11	6.4%	19.9%
1995-96	\$47,645	\$56,273	12	18.1%	31.8%	\$51,857	11	8.8%	18.4%

## Ranked Overall Average Salary

Institution	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
Baylor	5	4	6	5	5	8
Iowa State University	4	3	3	2	4	2
Kansas State University	12	12	12	12	12	12
Oklahoma State University	6	8	11	11	6	9
Texas A&M	3	5	4	3	3	6
Texas Tech	9	11	10	9	9	10
University of Colorado	2	2	2	4	2	3
University of Kansas	8	9	7	7	8	7
University of Missouri	7	10	9	8	7	5
University of Nebraska	11	6	5	6	11	4
University of Oklahoma	10	7	8	10	10	11
University of Texas Austin	1	1	1	1	1	1

<sup>a</sup>This Table provides a comparison of average faculty salaries at KSU and the other Big Eight schools including: Iowa State, Oklahoma State, University of Kansas, University of Missouri - Columbia, University of Colorado - Boulder, University of Nebraska - Lincoln, and the University of Oklahoma, and after 1990, the Big Twelve schools including Baylor, University of Texas, Texas Tech, and Texas A&M. Comparisons are made between the Big Eight composite and KSU salaries based on average salary and rank by rank average salary (Board of Regents method of calculating average salary for comparison).

<sup>b</sup>Average salary excluding fringe benefits.

<sup>c</sup>Rank Adjusted Average Salary is calculated by multiplying the overall average of peer salaries by rank x the distribution of KSU faculty by rank; these values estimate what the comparison institutions' average salaries would be if their distribution by professional rank were identical to KSU.

<sup>d</sup>A rank of 1 equals the highest.

Source: Data taken from American Association of University Professors, AAUP Bulletin, Vols. 76-81, 1990-1995.

**Table 3**  
**Faculty Salaries at KSU Compared to NASULGC Institutions<sup>a</sup>**

Fund Unit	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor		All Ranks		Rank by Rank
	\$ <sup>b</sup>	% DFCT <sup>c</sup>	\$	% DFCT	\$	% DFCT	\$	% DFCT	\$	% DFCT	% DFCT
1986-87 KSU	38,819	20.3	30,368	14.2	27,482	7.5	21,202	4.0	32,469	17.4	15.3
Other	46,692		34,691		29,533		22,051		38,118		
1987-88 KSU	39,631	25.5	30,560	20.0	28,296	10.8	21,767	2.9	32,904	23.6	19.8
Other	49,740		36,685		31,346		22,403		40,658		
1988-89 KSU	42,983	25.0	33,617	15.8	30,464	9.7	23,454	1.0	35,667	22.4	17.9
Other	53,709		38,913		33,420		23,686		43,642		
1989-90 KSU	47,654	19.5	36,782	11.8	32,707	8.1	25,140	-1.5	38,819	19.2	13.8
Other	56,946		41,140		35,341		24,771		46,261		
1990-91 KSU	48,394	24.6	38,625	12.6	34,876	6.7	25,745	5.2	40,402	21.4	16.1
Other	60,297		43,656		37,205		27,074		49,042		
1991-92 KSU	50,085	20.4	39,498	11.8	35,545	6.7	27,321	-0.7	41,529	18.4	13.9
Other	60,322		44,165		37,932		27,136		49,162		
1992-93 KSU	51,433	22.9	39,940	13.2	36,552	6.1	28,025	-4.6	42,332	20.6	16.0
Other	63,211		45,195		38,764		28,434		51,038		
1993-94 KSU	51,630	23.0	41,525	11.6	37,417	6.3	29,835	-5.7	43,725	18.5	14.3
Other	63,506		46,322		39,755		28,137		51,799		
1994-95 KSU	54,672	22.0	43,616	10.9	38,388	8.0	29,195	-0.5	45,198	20.5	14.1
Other	66,711		48,363		41,422		29,051		54,475		
1995-96 KSU	57,309	20.3	45,020	10.9	40,063	6.5	30,290	-2.3	47,039	19.9	13.4
Other	68,966		49,949		42,657		29,580		56,415		

All University (including Veterinary Medicine)

<sup>a</sup>This table contains a comparison of KSU faculty salaries with salaries at 76 other members of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) by rank, all ranks, and rank by rank. 1994-95 data includes College of Salina, in addition to KSU Main Campus and the College of Veterinary Medicine.

<sup>b</sup>All salaries are reported as 9 month. "Other" refers to the average at the NASULGC institutions.

<sup>c</sup>Refers to the percentage increase or decrease required to change our salary to that of the average of the NASULGC salaries.

Source: Data taken from American Association of University Professors, AAUP Bulletin, Vols. 76-81, 1990-1995.



Table 4  
Average Faculty Salaries at KSU in Constant Dollars\*

Year	Current Dollar			Consumer Prices			Constant Dollar Salary		
	Amount <sup>b</sup>	% Inc	Index <sup>c</sup>	% Inc	Amount <sup>d</sup>	% Inc	Index <sup>e</sup>		
1969-70	\$12,094	5.1	37.8	5.9	\$32,029	-0.7	100.0		
1970-71	\$12,794	5.8	39.7	5.2	\$32,203	0.5	100.5		
1971-72	\$12,801	0.1	41.2	3.6	\$31,097	-3.4	97.1		
1972-73	\$13,318	4.0	42.8	4.0	\$31,117	0.1	97.2		
1973-74	\$14,018	5.3	46.6	9.0	\$30,056	-3.4	93.8		
1974-75	\$15,528	10.8	51.8	11.1	\$29,968	-0.3	93.6		
1975-76	\$16,956	9.2	55.5	7.1	\$30,559	2.0	95.4		
1976-77	\$18,027	6.3	58.7	5.8	\$30,715	0.5	95.9		
1977-78	\$19,008	5.4	62.6	6.7	\$30,349	-1.2	94.8		
1978-79	\$20,299	6.8	68.5	9.4	\$29,630	-2.4	92.5		
1979-80	\$21,641	6.6	77.7	13.4	\$27,868	-5.9	87.0		
1980-81	\$23,629	9.2	86.6	11.5	\$27,284	-2.1	85.2		
1981-82	\$25,364	7.5	94.1	8.7	\$26,728	-3.0	82.7		
1982-83	\$27,651	8.3	98.2	4.3	\$27,794	3.8	86.7		
1983-84	\$27,971	2.9	101.8	4.7	\$27,478	-1.0	85.8		
1984-85	\$30,690	9.7	105.8	3.9	\$29,017	5.6	90.6		
1985-86	\$32,074	4.5	108.8	2.9	\$29,470	1.6	92.0		
1986-87	\$32,994	2.9	111.3	2.2	\$29,651	0.6	92.6		
1987-88	\$32,818	-0.5	115.8	4.1	\$28,340	-4.4	88.5		
1988-89	\$36,365	10.8	121.2	4.7	\$30,004	5.9	93.7		
1989-90	\$39,135	7.6	127.0	4.8	\$30,815	2.7	96.2		
1990-91	\$40,889	4.5	133.9	5.4	\$30,537	-0.9	95.3		
1991-92	\$41,875	1.5	138.3	3.3	\$30,018	-1.7	93.7		
1992-93	\$42,529	2.4	140.1	1.3	\$30,355	1.1	94.8		
1993-94	\$43,569	3.4	143.7	2.6	\$30,612	0.8	95.6		
1994-95	\$45,968	4.5	147.8	2.9	\$31,101	1.6	97.1		
1995-96	\$47,645	3.6	151.8	2.7	\$31,387	0.9	98.0		

\*This table provides a record of average salaries at KSU since 1969-70. It shows actual percentage increase in dollars, adjusts the salaries for inflation using the Consumer Price Index and indicates the purchasing power of the current salary when compared to the purchasing power in 1969-70. Data from American Association of University Professors, *Academe*, Bulletin Vols. 56 1969-1995.

<sup>b</sup>Average 9-month equivalent salary excluding fringe benefits.

<sup>c</sup>Fiscal (July 1 to June 30) average of monthly Consumer Price Index values reported in the CPI Detailed Report published by the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Effective January 1989, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics changed the base year to the average during 1982-1984.

<sup>d</sup>Constant Dollar Series = (Current Dollar Salary/Consumer Price Index) X 100.

<sup>e</sup>Constant Dollar Faculty Salary relative to the Constant Dollar Faculty Salary in 1969-70.

Table 5  
Average Salary and Compensation Comparisons  
Fifty Land Grant Universities  
Fall 1995

RANK	UNIVERSITY	SALARY	%DIFF	RANK	COMPENSATION	%DIFF
1	RUTGERS-NEW BRUNSWICK	\$72,507	24.8%	1	\$90,093	25.0%
2	CONNECTICUT-STORRS	\$68,054	19.8%	2	\$84,384	19.9%
3	CALIFORNIA-DAVIS	\$64,889	15.9%	3	\$82,085	17.7%
4	ILLINOIS-URBANA	\$62,886	13.3%	16	\$72,490	6.8%
5	SUNY-BUFFALO	\$62,359	12.5%	5	\$79,032	14.5%
6	WISCONSIN-MADISON	\$61,943	11.9%	7	\$78,228	13.6%
7	MARYLAND-COLLEGE PARK	\$61,902	11.9%	10	\$76,085	11.2%
8	MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES	\$61,711	11.6%	6	\$78,708	14.1%
9	MASSACHUSETTS-AMHERST	\$61,619	11.5%	9	\$76,660	11.8%
10	DELAWARE	\$61,343	11.1%	4	\$79,223	14.7%
11	OHIO STATE-COLUMBUS	\$59,771	8.7%	13	\$73,588	8.2%
12	ARIZONA	\$59,313	8.0%	18	\$71,132	5.0%
13	PURDUE-WEST LAFAYETTE	\$59,282	8.0%	11	\$75,823	10.9%
14	IOWA STATE	\$59,230	7.9%	14	\$73,313	7.8%
15	NC STATE-RALEIGH	\$59,060	7.6%	19	\$71,045	4.9%
16	MICHIGAN STATE	\$58,770	7.2%	8	\$76,811	12.0%
17	PENN STATE	\$57,522	5.2%	17	\$71,670	5.7%
18	TEXAS A&M	\$57,496	5.1%	20	\$70,236	3.8%
19	HAWAII-MANOA	\$57,413	5.0%	15	\$73,027	7.5%
20	NEVADA-RENO	\$57,094	4.5%	29	\$66,156	-2.2%
21	RHODE ISLAND	\$56,985	4.3%	12	\$74,278	9.0%
22	NEBRASKA-LINCOLN	\$55,679	2.0%	26	\$67,214	-0.5%
23	VIRGINIA TECH	\$55,613	1.9%	23	\$68,442	1.3%
24	COLORADO STATE	\$55,435	1.6%	30	\$66,063	-2.3%
25	MISSOURI-COLUMBIA	\$55,319	1.4%	32	\$65,756	-2.8%
26	KENTUCKY	\$55,286	1.3%	27	\$66,800	-1.2%
27	TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE	\$54,765	0.4%	21	\$69,872	3.3%
28	FLORIDA-GAINESVILLE	\$54,531	-0.0%	28	\$66,436	-1.7%
29	GEORGIA	\$54,509	-0.1%	25	\$67,677	0.1%
30	ALASKA-FAIRBANKS	\$54,401	-0.3%	22	\$69,642	3.0%
31	NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$53,386	-2.2%	24	\$68,172	0.9%
32	CLEMSON	\$52,527	-3.8%	33	\$64,305	-5.1%
33	VERMONT	\$51,833	-5.2%	31	\$66,017	-2.4%
34	OKLAHOMA STATE	\$50,549	-7.9%	35	\$62,077	-8.9%
35	WASHINGTON STATE	\$50,251	-8.6%	36	\$61,983	-9.0%
36	OREGON STATE	\$49,928	-9.3%	34	\$64,222	-5.2%
37	WYOMING	\$49,693	-9.8%	37	\$61,104	-10.6%
38	MISSISSIPPI STATE	\$48,851	-11.7%	42	\$58,931	-14.7%
39	ARKANSAS-FAYETTEVILLE	\$48,711	-12.0%	43	\$58,794	-14.9%
40	AUBURN	\$48,447	-12.6%	41	\$59,617	-13.4%
41	WEST VIRGINIA	\$48,435	-12.6%	44	\$58,113	-16.3%
42	KANSAS STATE	\$47,645	-14.5%	40	\$59,673	-13.3%
43	MAINE-ORONO	\$47,467	-14.9%	39	\$59,933	-12.8%
44	LOUISIANA STATE	\$46,468	-17.4%	46	\$56,150	-20.4%
45	NM STATE-LAS CRUCES	\$46,436	-17.5%	45	\$56,848	-18.9%
46	UTAH STATE	\$44,909	-21.5%	38	\$60,247	-12.2%
47	MONTANA STATE	\$43,878	-24.3%	47	\$53,512	-26.3%
48	NORTH DAKOTA STATE	\$42,302	-29.0%	49	\$49,488	-36.6%
49	IDAHO STATE	\$40,242	-35.6%	48	\$51,917	-30.2%
50	SOUTH DAKOTA STATE	\$38,783	-40.7%	50	\$45,938	-47.1%

Big twelve and peer institution. % Difference from average salary of these 50 schools.  
Source: Data taken from American Association of University Professors, AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 81, 1995.

## II. PROBLEMS CREATED BY SALARY DEFICIENCIES

Over the last decade low salaries have caused a multitude of problems. Today KSU faces serious challenges in several areas caused by non-competitive salaries and salary compression. There were difficulties collecting recent information. However, data have tended to remain stable, and details can be found in the December 1995 Annual Report on the Status of Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits at Kansas State University. That report indicated that the recruitment of promising new faculty is difficult, and morale of senior faculty is low, due to salary compression, and consequently, we remain a training center for junior faculty who leave for higher paying positions elsewhere.

## III. STATUS OF FACULTY FRINGE BENEFITS AT KSU

Kansas State faculty remained at the bottom of the comparison tables with the Big Twelve institutions on most types of fringe benefits. The Board of Regents needs to improve the benefit package. Table 6 (below) provides information on retirement contributions, and table 7 (p.11) provides details on Medical and Dental Insurance for the old Big Eight institutions.

Table 6.

Retirement Contributions at Big Eight and Peer Institutions			
School	Employer pays	Employee pays	Total
Colorado (5)	.09 x SAL	.05 x SAL	.14 x SAL
Colorado State (1,5)	.09 x SAL	.05 x SAL	.14 x SAL
Iowa State	.10 x SAL	.05 x SAL	.15 x SAL
Kansas/KSU	.085 x SAL	.055 x SAL	.14 x SAL
Missouri (2)	.0596 x SAL	0	.0596 x SAL
Nebraska	.075 x SAL	.055 x SAL	.13 x SAL
N. Carolina St. (3)	.066 x SAL	.06 x SAL	.126 x SAL
Oklahoma (4)	.145 x SAL	.055 x SAL	.20 x SAL
Oklahoma ST. (1,4)	.10 x SAL	0	.10 x SAL
Oregon ST. (1,3)	.146 x SAL	0	.146 x SAL
OVERALL AVE.	.096 x SAL	.038 x SAL	.134 x SAL

1. Peer institutions
2. Defined Benefit plans
3. Offers both a defined contribution and a defined benefit plan.
4. Combines TIAA/CREF with a state sponsored defined benefit plan.
5. Figures are from FY 1995.

Table 7.

## MONTHLY PREMIUMS FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL INSURANCE IN FY 96

University	INDIVIDUAL COVERAGE			FAMILY COVERAGE <sup>1</sup>		
	University Pays	Faculty Pays	Total	University Pays	Faculty Pays	Total
<b>Colorado<sup>6</sup></b>						
BC/BS-Basic	\$ 146.15	\$ 0.00	\$ 146.15	\$ 256.29	\$ 40.00	\$ 296.29
BC/BS-Basic + Dental	146.15	7.00	153.15	256.29	75.00	331.29
BC/BS-CU Plus	146.15	15.00	161.15	256.29	156.00	412.29
Kaiser HMO + Dental	146.15	18.00	164.15	256.29	188.00	444.29
Colorado HMO + Dent	146.15	36.00	182.15	256.29	240.00	496.29
<b>Colorado State<sup>2,3,6</sup></b>						
BC/BS - High	\$ 86.00	\$ 44.00	\$ 130.00	86.00	\$ 312.00	\$ 398.00
BC/BS - Low	86.00	0.00	86.00	86.00	177.00	263.00
CompreCare HMO	86.00	51.00	137.00	86.00	339.00	425.00
TakeCare CO HMO	86.00	51.00	137.00	86.00	337.00	423.00
Rocky Mountain HMO	86.00	32.00	118.00	86.00	226.00	312.00
Unident (fee)	16.00	0.00	16.00		24.00	40.00
Denticare DMO	9.35	0.00	9.35		9.45	25.45
<b>Iowa State<sup>2</sup></b>						
Principal Mutual	\$ 157.79	\$ 0.00	\$ 157.79	\$ 282.44	\$ 104.81	\$ 387.25
BC/BS - Prog.II	190.15	0.00	190.15	309.18	152.64	461.82
BC/BS - Prog.III	118.00	0.00	118.00	232.55	107.82	340.37
Preferred Blue-HMO	133.93	0.00	133.93	231.68	104.82	336.50
Dental care	12.69	0.00	12.69	12.69	22.08	32.77
<b>Kansas State University</b>						
Blue Select	\$ 195.59	\$ 22.00	\$ 217.59	\$ 340.66	\$ 236.80	\$ 576.80
HMO Kansas	181.46	22.00	203.46	189.84	330.06	519.90
Blue Select w/Dental	.00	.00	.00	344.59	248.59	593.18
<b>Missouri</b>						
Plan A:	\$81.88	\$ 40.52	\$ 122.40	\$ 275.96	\$ 137.95	\$413.54
Point-of-Service						
Plan B:	32.40	16.20	48.60	83.20	41.58	124.78
Catastrophic						
Plan C:	111.76	55.86	167.62	286.84	143.40	430.24
Out-of-Network-Area						
Group Health Plan	81.88	45.76	131.64	275.96	167.68	443.64
Plan D: HMOs						
GenCare/Sanus	81.88	33.70	115.58	275.96	116.98	392.94
Humana Prime	81.88	52.98	134.86	275.96	170.42	446.38
Health (KC area)						
Dental	6.60	6.60	13.20	22.62	22.62	45.34
<b>Nebraska<sup>4</sup></b>						
Mut Omaha-Low	\$ 141.12	\$ 0.00	\$ 141.12	\$ 282.06	\$ 0.00	\$ 282.06
Mut Omaha-Basic	151.26	0.00	151.26	289.20	23.38	312.58
Mut Omaha-High	152.36	31.50	183.86	289.20	120.82	410.02
Hth Am-Standard	151.84	4.80	157.16	289.20	103.68	392.88
Hth Am-Premium	152.36	17.48	169.84	289.20	135.40	446.38
ExclusiCare-Omaha	152.36	16.08	168.44	289.20	152.64	441.84
SHARE	152.36	15.28	167.64	289.20	146.60	435.86
Dental (M.Om)	9.42	9.24	18.66	40.78	19.22	60.00
<b>N. Carolina State<sup>2</sup></b>						
State of NC	\$ 144.60	\$ 0.00	\$ 144.60	\$ 144.60	\$ 216.18	\$ 360.78
Health Source HMO	144.60	27.97	172.57	144.60	307.40	447.00
Kaiser HMO	144.60	32.74	177.54	144.60	321.80	466.40
BC/BS	144.60	13.06	157.66	144.60	268.40	413.00
Dental-Tradition	0.00	24.65	24.65	0.00	74.97	74.97
Dental Managed	0.00	12.74	12.74	0.00	37.44	37.44

**MONTHLY PREMIUMS FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL INSURANCE IN FY 96(CONT.)**

University	INDIVIDUAL COVERAGE			FAMILY COVERAGE <sup>1</sup>		
	University Pays	Faculty Pays	Total	University Pays	Faculty Pays	Total
Maxicare	144.60	37.60	182.20	144.60	312.80	457.40
Partners	144.60	38.64	183.24	144.60	337.30	481.90
PHP	144.60	43.60	190.20	144.60	350.40	495.00
Procare	144.60	25.90	170.30	144.60	272.48	417.00
<b>Oklahoma</b>						
A. Managed Care	\$ 132.68	\$ 0.00	\$ 132.68	\$ 132.68	\$ 211.08	\$ 343.76
B. Limited Care	81.32	0.00	81.32	132.68	98.16	230.84
C. Procare Plus	136.77	0.00	136.77	132.68	323.19	455.87
D. Dental (Basic)	6.84	0.00	6.84	6.84	32.82	39.66
E. (Alternate)	6.84	18.28	25.12	6.84	61.12	67.96
<b>Oklahoma State<sup>2</sup></b>						
Am. Fidelity	\$ 145.00	\$0.00	\$ 145.00	\$ 145.00	\$ 232.50	\$ 377.50
Dental		18.06	18.06	0.00	33.56	33.56
<b>Oregon State<sup>2,5</sup></b>						
BC/BS	\$ 403.00	\$ (256.14)	\$ 146.86	\$ 403.00	\$ (173.06)	\$ 229.94
BC/BS - CoPay	403.00	(181.80)	221.20	403.00	(56.18)	346.82
Select Care HMO	403.00	(209.98)	193.02	403.00	(101.28)	301.72
Dental plans:						
Kaiser DMO	0.00		23.54			66.80
ODS	0.00		22.70			68.00

<sup>1</sup> Family coverage<sup>1</sup> is the cost for faculty member, non-faculty spouse, and children. Costs for faculty and spouse, faculty and children, or faculty couple and children will of course be less.

<sup>2</sup> Peer Institution

<sup>3</sup> Cafeteria Plan (see Appendix B for details). Each employee pays 2.6% of salary into a fund and in return is given 2.7% of average faculty salary plus 2.5% of that employee's salary to spend on benefits, subject to certain minimums. This example assumes a salary equal to the average for 1992/93 and an employee who elects to use \$7/month for \$50,000 term life insurance, \$67 for disability insurance, and the balance of \$143 on health insurance; life insurance and long-term disability insurance costs are subtracted from the "employer" contribution.

<sup>4</sup> Modified Cafeteria Plan. Employee is given \$63.00 to spend on fringe benefits. This is included in the employer total.

<sup>5</sup> Cafeteria Plan. Each faculty employee begins with \$403 to spend on health care premiums, supplemental retirement, life insurance, and other fringe benefits. Any amount not spent may be taken as salary. Figures in parentheses are surplus benefit dollars which may be spent on other insurance or taken as extra income.

<sup>6</sup> Figures are from FY 1995.