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Introduction

The Faculty Compensation Committee report focuses on three general but impactful topics that affect the Iowa State University Faculty. The first topic is salary compensation. The data used do not reflect the most current information but utilizes the most recent available information. The second topic compares changes in faculty numbers with student enrollment. The third topic describes faculty morale, issues relating to work/life balance, benefits and overall impressions about working for Iowa State University.

Salary Comparisons — A Review

Average salary increase for all faculty is provided in Figure 1. The horizontal line (orange) represents an average increase (3.4%) for the entire period. The actual salary change (blue) depicts a major decline (0%) for 2009-2010. However, this value is somewhat deceiving. Mandatory furlough days caused this significant salary decrease. Salary Increase has been slow to recover since the 2009-2010 fiscal year. The average annual salary increase since 2009-2010 has been 2.2%, in comparison to an average increase of 4% for the 1997-2009 period. It should be noted that the average recent increases may not meet cost of living increases attributable to inflation (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Annual salary increase at Iowa State University from 1997 to 2013
Comparison of 2013 salary by College

Iowa State University mean salary for each rank was deducted from the mean for the rank, for each college. The value was then divided by the ISU standard deviation for rank (see Table 1 for ISU values). The results present the differences, in standard deviations, between the mean salaries by faculty rank, by college and the ISU mean salary. These results are available in Table 2 and are graphically presented in Figure 3. It is important to note that the analysis did not consider number of faculty by rank and by college. Also, an item titled ‘All Divisions’ was not included in the calculations.

Table 1. Salary mean and standard deviations for Iowa State University faculty by rank in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Salary</td>
<td>$81,464</td>
<td>$89,857</td>
<td>$121,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
<td>$25,966</td>
<td>$24,364</td>
<td>$29,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Salary comparisons in standard deviations for 2013 by Iowa State University colleges and faculty ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Comparison of mean salary differences in standard deviations by Iowa State University colleges and by faculty ranks

The mean salaries for Full Professors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) is 1.22 standard deviations lower than the overall ISU mean salary for Full Professors (Tables 1 and 2 and Figure 3). The salary mean for this rank in the College of Business is 1.70 standard deviations higher than the overall ISU salary mean for Full Professor. The Colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS), Human Sciences (HS), and Design are all lower than the ISU mean salary for Full Professors while the Colleges of Veterinary Medicine (VET) and Engineering (ENG) are higher than the ISU mean salary for Full Professors (Tables 1 and 2 and Figure 3).

The salary mean for Associate Professors in LAS is 1.04 standard deviations lower than the overall ISU mean salary for Associate Professors. The salary mean for this rank in the College of Business is 1.94 standard deviations higher than the overall ISU salary mean for Associate Professors. As seen with the salary means for Full Professors, Associate Professor mean salaries were lower than the ISU mean salary in CALS, HS and Design while mean salaries were higher than the ISU mean salary in ENG and VET.
The mean salary trends for Assistant Professors were similar to those for Full and Associate Professors; LAS Assistant Professor salary means are 1.01 standard deviations lower than the overall ISU mean for Assistant Professors. The mean salary for this rank in the College of Business is 1.98 standard deviations higher than the overall ISU mean salary for Assistant Professor. Assistant Professors in VET and ENG have higher mean salaries than the ISU mean salary average while Assistant Professors in CALS, HS and Design are below the ISU mean salary for this rank.

Peer Land Grant Institution Comparison

The projected mean salary for the peer 11 institutions for fiscal year 2013-2014 was $106,882 with a standard deviation of $6,532 which represents 6.1% of the mean salary (Table 3). Utilizing the method described earlier in comparisons by college, mean salary differences comparing ISU and peer 11 institutions by standard deviation was developed (Figure 4).

Projected ISU mean salary for 2013-2014 was approximately 0.92 standard deviation lower than the mean salary for the peer 11 land grant institutions. Overall mean of salary increase for the peer 11 institutions was 2.28% while the salary increase for ISU was 3.2%.

Table 3. Projected mean faculty salaries in Iowa State University peer 11 land grant institutions for 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer University</th>
<th>Average salary 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>$118,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-U/C</td>
<td>$116,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-MPL/SP</td>
<td>$110,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>$105,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>$104,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>$103,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>$103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>$100,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>$100,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean salary</td>
<td>$106,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Final salary amounts for 2013-2014 were not available and these amounts are based on 2012-2013 figures.
Figure 4. Comparison of mean salary differences in standard deviations for Iowa State University peer 11 land grant institutions

Enrollment total and faculty numbers

From 2009 to 2013, enrollment has increased from 27,945 to 33,241 which represents a 20% increase (Figure 5). In the same period, tenure and tenure-eligible faculty have declined 3% from 1,346 to 1,306 (Figure 5). The number of tenured faculty declined from 1,018 to 1,013, and tenure-eligible faculty declined from 328 to 293 (Figure 6). However, tenured faculty numbers increased from 2004. Non-tenure eligible faculty have increased from 400 to 563 during the same period. The principle increase was in the number of lecturers and clinicians which represented a 41% increase (Figure 6). In another assessment, between 2010 and 2013, tenure-track faculty numbers declined 0.08%, non-tenure eligible faculty numbers increases 29.4% and student credit hours increased 17.6% (Table 4). Importantly, the higher number of junior and senior students anticipated, a 35% increase, suggests that more resources will need to be dedicated to specialized courses that are unlikely to be taught by temporary faculty (i.e., lecturers and clinicians).

While the overall increases in students from 2009 to 2013 and declines in tenured and tenure eligible faculty from 2004 to 2013, when total faculty are considered, there has been an increase of 162 positions (Figures 5 and 6). However a more important statistic is the change in student to faculty ratio (Table 5). There has been a dramatic increase in the ratio of students to tenure track faculty from 2009 to 2013 and in this time period, there are five more students per tenure track faculty (Table 5). Even when all faculty (i.e., tenure, tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible) are included, the student to faculty ratio has increased. This change represents significant challenges on maintaining the quality of the educational experience, the number of students in classes and the availability of tenure and tenure eligible faculty for the upper division courses.
Figure 5. Iowa State University student enrollment and Tenured and Tenured Eligible Faculty from 2009 to 2013

Figure 6. Changes in Iowa State University faculty from 2004-2013
Table 4. Percent change in faculty numbers and student credit hours for Iowa State University colleges from 2010 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tenure-track faculty</th>
<th>Non-tenure track faculty</th>
<th>Student credit hour growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Sci</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Adapted from Appendix A.

Table 5. Student to faculty ratios from 2009 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student:All faculty</td>
<td>16:1</td>
<td>16.5:1</td>
<td>16.9:1</td>
<td>16.8:1</td>
<td>17.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student:Tenure track faculty</td>
<td>20.8:1</td>
<td>21.9:1</td>
<td>23.1:1</td>
<td>23.3:1</td>
<td>25.4:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty morale, work/life balance and benefits

While it is important to recognize that budget constraints and lack of support from the legislature for a salary bill may preclude optimal salary increases, it is nevertheless important to be clear that faculty from many departments and colleges have expressed dismay over ISU salaries, especially the way they have been allowed to stagnate to levels that have become completely uncompetitive with salaries earned by colleagues in similar fields for similar work at other research universities in America. The compensation committee recognizes efforts in the past year to move toward greater parity in the area of the arts and humanities at ISU, and it also recognizes mitigating factors such as lower costs of living in Ames versus some (though by no means all) other places to live in the country. Nevertheless, in departments across the university, salaries can be shown to be below peer, sometimes as much as 20-25% below. A summary of faculty impressions by college can be reviewed in Appendix B.

It is also important to recognize that a salary increase is not the only avenue toward improving faculty morale in the workplace. Other benefits through non-salary mechanisms should also remain on the table for consideration as incentives toward improved morale, motivation and retention in the current environment of increasing workloads and student numbers.

We believe that most faculty are fairly satisfied with retirement benefits and healthcare, although adding coverage for eye examinations and glasses/contact lenses to the healthcare benefit would be a valued addition to existing coverage. Beyond these primary two benefits, when suggestions are made they tend to reside in one of three
areas: physical and mental wellness benefits, academic benefits, and other/general benefits. It is recommended that the Faculty Senate work closely with the new leadership in Human Resources to investigate options.

**Physical/Mental Wellness benefits**

It has been voiced in several instances that either free or reduced fee entrance to the physical and mental wellness spaces on campus (Lied Center, State Gym, Beyer Hall and others) would not only improve the work environment, but also help faculty members manage their expanding workloads, as they become increasingly stretched with rising student-to-faculty ratios as enrollments continue to grow. Programs that encourage and support employee wellness and stress reduction/management are ultimately to the university’s benefit in terms of healthcare savings, increased productivity, and retention of faculty, which reduces hiring and new faculty expenses. Even if reduced entrance fees are not seen as feasible at this time, perhaps a study could be undertaken to see if faculty would use the facilities more if certain times of day/week were dedicated as faculty/staff times. It is important to note that enhanced wellness will have direct effects on healthcare cost, as Iowa State University is self-insured.

**Academic Benefits**

In the area of academic benefits, two proposals have been voiced recently by faculty: 1) an increased support for and number of FPDAs granted and supported each year. Faculty have expressed disappointment over the few number of FPDAs granted in any year, and that they are not only granted infrequently, but to the same people multiple times in a career; 2) release time without consequence from certain collegiate responsibilities—teaching, research or service—for excellent work done in prior years, especially if salary raises are anticipated to be small or non-existent.

While the faculty are aware that benefits such as tuition reduction for family members pose problems for a “state employer,” it is nevertheless a topic in the area of benefits that comes up frequently. This is a common practice at several of the peer institutions (i.e., University of Illinois and The Ohio State University). When it is mentioned, it always encourages the perspective that faculty with families would find such an offer a reason to be recruited to and to remain at ISU as a place of employment.

**Other/General benefits**

A potential benefit that falls outside of those already mentioned is parking. Faculty would view a parking benefit—either in reduced fees or preferred parking spaces, perhaps as a reward for longtime service—as a genuine benefit and thank you from the university for years of service.

In earlier generations, universities were a community, not only of scholars and professors, but of people. In the hectic pace of modern life and the ever-increasing demand for research dollars and results, many universities—especially larger ones such as ISU—have lost much of their community environment. Any non-financial benefits that might increase the sense of community—and concomitantly reduce the stress of an
increasingly pressured research and teaching agenda—would likely be welcome. One idea put forth along this line of thought is a faculty club or social space—perhaps at the Union or the Alumni building, though a space central to campus would likely be preferable—where faculty could meet, socialize, and very possibly expand their interdisciplinary thinking and collaboration as a result. A second idea suggested the faculty and staff be offered reduced-cost tickets to entertainment events at Iowa State Center.

Conclusions

Faculty at Iowa State University are dedicated, hardworking and concerned about providing students an excellent educational experience. However, faculty continue to be challenged by the economic climate, lack of support and consistent “requests” to do more with less. Faculty have demonstrated their accountability for tenure which provides the academic freedom needed to maintain excellence in the scholarship of teaching, extension and research. The efforts of a dedicated faculty at Iowa State University provide the greatest economic resource to the State of Iowa; a high quality and well-educated student population who ultimately contribute to the welfare of Iowa. However, the faculty are concerned about their ability to continue to perform at such a high and sustained level given the opposite trends of student and tenure track faculty numbers and the relatively low level of compensation when compared to the peer 11 land grant institutions. The Iowa State University faculty will continue striving to perform at a high level but the need for improvement in the academic environment for faculty at Iowa State University is becoming increasingly pressing.
2010-2015 Strategic Plan

*Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century: Integrating Basic Research, the Design of New Technologies, and Entrepreneurial Applications*

**Mission:** Create, share, and apply knowledge to make Iowa and the world a better place.

**Vision:** Iowa State University will lead the world in advancing the land-grant ideals of putting science, technology, and human creativity to work.

**Priorities:**
- Iowa State will be a magnet for attracting outstanding students who seek an education that prepares them to make a difference in the world.
- Iowa State will be a magnet for attracting outstanding faculty and staff who create, share, and apply knowledge to improve the quality of life.
- Iowa State will be internationally known for faculty, staff, and students who address the challenges of the 21st century.
- Iowa State will be a treasured resource for Iowa, the nation, and the world.

---

**Iowa State Faculty by Tenure-track status, 1990-2013**

Index, 1990=1

- NonTenure-Track Faculty
- Tenure-Track Faculty
- Total Faculty
Table: Percent Change in Tenure-Track and NonTenure-Track Faculty and Student Credit Hours by College, 2010-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>NonTenure</th>
<th>SCHGrowth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Sci</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET MED</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are down 25 tenure-track faculty over the last year but up 49 nontenure-track faculty. We have added 163 nontenure-track faculty since 2009. Over that time, we are down 40 tenure-track faculty. Meanwhile the University is making pronouncements that are patently false. When your leadership is presenting misleading information to the public that says we are adding staff, what is the reaction of your current faculty who are having to do more with fewer resources? It is never a good idea to provide easily refutable data to your employees. What happens to morale? A sense of mission? Direction?

Between 1983-2008, the University average enrollment was 25,946. We are now at 33,000 (28% larger than the long-term average) and expect to level off at 35,000 students (35% larger than the long term average). The increased student course demands span the colleges and disciplines. That means that we have to scale up class sizes and section offerings across the board.

That scaling up may be able to take advantage of returns to scale in class delivery, but we cannot expect to meet all student needs with temporary faculty hired at the last second to meet needs. Moreover, 35% more juniors and seniors means more resources devoted to the more specialized classes that are unlikely to be taught appropriately by temporary faculty. Their needs are not going to be met by faculty hired into narrowly defined high-impact research areas. More students should generate tuition resources that will pay for faculty qualified in the discipline, but that will not happen if the tuition dollars are being devoted to specialized research areas. In short, the only way the University can go from a 25-year steady state of 26,000 students to a new steady-state of 35,000 students is if we scale up the University. That requires a systematic hiring strategy that looks at which classes can be made larger and which classes require a new body. I am concerned that the needed planning has not occurred, and instead, we are handling long-term planned growth with short-term emergency staffing. That is not sustainable.
Appendix B
Senate Input on Salaries and Benefits

LAS

There were deeply felt concerns among members of the caucus that the university needs to consider and address two principal issues:

1) compression of salaries for senior faculty when compared to new hires—market forces dictate starting salaries, but a history of great research and teaching and loyalty to the university are not recognized enough as senior faculty salaries do not track national trends, nor do they keep par with peer institutions. Even nationally ranked departments suffer in comparison with peer institution’s salaries. Senators from departments ranging from English to Psychology, History, EEOB, World Languages and Cultures and Music noted that their constituents perceived they were the “lowest paid” faculty by discipline and had researched comparisons with sister Regent university faculty who were paid considerably better in their discipline.

2) Departments that generate considerable tuition revenue through student credit hours feel they are treated unfairly when their salaries are comparably lower than those paid to faculty in disciplines that generate less SCH revenue (perhaps even negative revenue), independent of whether those departments generate significant revenue or indirect cost recovery from outside grants and contracts. If departments are given some return from indirect costs in grants, should not departments also benefit from the superior work generating SCHs? And should not excellent teachers be rewarded for the hours of dedicated labor they provide in a closer alignment with the rewards for research-intensive faculty? The alumni in which ISU claims pride were all taught by these professors.

Additionally, it was noted that it seems in many LAS disciplines, salary competitiveness is determined in comparison to peer universities, whereas in other disciplines (Engineering, Business, for example) salary comparisons are based upon competitiveness with the private sector. This is a market force that a) was not nearly so present 50 years ago, when salaries across disciplines were more closely aligned, and b) creates depressed salaries for faculty whose work may not have a clear parallel in the private sector, but who nevertheless contribute to the “whole” student at ISU and to the spectrum of each student’s ability to think and argue clearly, understand their humanity, and appreciate the great artistic achievements of people over history.

Senators understood the goal implicit in providing higher percent raises to faculty making less than $60,000 (initially higher salaries gain greater hard dollar increases for the same percent raise), yet many senators felt that the $60,000 number was both arbitrary, and also favored younger/newer faculty, thus increasing compression issues with senior faculty.

More generally, some senators expressed disappointment at the low number of, and difficulty of achieving FPDAs and wished for a more frequent and inviting atmosphere from the university in supporting research in the Arts and Humanities through FPDAs. Several senators noted the lack of real sabbaticals (no salary cut). While private schools have sabbaticals which all faculty receive and do not have to compete for, colleagues in other public schools also have much better access to sabbaticals than we do at Iowa State. It was also suggested that the university (perhaps through Human Resources) create an accessible, but secure web URL that would allow faculty leaving Ames for an FPDA to post
their home as a rental option for new or visiting faculty. Having a mortgage that is not covered while away on research leave makes the research leave financially unviable for many LAS faculty.

Two other senators wished the administration to once again consider the idea of making university gyms and health/recreation buildings available to faculty without cost.

**Human Sciences**

The CHS group discussed the lack of financial support for a wellness program as well as the salary compression problem. I think the existing faculty are not happy about new faculty obtaining better situations for their spouses than they were able to obtain in the past. We discussed how this can lead faculty to feel it is necessary to seek outside offers to improve their salaries and ultimately lead to faculty leaving.

**Vet Med** (compilation of responses)

1. Given that available resources are limited, what is the faculty view on how compensation (benefits and salary) is being handled?
   a. *Salary compression is severe. Raises are low and rare. Incremental creep.*
   b. *Starting salaries seem to be quite good (have to be to get people here), then they stay flat. Which may be a problem with retention.*
   c. *It is unclear how raises are determined. Not transparent. If it is outstanding performance, what are the criteria for outstanding performance?*
   d. *There are extreme differences between departments.*
   e. *Raises seem to be used for market equity to offset salary compression.*
   f. *Consider three pools of money: cost-of-living, retention, and merit.*
   g. *Not enough help so faculty end up staying and working and eventually lose vacation days.*
   h. *Funds to help support travel to scientific meetings.*

2. The Faculty Handbook (FH 4.1.1) specifies that in determining merit increases, all faculty whose performance is satisfactory (vs. unsatisfactory) receive a raise equal to at least 1/3 of the percentage of the general faculty increase. Last year, those with lower salaries (<=$60,000) received a higher minimum percentage raise than those with higher salaries. What is this faculty view on this?
   a. *It is not an incentive to stay here if you are only getting a 1/3 of average.*
   b. *Salaries don’t seem to keep up with cost-of-living.*

3. How satisfied are faculty with our health benefits, including their cost? Are there new benefits that should be considered? Are there current benefits that could be dropped?
   a. *Parental care- is an insurance plan that you can purchase “long-term care for parents”. Is it available for parents? As the population ages and faculty work responsibilities increase,*
   b. *Delta Dental- ok but could be improved*
   c. *Pharmacy program can drop*
4. Are there other (non-health) benefits that the faculty would like to have considered as part of compensation?
   a. Free membership or highly subsidized gym membership would help wellness.
   b. Discounts to Stephens performances like students get.
   c. Supported (free or partial) tuition for faculty dependents.

Engineering

In the Engineering Caucus, it was generally agreed that people are very happy with benefits overall, but suggestions were made in a few areas, such as physical fitness, prescriptions, etc. The recreation center fee increases were generally viewed as counter to university health objectives. Many faculty have discontinued use of ISU facilities because of cost, ease of use, availability of locker space, and lack of separation from students (in locker rooms). Other items discussed included reduced tuition for children of faculty. With regard to salaries, most express some concern with increased salary compression and the historical record suggesting that the only path to reasonable salary increase is through special retention-based offers. I would also like to raise the issue of spousal accommodations, which, aside from questions regarding fair hiring practices, is a very expensive and long-term benefit that is allocated to some in what could be considered to be a discriminatory manner.

Design

1. Salaries in our college are widely disparate between disciplines. A few disciplines feel fairly compensated, others do not. The Integrated Studio Arts department in particular has very low salaries that small incremental raises will not fix for the long-term faculty – they would need very large raises to even get close to other departments even in our college.

The issue that is most upsetting to faculty in our caucus is the growing salary gap on campus. Most of us have PRS's with a mix of teaching, research, and service. We understand that some faculty have more teaching, some only research. But it is still hard for our caucus to understand why the salary gap has grown so large – faculty in other colleges make 3-4 times what our faculty make. Market forces alone cannot explain this disparity. We feel that it reflects how our disciplines are valued on campus. In other words, we are not valued and we are paid accordingly, it is not really about the 'market.' Our low standing when compared with our peers shows this.

There is no transparency in our college about how raises are determined. A few departments have started to use a formula. In others it is just up to the chair. We feel that there should be more information about criteria within our departments beyond just meeting or exceeding expectations.

Our college includes many faculty who earn less than $60,000 and we are in favor of this sort of targeted raise. The money involved is so small - .5% of $60,000 ($300!), that it should not even be an issue. It is also a very small contribution toward bringing the low end of the salary range up.

2. Generally happy with benefits.

   Would like better coverage for eyeglasses – several complaints about the vision coverage.
Also, there is a suggestion that faculty be given free access to the rec center by having the university pay for faculty to use the facility. We know that student fees built the facility and we cannot have free access, but would like this to be a benefit that shows up as a cash benefit paid to the rec center.

3. If there is new money, we support targeted raises for groups on campus that are low compared with peers - like arts, humanities, and social sciences. The social sciences were not in the last round of targeted raises. Even if this happens, we feel that small percentage increases (3-4%) are not enough to really address salary compression and peer comparisons. We would prefer across the board fixed raises that bump up associate and full professors in certain disciplines where there is a historic disparity.

We do not support raises across campus – like everyone gets 1% - considering how high salaries are in some other colleges. Obviously 1% of $60,000 is a lot less than 1% of $150,000, so as the money spreads around, an increase like this would just increase the disparity rather than improve the situation.

**Business (compilation of individual responses)**

For the first set on salary, targeted salaries for different salary levels (under $60K) make less sense to me than targeted salary increases for faculty where salaries are below peer 11 schools. A fixed percentage for satisfactory performance seems fair, though it did not address how merit was distributed and I'm not sure satisfactory performance is consistent with 1/3 the general raise.

For the second question, the health benefits at ISU are more expensive than Iowa State. I'm not sure we need to cover acupuncture or coverage beyond basic health (shots) and coverage to limit employee expenses for large expenses (cancer, surgery, etc.). Decent prescription coverage and covering health maintenance issues like dental also need to be maintained.

For the third question, I always lean toward giving people the money, so they can make the best choice of how to use it. While I would like lower health premiums, I would like a pay increase more. If truly extra, then it should be a tide that lifts all boats or involve a general salary increase.

My preferences for salary would be for general salary increases.

It would seem to me like perhaps there should be a more formal vote regarding faculty preferences on this important matter. I would prefer any additional funding go toward either a general salary raise or a merit-based raise.

In general Iowa State is further below market on salaries rather than benefits, as such it would seem a better option to funnel resources for general increases in faculty salaries rather than additional benefits. Dissatisfaction with respect to salaries comes from both internal raises not keeping up with the market (particularly an issue in some disciplines, like business), and perceptions of a relatively weak link internally between pay and performance. Targeted salary increases are good, and even necessary, but the determinant of where those targets are should be based entirely on ISU salaries in that particular discipline relative to peer institutions (absolute levels are not what matters when the unit tries to hire and retain top faculty). One reasonable approach might be to use any additional resources to get all units on campus up to, say 95%, of market, and then once this goal is accomplished focus on things like more faculty lines and lower health care costs.
Paying tuition for our kids who go to ISU would be a great retention tool.

I think all faculty are underpaid, as faculty salaries, once you are hired, do not keep up with the market. One result of this is salary compression, where new assistant professors are offered more than professors who have worked for many years. This is true in most business schools, so to answer question 3, I think the best use for new funds is to correct the compression problem. As far as health insurance costs, and the quality of health care in Ames, I am extremely pleased. I don’t know how it could be any better.

The Faculty Handbook (FH 4.1.1) specifies that in determining merit increases, all faculty whose performance is satisfactory (vs. unsatisfactory) receive a raise equal to at least 1/3 of the percentage of the general faculty increase. The rest is distributed as merit increases (with the caveat that additional performance, equity, and retention increases are allowed).

- Given the reality of limited resources, how satisfied are faculty with their salaries? *Not at all satisfied; we are way below peers*
- Given that many have some dissatisfaction with their salary, are there particular discrepancies/issues that contribute to higher levels of dissatisfaction? *Major problem is compression and inversion. One just needs to leave to move above the rank below.*
- How satisfied are faculty with the way that raises are determined? *Not at all satisfied*
- Last year, those with lower salaries (<$60,000) received a higher minimum percentage raise than those with higher salaries. Last year, additional resources were to increase salaries in humanities, which were well below average when compared to the Peer 11. What is the faculty view on targeted salary increases like these? *Exactly, when below peers bring people to par at least*

2. How satisfied are faculty with our health benefits (medical/dental), including their cost?
   - Are there new health benefits that should be considered? *Free or reduced cost access to university recreational facilities, which would increase health and wellness.*
   - Are there current benefits that should be modified or could be dropped? *Vision coverage is not very good; probably could drop it*
   - Are there non-health related benefits that the faculty would like to have considered as part of compensation? *Access to recreation facilities.*

3. If additional resources were to become available that could be used for faculty, on what basis do you think they should be allocated—general salary increases, targeted salary increases, lowering health benefit costs, increasing tenured/tenure track faculty lines, other (be creative!)? *Combination of targeted and general increase.*

**CALS** (ideas not in any order of importance)

1. Targeted increases in salaries may need to be done occasionally using special funds not as general faculty raises. (e.g. additional resources available.)

2. Benefits should include eye exams and glasses/contact lenses.

3. Increase in retirement benefits.
4. If additional resources,
   Increase general salaries
   Increase tenured faculty lines.

5. Some faculty are not satisfied with how increases are determined.

6. Faculty seem relatively satisfied with benefits.

7. Faculty haven’t seen much of a salary increase for several years; people, in general, not satisfied with salary increases.

8. General comments indicate support for targeted salary increases for special circumstances (e.g. salaries in humanities in 2013).

9. Merit salary increases should be meaningful. The differences between basic and merit when considering satisfactory performance and merit should be significant.

10. The “Wellness” program should be a benefit. Free access to the gym for those that want it. What is the wellness proposal, really?

11. Some faculty believe that any additional resources that may become available should go toward general salary increases and tenure track lines. General salary increases should be competitive. Reward faculty for loyalty to ISU.

12. New benefits regarding maternity leave and child care should be considered.

13. There should be some reduction in tuition for children of faculty and staff enrolling in ISU. Very difficult to compete with institutions that offer some kind of tuition benefit for faculty families.