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# Committee composition

Andrea Arrington, Kevin Bolinger, Brian Bunnett (Senate Exec liaison),

Mark Green (Academic Affairs liaison), Debra Israel (secretary, fall), Jeff Kinne (chairperson),

Jin Park (secretary, spring), Virgil Sheets, Debra Vincent

# Executive Summary of Accomplishments

The committee was very active this academic year and spent a great deal of effort on a few particular tasks.

1. **Retirement benefits** – A survey was sent to department chairpersons asking for their thoughts on what might prevent faculty from retiring when they would prefer. We secured feedback from 100% of the department chairpersons and produced a summary of their feedback (enclosed in an appendix). Based on the chairperson feedback a survey was developed and sent to all regular faculty, with a response rate just over 50%. A summary of feedback from the regular faculty was also produced (enclosed in an appendix). The director of benefits Candy Barton, and Senior VP for Finance / University Treasurer Diann McKee both visited the committee twice to discuss ISU’s benefits and how these compare to other universities. The work of the committee has yielded a valuable summary of concerns of the faculty regarding retirement, which next year’s committee could use to look for modifications to retirement benefits that might be both impactful and doable financially.
2. **Parking for part time faculty** – The committee followed up on a recommendation from the previous year to provide free parking to part time faculty. A motion and justification was sent to Senate Exec and to the Parking Committee. The motion was rejected by the Parking Committee due to a number of factors (a justification document was produced and sent to the committee, summarized later in this document). FEBC has recommended that part time faculty be allowed to pay for parking via payroll deduction, and next year’s committee might solicit other feedback (other than cost) from part time and temporary faculty.
3. **Compensation for supervising graduate culminating experiences** – The committee followed up on a motion from the previous year to provide small stipends for supervising graduate culminating experiences. The previous year’s motion was sent back to FEBC asking for an estimate of the cost. An analysis was performed based on enrollment from 2016-2017 to produce a cost estimate. The motion was sent back to Senate Exec with the included cost. The provost explained at Senate Exec and Senate that he could not support the proposal because it would contribute to the “de-professionalization” of the faculty.

The remainder of this report contains details on the activity related to these tasks and others. The goal of this report is to serve as a thorough review of the committee’s work that can be passed on to the next year’s FEBC so the committee can continue the work on items left unfinished.

Meetings  
The committee met for one hour roughly every other week during the spring and fall semesters, for a total of 14 meetings.

# Charges from Senate Executive Committee

The Senate Executive Committee included the following charges to FEBC when FEBC was convened in the fall.

1. Continue regular annual reports on salary and health insurance recommendations.
2. Produce and submit an annual report by May 3, 2018.
3. Work with AAC, FAC, and Institutional Research to set up a mechanism for annual reports to be generated by them regarding faculty retention and other desired data.
4. Work with FAC to consider and recommend mechanisms to encourage faculty to retire while still effective.
5. Review faculty salaries in regards to gender equity among full professors.

The committee also followed up on two items that were considered by the 2016-2017 FEBC.

1. Motion from 2016-2017 to provide parking free to part time faculty.
2. Motion from 2016-2017 to pay graduate culminating experience supervision at the rate of $100-200 per headcount per term.

**Recommended Charges for 2018-2019** The results of FEBC’s work on these charges is summarized in the rest of this report. Suggestions for items to follow up on next year are given throughout with a bold paragraph heading. A ranked suggestion of charges for FEBC for 2018-2019 is as follows.

1. Perform a study of the current salary model and whether it is still appropriate.
2. Continue the study of retirement benefits, work with the Office of Human Resources and the University Treasurer to look for possible changes to benefits that would be affordable to the university and beneficial to faculty.
3. Produce and submit an annual report before the last Senate meeting of the academic year.
4. Work with FAC and AAC to issue joint data requests to Institutional Research early in the fall semester.
5. Follow up with Temporary Faculty Advocate and part time employees, in coordination with Parking Committee, on their recommendations for improvement to the parking situation as it pertains to them.
6. Follow up with the Office of Human Resources to determine whether HR can begin a regular rotation of visiting departments (on a 3 year cycle) to discuss retirement, health insurance, and other employee benefits.

# Annual Reports on Salary and Health Insurance, Charge 1

FEBC has not issued regular reports on salary and health insurance in recent years. The committee worked on other charges and did not take much action on this charge. FEBC was asked by a few members of Senate to investigate possible changes to Anthem’s policies related to coverage for Emergency Room visits. FEBC invited director of benefits Candy Barton and Senior VP for Finance / University Treasurer Diann McKee to visit to discuss. The new changes (which took effect Jan 1) were discussed, and FEBC recommended communication go out to all employees as early as possible and with a reminder to contact Staff Benefits whenever they have questions about insurance coverage or have claims that are denied.

**Recommendation** Charge 2018-2019 FEBC to investigate the current salary model to determine whether it is still appropriate. Include a member of FEBC (Debra Israel is willing and has recently looked at the current salary model) in discussions about adjusting salary information.

# Annual Report, Charge 2

The committee is submitting this annual report to Senate Exec so that Senate Exec can see the report in time to forward the report to Senate at Senate’s last meeting of the year, May 3.

# Coordinating Reports and Data Requests with AAC and FAC, Charge 3

FEBC, AAC, and FAC each appointed members to meet together to decide on data requests needed to fulfill charges for the year. The data requests were made in the fall, and some data was given back to the committees in the early spring. The main report given back to the three committees is a ten year staffing report summarizing FTE and salaries for certain groups of employees over a ten year period.

One member of FEBC was given additional data that was not authorized to be shared with the rest of the working group. One member of FAC was given additional data that was not authorized to be shared with the rest of the working group.

In the end, the FAC representative chose to perform a more thorough analysis of the data given him during the summer. AAC prepared the staffing report. FEBC has made recommendations on possible modifications to the staffing report in future years.

FEBC made some additional data requests that resulted from FEBC’s work on its charges. The specific requests made are given in an appendix. The committee appreciated all of the work done behind the scenes to provide as much of the data requested by the committee as possible. Some requests were not able to be granted.

The main FEBC data requests that were not granted were: (a) including race/ethnicity in demographic information about faculty [FEBC goal was to look at possible inequity in time to tenure/promotion, salary, etc.], (b) including age in demographic information about faculty [FEBC goal is to understand retirement benefit needs of the faculty], (c) obtaining data for more years into the past (salary information for past years, demographic information on faculty who left ISU, …). For (a) and (b) there was hesitation due to privacy concerns. For (a) it was suggested to coordinate with EO / Title IX office next year. For (c) the common reason given was that either the data is not maintained in a format that is easy to query, or it would be too much work to obtain many years of data. If the committee makes it request early in the fall, there may be enough time to have the discussions needed to determine whether any of this data could be obtained in future years.

**Recommendation** Charge 2018-2019 FEBC to coordinate with AAC and FAC to issue data request early in the fall.

**Recommendation** Follow up on requests for tenure extension. Specifically, obtain the precise data on which requests have been made in recent years, and determine how many faculty are aware that a tenure extension is possible in certain circumstances.

**Recommendation** Ten year running staffing report to include a row/category for Regular Faculty in each table and figure. This is a simple sum of tenured/tenure track and instructors, but is important enough that we want it to be easy to see trends.

**Recommendation** Ten year running staffing report to break down Staff into sub-categories (present report only had Executive [44 FTE in fall 2017] as a sub-category, some previous staffing reports included also the sub-categories of administrative, and professional).

**Recommendation** Ten year running staffing report to include a figure that compares categories in terms of FTE, share of total budget, and change in average salary. This may require more than one figure. This figure would answer one of the top questions that faculty have – how have different categories fared over time. Categories that should be included: tenured/tenure track, instructors, regular faculty, one year faculty, part time faculty, executive staff, administrative staff, professional staff, other staff. The figures should be such that it is easy to see how groups have compared in terms of salary growth, FTE, and total share of the budget.

**Recommendation** Determine data requests to investigate faculty retention over time – both trends in terms of retention numbers and demographics of those who leave and those who stay.

# Retirement, Charge 4

FEBC surveyed all department chairpersons (receiving a 100% response rate) to ask for thoughts on what might prevent faculty from retiring when they desired. The most common shortfall mentioned was that of healthcare. FEBC produced a one page summary that captures the most commonly mentioned issues; see the appendix “FEBC Chairperson Survey Summary”.

Based on the feedback from chairpersons, FEBC created a survey that was sent to all regular faculty. The response rate for this survey was 51%. The survey included quantitative questions and open-ended qualitative questions. A summary of the results was produced; see the appendix “FEBC regular Faculty Survey Summary”.

Based on the survey results, FEBC sent a motion to Senate Exec asking that Staff Benefits be asked to regularly visit each department on a rotating basis (e.g., each department every three years). This is viewed as a low-cost change that could have a real impact; many chairpersons and regular faculty members mentioned that some wish they had planned better for retirement. FEBC recommended the visits be to department meetings to have the highest impact – because faculty feel overworked, optional presentations would likely have low attendance and not have the desired impact. Ultimately it would be up to departments and colleges whether to require attendance (by having the visits occur at department meetings), and up to Staff Benefits to fit the visits into their schedule.

**Recommendation** Charge 2018-2019 FEBC to continue investigation of retirement benefits in coordination with the administration to recommend changes to retirement benefits would be doable and substantive. Detailed survey results and comments from chairpersons from this year can be passed on to the 2018-2019 FEBC.

**Recommendation** Charge 2018-2019 FEBC to follow up with Staff Benefits to see if they can begin visiting some departments to review retirement options and benefits.

# Gender Equity, Charge 5

One FEBC member was given access to salary data in sufficient detail to run an analysis to look for whether there is a gender gap in faculty salaries.

Based on data from 2017 salaries, the gender gap in full professor salaries is not statistically significant when controlling for years in rank and college. Average years in rank of female full professors is 6.5 years compared to 12 years for males, while average years at ISU is 20 years for female full professors and 22 years for males.

**Recommendation** Systematic examination of instructor salaries is recommended for next year. Through analysis of the salary data the FEBC can contribute to the discussion of the overall approach to be taken for future pay increases, by analyzing the impact of the approach from the past years (with target salaries using CIP and CUPA data, and the biennial review adjustments).  As in past years, the FEBC would provide broad analysis to make sure unexpected inequities are not occurring.

# Parking, Charge A

The committee sent the motion from last year, to provide free parking to temporary faculty, to the Parking Committee. Jeff Kinne attended a Parking Committee meeting to explain FEBC’s rationale. The Parking Committee considered the proposal, declined the proposal, and sent a memo explaining their rationale to FEBC and Senate Exec. The rationale included equity (all employees and students should be treated similarly) and alternate options (most locations on campus have free parking options within a half mile, there are monthly/daily options, free parking after 5pm and on weekends). FEBC contacted Staff Council to see if a joint recommendation on behalf of all employees would be possible. Staff Council Exec considered the issue and declined for reasons similar to the Parking Committee. FEBC hoped that a change could be viewed as an *employee* benefit, so that students and employees do not always have to be treated the same. Without support from Staff Council, such a proposal has little chance of being approved.

Some other options that came up in FEBC’s discussions: (i) a parking fund to defray parking costs to those in need (e.g., qualifying based on income), (ii) parking rates set as a percentage of base pay rather than the same fixed (regressive) fee for all. FEBC tried to be as thorough as possible in considering the parking issue because it has been repeatedly raised by part time and temporary faculty year after year.

**Recommendation** FEBC to discuss other concerns (e.g., space availability in the middle of the day, availability of handicap spots) with part-time faculty. Have temporary faculty advocate or other representative visit FEBC early in the fall.

**Recommendation** FEBC suggests part time employees be allowed to use payroll deduction for parking fees. 2018-2019 FEBC can follow up on whether this can be done.

# Supervising Graduate Culminating Experiences, Charge B

The committee had sent a motion to Senate Exec last year - to pay faculty $100-200 per head count per term for supervising theses / culminating experience. The recommendation was not acted upon. Within the discussion at Senate Exec last year, the question arose of how much this would cost.

This year’s FEBC decided to estimate the cost of the proposal. The Office of Registration and Records provided registration data for 699/799/899 sections for the 2016-2017 academic year; the total headcount was 259. FEBC surveyed all department chairpersons to determine if there were other course numbers that played a similar role; checking registration data for these courses gave an additional headcount of 337 for these courses. Most of the latter courses were identified as courses that were included in faculty members’ teaching load (e.g., one faculty member supervising all projects and having this count as teaching one course) and thus would not qualify for reimbursement under the FEBC proposal. Taking this into account, FEBC estimated that the headcount per year for this proposal would be around 350, resulting in a total cost of roughly $70K per year.

The motion was sent to Senate Exec again with the additional supporting data. Provost Licari explained that he could not support this proposal because it would contribute to the “de-professionalization” of the faculty. Provost Licari expressed sympathy with the issue of discrepancy in workloads and indicated he will address that issue directly with deans and chairpersons. Provost Licari explained his reasoning at the subsequent Senate meeting as well.

Given the provost’s position, FEBC should follow up in 2018-2019 to determine if there has been any action at the department and college level to address this particular workload equity issue.

**Recommendation** Charge 2018-2019 to follow up with Academic Affairs on what is being done in 2018-2019 to deal with workload equity.

# Appendix - FEBC Chairperson Survey Summary

Retirement Incentives/disincentives from the perspective of all spring 2018 Dept. Chairs.

#1. Health Insurance – At least 50% of respondents noted health insurance concerns as one of the major deterrents to retirement. While some simply mentioned “health insurance” others fleshed it out to identify issues such as the costs/gaps in coverage to reach Medicare eligibility and maintaining coverage for younger partners and/or children (due to marriage at late ages).

#2. Finances – Almost as many chairs noted faculty’s financial concerns as a deterrent to retirement. This category includes concerns about outliving savings, about stock market (& CREF) performance, about low salaries (and thus low TIAA-CREF contributions), and working to reach “full” social security eligibility (to overcome financial shortfalls). Several chairs noted that many joined the “faculty” late and are therefore not always retirement-ready or eligible at 62 or 65.

#3. Job qualities – Several chairs noted that it is the sheer enjoyment of the job keeps faculty from retiring. Faculty are on the whole intrinsically motivated and may continue to enjoy teaching and scholarship well past the point of retirement eligibility. A couple of chairs also noted the “ease” of the job (e.g., lack of strong productivity requirements in BR) motivates some faculty to retire-on-the-job and continue to draw their full salary.

Other suggestions: Some chairs identified strategies to motivate retirement without specifically identifying deterrents in the current system.

1. Facilitate faculty planning/conversations. It is evident even in the chair’s responses that many are simply unaware of what the retirement policies and options are, and some chair’s suggested that having HR initiate conversations with retirement age employees (or even before) to talk about preparations might be helpful (This author/chair notes that he has had no conversation with anyone in HR about retirement since he signed his TIAA-CREF paperwork upon hire 25 years ago). Such conversations might also allow incentives (and retirement guarantees) to be signed much earlier.
2. Phased options. Multiple chairs also observed issues with the phased retirement system. Although many faculty have taken advantage of it since its implementation, chairs have noted that the options are limited (e.g., how about allowing “blocked” activities or a terminal sabbatical) and in many ways detrimental to the department (i.e., the dept. isn’t allowed to “replace” the faculty member who is still on payroll even if duties are reduced) which may lead chairs to discourage its use and faculty to stay “full-time.”

# Appendix - FEBC regular Faculty Survey Summary

All regular faculty were sent a survey in the spring of 2018 asking the following questions: rank, age, age you *prefer* to retire at, age you *think* you will retire at, which existing[[1]](#footnote-1) or potential benefits[[2]](#footnote-2) would most help to retire at preferred age, whether financial planning would help, other comments for FEBC regarding retirement.

Summary of retirement proposals based on comments

* Healthcare - cover dependents even if not on coverage for 20 years, bridge to medicare even for those without 20 years of service, better medicare supplement for some period of time
* Social security - need to wait until full SS benefits and avoid penalty for drawing early - better phased option to bridge the gap? One mentioned they would be penalized $839 per month if retired at 62.
* Improved retirement planning - visits from HR, TIAA, (others?)
* Incentive/buyout - larger, some mentioned a 100% payout
* Phased retirement - count phased faculty as already retired in deciding on new lines
* Retain ability to do research - email, library, office, software, retain faculty computer
* Retain ability to teach - pay?, online?
* Tuition waiver for dependents - some are waiting for dependents to graduate
* Equity in retirement contributions
* Cost of living raises that meet or exceed the increased cost of healthcare

Other notes based on comments

* Some faculty are retiring before they would prefer to due to frustration with service workload, administration, etc.
* Separate remark - revisit the maximum age rule for child tuition discount, use a different mechanism to prevent abuse (e.g., available for first degree only)
* Many complained about differences in pay between departments, suggest a higher base pay for the lowest end and for instructors
* 5% of responses said they expected to retire *before* their preferred retirement age; 53% said they expected to retire within 4 years of their preferred age; 42% said the expected to retire at least 5 years later than their preferred age.
* 61% of respondents indicated financial planning seminars would be beneficial.
* Potential benefits – most popular was improved health insurance (73% said very important, 21% said important), followed by incentive to retire (44% very important, 35% said important).
* Existing benefits – most popular was health insurance (88% said very important, 8% said important), followed by phased retirement (33% very important, 42% said important)
* From HR fall 2017 snapshot of tenured/tenure track faculty, 50 are aged 60-64 with an average of 20.8 years at ISU, 55 are aged 65-69 with an average of 23.3 years at ISU, 13 are aged 70+ with an average of 30.2 years at ISU.

Summary demographic information from the respondents of the survey follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Age | 52.06 | 11.73 |
| Years taught at ISU | 14.49 | 10.55 |
| Age you *prefer* to retire | 65.33 | 5.61 |
| Age think you will *actually* retire | 68.88 | 6.6 |

The overall response rate was 51%; by rank the response rate was 31% for instructors, 50% for senior instructors, 50% assistant professors, 47% associate professors, 67% full professors.

The following data on the age of the tenured/tenure track faculty is relevant for context. The average age is roughly 53.

Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty - Fall 2017   
 Current Years of Service   
AgeRange Number Average Minimum Maximum  
25-29 3 1.7 1 3  
30-34 25 2.4 0 6  
35-39 42 3.8 0 10  
40-44 31 6.5 0 16  
45-49 47 9.7 0 23  
50-54 47 12.3 0 26  
55-59 52 15.5 0 34  
60-64 50 20.8 1 39  
65-69 55 23.3 1 42  
70-74 7 26.9 11 36  
75-79 6 34.0 19 49  
Total 365 13.7 0 49  
Source:  HR Employee Snapshot 9/25/2017

# Appendix – ISU Retirements

Data provided by Office of Human Resources. For each, the first number given is for faculty only and the second number given is a total for all employees.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *2012-2013* | *2013-2014* | *2014-2015* | *2015-2016* | *2016-2017* |
| **Retirees with Incentive Pay** | 4 / 6 | 7 / 15 | 9 / 21 | 5 / 16 | 11 / 20 |
| **Average Age** | 66.3 / 65.7 | 70.1 / 66.6 | 67.2 / 64.8 | 67.5 / 66.7 | 68.8 / 66.8 |
| **Average Years of Service** | 31.5 / 30.3 | 29.9 / 29.0 | 29.3 / 28.4 | 34.6 / 30.3 | 37.3 / 32.5 |
| **Average Incentive Pay, in $1,000** | 49.9 / 47.6 | 53.1 / 42.7 | 54.6 / 35.7 | 64.9 / 36.6 | 52.3 / 41.6 |
| **Retirees – 10 year plan** | 0 / 0 | 4 / 9 | 2 / 8 | 0 / 6 | 2 / 10 |

# Appendix – Data Requests from AAC, FAC, FEBC

Joint Data Requests From FEBC, AAC, and FAC

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Committee | Questions to be Answered | Data Being Requested | Point Person |
| AAC | 1. How are the (FTE) positions changing between faculty types? 2. How are the (FTE) positions changing between employee types? 3. How are the salaries devoted to faculty vs non-faculty changing? | The October 1 reports going as far back as is relevant. | James Gustufson |
| FAC | 1. How is promotion (from Associate to Full) impacted by race and gender? 2. How is time to promotion (from Associate to Full) impacted by race and gender? 3. How is promotion and tenure (from Assistant to Associate) impacted by race and gender? | 1. Cohorts of hired TT faculty going back as far as the data allow. 2. Promotion lists (perhaps from the archives of Faculty Honor’s Dinners) | Robert Guell |
| FEBC | 1. Are there gender and/or ethnicity inequities in salaries of faculty (accounting for and not accounting for market)? 2. Is the salary model treating faculty equitably (by race, gender, and rank)? | All of the data utilized as part of the salary model. Specifically, the data that go into creating the “target salary” (CUPA averages by CIP and rank, rank, years in rank, that are used to create the target salary), the target salary, the actual salary, race indicator, gender indicator. Lists of faculty who received BR pay increases for Contributing Exceptionally in 2013 and 2015. | Debra Israel |
| FEBC | 1. How has Section 305.15.3 been applied since its inception? | A listing of the faculty who have applied for and been granted tenure extensions. Names can be redacted. Need gender and reason (e.g. birth of a child, death of a dependent, fire, etc.) | Debra Israel |
| AAC | 1. How is SCH production distributed by faculty type. | Types: (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer, Graduate Student, non-faculty staff) | James Gustufson |

The data related to the salary model that was given to Debra Israel (not to all of FEBC) is mentioned below. FEBC requested the data for a longer time period (10 years if possible); the data received by Debra Israel was for both 2016-2017 and 2017-2018.

For the listing of faculty who have applied for tenure extensions, a list was not given. It was stated that all requests in recent years had been granted, that there were something like 5-10 in the past few years, for various reasons. It was stated that requests for tenure extensions are not kept in a single, easily accessed/summarized electronic location (i.e., no spreadsheet that covers the past 10 years).

FEBC additionally requested the following data.

1. # of faculty and staff currently on phased retirement. *Request granted: 7 faculty, 3 staff as of fall 2017.*
2. Faculty/staff composition broken down by age and # years in service. *Request partially granted: list of faculty with years in service shared with Jeff Kinne (did not include age, not shared with full FEBC), summary data shared with FEBC (# faculty in 5 year age bands, with min/max/mean years in service for each age band), the data did not include instructors.*
3. Current rank, year hired, year of change of rank, age, department and college of current faculty. *Request partially granted: data shared with Debra Israel contains most of this data.*
4. Total # of part time faculty for each term in the past 2 years. *Request granted: 184 in spring 2016, 176 in fall 2016, 182 in spring 2017, 223 in fall 2017.*
5. List of all current regular faculty with email address (used for sending survey to all regular faculty). *Request granted: list shared with Jeff Kinne to use for survey of regular faculty.*
6. # of retirements broken down by age and # years in service. *Request not granted: request made too late in the spring.*

For the data request for the salary model data, a spreadsheet was shared with Debra Israel with the following information. The spreadsheet was not shared with FEBC as a whole.

* Demographic information
  + College, Department, Full Name, Gender, JobsTitle AF, Term Degree DN (Y/N), Degree DL (which degree and date), Current Hire Date, Years of Service, CIP Code, Rank Date, Years in Rank, Tenure (Y/N), Tenure Date. *A separate file sent to Debra Israel contained race/ethnicity data.*
* Computation of year’s salary if no adjustments
  + 8/1/17 Base Salary less Chair Suppl and BR Perf Adj
  + Chair and Dir Supplement (not part of Base Salary and receives ATB)
  + Base salary used for Target Calc
  + 1.25% ATB increase (cost of living increase, depends on the year)
  + Equity Adjustments
  + 2013 BR Perf Adj
  + 2015 BR Perf Adj
  + 2017 BR Perf Adj
* Computation of target salary
  + Comparison Group Average Salaries
    - CUPA 8000 -12000 Student Population -Public - No Community Colleges - Exclude East & West Coast
    - CUPA 100M-350M Operating Budget Doctoral Intensive Public - Exclude East & West Coast
    - CUPA 100M-350M All Public-NO Comm Colleges - Exclude East & West Coast
    - CUPA NSFF 2017 All Doctoral Institutions
    - CUPA NSFF Public Doctoral
    - CUPA NSFF Midwest Regions All
  + Average of Comparison Group Median Salaries (if 2 or 3 reporting in peers 1-3, use 1-3 only, otherwise include 1-6 in average calculation)
  + Target Salary (90% of average of comparison group, adjusted up 2% per year in rank [up to 6 years for assistant and associate professor, up to 10 years for full professor])
* TARGET Adjustment needed to bring Base Salary to 93% of Target (no target adj for less than $500)
* 12/1/17 Base Salary (Includes 1.25% ATB, Target, Equity, and 2013, 2015 and 2017 BR Adj)

1. Ability to use phased retirement, health insurance coverage for yourself, health insurance coverage for dependents, tuition discount for family member(s), use of library services, use of recreation services, transition counseling, other (specify) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Incentive to retire early, improved health insurance coverage for yourself, improved health insurance coverage for family member(s), tuition discount for family member(s) after retirement, being able to retire before 20 years of service at ISU if at retirement age, improved phase retirement options, other (specify) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)