Memo

to: Dr R Masters, Vice President for Academic Affairs, KBOR

from: Dr T Bailey, Chair, Council of Faculty Senate Presidents

date: February 1, 2007

RE: Survey Results of Issues in Faculty Attraction and Retention in the Kansas Regents University System

During the June 2006 Kansas Board of Regents meeting, Chairman Galle outlined four major priorities for the Board for this fiscal year 2006-07. One of these dealt with faculty salaries. Tangentially, the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents raised the shared issue of difficulties in attracting and retaining quality faculty at our respective institutions. In light of the Regents’ proposed focus and our related concerns, the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents circulated two basic surveys to all Department Chairs and/or Program Administrators. The attached report summarizes the findings. In addition, comparative data on faculty salaries at the national level and at the peer institution level are attached.

It is our hope and intention that the following results will assist the Board staff in providing relevant information to the Board of Regents, such that their identified priorities may be successfully addressed. If KBOR staff would like our survey raw data in a tabular form or a list of the problems that were reported only once, please inform the Chair of the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents. We would be most pleased to provide this information.
Report from the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents on Obstacles in Attracting and Retaining Quality Faculty in the Kansas Board of Regents University System

During the June 2006 Kansas Board of Regents meeting, Chairman Galle outlined four major priorities for the Board for this fiscal year 2006-07. One of these dealt with faculty salaries. Tangentially, the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents raised the shared issue of difficulties in attracting and retaining quality faculty at our respective institutions. In light of the Regents proposed focus and our related concerns, the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents circulated two basic surveys to all Department Chairs and/or Program Administrators.

- With regard to difficulties in attracting quality faculty to accept positions in the Regents system, Chairs / Administrators were asked to prioritize the top four obstacles they had encountered in the past.

- With regard to difficulties in retaining quality faculty that had held positions in the Regents system, Chairs / Administrators were asked to prioritize the top four obstacles they had encountered in the past.

For each level of obstacle, there was a modest variety of responses. For example, when asked what the biggest obstacle was in attracting new faculty, answers included low salaries (73 percent of all responses), competition from other employers (18 percent), and a heavy workload (9 percent).

The results are summarized below. Any response that occurred only once was considered to be unique and was not included in the tabulation. This was done to ensure that common issues were identified. Further, one response (timing of employment search) appeared a few times; we believe this problem can be easily corrected by the institutions in question and, as such, was also omitted from this summary.

Given the recognition by the Kansas Board of Regents of salary as a major issue and further supported by the opinions of University Department Chairs / Program Administrators, comparative salary data from the Chronicle of Higher Education, AAUP and the KBOR Data Book have also been included for perusal.
Interpreting this graph:

Overall, salary was by far the biggest obstacle. Following it, workload was reported as the next significant problem. After these, relative geographic location and competition in the employment market were noted.

Column #1: Biggest obstacle in attracting quality faculty (who declined offers of employment). Three common responses:
- 73 percent reported that low salary was the biggest issue
- 18 percent felt that competition from other potential employers was the biggest issue
- 9 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the cause

Column #2: Second biggest obstacle in attracting quality faculty. Three common issues:
- 53 percent reported that low salary was the second biggest issue
- 27 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the second biggest cause
- 20 percent reported that geographic location was the problem

Column #3: Third biggest obstacle in attracting quality faculty. Four common problems:
- 42 percent reported that low salary was the problem
- 24 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the cause
- 17 percent reported that geographic location was now the issue of concern
- 7 percent felt that employer competition was the cause of failed hiring

Column #4: Fourth biggest obstacle in attracting quality faculty. Four shared responses:
- 33 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the cause
- 33 percent reported that geographic location was now the issue of concern
- 17 percent reported that low salary was the problem
- 17 percent felt that employer competition was the cause of failed hiring
**Interpreting this graph:**

*Overall, salary was the biggest obstacle. Following, workload was reported as the next significant problem. After these, professional development support was seen as inadequate and a cause for leaving, followed lastly by relative geographic location.*

**Column #1:** Biggest obstacle in retaining quality faculty (who left for other opportunities). Three common responses:
- 74 percent reported that low salary was the biggest issue
- 21 percent felt that inadequate professional development support was the biggest issue
- 5 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the primary cause

**Column #2:** Second biggest obstacle in retaining quality faculty. Four common issues:
- 46 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the second biggest cause
- 27 percent felt that inadequate professional development support was the second issue
- 19 percent reported that low salary was the second issue
- 9 percent reported that geographic location was the next problem

**Column #3:** Third biggest obstacle in retaining quality faculty. Four common issues:
- 38 percent felt that inadequate professional development support was the biggest issue
- 25 percent reported that too heavy a workload was the cause
- 25 percent reported that geographic location was the next problem
- 12 percent reported that low salary was the third issue

**Column #4:** Fourth biggest obstacle in retaining quality faculty. Three common issues:
- 50 percent reported that geographic location was the problem
- 38 percent felt that inadequate professional development support was the issue
- 12 percent reported that low salary was the fourth biggest issue
## Comparative Full Time Faculty Salary Data

### Average Salaries for Full Time Faculty Members 2005-6

**Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, 2005-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Doctoral Institutions</th>
<th>Public Master's Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$101,620</td>
<td>$78,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>$70,952</td>
<td>$62,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td>$60,440</td>
<td>$52,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$40,670</td>
<td>$39,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: AAUP (60th percentile scores), 2005-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Doctoral Institutions</th>
<th>Public Master's Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$105,987</td>
<td>$78,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>$74,919</td>
<td>$62,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td>$63,807</td>
<td>$52,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$48,040</td>
<td>$42,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: KBOR Data Book 2006, Table 4.31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KU</th>
<th>KSU</th>
<th>WSU</th>
<th>ESU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>FHSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$97,833</td>
<td>$83,159</td>
<td>$81,881</td>
<td>$64,937</td>
<td>$70,009</td>
<td>$66,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>$68,111</td>
<td>$65,386</td>
<td>$64,917</td>
<td>$55,880</td>
<td>$56,139</td>
<td>$54,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td>$59,159</td>
<td>$54,604</td>
<td>$54,964</td>
<td>$46,592</td>
<td>$47,395</td>
<td>$45,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$41,255</td>
<td>$40,110</td>
<td>$40,437</td>
<td>$36,694</td>
<td>$39,922</td>
<td>$38,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, 2005-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W Carolina St</th>
<th>NW Missouri St</th>
<th>Salisbury St</th>
<th>N Michigan</th>
<th>E Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$73,700</td>
<td>$77,051</td>
<td>$76,700</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
<td>$65,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>$60,700</td>
<td>$58,730</td>
<td>$60,800</td>
<td>$56,200</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td>$52,600</td>
<td>$47,949</td>
<td>$54,200</td>
<td>$47,100</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$39,518</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>