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Executive Summary:

The Faculty Council appointed a six person faculty committee and charged it with describing the distribution of raises given in 2014 – 2015 by percentage and dollar amount by division, and reporting on the attitude of faculty members toward the raises and on their understanding of the process. The committee used a three step process: 1) reviewed, analyzed and described 2014-2015 faculty raises; 2) surveyed deans on the process used to fund and allocate regular merit raises and on their opinion of the effect of variation in regular merit raises on morale; and 3) surveyed the faculty on their understanding of and attitudes toward the raise process. Both regular and special merit raises varied by academic unit. Overall, 86.5% of faculty members received some raise, and the percentages receiving raises ranged from 72.2% in the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources to 98.5% in the School of Health Professions. Median regular merit raises across academic units ranged from less than 1% to more than 2%. The percentage of faculty members receiving a special merit raise ranged from 9% in Medicine and the School of Health Professions (no end of year special merit raises were awarded in the School of Health Professions) to 36% in Human Environmental Sciences and Nursing. Responses to the faculty survey indicated that faculty morale was damaged by the raise process; however, there were strong differences of opinion on issues of fairness and morale depending on whether individuals received a special merit raise. Deans generally stated that overall lack of resources was as much or more damaging to morale than the special merit raise process. This view is supported by the fact that the median regular merit raise by academic unit had a strong effect on response to the morale statements, thus morale was not solely affected by whether the respondent received a special merit raise. There was general support among faculty of AAU membership; however, nearly 50% of those who did not receive a special merit raise were neutral or disagreed that it is important that MU stay in the AAU. The committee concludes that full transparency, well pre-defined performance metrics consistent with effort allocation, and equity among academic units in future raise processes are important to avoid further damage to faculty morale, and that leadership should undertake an educational effort to justify the importance of AAU membership.

Charge:

The charge of the committee was: 1) to describe the distribution of raises given in 2014 – 2015 by percentage and dollar amount by division; and 2) to report on the attitude of faculty members toward the raises and on their understanding of the process.

Process:

The committee approached its charge by first reviewing, analyzing and describing raises in 2014-2015. Three types of raises were reviewed: 1) Mid-year raises based on exceptional merit (see appendix document A); 2) End of year raises based on exceptional merit (see appendix document B); and 3) Regular merit raises provided from funds reallocated within division. As a second step in our process, we asked deans the following questions:

Please describe the procedures used to determine the amount of raises from the 2% regular merit pool.

What was the source of funds used to make up the raises in the 2% merit pool; for example, did they come from not filling open faculty or staff positions or reallocation of block budget?

The average raises from the 2% pool varied across divisions. What is your view on the effect of this variation on faculty morale in your division?
As the final step in the information gathering process, we sent a survey to each full-time ranked faculty member that stated the following:

**Preamble**

The purpose of this survey is to gauge faculty satisfaction with the 2014 raise process. There were three parts to the raise process:

1) a mid-year raise targeted to reach up to 15% of the faculty based on research expenditures, faculty awards, fellowships, memberships, and citations, and funded from the central administration;
2) a regular merit raise funded through reallocation within divisions suggested to average 2%;
3) a special merit raise targeted to reach up to 20% of the faculty who received a regular merit raise of at least 2%, based on the faculty member's salary compared to peer institutions, the significance and impact of scholarly works, research expenditures, faculty awards, fellowships, memberships, citations, and other factors that cause the faculty member to stand out, and also funded from the central administration.

Approximately 29% of tenure and tenure track and 4% of non-tenure track faculty members received salary increases from mid-year and/or special merit pools effecting average raises of 10.3 and 8.5%, respectively. Tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members who did not receive salary increases from the special pools averaged 2.0 and 2.1% raises, respectively, funded through reallocation within divisions. Detailed data regarding the 2014 raises can be found at: http://facultycouncil.missouri.edu/.

**Demographics**

What is your track? (Tenured, Tenure Track, Non-Tenure Track)

What College do you work in? (give a list for people to choose from)

Did you receive a mid-year raise? (yes, no, don't know, don't want to say)

Did you receive a regular merit raise? (yes, no, don't know, don't want to say)

Did you receive a special end-of-year merit raise? (yes, no, don't know, don't want to say)

**Opinions** – all will use the same responses (strongly disagree, disagree somewhat, neutral, agree somewhat, strongly agree, no opinion)

1) I was aware of the process for awarding special merit raises.

2) The special merit raises (mid-year and special merit) were beneficial to the University.

3) Irrespective of the benefit to the University, the execution of the special merit raise process was fair in terms of who received mid-year and special merit raises.

4) Irrespective of the fairness of the overall process, given my level of productivity, I was personally treated fairly in the raise process.

5) Irrespective of the correctness of the process, the faculty as a whole was treated fairly in the raise process.

6) Special merit raises reward contributions different from those expected of individual faculty members in teaching, research, extension and clinical activities.
7) The special merit raises improved my morale.
8) The special merit raises improved overall faculty morale.
9) The special merit raises will improve MU's stature in terms of AAU metrics.
10) In terms of raising future AAU metrics, it would have been more effective if fewer people had received very high raises and more people got larger raises in general.
11) It is important that MU stay in the AAU.
12) Other comments.

Results and Interpretation:

Distributions of Raises: There was much concern expressed by the Faculty Council leadership regarding information presented on faculty raises by the Chancellor and Interim Provost. More specifically, the mean raise values presented by the administration typically were separated into “special merit” and “regular merit” raises, and in the view of the Faculty Council leadership were thought to be misleading. In an attempt to characterize the raises actually received, the committee partitioned changes in compensation into two groups: 1) the total change in compensation received by individuals who had been awarded one or both of the special merit increases, and 2) the total change in compensation received by individuals who were not awarded a special merit increase. It is our belief that this partitioning of raises accurately represents the changes in compensation seen by faculty. (Table and graphs of the distributions of raises by division are presented in Appendix document C.)

The median raise for tenured and tenure track faculty members (TT/T) who did not receive one of the special merit raises was 1%, or $999.96. For TT/T faculty members, 29.3% received one or both of the special merit raises, with a median total raise of 9% or $10,250.38. For non-tenure track faculty members (NTT) who did not receive one of the special merit raises, the median raise was 2%. Non-tenure track faculty members who received one or both of the special merit raises (4.4% of the NTT faculty) received a median total raise of 8.15% or $6,088.14. The amount of raises varied substantially by academic unit as shown in the tables immediately below.
### Table 1. Median and mean raises for faculty members who did not receive a special merit raise by Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic unit</th>
<th>N Obs</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food &amp; Nat Resources</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Median and mean raises for faculty members who received a special merit raise by academic unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic unit</th>
<th>N Obs</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food &amp; Nat Resources</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deans’ Survey: Deans’ responses to the survey were somewhat mixed. Deans consistently indicated that regular merit raises were based on merit, but measured across a broader range of criteria—including teaching, research, service, extension and clinical activities—than were used for determining special merit raises. Funds for the regular merit raises mostly came from unfilled positions, but some academic units had resources from revenue generation that were used to provide funds. Those academic units which had sources of funds other than from closing positions tended to give larger regular merit raises than did those academic units in which raises came at the expense of positions. Deans were typically not of the opinion that variation in raises was damaging to morale, but this also varied by academic unit. Some noted that morale is dependent on factors other than just salary, and that faculty members were grateful to receive raises. The percentage of faculty members who received no raise was 13.5% overall, but varied by academic unit from less than 2% in the School of Health Professions to nearly 28% in CAFNR.

Faculty Survey: Overall, 581 out of 1842 faculty members responded to the survey, which was a response rate of approximately 36% for TT/T faculty and 25% for NTT faculty. The responses by academic unit were roughly in proportion to their percentage of the total faculty. Fifteen percent of the respondents indicated that they had received a mid-year raise, 13% indicated that they had received an end of year special merit raise, and 60% indicated that they had received a regular merit raise. The responses: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree were coded 1 – 5, respectively, and are presented numerically in the appendix. In addition to the overall distributions of answers, the committee evaluated responses by type of appointment, TT/T vs NTT, according to whether the faculty member received a mid-year or special merit raise, and by grouping academic units into those which received an average regular merit raise of less than 1% versus those that received an average regular merit raise of greater than 2%. The greatest differences between groups were associated with whether the faculty member had received a special merit raise, and tables of those values appear in Section E of the Appendix. Non-tenure track faculty were more likely to be neutral than TT/T faculty.

Results of the opinion of the faculty survey are shown in a series of graphs immediately below that summarize the overall response. These percentages have been adjusted to remove non-responses.
Statement 1 evaluated awareness of the process for awarding special merit raises. The mean response was 3.33, indicating slightly more individuals were not aware of the process than were aware. There was a strong difference in approval between those who received a special merit raise and those who did not. Among those who received a special merit raise, 54% agreed or strongly agreed that they were aware of the raise process, but only 33% of those who did not receive a special merit raise were aware of the process.

The second item stated that special merit raises were beneficial to the University. The mean response was 3.03, with more agreement than disagreement, but with more respondents strongly disagreeing than strongly agreeing. Responses differed depending on whether the respondent had received a special merit raise, with 72.6% of those who received a special merit raise agreeing or strongly agreeing that the special merit raises were beneficial to the University and only 21.5% of those who did not receive a special merit raise agreeing or strongly agreeing.
There was strong disagreement with the statement that irrespective to the benefit to the University, the execution of the special merit raise process was fair. The mean score was 3.62, and more responded ‘strongly disagree’ than any other response. Those who received one or more of the special merit raises were more likely to agree with the statement of fairness with 8.9% strongly agreeing and 34.1% agreeing. Only a single individual who did not receive a special merit raise strongly agreed that the process was fair.

The response for statement 4, addressing the fairness to the respondent, was more positive than that of the previous question, with a mean of 3.15. Responses are quite balanced between agreement and disagreement, with slightly more individuals strongly disagreeing than strongly agreeing. There was great disparity in response between those who received a special merit raise and those who did not. Approximately 75% of those who received a special merit raise agreed or strongly agreed that they, individually, were treated fairly, but only 19% of those who did not receive a special merit raise agreed or strongly agreed that individually, they had been treated fairly.
The response for statement five regarding fairness to the faculty as a whole was strongly negative. Many more individuals strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement than agreed or strongly agreed. Only 7% of those who did not receive a special merit raise thought the process was fair, and even among those who received a special merit raise only 33% thought the process was fair to the faculty as a whole.

One concern about the criteria used to determine special merit raises was that it did not reward the metrics used for assessing promotion and tenure. Statement six was designed to address that concern. The mean response to the statement, “Special merit raises reward contributions different from those expected of individual faculty members in teaching, research, extension and clinical activities” was 3.0. There were not substantial differences in responses between those who did and did not receive a special merit raise.
Much of the focus of the Faculty Council regarding distribution of raises was its effect on the morale of the faculty. Statement seven assessed whether special merit raises influenced the morale of the individual. Overall, there was strong disagreement that the special merit raises improved the morale of the individual respondent; however there was also great disparity of responses based on whether the individual had received a special merit raise. Among those who received a special merit raise, 72% responded that their morale was improved, and 73% of those who did not receive a special merit raise disagreed with the statement that their morale was improved. The effect on morale also differed depending on the average regular merit raise awarded by the respondent’s academic unit. In academic units in which the median regular merit raise was 1% or less, 47.6% of respondents strongly disagreed that the special merit raises improved the respondent’s morale, whereas in those academic units in which the median regular merit raise was 2% or greater, only 24.7% strongly disagreed.

To further evaluate the effect of distribution of raises on the morale of the faculty, statement eight evaluated agreement with the statement that overall faculty morale was improved by special merit raises. This statement elicited the strongest response of any in the survey, with a mean of 3.91. Fewer than 5% of the
faculty strongly agreed that special merit raises improved the morale overall, while more than 40% strongly disagreed. Among those who did not receive a special merit raise, 67% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that overall faculty morale was improved, and even among those who received a special merit raise, more disagreed with the statement than agreed. As with the previous statement, the effect on morale also differed depending on the average regular merit raise awarded by the respondent’s academic unit. In academic units in which the median regular merit raise was 1% or less, 44.3% of respondents strongly disagreed that the special merit raises improved overall faculty morale, whereas in those academic units in which the median regular merit raise was 2% or greater, only 20% strongly disagreed.

It is the general understanding of the committee that the raise process was designed to strengthen AAU metrics. Statement nine evaluates the faculty opinion on this concern. The overall response to the statement that, “The special merit raises will improve MU's stature in terms of AAU metrics,” was one of disagreement, with a mean response of 3.36. More than 50% of those who received a special merit raise agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while only 14% of those who did not receive a special merit raise agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.
In statement 10, the opinion toward the effect of a more even distribution of raises on AAU metrics was evaluated. The mean overall response was 2.91, a slight agreement that a more even distribution of raises would have been more effective in raising future AAU metrics, but a strong subgroup strongly disagreed with the statement. This view was largely shared by both those who received and those who did not receive a special merit raise.

The final statement in the survey asked the respondents to consider whether it is important for MU to stay in the AAU. The greatest number of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, and the mean response was 2.53. However, once again there was a difference in responses depending upon whether the respondent had received a special merit raise. Among those who had received a special merit raise, 42% strongly agreed that MU should stay in the AAU, more than twice the percentage of those who did not receive a special merit raise. Among those who did not receive a special merit raise, more than 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed that it was important for MU to stay in the AAU.
**NSEI Raises:** There was special concern regarding perceived possible irregularities of raises for NSEI faculty. Those are addressed in Section F of the Appendix.

**Summary:**

In summary, results of the survey suggest that the raise process has taken a toll on faculty morale. There are strong differences of opinion on issues of fairness and morale depending on whether individuals received a special merit raise. Deans generally concurred that overall lack of resources was as much or more damaging to morale than the special merit raise process. This view is supported by the fact that the median regular merit raise by academic unit had a strong effect on response to the morale statements, thus morale was not only affected by whether the respondent received a special merit raise. This along with perceived irregularities in raises for specific groups (NSEI and Extension) suggest that equity among academic units is important. There is general support for the AAU; however, nearly 50% of those who did not receive a special merit raise were neutral or disagreed that it is important that MU stay in the AAU suggesting that leadership must undertake an educational effort to justify the importance of AAU membership.
Appendix Document A

Mid-Year Faculty Raise Requests for the Highest Performing Ranked Faculty
Fall 2013

1. Name, Rank and Date of Hire of Faculty Member

2. Did the person receive a merit raise during calendar year 2013? Yes____ No____
   If no, why not? A raise based on promotion? Yes_____ No____

   Current salary____________ Salary as percentage of average of comparable departments/units in AAU institutions or in peer institutions, if there is no AAU comparator_______.

3. Describe the significance and impact of the scholarly works (e.g., publications, creative presentations, performances, and other scholarly activities) of the last three (3) years.
   Rank this person within the department based on productivity during this time period. ____of____

4. Provide the following information (as applicable)

   ______ Amount of competitively funded Federal research expenditures (past 3 years –7/1/10 – 7/1/13)

   ______ Faculty awards, fellowship, and memberships (lifetime)

   ______ Citations to scholarship (number—past 5 years)

   ______ Other externally-sponsored research expenditures (past 3 years)

5. What information, other than that supplied above, causes this person to stand out among your faculty for a special performance-based pay raise (e.g. teaching excellence, contribution to interdisciplinary teaching and research, outreach impact, significant contribution to economic development)?

6. What is the amount of the raise suggested? _______________. Why that amount?
Appendix Document B

Faculty Raise Requests for the Highest Performing Ranked Faculty
July 2014 (revised 7/7/14)

Note Well: Do not submit this form if the individual will not be receiving at least a 2% merit pay raise from the unit/school/college effective 9/1/2014.

1. Name
2.EMPLID
3. Rank
4. T/TT ☐ NTT ☐
5. Date of Hire
6. Effort Allocation:
   Research Click here to enter text,
   Teaching Click here to enter text,
   Service Click here to enter text,
   Extension Click here to enter text.
7. Amount of merit raise from your unit/school/college effective 9/1/2014? Click here to enter text.
   Percent increase: Click here to enter text.
8. Current salary: Click here to enter text.
   Salary as percentage of average of comparable units/schools/colleges in AAU institutions or in peer institutions, if there is no AAU comparator: Click here to enter text.
9. Describe the significance and impact of the scholarly works (e.g., publications, creative presentations, performances, and other scholarly activities) of the last 3 years.
   Click here to enter text.
10. Other factors which cause this person to stand out among your faculty for a performance/productivity based pay raise (e.g., teaching excellence, contribution to interdisciplinary teaching and research, outreach impact, significant contribution to economic development, other)? Click here to enter text.
11. Rank this person within the unit/school/college based on performance/productivity during the past 3 years. Rank: Click here to enter text. Of Click here to enter text.
12. Provide the following information (as applicable):
   Amount of competitively funded federal research expenditures (not awards) (past 3 years, 7/1/11-6/30/14; use most recent year to date data if year-end data not available): Click here to enter text.
   Faculty awards, fellowship, and memberships (lifetime). List only those recognized by the AAU:
   Click here to enter text.
   Citations to scholarship (number; begin with calendar year 2009):
   Click here to enter text.
   Other externally-sponsored research expenditures (not awards) (past 3 years, 7/1/11-6/30/14; use most recent year to date data if year-end data not available):
   Click here to enter text.
13. What is the amount of the raise suggested (on top of the 9/1/2014 merit increase)?
   Click here to enter text.
   Why that amount? Click here to enter text.
# Distribution of Faculty Raises, Academic Year 2014-2015

Note: This report is based on data provided by the Provost’s Office. The data contained in this report are accurate as of September 1, 2014 and include all transactions processed by 11/1/2014. The amount and percentage of total raise for faculty members who received a mid-year and/or end-of-year special merit raise are included in the “special merit pools” category, including any raise they received from the regular raise pool. Faculty who received no raise were assigned to the regular raise pool category for the purpose of calculating their percentage of raise (0%).

## Distribution of raises by division and track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>T/TT faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Distribution of special merit raises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>T/TT faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Percentage of raises, by division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies/Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of raises, by division, track, and funding source for raise

### TT/T faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic unit</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Regular merit raise only</th>
<th>Special merit raise</th>
<th>Any raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food &amp; Nat Resources</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>55.38%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>312.71%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.56%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42.58%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.64%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.52%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>98.60%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32.47%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>71.60%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>29.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NTT faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic unit</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Regular merit raise only</th>
<th>Special merit raise</th>
<th>Any raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food &amp; Nat Resources</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.66%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.91%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88.64%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81.63%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>79.68%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86.84%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>676</td>
<td>75.74%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All faculty

Distribution of raises, by division, track, and funding source for raise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic unit</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Regular merit raise only</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Special merit raise</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Any raise</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag, Food &amp; Nat Resources</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>88.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>82.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>66.34</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>Mid-Year</td>
<td>High-Performance</td>
<td>Total Special Raise (one/both)</td>
<td>Both special raises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources*</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is a discrepancy between the summary tables for the special raises and the detailed data on all raises that were provided by the Provost’s office for this division.
Table: Distribution of 2013-14 (Mid-Year) and 2014-15 (High Performance) Special Raises, and the total, by Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Mid-Year</th>
<th>High-Performance</th>
<th>Total Special Raise (one/both)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine*</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is a discrepancy between the summary tables for the special raises and the detailed data on all raises that were provided by the Provost's office for these divisions.
### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**All faculty combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01-.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26-.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-.75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>513.64</td>
<td>999.96</td>
<td>2376.24</td>
<td>2200.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNT faculty</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>567.43</td>
<td>1646.64</td>
<td>2760.43</td>
<td>3307.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7622.00</td>
<td>10250.38</td>
<td>11668.74</td>
<td>13493.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNT faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4379.88</td>
<td>6088.14</td>
<td>6921.64</td>
<td>8847.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.04</td>
<td>972.71</td>
<td>999.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>999.96</td>
<td>1238.89</td>
<td>2000.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>7783.00</td>
<td>10500.00</td>
<td>12648.78</td>
<td>16983.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>8847.08</td>
<td>9435.00</td>
<td>9603.51</td>
<td>10528.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26-.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-.75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

The table above provides univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise. It includes the distribution of raises by amount category for TT/T faculty, NTT faculty, and all faculty. The statistics include the number of raises, frequency, and percentage for each category. The table also includes columns for the 25th percentile, median, mean, and 75th percentile for the amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise.
### Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

#### Academic unit - Arts & Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01-.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26-.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-.75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>77.18</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>654.15</td>
<td>1493.80</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>392.97</td>
<td>404.57</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>6897.94</td>
<td>8668.78</td>
<td>10841.08</td>
<td>11413.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>4500.00</td>
<td>4500.00</td>
<td>4500.00</td>
<td>4500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

#### Academic unit - Business

#### Raise percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1688.00</td>
<td>3400.00</td>
<td>3265.87</td>
<td>5563.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1364.00</td>
<td>1675.00</td>
<td>1844.78</td>
<td>2206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>9423.00</td>
<td>14035.00</td>
<td>12593.92</td>
<td>15144.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26-.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.89</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>563.00</td>
<td>851.00</td>
<td>1007.61</td>
<td>1055.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>672.00</td>
<td>1025.04</td>
<td>2797.29</td>
<td>2348.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
<td>7310.00</td>
<td>8144.31</td>
<td>10720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
<td>5030.00</td>
<td>5726.39</td>
<td>5442.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1700.00</td>
<td>2100.54</td>
<td>2049.19</td>
<td>2538.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.52*</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>499.98</td>
<td>137.44</td>
<td>1740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>9291.96</td>
<td>11500.00</td>
<td>16445.12</td>
<td>18055.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: There was one substantial negative adjustment (~-$14,879.92) among NTT faculty. The raises offset this negative adjustment, yielding a positive mean. The percentage change for this individual, however, was -30%; all of the positive percentages didn't add up to this, yielding an average percent raise that is negative.
Total raise as a percentage of prior year's salary
For TT/T faculty in Engineering, by funding source for raise

Total raise as a percentage of prior year's salary
For NTT faculty in Engineering, by funding source for raise
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Graduate Studies/Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>2.01-2.5</th>
<th>3.01-4.0</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freq</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pct</strong></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1774.98</td>
<td>2077.80</td>
<td>2132.37</td>
<td>2489.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: the data represent 4 faculty members who do not work within an academic department: 2 in extension, 1 in a center, and 1 in graduate studies.
Total raise as a percentage of prior year's salary
For NTT faculty in Graduate School/Other, by funding source for raise
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

Academic unit = Health Professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td>1408.32</td>
<td>1732.08</td>
<td>3143.98</td>
<td>1970.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td>1166.34</td>
<td>1311.06</td>
<td>1710.27</td>
<td>1602.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td>10156.60</td>
<td>10897.22</td>
<td>10897.22</td>
<td>11637.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td>5742.64</td>
<td>6821.94</td>
<td>7222.46</td>
<td>8702.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Human Environmental Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51-.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-1.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1039.58</td>
<td>1498.57</td>
<td>1568.56</td>
<td>1880.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>960.00</td>
<td>1101.12</td>
<td>1038.71</td>
<td>1302.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>7200.93</td>
<td>9810.54</td>
<td>10039.54</td>
<td>12179.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

Academic unit = Journalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent raise</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1847.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1192.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5621.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3695.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Law**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1018.21</td>
<td>1339.25</td>
<td>1272.53</td>
<td>1646.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>1285.43</td>
<td>1155.17</td>
<td>1303.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>10596.00</td>
<td>11180.67</td>
<td>11139.64</td>
<td>12000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>9800.00</td>
<td>9800.00</td>
<td>9800.00</td>
<td>9800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Medicine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1085.28</td>
<td>2957.52</td>
<td>6557.89</td>
<td>5306.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1589.40</td>
<td>3084.42</td>
<td>4245.43</td>
<td>5100.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>8347.62</td>
<td>12108.00</td>
<td>12520.36</td>
<td>14891.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>7544.52</td>
<td>9017.58</td>
<td>10281.34</td>
<td>13297.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>9885.00</td>
<td>9885.00</td>
<td>9885.00</td>
<td>9885.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Faculty in NSEI were in the Graduate School during the previous academic year, and are now in Engineering.
Total raise as a percentage of prior year’s salary
For TT/T faculty in NSEI, by funding source for raise

- Regular pool only
- Special merit pool

Percentage of faculty members

Percentage raise
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Nursing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>678.30</td>
<td>830.66</td>
<td>1578.66</td>
<td>1544.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>606.06</td>
<td>667.98</td>
<td>1236.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5332.44</td>
<td>9665.28</td>
<td>11001.07</td>
<td>14576.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4379.88</td>
<td>4859.14</td>
<td>4859.14</td>
<td>5338.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total raise as a percentage of prior year’s salary

**For TT/T faculty in Nursing, by funding source for raise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage raise</th>
<th>Regular pool only</th>
<th>Special merit pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total raise as a percentage of prior year’s salary

**For NTT faculty in Nursing, by funding source for raise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage raise</th>
<th>Regular pool only</th>
<th>Special merit pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Public Affairs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26-1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>4 66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1 16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1 16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>2 33.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1145.64</td>
<td>1257.34</td>
<td>1598.33</td>
<td>2051.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>19.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>7286.48</td>
<td>13433.06</td>
<td>13433.06</td>
<td>19579.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of raise, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Veterinary Medicine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise percentage</th>
<th>TT/T faculty</th>
<th>NTT faculty</th>
<th>All faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>Special merit pools</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01-.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76-1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01-1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76-2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01-10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate statistics for faculty raises, by track and funding source for raise

**Academic unit - Veterinary Medicine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise source</th>
<th>Faculty track (TT, NTT)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>25th Pctl</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>75th Pctl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular pool only</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>1408.74</td>
<td>2364.60</td>
<td>2503.83</td>
<td>2811.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>2000.04</td>
<td>2461.80</td>
<td>2892.28</td>
<td>3080.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special merit pool</td>
<td>TT/T faculty</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>8300.04</td>
<td>11858.16</td>
<td>11559.12</td>
<td>14010.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent raise</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total raise</td>
<td>6771.68</td>
<td>6771.68</td>
<td>6771.68</td>
<td>6771.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total raise as a percentage of prior year’s salary
For TT/T faculty in Veterinary Medicine, by funding source for raise

Total raise as a percentage of prior year’s salary
For NTT faculty in Veterinary Medicine, by funding source for raise
Appendix Document Section D, Faculty Survey Results

1. What is your track?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What College do you work in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Includes the School of Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of Arts and Science Includes the School of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trulaske College of Business Includes the School of Accountancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>College of Education Includes the School of Information Science and Learning Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>School of Health Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>College of Human Environmental Sciences Includes the School of Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School of Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sinclair School of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harry S Truman School of Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What College or Division do you work in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did you receive a mid-year raise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>417</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do not want to say</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did you receive a regular merit raise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do not want to say</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Did you receive a special end-of-year merit raise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>394</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do not want to say</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please rate each question below on the Agree/Disagree scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) I was aware of the process for awarding special merit raises.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2) The special merit raises (midyear and special merit) were benefic to the University.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3) Irrespective of the benefit to the University, the execution of the special merit raise process was fair in terms of who received midyear and special merit raises.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4) Irrespective of the fairness of the overall process, given my level of productivity, I was personally treated fairly in the raise process.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5) Irrespective of the correctness of the process, the faculty as a whole was treated fairly in the raise process.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6) Special merit raises reward contributions different from those expected of individual faculty members in teaching, research, extension and clinical activities.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7) The special merit raises improved my morale.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8) The special merit raises improved overall faculty morale.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9) The special merit raises will improve MU's stature in terms of AAU metrics.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10) In terms of raising future AAU metrics, it would have been more effective if fewer people had received very high raises and more people got larger raises in general.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11) It is important that MU stay in the AAU.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Document Section E

Survey responses by receipt of a special merit raise.

1) I was aware of the process for awarding special merit raises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Did not answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>61.07</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>26.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of respondents (48.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that they were aware of the special merit raise process. Those who had received a special merit raise were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they were aware of the process (54.1%) compared with those who did not receive a raise (33.3%).
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

2) The special merit raises (midyear and special merit) were beneficial to the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.85</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar proportions of faculty agreed or strongly agreed (32.9%) vs. disagreed or strongly disagreed (29.7%) that the special merit raises were beneficial to MU.
Those who had received a raise were much more likely to agree or strongly agree (72.6%) that the raises were beneficial to MU than those who did not receive a raise (21.5%).
There was a sizeable group (13.5%) who did not know.
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

3) Irrespective of the benefit to the University, the execution of the special merit raise process was fair in terms of who received midyear and special merit raises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Did not ans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>77.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>63.01</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>35.58</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if the raise process was fair in terms of who received special merit raises, 41.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. There was a strong division by receipt of a special merit raise. Just over 1 in 6 respondents did not know (16.9%).
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

4) Irrespective of the fairness of the overall process, given my level of productivity, I was personally treated fairly in the raise process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Did not</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.21</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (74.8%) of faculty who received a special merit raise agreed or strongly agreed that the process had been fair to them. Most (55.2%) of faculty who did not receive a special merit raise disagreed or strongly disagreed that the process had been fair to them.
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

5) Irrespective of the correctness of the process, the faculty as a whole was treated fairly in the raise process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Did not ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>90.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.07</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>77.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>77.39</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty who received a special merit raise were more likely to agree or strongly agree that the process had been fair to the faculty as a whole (33.3%), while most (56.0%) faculty who did not receive a special merit raise disagreed or strongly disagreed that the process had been fair to faculty. Many (16.7%) reported that they did not know.
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

6) Special merit raises reward contributions different from those expected of individual faculty members in teaching, research, extension and clinical activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>85.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>60.16</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

7) The special merit raises improved my morale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, those who received a special merit raise were likely to agree or strongly agree that it improved their morale (71.8%), while those who did not receive one were likely to disagree or strongly disagree with this statement (72.9%).
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

8) The special merit raises improved overall faculty morale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Did not ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>82.14</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.68</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>32.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

9) The special merit raises will improve MU's stature in terms of AAU metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Did not ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>1 4 1 45</td>
<td>0.17 0.68 0.17 7.60</td>
<td>1.96 7.84 1.96 88.24</td>
<td>0.74 1.18 2.00 66.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>30 7 1 6</td>
<td>5.07 1.18 0.17 1.01</td>
<td>68.18 15.91 2.27 13.64</td>
<td>22.22 2.06 2.00 8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40 41 12 1</td>
<td>6.76 6.93 2.03 0.17</td>
<td>42.55 43.62 12.77 1.06</td>
<td>29.63 12.09 24.00 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23 48 16 1</td>
<td>3.89 8.11 2.70 0.17</td>
<td>26.14 54.55 18.18 1.14</td>
<td>17.04 14.16 32.00 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10 66 1 3</td>
<td>1.69 11.15 0.17 0.51</td>
<td>12.50 82.50 1.25 3.75</td>
<td>7.41 19.47 2.00 4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>15 102 7 5</td>
<td>2.53 17.23 1.18 0.84</td>
<td>11.63 79.07 5.43 3.88</td>
<td>11.11 30.09 14.00 7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>16 71 12 7</td>
<td>2.70 11.99 2.03 1.18</td>
<td>15.09 66.98 11.32 6.60</td>
<td>11.85 20.94 24.00 10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135 339 50 68</td>
<td>22.00 57.26 8.45 11.49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who received a special merit raise were likely to agree or strongly agree that it improved MU’s AAU metrics (51.8%), while those who did not receive one were likely to disagree or strongly disagree with this statement (49.6%). Over 1 in 6 (17.9%) did not know.
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

10) In terms of raising future AAU metrics, it would have been more effective if fewer people had received very high raises and more people got larger raises in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Did not ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>83.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>57.47</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.92</td>
<td>49.23</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey responses, by receipt of a special merit raise.

11) It is important that MU stay in the AAU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Did not answer</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Did not ans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>339.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>592.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty who received special merit raises were more likely to agree or strongly agree that it is important for MU to stay in the AAU (66.7%) compared with 48.1% of those who did not receive a raise.
Appendix Document Section F

Salary Raises in Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute (NSEI): Some data and observations

Until August 31, 2014 NSEI was a part of the MU Graduate School; after this date, it became a part of the College of Engineering (COE). For all the raises discussed in the ACCORD report, NSEI was thus a part of the MU Graduate School. Through several requests, NSEI faculty obtained their Academic Analytics rankings and AAU Public salary information from the administration, which has been made available to ACCORD. This information, together with that obtained by the ACCORD, provides a case study in how the raises were handled in one unit. The net result of the raise processes has been demoralizing to a highly-ranked group of faculty.

- The salaries of the NSEI faculty are noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>101,954</td>
<td>101,954</td>
<td>101,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>136,578</td>
<td>136,578</td>
<td>136,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curators’ Professor</td>
<td>197,705</td>
<td>207,590*</td>
<td>207,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>100,456</td>
<td>100,456</td>
<td>100,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There have been thus no regular merit raises to NSEI faculty from the Grad School during the period 2013-14 and 2014-15.
- One faculty member was recommended for, and received a 5% mid-year raise.
- Other faculty were also ranked well by Academic Analytics, but their salaries are much below the AAU-Public mean for professors in Nuclear Engineering (AAU-Public refers to group of AAU members that are public universities). The salaries of two professors are about 54,000 below the mean of 154,000 (of AAU-Public members other than MU). The distributions of AAU-Public Nuclear Engineering faculty salaries were not available to the Graduate Dean or the NSEI faculty.
- The Grad School Dean did not evaluate faculty for 2013-14 or 2014-15 regular merit raises. For 2014-15 the Graduate Dean has stated,

   “I did not write any annual evaluation for NSEI when it became apparent there was no option for sending it forward for a raise.” (email of , 1/30/2015 in response to a request for copies of evaluations)

- In response to the ACCORD questionnaire, the Dean has stated (January. 2015),

  Q. Please describe the procedures used to determine the amount of raises from the 2% regular merit pool.

  A. NSEI faculty did not receive raises from the 2% pool for 2014.

  Q. What was the source of funds used to make up the raises in the 2% merit pool, for example, did they come from not filling open faculty or staff positions or reallocation of block budget?
A. This decision was made by both myself and Rhonda Gibler as the GO account for NSEI was already negative. NSEI faculty had several conversations with Rhonda about a process to help clear the deficit but....Rhonda was waiting for them to identify what accounts they wanted to use to cover the deficit and they were waiting for Rhonda to do something although what that something was, was not clear. As a result the deficit remained and there was no resolution.

Q. The average raises from the 2% pool varied across divisions. What is your view on the effect of this variation on faculty morale in your division?

A. One faculty member received a 5% (~$10,000) mid-year, merit increase. The funds for this increase came directly from a campus pool and not from any funds internal to the graduate school or NSEI. The criterion for this increase was placement in the top quintile of academic analytics. He was the only NSEI faculty in this category and thus the only NSEI faculty member to receive a mid-year merit increase.

• Needless to say, the morale of the NSEI faculty was low due to no annual increases for two years in a row.

• The Graduate Dean was not aware of the excellence raise pool during most of July 2014, and when the existence of the pool was realized, it was too late also for any recommendations for the excellence pool.

• The MU Chancellor moved NSEI faculty’s tenure homes to various departments in the College of Engineering (COE) on September 1.

• The faculty discussed the raise situation with the COE Interim Dean, lack of reviews and the reasons given by the Grad School. Since COE had a deficit in its GO accounts of about $7.5 million and still had been allowed a 2% regular merit raise pool, while NSEI had a deficit of 23K only in its GO account and was not allowed a merit raise pool because of this deficit, it appeared to all involved that NSEI faculty had been treated differently.

• The COE Interim Dean arranged performance reviews of all NSEI faculty by respective department chairs for Calendar year 2013. As a result, all NSEI faculty were approved for 2% merit raise in December 2014, retroactive to September 1, 2014 (the table above does not show these adjustments as these are not included in the ACCORD data). This however precluded any considerations for the excellence pool as the pool was no longer available.

The NSEI deficit, small as it is, has been in dispute as the faculty have maintained all along that it was caused by a persistent misunderstanding on the part of the administration regarding “Compete Missouri” Funds. The faculty had proposed to take care of this deficit from their RIF and other accounts, but they did not want to be held responsible for a deficit for which they were not responsible. In their view, there was no confusion regarding this.