Introduction

The University of Tennessee System engaged Sibson Consulting to conduct an external market competitiveness assessment across the system. This assessment includes the following populations:

- **Board-Elected Executive Staff**: System-wide administrators (e.g., President, Chancellors)
- **Chief Executive / Executive Staff**: President’s staff and other senior-level positions (e.g., Vice Chancellors, Associate Vice Chancellors, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, and Executive Directors)
- **Faculty**
- **Staff**

The market assessment was conducted using the peer and aspirant groups approved by the Board of Trustees on August 4, 2017.

The staff assessment will be conducted in the second half of 2018. Additionally, UTHSC faculty will be assessed separately due to the complexity of their compensation packages and market surveys sources.

This report presents the market assessment results for the executive staff and faculty.

---

1 Peer and aspirant group details can be found in Appendix IV. Given the lack of participation of System peers (for University Administration), each System’s flagship was used to gather CUPA-HR market data.
Interpreting Market Data Results

- Many institutions target the market median *in the aggregate* in order to remain “competitive”
- However it is important to keep in mind that market data are often a guide to be used when making compensation decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT MARKET DATA TELL US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Indicate a <strong>range</strong> for the value of a job in the identified market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Represent the <strong>cost to hire</strong> an employee in the market from which the organization recruits talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrate <strong>trends</strong> in compensation year-over-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Are not a precise number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Do not represent changes to the <strong>cost of living</strong> within a market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Do not represent the appropriate <strong>pay rate for every individual</strong> in a job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Individual relationships to the market may also vary based on the characteristics of the individual such as skills, knowledge, experience, and performance
- Our analysis does not assess appropriateness of competitiveness at an individual level. It may or may not be appropriate for someone to be paid at or near the 25th, 50th, or 75th percentile based on the factors noted above
Understanding Percentiles

- Sibson uses percentiles in reviewing market pay ranges as these values are less affected by outliers on the high- and low-ends (as opposed to the average).

- A percentile is a measurement indicating the relative positioning within a group of observations.
  - As an example, the 20th percentile is the value below which 20% of the observations may be found.
  - If a value is at the 86th percentile, for example, it is higher than 86% of the data points.
  - Percentiles do **not** signify a percent of the target market position (e.g., 75% of target).

- While analyzing percentiles, it is important to keep in mind that a number of factors that may affect pay levels at other institutions are unknown, including compensation philosophy and demographic breakdown. A competitive range from the 25th to 75th percentiles typically provides a strong comparison of competitiveness despite unknown circumstances. Another way to look at a competitive range might be plus or minus 15% of a specific target (e.g., plus or minus the 50th percentile).

An illustrative example is included on the following slide for more clarification on percentiles.
Understanding Percentiles

Illustrative Example

Consider eleven raw data points for a single position at eleven institutions. Note that the hypothetical salary points provided below could represent a single individual at an institution or an average of multiple incumbents in the same role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Salary Data Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>$35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>$38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution H</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution I</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution J</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution K</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMONLY USED COMPETITIVE MARKET RANGE

1 Calculated as the average of the 20th and 30th percentiles
2 Calculated as the average of the 70th and 80th percentiles
Understanding Percentiles

General Guidelines for Placement within Range

Our analysis does not assess appropriateness of competitiveness at an individual level. It may or may not be appropriate for someone to be paid at or near the 25th, 50th, or 75th percentiles based on the following general guidelines:

25th Percentile
- New to job/rank
- Little or no prior experience at present level in similar organization / institution
- Demonstrated potential but still unproven in role

50th Percentile
- Effectively performs job duties
- Works well with various functional areas and is able to make decisions independently, or with minimal support
- Positively impacts the institution and supports its goals
- Demonstrates aptitude for advanced level and long-term promise

75th Percentile
- Accomplished professional with proven performance record
- Experienced in the job/rank with unique capabilities
- Demonstrated ability to perform under many circumstances
- Adaptable skills and abilities suggest continuation of high performance into the future

Sibson Consulting
# Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Board-Elected Executive Staff** | - The President’s base salary is 97% of the market median, with total remuneration at 110% of the median  
                                 - The UTK Chancellor’s competitiveness for base salary and total remuneration are similar for both the peer (92% and 86% of the median) and aspirant groups (91% and 87% of the median)  
                                 - The most prevalent perquisites / benefits include housing and/or automobile use / allowance  
                                 - Individual competitiveness varies by position, but many Board-elected executives are between the market 25th and 75th percentiles compared to the peer group and peer & aspirant group |
| **Chief Executive / Executive Staff** | - In the aggregate, chief executive / executive staff are at 99% of both the peer group and peer & aspirant group market median  
                                 - Chattanooga is the most competitive in both comparison groups while Martin is the least competitive in both comparison groups  
                                 - Knoxville’s competitiveness remains the same when including aspirants in the comparison group, but Martin’s competitive decreases slightly while Chattanooga’s competitiveness decreases more significantly  
                                 - Over half of in-scope positions are below the market median of both comparison groups |
| **Faculty**             | - In the aggregate, faculty are at 102% of the peer group and 100% of the peer & aspirant group  
                                 - Aggregate competitiveness varies by entity, with all entities between 93% (Institute of Agriculture) and 109% (Chattanooga) of the median for the peer group  
                                 - Adding the aspirants into the comparison group has limited impact on market competitiveness in the aggregate, which decreases from 102% to 100%; competitiveness for each entity changes by zero to five percentage points  
                                 - There is less variability in competitiveness by rank (as compared to entity); Professors and Instructors are the most competitive to market at 104% of the median for the peer group. As with the results by entity, competitiveness for each rank only changes by two to three percentage points when adding aspirants  
                                 - While aggregate competitiveness is very close to the market median, individual distribution tends to be bifurcated, with a group of individuals below the 25th percentile and a group of individuals above the 75th percentile |
1. **Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment**

2. Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment

3. Faculty Market Assessment

4. Appendix
Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment
Methodology—System President and UTK Chancellor

Data for the System President and UTK Chancellor market assessment were gathered from The Chronicle of Higher Education Executive Compensation database\(^1\) (“the Chronicle”) for Fiscal Year 2015-2016, which reports multiple compensation elements including base salary, bonus / incentive, and retirement and deferred compensation.

Market data were annualized (for partial-year incumbents) and aged to July 1, 2018 using a 2.7% annual update factor for base salary, incentives, other compensation, and retirement & deferred compensation, and an 8% update factor for non-taxable benefits.\(^2\) UT salaries are effective July 1, 2017 with several updates effective May 1, 2018.

Key Compensation Terms Presented

- **Total Cash Compensation (TCC):** Reflects the sum of base salary and bonus / incentive compensation
- **Total Remuneration (TR):** Reflects the sum of total cash compensation, other taxable compensation, retirement and deferred compensation, and nontaxable benefits

Analyses Presented

1. **Total Remuneration Summary:** Market levels for all components of pay; includes medians as well as other percentiles

2. **Pay Mix:** Mix of cash and non-cash compensation in the market

\(^1\) The Chronicle database includes public doctoral universities in the United States and all state college and university systems or governing boards with at least three campuses and 50,000 total students.

\(^2\) Source: Sibson’s Annual Compensation Planning Survey analyzing salary increase budgets by industry and job classification.
### TOTAL REMUNERATION - PEER GROUP DATA DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Bonus &amp; Incentive Compensation</th>
<th>Total Cash Compensation</th>
<th>Other Compensation</th>
<th>Retirement &amp; Deferred Compensation</th>
<th>Non-Taxable Benefits</th>
<th>Total Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT System President – Joseph DiPietro</td>
<td>$539,011</td>
<td>$101,816</td>
<td>$640,827</td>
<td>$48,530</td>
<td>$40,403</td>
<td>$15,096</td>
<td>$744,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,714</td>
<td>$12,002</td>
<td>$715,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University at New Brunswick</td>
<td>$691,495</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$691,495</td>
<td>$131,682</td>
<td>$22,360</td>
<td>$3,013</td>
<td>$848,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University System</td>
<td>$534,202</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$534,202</td>
<td>$2,793</td>
<td>$36,216</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$573,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama System</td>
<td>$702,353</td>
<td>$109,281</td>
<td>$811,634</td>
<td>$14,363</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$825,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado System</td>
<td>$378,753</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$378,753</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,453</td>
<td>$392,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois System</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,289</td>
<td>$13,697</td>
<td>$679,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts System</td>
<td>$557,993</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$557,993</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$93,466</td>
<td>$32,513</td>
<td>$683,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri System</td>
<td>$500,387</td>
<td>$105,473</td>
<td>$605,860</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,453</td>
<td>$13,281</td>
<td>$661,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska System Office</td>
<td>$506,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$506,270</td>
<td>$21,095</td>
<td>$68,346</td>
<td>$12,345</td>
<td>$608,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Percentile</td>
<td>$506,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$534,202</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,360</td>
<td>$3,013</td>
<td>$608,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$557,993</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$605,860</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$36,216</td>
<td>$12,345</td>
<td>$679,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$14,363</td>
<td>$68,346</td>
<td>$13,453</td>
<td>$715,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th Percentile</td>
<td>$693,667</td>
<td>$106,235</td>
<td>$715,523</td>
<td>$43,212</td>
<td>$75,265</td>
<td>$17,460</td>
<td>$830,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Median</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rank</td>
<td>40th</td>
<td>87th</td>
<td>77th</td>
<td>91st</td>
<td>58th</td>
<td>88th</td>
<td>78th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data were gathered from The Chronicle of Higher Education Executive Compensation database for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. Data was aged, annualized, and adjusted (if appropriate) by Sibson.
2 Includes non-accountable expense allowance.
The President’s base salary is 97% of the peer group median and total remuneration is at 110% of the peer group median.

- Two out of the nine peers offered incentives at an average of 18% of base salary, which is aligned with the President’s incentive.

- Two out of the nine peers also offered deferred compensation at an average value of approximately $76,000.

### PAY MIX: CASH VS. NON-CASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cash Compensation</th>
<th>Non-Cash Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Average</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=9)
# Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment

## UTK Chancellor

### TOTAL REMUNERATION - PEER GROUP DATA DETAILS\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Bonus &amp; Incentive Compensation</th>
<th>Total Cash Compensation</th>
<th>Other Compensation</th>
<th>Retirement &amp; Deferred Compensation</th>
<th>Non-Taxable Benefits</th>
<th>Total Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTK Chancellor</td>
<td>$585,000</td>
<td>$87,775(^2)</td>
<td>$672,775</td>
<td>$41,550(^3)</td>
<td>$24,900(^4)</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$749,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>$567,449</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$567,449</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$298,066</td>
<td>$8,505</td>
<td>$874,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>$823,186</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$823,186</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,833</td>
<td>$15,504</td>
<td>$964,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>$554,963</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$554,963</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$280,220</td>
<td>$21,096</td>
<td>$856,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,714</td>
<td>$12,002</td>
<td>$715,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>$622,290</td>
<td>$211,737</td>
<td>$834,027</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,475</td>
<td>$6,399</td>
<td>$888,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>$681,023</td>
<td>$110,011</td>
<td>$791,034</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$791,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$833,236</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$833,236</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$492,031</td>
<td>$52,340</td>
<td>$1,377,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri at Columbia</td>
<td>$664,479</td>
<td>$60,120</td>
<td>$724,599</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$171,432</td>
<td>$13,195</td>
<td>$909,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Lincoln</td>
<td>$388,648</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$388,648</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,375</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$410,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina at Columbia</td>
<td>$684,877</td>
<td>$105,473</td>
<td>$790,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$166,236</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$956,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$542,746</td>
<td>$26,368</td>
<td>$569,114</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$236,490</td>
<td>$26,447</td>
<td>$832,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Percentile</td>
<td>$561,206</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$568,281</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$59,595</td>
<td>$3,199</td>
<td>$811,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$632,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$724,599</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$166,236</td>
<td>$12,002</td>
<td>$874,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
<td>$682,950</td>
<td>$82,796</td>
<td>$807,110</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$258,355</td>
<td>$18,300</td>
<td>$932,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th Percentile</td>
<td>$823,186</td>
<td>$110,011</td>
<td>$833,236</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$298,066</td>
<td>$26,447</td>
<td>$964,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Median</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rank</td>
<td>33(^{rd})</td>
<td>76(^{th})</td>
<td>44(^{th})</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>11(^{th})</td>
<td>45(^{th})</td>
<td>14(^{th})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) Data were gathered from The Chronicle of Higher Education Executive Compensation database for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. Data was aged, annualized, and adjusted (if appropriate) by Sibson.

\(^{2}\) Incentive compensation is not guaranteed.

\(^{3}\) Includes non-accountable expense allowance.

\(^{4}\) Deferred compensation is limited by Tennessee state law.
### TOTAL REMUNERATION - ASPIRANT GROUP DATA DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Bonus &amp; Incentive Compensation</th>
<th>Total Cash Compensation</th>
<th>Other Compensation</th>
<th>Retirement &amp; Deferred Compensation</th>
<th>Non-Taxable Benefits</th>
<th>Total Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTK Chancellor</td>
<td>$585,000</td>
<td>$87,775</td>
<td>$672,775</td>
<td>$41,550</td>
<td>$24,900</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
<td>$749,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>$791,047</td>
<td>$105,473</td>
<td>$896,520</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$79,105</td>
<td>$11,895</td>
<td>$987,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University at West Lafayette</td>
<td>$442,986</td>
<td>$119,606</td>
<td>$562,592</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,950</td>
<td>$26,161</td>
<td>$616,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>$910,542</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$910,542</td>
<td>$75,319</td>
<td>$230,261</td>
<td>$21,177</td>
<td>$1,237,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>$624,254</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$624,254</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$247,599</td>
<td>$5,312</td>
<td>$877,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>$659,469</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$659,469</td>
<td>$1,266</td>
<td>$194,545</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$855,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Madison</td>
<td>$527,312</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$527,312</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$84,859</td>
<td>$20,375</td>
<td>$632,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Percentile</td>
<td>$551,547</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$578,008</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,543</td>
<td>$6,958</td>
<td>$688,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$641,862</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$641,862</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$139,702</td>
<td>$16,135</td>
<td>$866,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile</td>
<td>$758,152</td>
<td>$79,105</td>
<td>$837,257</td>
<td>$949</td>
<td>$221,332</td>
<td>$20,977</td>
<td>$959,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th Percentile</td>
<td>$850,795</td>
<td>$112,540</td>
<td>$903,335</td>
<td>$38,292</td>
<td>$238,930</td>
<td>$23,669</td>
<td>$1,112,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Median</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Rank</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>61st</td>
<td>91st</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>31st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Data were gathered from The Chronicle of Higher Education Executive Compensation database for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. Data was aged, annualized, and adjusted (if appropriate) by Sibson.
2. Incentive compensation is not guaranteed.
3. Includes non-accountable expense allowance.
4. Deferred compensation is limited by Tennessee state law.
The Chancellor’s competitiveness for base salary and total remuneration are similar for both the peer (92% and 86% of the median) and aspirant groups (91% and 87% of the median).

However, due to the small size of the aspirant group, the Chancellor’s pay positioning is higher than the peer group for Total Remuneration (14th vs. 31st percentile).

Five out of the eleven peers offered incentives at an average of 16% of base salary; two out of six aspirants offered incentives at an average of 20% of base salary.

Six out of eleven peers also offered deferred compensation at an average value of approximately $208,000; three out of six aspirants offered deferred compensation at an average value of approximately $181,000.
The most prevalent perquisites/benefits include housing and automobile use or allowance; the System President and the UTK Chancellor are provided with a housing allowance.

The Board-Elected Executive Staff are also provided a non-accountable expense allowance and other perquisites (e.g., cell phone allowance).

---

The perquisites reported above only include categories reported by The Chronicle of Higher Education. The value of these and other benefits and perquisites (both taxable and non-taxable) is now reported for the first time by the Chronicle, and is included as part of Total Remuneration in this report. However, based on our review of the data, and our experience conducting similar studies, we believe that many respondents are not reporting the full value of these perquisites in their data submissions to the Chronicle.
Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment

Methodology

1. Survey Sources: Selected quality, credible survey sources that have appropriate scope cuts to reflect appropriate talent markets, and sufficient data points for survey matches selected. Data were gathered from the 2017-18 CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) National Administrator Salary Survey.

2. Comparison Markets: The assessment incorporates several different comparison markets, including peer and aspirant institutions approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. Match Selection: UT selected survey matches based on the content of the job, not the title. As there is little likelihood of a perfect match, a survey match is considered appropriate if approximately 70% of the job content and requirements align.

4. Data Adjustments: Market data were aged to July 1, 2018 using an aging factor of 2.7%. UT Board-elected executive staff salaries are effective July 1, 2017 with several updates effective May 1, 2018.

5. Benchmark and Non-Benchmark Jobs: Many of the jobs provided by UT were matched to survey data; these are referred to as benchmark jobs. In some cases, there is not reliable data in the market for particular jobs; these are referred to as non-benchmark jobs.

---

1 Source: Sibson’s Annual Compensation Planning Survey analyzing salary increase budgets by industry and job classification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>UT Annual Salary</th>
<th>Matched?</th>
<th>Data Available?</th>
<th>25th PCTL.</th>
<th>50th PCTL.</th>
<th>75th PCTL.</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
<th>Positioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Angle</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTC</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>$336,728</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$294,235</td>
<td>$326,067</td>
<td>$343,232</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Between 50th and 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schwab</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTHSC</td>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>$631,630</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Cross</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTIA</td>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$342,021</td>
<td>$356,691</td>
<td>$397,722</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Below 25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Carver</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTM</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$280,233</td>
<td>$298,454</td>
<td>$330,992</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Between 50th and 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonja Johnson</td>
<td>EVP &amp; COO</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$344,328</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$284,827</td>
<td>$346,093</td>
<td>$453,585</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Patterson</td>
<td>VP-Research</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$310,720</td>
<td>$328,172</td>
<td>$332,663</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Below 25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Mizell</td>
<td>Secretary-Board of Trustees</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$250,380</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Scoggins</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Maples</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$221,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>VP-Dev &amp; Alumni Affrs</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>$318,3241</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$290,219</td>
<td>$320,848</td>
<td>$341,358</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Represents prior incumbent’s salary.
### Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment

**CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>UT Annual Salary</th>
<th>Matched?</th>
<th>Data Available?</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
<th>Positioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Angle</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTC</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>$336,728</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$297,986</td>
<td>$342,590</td>
<td>$361,616</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schwab</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTHSC</td>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>$631,630</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$515,047</td>
<td>$767,311</td>
<td>$883,669</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Cross</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTIA</td>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$323,815</td>
<td>$366,660</td>
<td>$396,716</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Carver</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTM</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$282,982</td>
<td>$330,824</td>
<td>$351,501</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Between 25th and 50th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer Group Findings

- All of the executives with market data are close to the 50th percentile; all are between 91-103% of the median

### Peer & Aspirant Group Findings

- The UTHSC Chancellor is at 82% of the market median
- When adding the aspirants to the market group, competitiveness decreases somewhat for the Chattanooga and Institute of Agriculture Chancellors, and more significantly for the Martin Chancellor

---

1 University Administration positions are excluded from this exhibit since the entity does not have a CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group.

2 Market results average CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group data and AAHC survey data.
1. Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment
2. Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment
3. Faculty Market Assessment
4. Appendix
Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment

Methodology

1. **Survey Sources**: Selected quality, credible survey sources that have appropriate scope cuts to reflect appropriate talent markets, and sufficient data points for survey matches selected. Data were gathered from the 2017-18 CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) National Administrator Salary Survey.

2. **Comparison Markets**: The assessment incorporates several different comparison markets, including peer and aspirant institutions approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. **Match Selection**: UT selected survey matches based on the content of the job, not the title. As there is little likelihood of a perfect match, a survey match is considered appropriate if approximately 70% of the job content and requirements align.

4. **Data Adjustments**: Market data were aged to July 1, 2018 using an aging factor of 2.7%\(^1\). UT chief executive / executive staff salaries are effective February 1, 2018 with several updates effective May 1, 2018.

5. **Benchmark and Non-Benchmark Jobs**: Many of the jobs provided by UT were matched to survey data; these are referred to as benchmark jobs. In some cases, there is not reliable data in the market for particular jobs; these are referred to as non-benchmark jobs.

---

\(^1\) Source: Sibson’s Annual Compensation Planning Survey analyzing salary increase budgets by industry and job classification.
Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment
CUPA-HR Peer Group

- The overall aggregate relationship to market median (50th percentile) provides a high-level perspective on competitiveness but does not necessarily mean that specific entities and/or individual staff members are paid appropriately.

- Aggregate competitiveness varies with Martin at 91% of the median, Knoxville at 95% of the median, and Chattanooga at 133% of the median.

### AGGREGATE MARKET COMPETITIVENESS BY ENTITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$2,329,745</td>
<td>$1,586,039</td>
<td>$1,752,276</td>
<td>$1,929,393</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Public Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$7,147,021</td>
<td>$6,571,151</td>
<td>$7,493,457</td>
<td>$8,199,968</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$1,506,492</td>
<td>$1,515,933</td>
<td>$1,648,700</td>
<td>$1,728,413</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,667,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,476,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,801,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,860,537</strong></td>
<td><strong>111%</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>91%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment
CUPA-HR Peer Group

- The exhibit below shows the percent of incumbents at various market percentiles by entity; individual positioning is dependent upon the characteristics of each incumbent such as experience, length of service, contribution, performance, etc.

- In alignment with aggregate competitiveness, Chattanooga has the majority of its incumbents above the 75th percentile (77%)

- Knoxville is more evenly distributed across the different percentiles, while Martin has the majority of its incumbents below the 25th percentile (62%)

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETITIVENESS BY ENTITY¹**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga (n=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Center (n=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Public Service (n=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture (n=1)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville (n=30)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (n=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration (n=3)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
² Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment
CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group

- Aggregate competitiveness for all entities together is the same for both the peer and peer & aspirant groups at 99% of the median
- The Health Science Center is at 100% of the median
- Knoxville competitiveness remains the same when including aspirants in the comparison group, but Chattanooga’s competitiveness decreases from 133% to 120% of the market median and Martin’s competitiveness decreases from 91% to 89% of the market median

**AGGREGATE MARKET COMPETITIVENESS BY ENTITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$2,788,580</td>
<td>$2,064,163</td>
<td>$2,332,434</td>
<td>$2,698,912</td>
<td>135%</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$2,242,929</td>
<td>$1,769,231</td>
<td>$2,250,117</td>
<td>$2,865,974</td>
<td>127%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>$7,325,066</td>
<td>$6,852,735</td>
<td>$7,686,633</td>
<td>$8,548,236</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$2,049,107</td>
<td>$2,113,330</td>
<td>$2,297,918</td>
<td>$2,450,099</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$13,396,617</td>
<td>$12,036,426</td>
<td>$13,565,034</td>
<td>$15,181,907</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Institute for Public Service and University Administration positions are excluded from this exhibit since the entities do not have a CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group.
2. Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
3. Market results average CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group and AAHC survey data.
Competitiveness varies by entity; however, the majority of incumbents fall below the market median (60%).

Aggregate individual distribution is similar for both comparison groups.

**INDIVIDUAL DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETITIVENESS BY ENTITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga (n=16)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture (n=2)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville (n=31)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin (n=18)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Institute for Public Service and University Administration positions are excluded from this exhibit since the entities do not have a CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group.
2. Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
3. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
4. Market results average CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group and AAHC survey data.
1. Board-Elected Executive Staff Market Assessment
2. Chief Executive / Executive Staff Market Assessment
3. Faculty Market Assessment
4. Appendix
Faculty Market Assessment

Methodology

1. **Survey Sources**: Selected quality, credible survey sources that have appropriate scope cuts to reflect talent markets, and sufficient data points for any survey match selected. Data were gathered from the 2017-18 CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) National Four-Year Faculty Salary Survey.

2. **Comparison Markets**: Survey comparison markets were selected that align with the talent pool or labor market for each entity at UT. The assessment incorporates talent markets identified by UT and approved by the Board of Trustees, including Peer Groups and Peer & Aspirant Groups.

3. **Tenure-Status Data**: CUPA-HR offers data that is tenure-specific (i.e., tenured and tenure-track vs. non-tenure track teaching) or combined (i.e., tenured and tenure-track plus non-tenure track teaching together). The assessment uses combined data in order to increase market coverage and based on the fact that the average combined data is very similar to the tenure-specific data for each CUPA-HR comparison market and tenure status.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Additional details on tenure-status data can be found in Appendix V.
4. **Match Selection:** Faculty were matched using their rank\(^1\) and Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code published by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics using the 4-digit code (which define intermediate groupings of programs that have comparable content and objectives). If data were not available using the 4-digit code for the *combined tenure-status* peer groups, the 2-digit (i.e., aggregate) CIP code was used.

**Example:** 01.04 Agricultural and Food Products Processing: A program that prepares individuals to receive, inspect, store, process, and package agricultural products in the form of human food consumables, animal or plant food, or other industrial products.

01 Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences: Instructional programs that focus on agriculture and related sciences and that prepare individuals to apply specific knowledge, methods, and techniques to the management and performance of agricultural operations.

5. **Data Adjustments:** The following adjustments were made to the survey data:

- Market data were aged to July 1, 2018 using an aging factor of 2.7%.\(^2\) UT’s faculty salaries are effective August 1, 2017.
- CUPA-HR data reports base salary for a 9- to 10-month term; data were adjusted by a factor of 1.22 as recommended by CUPA-HR to account for any UT faculty members with 11- to 12-month terms.

6. **UT Pay Components:** This assessment includes only faculty salaries provided by UT; administrative pay, stipends, etc. were excluded to the extent possible.

---

\(^1\) Note: Lecturers are excluded from this assessment given the high degree of variability in experience and responsibilities at that rank.

\(^2\) Source: Sibson’s Annual Compensation Planning Survey analyzing salary increase budgets by industry and job classification.
Faculty Market Assessment
Aggregate Results by Entity: CUPA-HR Peer Group

- In the aggregate for all entities, UT is at 102% of the median
- Aggregate competitiveness varies by entity, with all entities between 93% (Institute of Agriculture) and 109% (Chattanooga) of the median
- Individual competitiveness varies, with approximately 20-30% of faculty in each percentile grouping

### COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Inc. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$27,712,370</td>
<td>$24,082,805</td>
<td>$25,454,153</td>
<td>$26,936,794</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agri</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$29,273,576</td>
<td>$28,558,746</td>
<td>$31,585,240</td>
<td>$34,326,444</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$121,451,507</td>
<td>$108,628,307</td>
<td>$116,551,886</td>
<td>$125,803,213</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$11,679,166</td>
<td>$11,689,815</td>
<td>$12,192,011</td>
<td>$13,125,410</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,116,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>$172,959,673</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185,783,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200,191,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>110%</strong></td>
<td><strong>102%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Aggregate Results by Entity: CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group

- Adding the aspirants into the comparison group has limited impact on market competitiveness in the aggregate, which decreases from 102% to 100%
- Competitiveness for each entity only changes by zero to five percentage points
- Aggregate distribution of competitiveness is fairly similar to the peer group for most entities; however, individual competitiveness does decrease in some instances

### COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Incumbents</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Aggregate Spend

| Entity                  | # of Incs. | % of Incs. Priced | UT Aggregate Spend | 25th PCTL | 50th PCTL | 75th PCTL | % to 25th PCTL | % to 50th PCTL | % to 75th PCTL |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Chattanooga             | 384        | 93%               | $30,192,233        | $27,074,872 | $29,110,066 | $31,402,437 | 112%           | 104%           | 96%            |
| Institute of Agriculture| 261        | 100%              | $29,273,576        | $28,418,652 | $31,642,611 | $34,643,410 | 103%           | 93%            | 84%            |
| Knoxville               | 1,217      | 96%               | $127,215,105       | $115,118,567 | $125,910,251 | $136,680,771 | 111%           | 101%           | 93%            |
| Martin                  | 237        | 94%               | $15,631,299        | $15,331,388 | $16,318,238 | $17,264,129 | 102%           | 96%            | 91%            |
| TOTAL                   | 2,099      | 96%               | $202,312,213       | $185,943,480 | $202,981,166 | $219,990,746 | 109%           | 100%           | 92%            |

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Aggregate Results By Rank: CUPA-HR Peer Group

- There is less variability in competitiveness by rank (as compared to entity)
- Professors and Instructors are the most competitive to market at 104% of the median

![Chart showing comparison of base salary by rank and percentile]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$90,309,841</td>
<td>$80,517,642</td>
<td>$86,664,245</td>
<td>$94,194,768</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$49,449,076</td>
<td>$45,787,256</td>
<td>$48,323,261</td>
<td>$51,263,805</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$46,665,482</td>
<td>$43,276,582</td>
<td>$47,244,979</td>
<td>$50,621,992</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>$3,692,222</td>
<td>$3,378,193</td>
<td>$3,550,806</td>
<td>$4,111,296</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$190,116,620</td>
<td>$172,959,673</td>
<td>$185,783,290</td>
<td>$200,191,860</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
As with the results by entity, competitiveness for each rank only changed by two to three percentage points by adding aspirants to the comparison group.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer Group

CHATTANOOGA—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$12,742,284</td>
<td>$10,799,738</td>
<td>$11,333,693</td>
<td>$12,056,160</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$6,394,101</td>
<td>$5,541,073</td>
<td>$5,872,810</td>
<td>$6,170,114</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$7,886,838</td>
<td>$7,084,608</td>
<td>$7,532,523</td>
<td>$7,942,283</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$689,148</td>
<td>$657,386</td>
<td>$715,127</td>
<td>$768,236</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$27,712,370</td>
<td>$24,082,805</td>
<td>$25,454,153</td>
<td>$26,936,794</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
### CHATTANOOGA—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Incumbents¹</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

### Market Aggregate Spend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$14,088,596</td>
<td>$12,342,566</td>
<td>$13,298,731</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$6,394,101</td>
<td>$5,724,711</td>
<td>$6,180,274</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>$9,020,389</td>
<td>$8,332,720</td>
<td>$8,887,349</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$689,148</td>
<td>$674,874</td>
<td>$743,713</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,192,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,074,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,110,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>112%</strong></td>
<td><strong>104%</strong></td>
<td><strong>96%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer Group

INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

Percent of Incumbents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% of Incs.</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$13,947,041</td>
<td>$13,750,939</td>
<td>$15,098,390</td>
<td>$16,642,618</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$6,447,247</td>
<td>$7,006,889</td>
<td>$7,490,818</td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$8,606,763</td>
<td>$7,915,691</td>
<td>$9,207,328</td>
<td>$9,888,918</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$29,273,576</td>
<td>$28,558,746</td>
<td>$31,585,240</td>
<td>$34,326,444</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
2 Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group

INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Incumbents</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
2 Results not displayed if fewer than five incumbents benchmarked.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer Group

KNOXVILLE—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Incumbents</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>Knoxville as a % of Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group

KNOXVILLE—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Incumbents</th>
<th>Below 25th</th>
<th>Between 25th and 50th</th>
<th>Between 50th and 75th</th>
<th>Above 75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>Knoxville as a % of Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Aggregate Spend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th PCTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th PCTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th PCTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to 25th PCTL</td>
<td>% to 50th PCTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$62,575,101</td>
<td>$54,884,753</td>
<td>$60,466,793</td>
<td>$66,791,850</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$34,568,382</td>
<td>$32,215,908</td>
<td>$34,606,689</td>
<td>$36,838,850</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>$28,124,652</td>
<td>$26,272,711</td>
<td>$29,012,030</td>
<td>$30,912,867</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,946,969</td>
<td>$1,745,195</td>
<td>$1,824,740</td>
<td>$2,137,199</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>$127,215,105</td>
<td>$115,118,567</td>
<td>$125,910,251</td>
<td>$136,680,771</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer Group

MARTIN—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$4,621,874</td>
<td>$4,676,803</td>
<td>$4,929,676</td>
<td>$5,290,572</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$4,226,484</td>
<td>$4,277,171</td>
<td>$4,441,304</td>
<td>$4,688,380</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$2,047,229</td>
<td>$2,011,730</td>
<td>$2,070,069</td>
<td>$2,355,877</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>$783,579</td>
<td>$724,111</td>
<td>$750,962</td>
<td>$790,581</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$11,679,166</td>
<td>$11,689,815</td>
<td>$12,192,011</td>
<td>$13,125,410</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Faculty Market Assessment
Results By Entity & Rank: CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Group

MARTIN—COMPARISON OF BASE SALARY

Percent of Incumbents¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced</th>
<th>UT Aggregate Spend</th>
<th>25th PCTL</th>
<th>50th PCTL</th>
<th>75th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 25th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 50th PCTL</th>
<th>% to 75th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>$6,203,397</td>
<td>$6,209,651</td>
<td>$6,911,071</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$5,419,403</td>
<td>$5,269,237</td>
<td>$5,864,864</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$3,194,316</td>
<td>$3,118,531</td>
<td>$3,649,342</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$814,182</td>
<td>$733,968</td>
<td>$838,852</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>$15,631,299</td>
<td>$15,331,388</td>
<td>$17,264,129</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
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I. UT President and UTK Chancellor Compensation Details

Data Sources and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation Component</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>University of Tennessee System President</th>
<th>University of Tennessee – Knoxville Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Salary</strong></td>
<td>Total base salary provided to the chief executive, including compensation from private university-related foundations</td>
<td>$539,011</td>
<td>$585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus and Incentive Compensation</strong></td>
<td>The value of all bonuses and incentive compensation paid out to the chief executive</td>
<td>$101,816</td>
<td>$87,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Compensation (Taxable)</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous pay and benefits, including, tax gross-ups (money an employer provides an employee for taxes paid on benefits), vacation leave cashed out, debt forgiveness, fellowships, employer-provided vehicles and parking, housing payments, travel, meals, moving expenses, entertainment, spending accounts, and club dues. May also include interest accrued on deferred compensation.</td>
<td>$48,530</td>
<td>$41,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retirement and Deferred Compensation</strong></td>
<td>Payments made by the university on behalf of the chief executive to a retirement plan that is available to any university employee during the fiscal year. This can include 401(k) plans, state pension plans, and other retirement plans that are broadly available plus deferred compensation set aside in the fiscal year covered that is to be paid out in future years. This includes contributions to supplemental executive retirement plans and does not overlap with any compensation paid out in the reported year.</td>
<td>$40,403</td>
<td>$24,900(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nontaxable Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Health and medical benefits, life insurance, housing provided by the employer, personal legal and financial services, dependent care, adoption assistance, tuition assistance, and cafeteria plans.</td>
<td>$15,096</td>
<td>$10,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Deferred compensation is limited by Tennessee state law.
II. How to Read and Interpret Exhibits

*Relationship to Market*

The chart illustrates how an institution’s salaries are compared to the market:

1. Total all base salaries for incumbents included in a particular group
2. Total all the market base salaries for incumbents included in that group
3. Divide the total institution salaries from Step 1 by the total market salaries from Step 2 to obtain a percentage (i.e., UT as a percent of market)

**EXAMPLE:** There are three incumbents in an institution. Their base salary data, as well as the survey data for their job, are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Incumbent Base Salary ($000)</th>
<th>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile</th>
<th>50&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile</th>
<th>75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent A</td>
<td>$55.0</td>
<td>$43.0</td>
<td>$53.0</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent B</td>
<td>$57.0</td>
<td>$49.0</td>
<td>$61.0</td>
<td>$76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent C</td>
<td>$62.0</td>
<td>$57.0</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
<td>$72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$174.0</td>
<td>$149.0</td>
<td>$174.0</td>
<td>$208.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution as a % of Market

117% 100% 84%
II. How to Read and Interpret Exhibits

*Distribution of Competitiveness*

**EXAMPLE**

Each bar represents the distribution of market competitiveness for incumbents within a specific group.

- Provides a view of where salaries fall relative to the defined market range (25th – 75th percentile is used as market cutoffs for display purposes)
- Can highlight general concerns within a group (e.g., a large proportion of incumbents are paid below the defined market range, yet the population is highly skilled and experienced)
- Note that this analysis is intended to provide a snapshot of the current state and is not an indicator of whether or not individual salaries are appropriate.
III. Peer Group Lists

*Board-Approved CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td>Fort Myers, Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>Milledgeville, Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville State University</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>Murray, Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern State University</td>
<td>Tahlequah, Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau, Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>Nacogdoches, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
<td>Cookeville, Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>Conway, Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Omaha</td>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td>Valdosta, Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
<td>Carrollton, Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>Boone, North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas at Little Rock</td>
<td>Little Rock, Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>Greensboro, North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Wilmington</td>
<td>Wilmington, North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Aspirant institutions indicated with yellow highlighting.
### III. Peer Group Lists

**Board-Approved CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans</td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio</td>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences</td>
<td>Little Rock, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska Medical Center</td>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma-Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science University</td>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Aspirant institutions indicated with yellow highlighting.
2. UTHSC faculty will be assessed separately due to the complexity of their compensation packages and market surveys sources.
### III. Peer Group Lists

**Board-Approved CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Groups continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute for Public Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University at Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University-Main Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia-Main Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institute of Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Auburn, Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>Clemson, South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University and Agricultural &amp; Mechanical College</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Mississippi State, Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Stillwater, Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick</td>
<td>New Brunswick, New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>Fayetteville, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens, Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia, Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>Blacksburg, Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University-Main Campus</td>
<td>West Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville, Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Champaign, Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Aspirant institutions indicated with yellow highlighting.
### III. Peer Group Lists

**Board-Approved CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Auburn, Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>Clemson, South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Ames, Iowa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University and Agricultural &amp; Mechanical College</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University at Raleigh</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa, Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Lexington, Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia, Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina-Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>Blacksburg, Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University-Main Campus</td>
<td>West Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville, Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens, Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Aspirant institutions indicated with yellow highlighting.
## III. Peer Group Lists

*Board-Approved CUPA-HR Peer & Aspirant Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Jonesboro, Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Tech University</td>
<td>Russellville, Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University at Montgomery</td>
<td>Montgomery, Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State University</td>
<td>Clarksville, Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frostburg State University</td>
<td>Frostburg, Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNeese State University</td>
<td>Lake Charles, Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern State University</td>
<td>Wichita Falls, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
<td>Morehead, Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Tyler</td>
<td>Tyler, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Canyon, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University</td>
<td>Huntington, West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>Murray, Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau, Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F Austin State University</td>
<td>Nacogdoches, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>Conway, Arkansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td>Cullowhee, North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Aspirant institutions indicated with yellow highlighting.
### University Administration ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Administrators Survey Participant</th>
<th>CUPA-HR 4-Yr. Faculty Survey Participant²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick</td>
<td>New Brunswick, New Jersey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa, Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder, Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Champaign, Illinois</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Amherst, Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri - Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia, Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Given the lack of participation of System peers (for University Administration), each System’s flagship was used to gather CUPA-HR market data.

² The University Administration peer & aspirant group was not used for the faculty assessment as no faculty exist in this entity.
## IV. Chief Executive / Executive Staff Matching Details

The following CUPA-HR matches were used for each of the Chief Executive / Executive Staff members in scope for the assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>CUPA-HR Job Title (Market Match)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Angle</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTC</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution or Campus within a System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schwab</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTHSC</td>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution or Campus within a System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Cross</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTIA</td>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>Dean Agriculture&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Carver</td>
<td>Chancellor-UTM</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution or Campus within a System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonja Johnson</td>
<td>EVP &amp; COO</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Executive Vice President/Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Patterson</td>
<td>VP-Research</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Chief Research Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Mizell</td>
<td>Secretary-Board of Trustees</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Scoggins</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Chief Legal Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Maples</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>VP-Dev &amp; Alumni Affrs</td>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Chief Development /Advancement Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary statistics below were used to assess current market coverage for 4-digit CIP code market data and the relationship between the tenure-specific (i.e., tenured and tenure-track vs. non-tenure track teaching) and combined (i.e., tenured and tenure-track plus non-tenure track teaching together) CUPA-HR data.

**CUPA-HR PEER GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced (Tenure-Specific)</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced (Combined)</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced (in both data sets)</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL. as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced (in both data sets)</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL. as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUPA-HR PEER & ASPIRANT GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th># of Incs.</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced (Tenure-Specific)</th>
<th>% of Incs. Priced (Combined)</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced (in both data sets)</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL. as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
<th># of Incs. Priced (in both data sets)</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL. as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Agriculture</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL</th>
<th>Combined 50th PCTL</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL</th>
<th>Combined 50th PCTL</th>
<th>Tenure-Specific 50th PCTL as a % of Combined 50th PCTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$99,513</td>
<td>$98,602</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$57,577</td>
<td>$60,121</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>