FY-14 FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

TO: University Governance, Nancy Kinnersley, University Senate President,
                Chris Steadman, Faculty Senate President
FROM: Faculty Compensation Committee
                Chair: Donna Ginther, Economics, (2014)
                Members: Cindy Colwell Dunn, Music (2014) , Ron Hui, EECS (2014) , Peter Chun, Music,
                (2016), Jorge Perez, Spanish & Portuguese (2016), John Keating, Economics (2016),
                Ex-officio member, Mary Lee Hummert, Office of the Provost

DATE: 05/1/2014

Standing charges:

1. Continue to monitor the level and distribution of faculty salaries to identify issues and concerns. Report issues, problems, and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

    Deb Teeter (OIRP) provided the FY 2013 Faculty Salary Equity Study. The report was discussed by the committee in the May 1, 2014 meeting. This study is attached to the report. The committee concluded that there were no significant pay differences as a result of age, gender or race/ethnicity. However, the committee would like to view the actual regression analysis in order to gain a better understanding of the statistical model.

    We also examined data comparing KU faculty salaries to peer institutions for FY 2013. These data are available on the OIRP website (http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/profiles.shtml) and attached to this report. As of FY 2013, KU faculty salaries rank in the lowest quartile of our 10 peer institutions (9th out of 11 for full and associate professors and 8th out of 11 for assistant professors).   KU salaries compare more favorably to institutions in the Great Plains states (5th out of 12 for full professors and 7th out of 12 for assistant professors). If assistant professor salaries remain comparably low as these faculty progress through the ranks, KU will lose ground compared with Great Plains institutions. KU ranks near the bottom of the 16 AAU public universities (14th out of 16—ahead of Missouri and Nebraska). Now that Nebraska has left the AAU, KU will only rank ahead of Missouri for FY 2014.

2. Continue the cooperative communication between the Chairs of the Planning and Resources and Faculty Compensation committees to facilitate coordination on issues of mutual concern. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

    The Faculty Compensation Committee did not communicate with the Chair of the Planning and Resources Committee. We had several charges to attend to as discussed below.

Specific charges:

1. Drawing upon the work of the Tuition Assistance Task Force, and in coordination with the Planning and Resources Committee, consider how an expanded tuition assistance policy might affect faculty compensation, recruitment, and retention. Consider which Task Force recommendations might be prioritized if a phased or incremental approach is pursued. Report findings and recommendations to FacEx.

    Diane Goddard and Richard McKinney reviewed the Tuition Assistance Task Force report and updated cost of Tuition Assistance based on administrative records. Using these numbers, the Faculty Compensation Committee developed a revised estimate of the cost of expanding Tuition Assistance based on current use and faculty dependents using the Coca Cola Scholarships (attached). Donna Ginther, Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, met with Diane Goddard and Richard McKinney on April 29, 2014 to discuss the cost and the need for an expanded Tuition Assistance

Policy. Goddard and McKinney agreed on the importance of providing an expanded Tuition Assistance Policy. In order to evaluate the change in enrollment associated with expanding Tuition Assistance, they plan to request information from Kansas State and Wichita State, institutions that have expanded tuition assistance for dependents. They plan to present the Tuition Assistance Task Force report to the Chancellor and the Provost and investigate ways to pay for this program. This charge should carry over to next year's Faculty Compensation Committee in order to continue the dialogue with the KU administration.

2. Consider how current online education initiatives might affect faculty compensation, recruitment, and retention. Report issues and findings to FacEx.

   The Faculty Compensation Committee requested data from OIRP on courses taught by mode for the 2013-2014 academic year. The committee evaluated data by total students, school, semester, rank of the professor, class size and course level. We found first, that comparatively few students enroll in hybrid or online courses during the 2013-14 academic year. Second, Social Welfare has developed a hybrid degree program. Third, online and hybrid courses are concentrated in CLAS and the School of Education. Fourth, these courses are more likely to be taught during the spring and fall semesters than in the summer. Fifth, adjuncts and associate professors are more likely to teach online/hybrid courses. Finally, although hybrid and online courses are distributed evenly across course levels, they are larger than in-person classes.

School	Course Load Accounting	Extra Compensation
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	During semester online and hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	One-time course development funds are available to encourage faculty to develop online/hybrid courses.
School of Education	Online/hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	Pay faculty $3500 for the development of online/hybrid courses.
School of Journalism	Online/hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	Pay is same for teaching online or in-person courses. Student enrollment caps are same for both types of courses.
School of Pharmacy	School of Pharmacy teaches several video courses delivered in Lawrence, Wichita, and Kansas City. These course lectures are delivered once and recorded. Graduate courses in PHCH are on-line.	No overload payments for teaching video courses. Online PHCH courses may result in overload payments depending on the teaching commitments of the faculty member.
School of Business	Online/hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	No course development funds reported.
School of Social Welfare	Online/hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	One-time $5,000 course development payment as long as the courses are taught for three years.
School of Music	Online/hybrid courses are counted as part of regular teaching load.	No course development funds reported.

After reviewing the data, the Faculty Compensation Committee contacted the Deans of schools where online courses are taught to request information on how online and hybrid courses are counted as part of the teaching load and whether additional compensation was provided for these courses. All Deans responded promptly to our requests (see the above table). Given the responses from the Deans, the Faculty Compensation Committee suggests that consistency of how extra compensation is dispersed be considered across Schools and the College for course development. Currently, there is a range of protocols from no course development funds to one-time $5000 payments. With the increased priority on offering online or hybrid courses, extra compensation for the significant time investment by the faculty in the development of online or hybrid courses should be addressed through either one-time payments or a course release.

3. Consider how the issues of "salary caps" and salary compression might affect faculty compensation, recruitment, and retention. Report issues and findings to FacEx.

    The Faculty Compensation Committee finds that salary caps and salary compression have detrimental effects of faculty compensation, recruitment and retention. Salary caps and salary compression act as "real wage" cuts. Salary caps mean that salary stays the same despite the fact that inflation increases over time. As a result, the real salary (e.g. purchasing power) of faculty falls over time. Salary compression is more pernicious. It occurs when new faculty are hired at the prevailing market wage, while faculty with longer job tenure at KU earn below this prevailing wage. This usually happens because merit increases have failed to keep pace with prevailing wage increases in the market. As a result salaries are compressed or the salary structure is inverted where new assistant professors earn more than tenured, full professors.

    In some cases, Deans have argued against paying the prevailing market wage citing the effects of salary compression in the department. The Faculty Compensation Committee suggests that in order to recruit and retain the best and brightest new faculty, it is important to pay them the market wage. Paying below market salaries will only have a detrimental effect on recruitment and retention. Salary compression should be addressed separately. The Faculty Compensation Committee suggests that the administration should conduct periodic market reviews that align the salaries of faculty with longer service to KU to the prevailing wage paid to new hires at that rank or the average of salaries at that rank (in similar departments) at peer institutions.

    We recommend that the 2014-2015 Faculty Compensation Committee work with OIRP to perform a quantitative analysis of salary compression by school. This analysis should consider the effect of time-in-rank and the effect of job tenure at KU on salary. A more ambitious project would be to work with AAU 16 Public institutions to examine salary compression as well.

ANALYSIS OF ONLINE/HYBRID COURSES TAUGHT 2013-2014

The Faculty Compensation Committee requested and received data on courses taught in the summer, fall, and spring semesters 2013-14 by mode (Online, hybrid, in-person, Video Course); course level; unit (school and department); and faculty rank of the instructor. We have analyzed these data to determine the incidence of online and hybrid courses, the faculty rank of the instructors, and number of students taught. Results appear below.

1. Comparatively few students enroll in hybrid or online courses during the 2013-14 academic year.

```
Mode      |  Total Students
----------+----------
   Hybrid |     2912
In Person |   195592
    Video |     6562
   Online |     6088
----------+----------
    Total |   211154
```

2. These courses are concentrated in CLAS and the School of Education:

| | | Teaching Mode | | | |
school	Hybrid	In Person	Video	Online	Total
Applied English Cente	0	211	0	0	211
College of Liberal Ar	17	6,836	14	133	7,000
Office of the Univers	0	31	0	0	31
School of Architectur	0	413	5	3	421
School of Business	10	569	0	6	585
School of Education	18	1,020	7	49	1,094
School of Engineering	1	1,022	9	1	1,033
School of Journalism	12	161	0	6	179
School of Law	0	259	0	0	259
School of Music	0	1,146	1	13	1,160
School of Pharmacy	1	205	65	33	304
School of Social Welf	43	188	4	2	237
Total	102	12,061	105	246	12,514

3. These courses are somewhat more likely to be taught in the spring and fall semesters:

| Teaching Mode | | Term | | |
	Sum 2013	Fall 2013	Spr 2014	Total
Hybrid	10	35	57	102
In Person	1,702	5,053	5,306	12,061
VC	2	53	50	105
Online	82	80	84	246
Total	1,796	5,221	5,497	12,514

4

4. Adjuncts and Associate Professors are more likely to teach online and hybrid courses:

```
                |               Teaching Mode
 Academic Rank  |    Hybrid  In Person       Video  Online  |     Total
----------------+---------------------------------------------+----------
Student Teacher |         2        382          10      20  |       414
        Adjunct |        36      1,751          11      64  |     1,862
     Other Rank |        18      3,006          35      27  |     3,086
      Assistant |         7      1,424          10      17  |     1,458
      Associate |        23      3,389          29      65  |     3,506
           Full |        16      2,109          10      53  |     2,188
----------------+---------------------------------------------+----------
          Total |       102     12,061         105     246  |    12,514
```

5. Excluding remedial courses and 900 level courses, online and hybrid courses have more students on average.

```
--------------------------
Teaching  |
Mode      | mean(students)
----------+---------------
   Hybrid |           28.5
In Person |           19.6
    Video |           64.6
   Online |           25.1
          |
    Total |           20.3
--------------------------
```

6. Online and hybrid courses are distributed fairly evenly across course levels.

```
----------------------------------------------------------------
                 |               Teaching Mode
   Course Level  |    Hybrid  In Person       Video   Online
-----------------+----------------------------------------------
Remedial courses |                    133
      100 level  |         8      1,498           3       59
      200 level  |         1        805                   26
      300 level  |        12      1,237           6       38
      400 level  |        12      1,126           1        5
      500 level  |         1      1,016          28       16
  600-800 level  |        29      1,715          54       35
      800 level  |        39      2,000           9       63
      900 level  |               2,531           4        4
----------------------------------------------------------------
```

April 16, 2014

To: Faculty Compensation Committee, Diane Goddard, Mary Lee Hummert
From: Donna K. Ginther, Chair, Faculty Compensation Committee

RE::   Tuition Assistance Revised Estimates

Last year, the University Senate's Task Force on Tuition Assistance proposed an expansion of tuition assistance to 7 credits per semester and expanding eligibility to include dependents, spouses, and domestic partners.[1] The Tuition Assistance proposal included estimates of the cost of expanding tuition assistance, based on different numbers of students and 2013 tuition rates.

Recently, Richard McKinney updated that analysis, providing estimates based on current Tuition Assistance use and costs and dependents currently enrolled who received the Coca Cola scholarship. McKinney's estimates of current tuition assistance use and cost appear in Table 1. If KU expands Tuition Assistance to 7 credit hours, and every eligible employee takes advantage of the program, the costs will double from an estimate of $477,121 in FY 2014 to $1,009,628. This should be considered an upper bound on the cost of expansion since not all faculty/staff will have the time to take additional courses.

Using Fall 2013 compact undergraduate costs and including an 11% premium for fees and differential tuition, we have estimated the costs of expanding Tuition Assistance to dependents. First, we used the count of current and former Coca Cola scholarship recipients enrolled at KU (285) and then assumed that the number of spouses and dependents doubled to 500.

- If 285 dependents receive 4 credits per semester, total annual cost would be $972,776 per year (the near-term cost of expanding program to dependents).

- If 500 dependents/spouses/partners receive 4 credits per semester, total annual cost would be $1,706,625 per year (an upper bound on additional cost of expanding eligibility).

- If 500 dependents/spouses/partners receive 7 credits per semester, total annual cost would be $2,987,288 per year.

- If 1000 receive 4 credits per semester, total annual cost would be $3,413,250 per year (an estimate of total cost of expanding eligibility).

- If 1000 receive 7 credits per semester, total annual cost would be $5,974,575 per year (an estimate of total cost of expanding eligibility and credit hours).

---

[1] The current Tuition Assistance program only covers full-time faculty and staff without a doctorate, and allows them to take a 5 credit course per semester without charge.

Table 1: Tuition Assistance Estimates

		Paid to KU	Number	Other	Number	7 Hours	Cost Increase
FY 2013 Tuition Assistance	Summer	$67,649	74	$3,659	20		
	Fall	$168,330	165	$11,570	16		
	Spring	$146,615	146	$8,690	36		
Total		$382,594	385	$23,919	72	$863,922	$481,328
FY 2014 Tuition Assistance	Summer	$69,502	71	$1,962	6		
	Fall	$183,797	165	$5,472	16		
	Spring (est)	$193,822	174	$6,640	22		
Total		$447,121	410	$14,074	44	$1,009,628	$562,507

Notes: Most Tuition assistance recipients are taking graduate courses. Based on Richard McKinney's estimates

	Students	Hours	Per student	Per semester	Per Year	Add fees Per semester	Add fees Per Year
Adding Dependents--based on estimated							
285 Coca Cola scholars, 4 credits	285	4	$1,230	$350,550	$876,375	$389,111	$972,776
Assume 285 students, 7 credits	285	7	$2,153	$613,463	$1,533,656	$680,943	$1,702,358
Assume 500 students, 1 course	500	4	$1,230	$615,000	$1,537,500	$682,650	$1,706,625
Assume 500 students, 7 credits	500	7	$2,153	$1,076,500	$2,691,250	$1,194,915	$2,987,288
Assume 1000 staff/students, 4 credits	1000	4	$1,230	$1,230,000	$3,075,000	$1,365,300	$3,413,250
Assume 1000 staff/students, 7 credits	1000	7	$2,153	$2,153,000	$5,382,500	$2,389,830	$5,974,575

Notes: Uses FY 2013 Compact rate of $307.50 and assumes fees add 11% in costs. Per year multiplies per semester rate by 2.5 to account for summer.

Public Report
FY 2013 Faculty Salary Equity Study
University of Kansas - Lawrence Campus

Key Findings

♦ **The faculty salary model accounts for 86.6 percent of the variation in faculty salary levels at the University of Kansas.** The factors that account for the greatest proportion of variation in faculty salaries are the most senior faculty rank and departmental appointments.

♦ **Gender, race/ethnicity, and age had no effect on faculty salary levels, providing no indication of systematic salary discrimination at the university.** In other words, knowing an individual's gender, race/ethnicity, or age did not increase the salary model's ability to account for differences in faculty salaries.

Background

The statistical model used to examine salary equity is based on previous faculty salary research conducted both nationally and in the state of Kansas. The objectives of the faculty salary study were twofold:

♦ To gain a better understanding of the variation among faculty salary levels at the University of Kansas.
♦ To determine whether demographic variables such as gender, race/ethnicity, and age inappropriately affect the level of faculty salaries.

The study builds upon a tradition, spanning more than 35 years, of attentiveness to issues of salary equity for all groups at the University of Kansas. Earlier faculty studies employed a technique that matched women with men of the same department, rank, and years in rank and similarly for racial and ethnic minorities. The method allowed administrators to better identify and correct any differences based on demographic characteristics, rather than performance or merit. Since 1999, linear regression has been utilized to isolate the effects of gender and race/ethnicity, after controlling for factors such as academic rank, discipline, and individual accomplishments. The current study replicates the earlier regression analyses, with similar results – over 86 percent of the differences in faculty salaries can be accounted for by the variables included in the model.

Description of Salary Model

Regression analysis is a popular choice for salary equity studies because it provides a relatively simple, but robust method for examining interrelationships among a set of variables. Regression techniques can be used to study the effects of race/ethnicity or gender on salary independent of other factors such as academic department or work experience. In addition, regression analysis can be used to predict or explain changes in salary levels based on changes in factors such as rank, experience, accomplishments, or academic department.

The faculty salary information used for this study is from the October 2012 official census file for university reporting. Faculty included in the study are full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty on the Lawrence campus who are at least 50 percent instruction – 998 individuals. This definition excludes tenured and tenure-track faculty whose duties are primarily research-based or administrative, as well as those on phased retirement.

The following variable groups are used in the regression model.

Academic Rank: Assistant, associate, or full professor – assistant professor is the reference category and is omitted from the model.

School/Division Appointment: The academic units are architecture, arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences/math, business, education, engineering, journalism, law, music, pharmacy, or social welfare. Business is grouped into three areas to approximate the different salary levels or market values of the individual disciplines – high (accounting/information systems and finance), medium (economics/decision sciences/marketing/entrepreneurship) and low (management /law). Arts serves as the comparison group and is omitted from the model.

Premium for Outside Job Market: Represents the salary premium in fields with a strong labor market outside of academia that is not typical of other disciplines within the unit. This group includes faculty in economics, who enjoy a salary premium not typical of the social sciences as a whole. Other disciplines (i.e., engineering, law, business, pharmacy) also have strong outside labor markets, but this influence is consistent enough across the entire school to be represented by the school/division variable alone. This indicator is also used for faculty members with salary premiums that are based upon their individual marketability.

Individual Accomplishments:
- Distinguished or named professor
- Named teaching professor
- Teaching, service, or research/scholarship award, including Chancellor's Club[1]
- Top 20 percent of university researchers based on prior years research expenditures

Experience Factors:
- Years of tenured service at KU
- Years in current rank
- Administrative experience
- Hired at a rank above Assistant Professor

Demographic Factors*:*
- Gender
- Age as of October 2012
- Member of a minority group (Black, Hispanic, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, or multiple races) and a native citizen, naturalized citizen, or permanent resident alien (IPEDS definition)

Salary: 9-month faculty salary

The dependent variable, 9-month salary, was converted to a natural logarithm because the relationship between earnings and many human capital factors (i.e., age and experience) are exponential, not linear. In addition, salary increases at the University of Kansas are primarily percentage-based, or calculated as a percentage of one's current salary, rather than a constant amount awarded to each individual. Without the transformation, the predictive power of the regression equation is reduced, particularly at higher salary levels.

---

1. All Chancellor's Club designations are counted as teaching awards; see Profiles pages 6a-460 and 6a-465.

Results

♦ Without knowing a faculty member's gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship, or age, the model accounts for 86.6 percent of the variation in faculty salary levels. The factors that individually account for the most variation include – the rank of professor, a distinguished/named professorship, as well as appointments in accounting, information systems, finance, management, marketing, engineering, or law. These factors make up over half of the variance explained by the model.

♦ When information on gender is added to the model, the explanatory power of the model for faculty salaries remains constant at 86.6 percent. In other words, knowing whether or not a faculty member is female does not increase the model's accuracy in predicting the faculty member's salary. It would be more helpful to know whether or not a faculty member is a professor in engineering than if the faculty member was male or female.

♦ When status as a member in an underrepresented racial/ethnic group is added to the model, the amount of variance in salaries explained by the model remained at 86.6 percent. Like gender, knowledge of one's status as a minority faculty member would not help in predicting the faculty member's salary, over and above the information included in the model.

♦ When information on age is added to the model, again, the results do not change – the model accounts for 86.6 percent of the differences in faculty salaries.

Conclusions/Implications

♦ In addition to providing insight into the differences between faculty salary levels, this study found that sex, race/ethnicity, and age were not statistically significant at the traditional confidence level of $\alpha < .05$ that is used for most research in the behavioral and social sciences. In other words, a researcher is willing to take a 5 percent chance of incorrectly identifying a relationship between factors (when actually there is no relationship) so as to better uncover any true relationships between factors. With the large number of faculty members included in the study, the statistical tests of significance are quite powerful and should detect even small differences between groups.

♦ Although the model identifies factors that account for 86.6 percent of the variation of salaries on an aggregate university level, the model has limited usefulness in predicting individual faculty salaries within academic units. For example, in this study performance and productivity are represented by indirect or proxy measures such as distinguished professorships or top research awards. It is likely that the indirect measures do not fully capture variation in salaries due to actual performance. Further, the overall model may not reflect the patterns of salary variation within academic units. An additional 13.4 percent of the variation among faculty salaries cannot be explained or predicted by the model. It is possible that performance and differences within departments are included in the unexplained variance. Thus, the model must be used with caution in predicting individual salaries.

---

1. All Chancellor's Club designations are counted as teaching awards; see Profiles pages 6a-460 and 6a-465.

6/13
TABLE 6-300
COMPARISON OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE SALARY AND COMPENSATION
PEER COMPARISON AVERAGES (KU EXCLUDED) AND KU FACULTY HEAD COUNT
(Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor)
FISCAL YEAR 2013
University of Kansas
Lawrence Campus

Fiscal Year	University of Kansas		Peer Average		KU as Percent of Peers	
	Salary	Compensation	Salary	Compensation	Salary	Compensation
2013	$93,932	$119,079	$102,615	$132,279	91.5%	90.0%

Source: *University of Kansas Profiles*, Tables 6-305, and 6-306.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Office of Institutional Research and Planning

TABLE 6-305
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARY BY RANK
PEER GROUP
FISCAL YEAR 2013

School	Professor Salary	Professor F-T Head Count	Associate Salary	Associate F-T Head Count	Assistant Salary	Assistant F-T Head Count	All Ranks without Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks without Instructors F-T Head Count	Instructors Salary	Instructors F-T Head Count	All Ranks with Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks with Instructors F-T Head Count
Colorado	$127,800	440	$92,200	354	$79,400	269	$103,697	1,063	$55,900	255	$94,449	1,318
Florida	122,500	689	81,100	586	71,000	444	95,085	1,719	--	--	95,085	1,719
Indiana	132,000	663	88,600	479	80,400	333	106,257	1,475	--	--	106,257	1,475
Iowa	132,200	503	87,400	405	74,600	324	102,325	1,232	47,000	7	102,012	1,239
Kansas	118,300	397	80,600	377	71,800	210	93,932	984	--	--	93,932	984
Michigan State	131,200	839	90,900	569	71,000	616	101,549	2,024	42,200	177	96,776	2,201
Missouri	117,200	394	78,000	420	63,800	387	86,284	1,201	--	--	86,284	1,201
North Carolina	147,900	596	96,600	350	84,400	321	117,641	1,267	--	--	117,641	1,267
Oregon	110,900	233	80,300	248	76,500	200	89,654	681	46,300	227	78,815	908
SUNY - Buffalo	133,700	372	91,800	347	78,500	288	103,475	1,007	55,200	15	102,766	1,022
Virginia	143,200	502	93,800	335	82,900	196	115,738	1,033	53,100	5	115,437	1,038
Weighted Average	130,326	5,628	87,219	4,470	74,855	3,588	101,705	13,686	49,062	686	99,192	14,372
KU Diff from WTD	(12,026)		(6,619)		(3,055)		(7,773)		--		(5,259)	
WTD Avg w/o KU	131,239	5,231	87,829	4,093	75,045	3,378	102,615*		49,062	686	102,615*	
KU Diff from Above	(12,939)		(7,229)		(3,245)		(8,683)		--		(8,682)	
KU's Rank	9/11		9/11		8/11		9/11		--/6		9/11	

* Salary average computed using the peer average dollars by rank and the KU head count for each rank.

Note: Ranks with less than three individuals are not reported.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Office of Institutional Research and Planning

TABLE 6-335
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARY BY RANK
AAUDE SIXTEEN MEMBER COMPARISON GROUP
FISCAL YEAR 2013

School	Professor Salary	Professor F-T Head Count	Associate Salary	Associate F-T Head Count	Assistant Salary	Assistant F-T Head Count	All Ranks without Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks without Instructors F-T Head Count	Instructors Salary	Instructors F-T Head Count	All Ranks with Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks with Instructors F-T Head Count
Colorado	$127,800	440	$92,200	354	$79,400	269	$103,697	1,063	$55,900	255	$94,449	1,318
Illinois	141,700	773	91,100	540	87,400	397	113,115	1,710	60,300	21	112,474	1,731
Indiana	132,000	663	88,600	479	80,400	333	106,257	1,475	--	--	106,257	1,475
Iowa	132,200	503	87,400	405	74,600	324	102,325	1,232	47,000	7	102,012	1,239
Iowa State	119,300	524	86,100	393	76,600	315	97,792	1,232	--	--	97,792	1,232
Kansas	118,300	397	80,600	377	71,800	210	93,932	984	--	--	93,932	984
Michigan	148,700	1,043	101,100	543	88,800	541	121,313	2,127	66,100	19	120,824	2,146
Michigan State	131,200	839	90,900	569	71,000	616	101,549	2,024	42,200	177	96,776	2,201
Minnesota	134,300	703	88,500	538	81,800	341	107,408	1,582	48,700	158	102,077	1,740
Missouri	117,200	394	78,000	420	63,800	387	86,284	1,201	--	--	86,284	1,201
Nebraska	116,000	459	78,900	296	74,600	232	95,142	987	--	--	95,142	987
Ohio State	136,900	961	92,000	751	85,100	466	110,335	2,178	94,000	8	110,275	2,186
Purdue	127,700	807	89,300	554	80,400	450	104,200	1,811	49,400	12	103,839	1,823
Texas	144,000	982	92,800	528	86,000	398	117,733	1,908	--	--	117,733	1,908
Texas A&M	122,200	707	84,500	505	75,600	321	100,023	1,533	--	--	100,023	1,533
Wisconsin	118,800	740	91,100	261	77,500	348	102,787	1,349	58,500	17	102,235	1,366
Weighted Average	131,558	10,935	88,946	7,513	78,880	5,948	105,592	24,396	51,349	674	104,134	25,070
KU Diff from WTD	(13,258)		(8,346)		(7,080)		(11,660)		--		(10,201)	
WTD Avg w/o KU	132,058	10,538	89,387	7,136	79,139	5,738	104,416*		51,349	674	104,416*	
KU Diff from Above	(13,758)		(8,787)		(7,339)		(10,484)		--		(10,484)	
KU's Rank	14/16		14/16		14/16		15/16		--/9		15/16	

* Salary average computed using the comparison group's average dollars by rank and the KU head count for each rank.
Note: Ranks with less than three individuals are not reported.

Source: *ACADEME, Economic Status of the Profession*, March-April 2013, Vol. 99, No. 2, American Association of University Professors.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Office of Institutional Research and Planning

TABLE 6-320
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SALARY BY RANK
MIDWEST COMPARISON GROUP
FISCAL YEAR 2013

School	Professor Salary	Professor F-T Head Count	Associate Salary	Associate F-T Head Count	Assistant Salary	Assistant F-T Head Count	All Ranks without Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks without Instructors F-T Head Count	Instructors Salary	Instructors F-T Head Count	All Ranks with Instructors Average Salary	All Ranks with Instructors F-T Head Count
Baylor	$116,900	248	$90,400	192	$76,100	165	$97,363	605	--	--	$97,363	605
Colorado	127,800	440	92,200	354	79,400	269	103,697	1,063	$55,900	255	94,449	1,318
Iowa State	119,300	524	86,100	393	76,600	315	97,792	1,232	--	--	97,792	1,232
Kansas	118,300	397	80,600	377	71,800	210	93,932	984	--	--	93,932	984
Kansas State	102,700	267	74,000	273	64,300	269	80,247	809	44,000	192	73,294	1,001
Missouri	117,200	394	78,000	420	63,800	387	86,284	1,201	--	--	86,284	1,201
Nebraska	116,000	459	78,900	296	74,600	232	95,142	987	--	--	95,142	987
Oklahoma	114,700	395	75,900	334	66,000	269	88,588	998	37,400	99	83,969	1,097
Oklahoma State	100,200	326	74,700	313	69,000	222	82,885	861	--	--	82,885	861
Texas	144,000	982	92,800	528	86,000	398	117,733	1,908	--	--	117,733	1,908
Texas A&M	122,200	707	84,500	505	75,600	321	100,023	1,533	--	--	100,023	1,533
Texas Tech	110,800	303	75,800	383	68,800	269	84,933	955	48,900	216	78,286	1,171
Weighted Average	121,443	5,442	82,411	4,368	72,908	3,326	96,175	13,136	48,514	762	93,562	13,898
KU Diff from WTD	(3,143)		(1,811)		(1,108)		(2,243)		--		371	
WTD Avg w/o KU	121,690	5,045	82,582	3,991	72,982	3,116	96,311*		48,514	762	96,311*	
KU Diff from Above	(3,390)		(1,982)		(1,182)		(2,379)		--		(2,379)	
KU's Rank	5/12		6/12		7/12		7/12		--/4		7/12	

* Salary average computed using the comparison group's average dollars by rank and the KU head count for each rank.

Note: Ranks with less than three individuals are not reported.

Source: *ACADEME*, *Economic Status of the Profession*, March-April 2013, Vol. 99, No. 2, American Association of University Professors.