Discussion Roadmap

What We Will Cover In Today’s Session

- Describe the situation that led to the development of the Administrative Professional (AP) Classification and Compensation Program
- Share the technical designs of the AP Classification and Compensation Program including the rationale for decisions
- Respond to your questions
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Study conducted by Sibson Consulting in 2011 to assess the ability of CSU’s systems and processes to address legislative changes associated with HB 11–1301

- Interviews and small group discussions held with University employees and leaders
- Focus of the study:
  - Issues and concerns associated with the transition of positions from the state classified system to the Administrative Professional classification and compensation program
  - Methodology for defining classification and compensation for jobs and individuals in the state classified system and the Administrative Professional program
  - Perceptions on what works well and what does not work well in the classification and compensation program
  - Degree of consistency versus variability across campus when making classification and compensation decisions
  - The balance between internal salaries and external market data as drivers of salary decisions
  - Degree of mobility of staff across Colleges and administrative Departments and rationale for future balance between consistency and flexibility across campus
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Interview List—Individuals (alphabetical)

- Carpenter, Kinda—Employee Relations Manager, Human Resource Services
- Gallagher, Timothy—Professor, Finance and Real Estate; Chair, Faculty Council
- Gorell, Thomas—Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost/Executive Vice President
- Holliday, Joanna—Director of HR, College of Engineering
- Hultin, Steve—Interim Director, Facilities Management
- Hutton, Tracy—Associate Director, Human Resource Services
- Jensen, Laura—Director, Institutional Research
- Johnson, Lynn—Associate Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
- Liley, William—Coordinator, Human Resource Services (former HR Director)
- Olsen, Nicole—Director, Continuing Education—Administration
- Rich-Goldschmidt, Wendy—Chief, CSU Police Department
- Schur, Robert—Director, Office of Policy & Compliance
- Shirey, Carol—Coordinator, Human Resource Services (former HR Director)
- Thompson, Angela—HR Director, Center for the Environmental Management of Military Lands (CEMML)
- Venis, Georgeann—Director, College of Natural Sciences
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Interview List—Groups

- Executive Office
  - Frank, Anthony—President, Colorado State University
  - Parsons, Amy—Vice President, University Operations

- Administrative Professional Council
  - Mornes, David—Coordinator, Biomedical Sciences, Chair, Administrative Professional Council
  - Viney, Toni-Lee—Coordinator, College of Liberal Arts, Vice Chair, Administrative Professional Council

- Classified Personnel Council
  - Bustamante, Farrah—Strategic Sourcing Specialist, Purchasing, Chair Classified Personnel Council
  - Bates, Lori—Program Assistant II, Vice President for the Office of Engagement, Vice Chair, Classified Personnel Council

- OEO
  - Prieto, Diana—Director, Office of Equal Opportunity
  - Haas, Christine—Assistant Director, Office of Equal Opportunity

- Library and Information Services
  - Burns, Patrick—Vice President for Information Technology and Dean of Libraries
  - Baily, Scott—Director, ACNS and Telecommunications
  - Engmark, Robert—Director, Information Systems
  - Sugnet, Chris—Assistant Dean, CSU Libraries
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Interview Lists—Groups (continued)

- **Office of General Counsel**
  - Johnson, Jason—Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel
  - Mohr, Jannine—Associate Legal Counsel, Office of General Counsel

- **Student Affairs**
  - Dolak, James—Executive Director, Housing & Dining Services
  - Ellis, Mike—Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs
  - Hudgens, Anne—Executive Director, Hartshorn Health Services
  - Muenchow, Judy—Executive Director, Campus Recreation

- **Veterinary Medicine**
  - Hadley, Thomas—Director, CVMBS Finance & Strategic Services
  - Gumminger, Gail—Administrator, Veterinary Teaching Hospital
  - Brown, Janice—Assistant to the Dean, CVMBS Finance & Strategic Services

- **Werner College of Natural Resources**
  - Davis, Carl—Coordinator of Human Resources, Warner College of Natural Resources
  - Orwick, Julie—Assistant to the Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Key Findings: AP Compensation

- Limited professional guidance provided on appropriate compensation decisions, resulting in reliance on anecdotal information
- Internal compensation comparisons are used for pay decisions, with inconsistent and questionable job comparability
- OEO involvement in salary offers within the hiring process reviews occurs without clear criteria, providing limited guidance to hiring managers
- Some desire for enhanced linkage between pay and performance
What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?

Key Findings: AP Processes and Procedures

- Inconsistent processes for management of the AP population (compensation, performance management) exist across campus
- Strong desire across the University for documented processes which balance need for standardization with flexibility to meet business needs
- Broad current job titles and lack of job descriptions complicate strategic HR planning and limits HR’s effectiveness in advising managers; employee and manager understanding of career and job progression is limited
Recommendations

- CSU should complete a transition strategy integrated with development of a more formal compensation and job structure, along with changes to performance and hiring processes, for all non-classified positions.
- Develop and implement a Compensation Program and Job Family System including the following steps:
  - Develop a compensation philosophy for all Non-Faculty staff employees that is applied University-wide with flexibility to meet each College/Department’s needs.
  - Identify compensation survey-based job descriptors which represent the market’s view of the broad requirements of the job and align with CSU jobs to these descriptions where possible, to create job family structure.
  - Conduct competitive review of a benchmark representative sample of CSU jobs to serve as basis for a salary structure, (e.g., grades and salary ranges).
  - Design compensation structure(s) for jobs and place jobs into the structure, ensuring clear, logical career progressions within and across job families.
  - Develop titling and administrative guidelines for ongoing job and pay decisions.

What Led to the Creation of an AP Classification and Compensation Framework?
Aon Retained to Address Identified Needs

Aon was retained by CSU in 2012 to design a Classification and Compensation Program for the AP employee population; the parameters of the project were to include:

- Developing a format for job documentation
- Creating a job family structure and levels
- Creating a classification methodology and criteria that can be applied consistently across CSU
- Conducting classifications for all AP jobs
- Compiling market data for over 300 AP jobs
- Creating a salary structure with market competitive ranges
- Modeling the salary structure based on market data
Components of a Compensation Program

Compensation Philosophy & Strategy

4 Building Blocks of Pay

- **Job Analysis**
  - What work is needed

- **Job Classification**
  - Internal hierarchy of job "worth"

- **Market Pricing**
  - What does the external market pay?

- **Pay Structures**
  - Job structure/bands
  - Compensation ranges

- **Pay Delivery**
  - Market adjustments
  - Merit increases
  - Promotions

Communication and Transparency
Compensation Program Design Activities

1. Job Documentation
2. Job Family Framework
3. Job Classification
4. Market Analysis
5. Salary Structure Development
6. Impact Analysis
7. Approvals
Key Decision Points

**Job Documentation**
Select a simple, consistent job documentation format for all AP jobs. Determine accuracy and relevance of existing job documentation and need to update/supplement/add content.

**Job Family Framework**
Define the appropriate career job architecture and grade/band structure for AP jobs. Identify desired titling nomenclature.

**Job Classification**
Select a valid, defensible, comprehensive, and relevant set of criteria to apply to all AP jobs to facilitate internal value comparisons.

**Market Analysis**
Define the appropriate labor market comparators for AP jobs and determine the optimal number of market benchmarks.

**Salary Structure Development**
Determine the desired within grade/band infrastructure.

**Impact Analysis**
Define a cost-effective transition strategy for impacted incumbents.

**Approvals**
Determine the degree of participation in the design process and socialization of work-in-progress.
**Design Project Activities and Timeline**

- **Job Documentation**: Template created and job documentation updating process began in 2012

- **Job Family Framework**: Career levels, job families, and criteria were developed and socialized in 2013. Briefing on design approach with the Council of Deans and CSU Leaders.

- **Job Classification**: Job classifications were started in 2013 and are still in progress. Individual Departmental discussions on design approach conducted AP Classification Overview sessions Fall 2015–Spring 2016.

- **Market Analysis**: Market analysis was originally conducted in 2014 and expanded and refreshed in 2016/2017.

- **Salary Structure Development**: Draft salary structure was created in 2017.

- **Impact Analysis**: Draft impact analysis was created in 2017.

- **Approvals**: New compensation program has not yet been approved for implementation.
Why Was This Approach Selected?
- Streamlined family structure design will create transparency on where work gets done across CSU
- Desire to have the Family Group/Family/Role organization to job families
CSU Job Families

20 unique job family groups have been identified for CSU

- Academic Services
- Administrative Services
- Athletics
- Bio Pharma
- Business Services
- Communications
- Development
- Executive
- Extension
- Finance and Accounting
- Health and Safety
- Health Care
- Hospitality
- Human Resources
- Information Technology
- Natural Resources
- Physical Infrastructure
- Research Services
- Student Services
- Veterinary Science

Why Was This Approach Selected?
- Supports the unique groupings of similar skills and responsibilities within the context of subject matter expertise at CSU
- Reflects the way other major universities are organized
Why Was This Approach Selected?

- Supports the desire to have dual career ladders
- Simple
- Not overly hierarchical and provides enough support for career development/growth
CSU Job Levels Descriptors

- **Technical/Support**—Clerical or technician roles that perform specific activities and follow general guidelines and processes to either service the organization’s students or support the University’s operations. Education requirements consist of a high school diploma, or equivalent, or vocational certification.

- **Professional/Individual Contributor**—Individual contributors with knowledge of the principles and practices within a professional discipline requiring academic preparation. Their scope of responsibility is measured based on the amount of latitude they have to schedule and manage their own work loads.

- **Project/Program Management**—Individual Contributors responsible for the development and implementation of small to large projects and the single point of contact for assigned projects. Managerial responsibilities are limited to coordinating tasks and ensuring projects are completed on time and within scope. Program Managers are responsible for the establishment and administration of University programs but with no managerial responsibilities for staff personnel.

- **Management**—These individuals are typically degreed professionals that have responsibility for leading, supervising, or managing other employees. Managers ensure the alignment of team priorities with broader organizational initiatives and objectives.

- **Senior Management**—Senior Managers are responsible for implementing strategies within a defined business area, functional area, or several smaller areas that have may have competing interests.

- **Executive Leadership**—The highest level of leadership within an organization with multiple business or functional areas. This group holds ultimate accountability for the strategic vision, operational execution, and financial performance of the entire organization.

**Why Was This Approach Selected?**
- Desire to have definitions of the different categories of work performed at CSU
- Reinforces career development/growth
- Simple
- Help Campus to understand the classification structure
## CSU Structure Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical/Support</th>
<th>Professional/Individual Contributor</th>
<th>Project/Program Management</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Sr Management</th>
<th>Executive Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Management III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr Management 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Management II</td>
<td>Management III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sr Management 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional IV</td>
<td>Management II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional III</td>
<td>Management I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Support III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Support II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Support I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why Was This Approach Selected?
- Supports the desire to have dual career ladders
- Simple
- Not overly hierarchical and provides enough support for career development/growth
- Similar approach used at other major universities
## Job Progression Criteria—Professional Individual Contributor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Professional Level I</th>
<th>Professional Level II</th>
<th>Professional Level III</th>
<th>Professional Level IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Received</td>
<td>▪ Close supervision ▪ Frequent monitoring of work</td>
<td>▪ Limited supervision through review of work product ▪ Periodic monitoring of work</td>
<td>▪ Works independently ▪ May serve as a resource for other professionals</td>
<td>▪ Complete autonomy in work approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>▪ Recurring problems with defined solutions</td>
<td>▪ Applies concepts to resolve a variety of problems ▪ Discretion to determine a course of action with review</td>
<td>▪ Defines and solves advanced problems with non-standard solutions</td>
<td>▪ Defines and solves the most complex problems ▪ Has authority to commit the University to a decision or outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Communication</td>
<td>▪ Communication typically with those familiar with occupational discipline</td>
<td>▪ Communicates to a broad audience that may be outside of occupational discipline</td>
<td>▪ Communication of complex concepts as a regular and primary requirement</td>
<td>▪ Communicates complex concepts to broad audiences ▪ Viewed as expert by those within and outside occupational discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td>▪ Acquiring knowledge of University policies and systems ▪ Impact limited to immediate work team</td>
<td>▪ Working knowledge of University policies and systems ▪ Impact is on work team or department</td>
<td>▪ Potential impact across multiple department or even University-wide</td>
<td>▪ Impact primarily at University-wide level ▪ Influences others through subject matter expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Experience or Education</td>
<td>▪ May require a Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>▪ Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>▪ Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree</td>
<td>▪ Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why Was This Approach Selected?
- Facilitates comparison across all CSU jobs
- Customizable to CSU
- Easy to understand and use
- Consistent with application at other major universities
## Example: Job Progression Criteria—Advisor TS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Advisor TS</th>
<th>Professional Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oversight Received| ▪ This position has minimal decision making, decisions regarding budget, purchases, and policies need to be approved by the assistant director. Decisions regarding day to day work and interaction with students can be made by this position. | ▪ Close supervision  
▪ Frequent monitoring of work                                                                                                                                  |
| Problem Solving   | ▪ Maintain a student caseload, and provide counseling, assessment, information, workshops, leadership development, and cultural enrichment events for participating students.  
▪ Plan and implement interactive and effective workshops during the academic year and during summer programs.  
▪ Plan, implement and supervise many one-day and several multiple-day trips to colleges/universities, educational and career sites in order to expose students to regional and national cultural, educational and career opportunities.  
▪ Recruit eligible participants into the program and develop a substantial wait-list of qualified potential participants.  
▪ Participate in and contribute to program planning and professional development activities of the program, including appropriate conference and training opportunities when available, as well as the development of the staff team. | ▪ Recurring problems with defined solutions                                                                 |
| Interaction/Communication | ▪ The Advisor reports to the Assistant Director of Educational Talent Search.  
▪ Meet regularly with parents of participating students, and design and present workshops for parent groups.  
▪ Develop and maintain a network of academic and career resources for the benefit of the program and participants, and connect students with appropriate resources based on student needs. | ▪ Communication typically with those familiar with occupational discipline                                                                                      |
| University Impact | ▪ The Advisor for the Educational Talent Search program in the Access Center is responsible for the group and individual student advising related to applying to and persisting in post-secondary education. | ▪ Acquiring knowledge of University policies and systems  
▪ Impact limited to immediate work team                                                                                                                                |
| Typical Education | ▪ Bachelor’s degree in liberal arts, education, behavioral/social sciences, social work, communications or related field must be obtained by start date.  
▪ At least one year experience advising, supervising and/or mentoring disadvantaged youth in and educational setting. | ▪ May require a Bachelor’s degree                                                                                                                                   |

For other examples launch this link: [http://www.hrs.colostate.edu/compensation/plans.html](http://www.hrs.colostate.edu/compensation/plans.html)
Example: Job Progression Criteria—Assistant Director of Education Abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Assistant Director of Education Abroad</th>
<th>Professional Level III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Received</td>
<td> This position is the administrative professional responsible for managing the operations of the Education Abroad Center; executing and/or overseeing the administrative functions of OIP managed exchange and direct enrollment programs including advising, agreement renewals, and orientations; supporting the recommended programs initiatives across campus and other Curriculum Integration initiatives; and developing relationships with faculty, departments and administrative support units.</td>
<td>Works independently&lt;br&gt;May serve as a resource for other professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td> Manage the CSU Education Abroad Center and all of its functions. This includes supervising and training Coordinators, researching best practices and leading some special project teams to implement new projects.&lt;br&gt; Manage a part-time portfolio of CSU Education Abroad programs&lt;br&gt; Act as team leader for staff on processes related to exchange, direct enrollment, and affiliated 3rd party programs.&lt;br&gt; Develop and maintain participant materials for application, acceptance, registration, orientation, and evaluation specific to CSU programs in assigned areas.&lt;br&gt; Serve as the campus advisor and administrative support for educational opportunities abroad in assigned geographic regions of the world.&lt;br&gt; Meet with potential students individually during walk in hours and appointments to assess appropriate program placement with regard to academic, personal, professional, and financial goals for education abroad.&lt;br&gt; Advise Education Abroad Coordinators, students, faculty, staff and parents on Colorado State University administrative policies and procedures as related to education abroad.&lt;br&gt; Conduct outreach to academic departments on the supports offered through the OIP-Education Abroad unit for new program development.</td>
<td>Defines and solves advanced problems with non-standard solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Communication</td>
<td> Advise outbound students on visa regulations for program destinations through email, meetings, and walk-in advising. Communicate with appropriate consular officials, faculty, and students on changes to visa regulations&lt;br&gt; Oversee development and delivery of four annual Coordinator workshop sessions; make recommendations regarding content; invite speakers; handle logistics; perform evaluation and suggest methods of improvement.&lt;br&gt; Meet with faculty or staff exploring new exchange and direct enrollment program development.&lt;br&gt; Advise on curricular policies, Education Abroad processes, and timeline for program development.&lt;br&gt; Collaborate with CSU academic departments on the development of new and strategic programs with regard to academic offerings, logistics, on-site safety and emergency response planning, and approval through the appropriate CSU channels.&lt;br&gt; Serve as the Education Abroad liaison to our exchange administration.</td>
<td>Communication of complex concepts as a regular and primary requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td> Facilitate education abroad experiences in study, research, internship, service learning and other academic experiences for more than 1,600 Colorado State University students annually.&lt;br&gt; Collaborate with CSU academic departments on the development of new and strategic program.</td>
<td>Potential impact is across multiple departments or even University-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Education</td>
<td> Master’s degree plus five years of progressively responsible professional work experience in the field of international education OR&lt;br&gt; Bachelor’s degree plus 7 years of progressively responsible professional work experience in the field of international education</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For other examples launch this link: [http://www.hrs.colostate.edu/compensation/plans.html](http://www.hrs.colostate.edu/compensation/plans.html)
## Decision Points “Roadmap”—Structure Design

### Decision Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay Structure</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Salary Grades</td>
<td>Midpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Grades</td>
<td>Pay Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Lands</td>
<td>Market Reference Ranges/Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Market Reference Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pay Positioning Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Positioning Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compensation Structures—Options and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
<th>Conventional Salary Grades</th>
<th>Broad Grades</th>
<th>CSU Compensation Levels</th>
<th>Career Bands</th>
<th>Market Reference Points/Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Primarily internal with an external view</td>
<td>Balance between internal/external</td>
<td>Balance between internal and external</td>
<td>Primarily external</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Levels</strong></td>
<td>Many grades</td>
<td>Fewer grades (usually 11–13)</td>
<td>No structure replaced by broad levels (6)</td>
<td>Grades replaced by bands (3–5)</td>
<td>No levels—rather each job (or group of jobs) has its own reference range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranges</strong></td>
<td>50%–60%</td>
<td>Widen to 75%–100%</td>
<td>Use market values with pay cluster guidance for managing pay around the market value</td>
<td>Widen to 200%–400%</td>
<td>Can be anywhere from +/- 5% around a point to +/- 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage Pay</strong></td>
<td>Use minimum/ midpoint/maximum</td>
<td>Use market values with guidelines for managing pay around market value</td>
<td>Use market values with pay cluster guidance for managing pay around the market value</td>
<td>Use market values with little guidelines</td>
<td>Use guidelines to manage pay around or within the range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Use whole job slotting or market data</td>
<td>Use broad grade definitions, whole job slotting, or market data</td>
<td>Use factor-based job slotting or market data</td>
<td>Use market data, band definitions, or whole job slotting</td>
<td>Use market data supported by whole job slotting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market Benchmarking Process

Position matches and market data were created for 300 CSU roles using the following scoping guidelines

- Operating budget over $900 million
- Enrollment of 10,000 students or greater
- Data extracted for both General Industry and Higher Education comparators where available
- Data reflective of the Fort Collins employment area (National marketplace)

Why Was This Approach Selected?

- Data matched on job content requirements
- Data was not matched based on title
- Desire to establish the competitive market based on similar employer attributes
Illustration: Geographic Differentials for CSU Campuses

Colorado State University’s locations are at National pay levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Cities</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
<th>$150,000</th>
<th>$200,000</th>
<th>$250,000</th>
<th>$300,000</th>
<th>$350,000</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, Colorado</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>101.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo, Colorado</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Economic Research Institute (ERI).
Market Benchmarking Process

Market data was collected from 40 different reputable published market surveys

- Aon
- Bureau of Labor Statistics
- CEL National Real Estate
- College and University Professional Association (CUPA)
- Dietrich Compensation Surveys
- Mercer
- PRM Not-For-Profit Survey
- Sullivan Cotter
- Total Compensation Solutions Not-For-Profit Survey
- Towers Watson

Why Was This Approach Selected?

- Desire to establish the competitive market based on similar employer attributes
- Multiple sources helps to confirm and validate market data observations
- Unique skillsets are better reflected in customized market data sources
- Only professional, ongoing, quality, and transparent sources were included
Market Benchmarking Process—Survey Database

The following is a key to the survey source abbreviations, as well as a brief description of each survey used in the analysis.

**ALM-LAW**—ALM Legal Intelligence (formerly Altman Weil Publications, Inc.): Law Department Compensation Benchmarking Survey.

- This survey reports compensation data for attorney and manager positions employed by corporate law departments in the U.S. The survey includes data on 13 positions provided by 224 employers and presents information by region, metropolitan area, number of employees, annual sales revenue, department size, form or ownership, reporting relationship, salary administration plan, number of years in position, maturity (year admitted to the bar), practice specialty, and industry. (Data effective March 2015.)


- This survey includes data of employment and wage estimates for over 800 occupations in each standard metropolitan statistical area. Effective dates and number of jobs with data vary by city. (SURVEY JOB DESCRIPTIONS ARE NOT IN EXCEL.) (Data effective May 2015.)

**CEL-NRE**—CEL & Associates, Inc./CEL Compensation Advisors, LLC: National Real Estate Compensation and Benefits Survey.

- This survey has been conducted for 26 consecutive years and presents compensation data on 198 positions from approximately 400 companies in the Real Estate industry. Data is displayed on a nationwide basis, as well as by employer size, ownership type, organization type, geographic region, industry specialization, and metro area. The data in this report was created by Aon Hewitt using information obtained from CEL & Associates, Inc./CEL Compensation Advisors, LLC © 2016 National Real Estate Compensation Survey. This Aon Hewitt report is not endorsed or sponsored by CEL. (Data effective April/May 2016.)

**CUPA-ADM**—CUPA Administrators in Higher Education

- This survey collects salary data for positions with primary assignments requiring management of the institution or of a customarily recognized division within it. All survey positions are matched to BLS Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) codes to facilitate completion of IPEDS reporting requirements.

**CUPA-NEX**—CUPA Non-Exempt

- The Staff Salary Survey (formerly the Non-Exempt Staff Salary Survey) collects annual (12 month) salary data for positions commonly found in higher education institutions. The positions in the survey are non-exempt, meaning that job incumbents are generally paid an hourly rate and are eligible for overtime. To ensure comparability of data across respondents, all institutions will be asked to report the annual salary each incumbent would receive for working 2080 hours in 12 months without overtime.
Market Benchmarking Process—Survey Database (cont’d)

CUPA-PHE—CUPA Professionals in Higher Education
- This survey collects salary data for “functional professional” positions with primary assignments and responsibilities requiring professional-level expertise and work in a specific functional area, such as academic or student services, facilities management, human resources, information technology, athletics, etc. Positions covered include those with supervisory duties that do not represent the majority of their time and effort. All positions require at least a baccalaureate degree or equivalent in the field and may require a terminal degree and/or professional licensure in the field.

- This annual survey contains data collected for 43 job titles. This report represents 76 firms. Participating companies include 43 architectural firms, 17 architectural/engineering firms, 5 consulting engineering firms, and 11 industrial and/or other sector firms. The data is reported by company revenues, employment size, years since degree, and by region. (Data effective January 1, 2016.)

- This annual survey has data from 41 firms reporting data on 2,389 employees in construction services, construction management, and construction inspection. The data is reported by industry group, employment size, and geographic region. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- The Spring edition of this semi-annual survey contains data from 57 firms reporting hourly rates on 3,808 drafters and designers. The data is reported by industry group, staff size, region, and major metropolitan areas. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- This survey contains data from 24 firms reporting salaries of 3,791 scientists at eight levels of expertise and 1,197 lab technicians at seven levels. The data is reported by industry, discipline, as well as by region. Within each industry, data is reported by scientist staff size, geographic region, and by years since degree. (Data effective April 1, 2016.)

- This survey contains data from 66 firms for 125 jobs. Data is reported on a nationwide basis for each job, as well as by industry group, employment size, U.S. region, and metropolitan area. The majority of data reported is for base pay only. (Data effective May 1, 2016.)

EAA-EXE—Employers Association of America, Executive Compensation
- This survey contains data for the top 47 positions in manufacturing and service firms. 1,798 organizations participated, reporting data on more than 11,000 executives.
HEW-EXE—Aon: Total Compensation Measurement® Total Compensation by Industry: Executive.

- This report combines cash compensation and the value of all long-term incentives for the resulting total compensation. It covers all Industrial and Service, Retail and Energy (Oil/Gas) positions collected through Aon Total Compensation Measurement(TCM) Executive database. Four hundred and one (401) companies are included in this report. This number includes companies that reported long-term incentive grants or companies that reported offering no long-term incentives. By including all companies, this report presents the total market value of cash plus long-term incentives. The report is cut by industry and sales. (Data effective March 2016.)


- This report contains data from 128 organizations, for 78 technology skills and 18 ERP roles surveyed, representing 22,262 incumbents. (Data effective March 2016.)


- This report contains data from 431 companies with between $5.0 million and $155.427 billion in sales volume. Data is shown by specific industries and by sales/revenue or base salary within each industry breakout. This report includes all cash components of pay. LTI is available in the total compensation report. Regional data is available in the geographic region report. THIS SURVEY DATA IS AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS ONLY. (Data effective March 2016.)

HEW-NEX—Aon: Nonexempt Compensation Study.

- This report includes data for 184 roles out of a total of 260 in the survey. THIS SURVEY DATA IS AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS ONLY. (Data effective 2016. The survey is now an ongoing “rolling” database.)


- This report presents compensation on 47 executive and management level positions. The data is gathered from 2,025 organizations. (Data effective January 31, 2015.)


- This survey presents data on 171 executive positions from 2,433 participating organizations representing 170,769 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)


- This survey module reports data from 1,129 organizations encompassing 945,896 incumbents for 274 positions. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by short-term incentives, shift premiums analysis, other premiums analysis, net revenue, regions, teaching and non-teaching organizations, and location/region, where available. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)
Market Benchmarking Process—Survey Database (cont’d)

**MER-HPEM**—Mercer: IHN Compensation Survey—Healthcare Provider System Executives and Management.
- This survey presents data on 163 executive positions from 1,039 participating organizations representing 9,239 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by entity type, ownership, religious affiliation, teaching prevalence, publicly traded, privately-held, and non-for-profit organizations by net revenue, and by region, where available. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

**MER-HPOPS**—Mercer: IHN Compensation Survey—Health Plan Operations.
- This survey module reports data from 236 organizations encompassing 195,555 incumbents for 236 positions. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by entity, BlueCross BlueShield (BCBS), organizations by net revenue/sales, and all organizations by covered lives/membership, and by region, where available. (Data effective April 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents data on 138 executive positions from 2,281 participating organizations representing 97,702 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents data on 454 executive positions from 2,243 participating organizations representing 353,430 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents data on 83 executive positions from 1,824 participating organizations representing 242,142 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents data on 109 executive positions from 1,689 participating organizations representing 220,373 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

**MER-MBC-SC**—Mercer: US Mercer Benchmark Database—Metropolitan Areas Report South Central Region.
- This survey presents data on 411 non-managerial exempt, nonexempt, and lower-level exempt positions from 1,252 participating organizations representing 276,082 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by the region, and individual cities within the region where sufficient data is available. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)
Market Benchmarking Process—Survey Database (cont’d)

MER-RET—Mercer: US Retail Compensation and Benefits Survey.
- This study presents data on 217 jobs representing 2,531,177 employees in 216 organizations. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, by merchandise category, market category, total gross organization sales, most prevalent store size, and region. (Data effective April 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents data on 215 executive positions from 2,212 participating organizations representing 208,699 incumbents. Data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by revenue/sales, total assets, gross premiums, total operating budget, and total net revenue. Regression analysis results for revenue/sales, assets, premiums (gross), and operating expenses/budget are reported. (Data effective March 1, 2016.)

- The annual edition of this report contains compensation and data for 100 positions in 366 not-for-profit responses including trade, professional, educational, and health and social welfare organizations. Data is reported on a nationwide basis for each job, as well as by geographical location, organization type, organization budget, total employees, and time in position. (Data effective July 1, 2016.)

- This survey presents compensation data for managers and executives in the hospitals and health systems, representing 1,732 organizations including corporate units of 426 health systems and 1,306 hospitals. The data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by net revenue and region where available. (Data effective January 1, 2016.)

- The data in this report were obtained from 560 health care organizations across the U.S. and this survey contains compensation levels paid to 114,915 physicians, Ph.D.s, advanced practice clinicians (APCs) and medical group executives. The data is displayed for each job on a nationwide basis, as well as by type of organization, and by region where available. (Data effective January 1, 2016.)

TCS-NFP—Total Compensation Solutions (TCS): Not-For-Profit Compensation Survey.
- This annual survey contains base and total cash compensation data on 72 positions found in 632 not-for-profit organizations. Data is reported on a nationwide basis for each job, as well as by region, operating budget, and the following five industry groups: social/service religious, health and welfare/education, membership organizations, research/environmental advocacy, and cultural. (Data effective January 1, 2016.)

- This report covers 150 administrative and support positions. Salary data was provided by 318 organizations reporting data on 296,000 incumbents. The data is reported for national, regional, and metropolitan delineations, as well as by health care industry classification. (Data effective February 2016.)

- This two-volume report covers 219 non-management positions. Salary data was provided by 341 organizations reporting data on 738,297 incumbents. The data is reported for national, regional, and metropolitan delineations, as well as by health care industry classification. (Data effective February 2015.)
Market Benchmarking Process—Survey Database (cont’d)

- This study reports compensation data on 318 office personnel positions. Information was provided by 543 organizations reporting data on 230,566 incumbents. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is only provided at the national level. (Data effective February 2016.)

- This study reports compensation data on 606 professional administrative service jobs. Information was provided by 541 organizations reporting data on 152,348 incumbents. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is only provided at the national level. (Data effective February 2016.)

- This study reports compensation data on 402 professional specialized service jobs. Information was provided by 548 organizations reporting data on 224,537 incumbents. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is only provided at the national level. (Data effective February 2016.)

**TW-SMM**—Towers Watson: Survey Report on Supervisory and Middle Management Compensation Survey
- This study reports compensation data on 808 middle management positions from 562 organizations reporting data on 240,029 incumbents. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is only provided at the national level. (Data effective February 2016.)

- This report contains cash compensation data for 98 top executive positions. Information was provided by 410 organizations reporting data on 7,374 incumbents across the U.S. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is provided at the national level only. (Data effective March 2016.)

- This study reports compensation data on 383 technical and skilled trades positions. Information was provided by 531 organizations reporting data on 221,901 incumbents. Both geographic and industry specific data are broken out by for-profit and not-for-profit categories. In addition, all organization (combining for-profit and not-for-profit) data is only provided at the national level. (Data effective February 2016.)
# Competitive Market Analysis: Detail

**Colorado State University**  
October 13, 2017

## Academic Service

### Academic Support Coordinator (14007.0002) ACPI02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Survey Source/Job Code</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th># Cos</th>
<th># Incs</th>
<th>Market 25th</th>
<th>Market 50th</th>
<th>Market 75th</th>
<th>Average Target</th>
<th>Bonus %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base TCC</td>
<td>Base TCC</td>
<td>Base TCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43.7</td>
<td>$50.8</td>
<td>$59.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUPA-PHE-CSU-AHC-G16**  
412130  
Student Success Professional ( Admin 2016: Enrollment FTE Q4 (>9,058) > 15 )  
44  
567  
$43.7  
$50.8  
$59.3

### Benchmark Descriptions

**CUPA-PHE-CSU-AHC-G16**  
412130  
Student Success Professional (> 15 )  
Provides direct service and support to students through comprehensive academic and career planning from the point of admission to graduation. Provides learning strategy support, graduation planning, and monitoring student progress toward degree. Specific responsibilities include the provision of guidance and monitoring to optimize the student experience and, in turn, improve student retention and success. Provides services related to the registration, assessment of learning, referral, and facilitates student engagement in academic and career planning activities and the life of the university.
# Sample Market Data Worksheet—Developer

## Competitive Market Analysis: Detail
Colorado State University
October 13, 2017

## Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Source/Job Code</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th># CoS</th>
<th># Incs</th>
<th>Market 25th Base</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>Market 50th Base</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>Market 75th Base</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>Average Target Bonus %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer (18037.0001)</td>
<td>ITPI02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEW-HDIT16</td>
<td>Applications Development-Developer 1</td>
<td>All Reported</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>$68.3</td>
<td>$66.8</td>
<td>$71.2</td>
<td>$72.6</td>
<td>$77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEW-MP-IND-T16</td>
<td>Programmer/Analyst-Junior</td>
<td>All Industries</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>$60.9</td>
<td>$62.2</td>
<td>$63.5</td>
<td>$66.7</td>
<td>$68.4</td>
<td>$71.8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIS.300.104.01</td>
<td>Application Development - P2 - Intermediate</td>
<td>Group, Associations, Foundations, Education and Government</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>$62.5</td>
<td>$64.1</td>
<td>$72.3</td>
<td>$72.6</td>
<td>$84.5</td>
<td>$85.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Benchmark Descriptions

**HEW-HDIT16**

Applications Development-Developer 1

**HEW-MP-IND-T16**

Programmer/Analyst-Junior

**ITIS.300.104.01**

Application Development - P2 - Intermediate

**AID010-P2**

Provides application software development services or technical support typically in a defined project. Develops program logic for new applications or analyzes and modifies logic in existing applications. Codes, tests, debugs, documents, implements, and maintains software applications. Analyzes requirements and maintains, tests and integrates application components. Ensures that system improvements are successfully implemented. LEVEL: P2 - Intermediate. Job requires knowledge and experience in own discipline. Performs a range of mainly straightforward assignments. Uses prescribed guidelines or policies to analyze and resolve problems. Receives a moderate level of guidance and direction.

---

Survey data was aged to 09/01/2017 at 3.0%
Sample Market Data Worksheet—FRA Supervising Accountant

Competitive Market Analysis: Detail  
Colorado State University  
October 13, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Source/Job Code</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Market 25th</th>
<th>Market 50th</th>
<th>Market 75th</th>
<th>Average Target Bonus %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Cos</td>
<td># Incs</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>TCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>FRA Supervising Accountant (17984.0002) FAP103</td>
<td>Estimated Market Value: $62.5 $63.6 $75.6 $79.0 $87.5 $93.9 9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA-PHE-CSU-AHC016</td>
<td>Accounting Unit Supervisor</td>
<td>Admin 2016: Enrollment FTE Q4 (&gt;9,858)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>$63.8</td>
<td>$73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER-FAL16</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor</td>
<td>All Data</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>$73.7</td>
<td>$87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW-SMM16</td>
<td>General Accounting - M1: Supervisor</td>
<td>Group: Associations, Foundations, Education and Government</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>$67.1</td>
<td>$66.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark Descriptions**

**Accounting Unit Supervisor**  
Supervises accounting and clerical staff performing specialized or general accounting, statistical, or finance-oriented functions. Provides training and development of newly assigned or less experienced personnel. Provides for the accumulation of data and the preparation of financial reports, special projects, and analyses as needed. Advises management regarding the effective use of resources and methods to maximize earnings. Requires a bachelor's degree in accounting, finance, or related field or equivalent plus 5-8 years' experience in an accounting function. Supervisory experience preferred. Excludes controller.

**Accounting Supervisor**  
Supervises the day to day activities of staff that comprise the accounting function to ensure including accounts payable, accounts receivable, joint interest billings, revenue and asset accounting. Responsibilities may include other accounting functions such as payroll, cost analysis and reporting. Responsible for accuracy, timelines and the general integrity of the accounting function and related reports. Typically requires eight or more years of experience with at least one year of supervisory experience. Frequently reports to a Accounting Manager. JOB FAMILY: Finance. LEVEL: 21. CAREER STREAM: Management. CAREER LEVEL: Team Leader (Professionals). CAREER STREAM & LEVEL DEFINITION: Leads/supervises a team of two or more professionals; first level manager of a work team that could comprise professionals, technical and/or administrative staff. Typically without budget or hire/fire authority. Focuses on mentoring, coaching, and coordination.

Aon Hawill  
228 of 461  
10/13/2017  
Survey data was aged to 09/01/2017 at 3.0%
Decision Points “Roadmap”—Structure Design

Decision Point

- Base Pay Structure
- Base Pay Management
- Pay Positioning Guidelines
- Base Pay Structure Aging Strategy

Alternatives

- Conventional Salary Grades
- Broad Grades
- Career Lands
- Market Reference Points/Ranges
- Midpoints
- Pay Zones
- Market Reference Ranges/Clusters
- Individual Market Reference Points
- Lag/Lag
- Lead/Lag
- Lead/Lead
- Prescriptive Zones
- General Guidelines
- No Formal Guidelines
### Job Levels With Market Clusters

- Positions assigned to a market cluster within the band based on market value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Job Level Descriptor</th>
<th>CSU Job Level</th>
<th>CSU Career Path</th>
<th>Cluster Low</th>
<th>Cluster High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Leadership</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EL02</td>
<td>$232,104</td>
<td>$301,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EL01</td>
<td>$212,103</td>
<td>$275,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$154,027</td>
<td>$200,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$129,884</td>
<td>$168,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Management</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SM01</td>
<td>$190,032</td>
<td>$247,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$109,278</td>
<td>$142,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,882</td>
<td>$133,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,457</td>
<td>$94,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MG03</td>
<td>$152,601</td>
<td>$198,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG02</td>
<td>$103,129</td>
<td>$134,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG01</td>
<td>$91,665</td>
<td>$119,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,611</td>
<td>$107,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,744</td>
<td>$89,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,517</td>
<td>$76,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,597</td>
<td>$65,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project/ Program Management</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>$91,110</td>
<td>$118,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>$67,924</td>
<td>$88,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,215</td>
<td>$67,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,314</td>
<td>$55,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional/ Individual Contributor</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PI04</td>
<td>$185,552</td>
<td>$241,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI03</td>
<td>$116,149</td>
<td>$150,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI02</td>
<td>$107,366</td>
<td>$139,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI01</td>
<td>$90,038</td>
<td>$117,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,868</td>
<td>$102,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,165</td>
<td>$86,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,892</td>
<td>$75,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,664</td>
<td>$63,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,764</td>
<td>$55,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,575</td>
<td>$37,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical/Support</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS03</td>
<td>$78,604</td>
<td>$102,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS02</td>
<td>$62,253</td>
<td>$80,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS01</td>
<td>$48,690</td>
<td>$63,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,119</td>
<td>$53,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,891</td>
<td>$45,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Job Levels With Market Clusters

- Positions assigned to a market cluster within the band based on market value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Low</th>
<th>Cluster High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL02</td>
<td>$232,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL01</td>
<td>$212,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM01</td>
<td>$190,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG03</td>
<td>$152,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG03</td>
<td>$103,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG02</td>
<td>$91,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG02</td>
<td>$82,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG02</td>
<td>$68,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG01</td>
<td>$58,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>$50,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>$91,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/ Program Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>$67,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>$52,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI04</td>
<td>$185,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI04</td>
<td>$116,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/ Individual Contributor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI04</td>
<td>$107,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI03</td>
<td>$90,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI03</td>
<td>$79,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI02</td>
<td>$66,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI02</td>
<td>$57,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI01</td>
<td>$48,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI01</td>
<td>$42,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS03</td>
<td>$78,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS03</td>
<td>$62,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS03</td>
<td>$48,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS02</td>
<td>$41,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS02</td>
<td>$34,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why Was This Approach Selected?
- Represents a blend of the internal value of roles to CSU with a need to be market competitive
- Allows for a broad range or roles in each job level with the ability to provide market targeted pay ranges
- Flexibility
Where We Are Today

Some Key Statistics

- Number of market benchmark positions: 328
- Number of positions classified in the AP Framework: 2,912
- Number of occupied positions not classified: 202
- Compensation is on hold pending completion of classifications
What This New AP Classification and Compensation Approach Brings to CSU

- Clears up confusion on how jobs have been leveled
- Establishes pay ranges that are grounded in market competitive practices
- Provides greater clarity on career paths for employees
- Encourages consistent and equitable compensation decisions
- Provides better guidance in making job offers
Your Questions
Appendix
## Technical/Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Technical/Support Level I</th>
<th>Technical/Support Level II</th>
<th>Technical/Support Level III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oversight Received | - Works under close supervision  
- Work is regularly checked                             | - Completes tasks without immediate supervision  
- Work is regularly checked                             | - Acts independently working under limited supervision                                    |
| Problem Solving | - Refers to procedures, technical aids, co-workers, or supervisors to solve routine, well-defined problems | - Problems encountered are varied but similar  
- Responses typically drawn from pre-established solutions  
- Resolves non-routine issues escalated from junior team members |
| Interaction/Communication | - Interaction is of a day-to-day nature, requiring a professional manner, customer services skills, common courtesy, and tact | - Audience is typically knowledgeable about the subject matter  
- May need to present information in multiple written forms |
| University Impact | - Accountable for the delivery of own tasks within agreed time and quality standards      | - May be accountable for on-time delivery of own work or that of others on the team       | - May act as a team lead, or have supervisory responsibility over others  
- May be accountable for on-time delivery of own work or that of others on the team |
| Typical Experience or Education | - Basic numeracy and literacy skills required  
- Ability to understand instructions and follow procedures | - Requires technical know-how and broad understanding of subject area  
- May require vocational qualification or certification | - In-depth experience in a technical field  
- May require vocational qualification or certification  
- May be working towards professional certification or degree |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Professional Level I</th>
<th>Professional Level II</th>
<th>Professional Level III</th>
<th>Professional Level IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight/Received</td>
<td>Close supervision</td>
<td>Limited supervision through review of work product</td>
<td>Works independently</td>
<td>Complete autonomy in work approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent monitoring of work</td>
<td>Periodic monitoring of work</td>
<td>May serve as a resource for other professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Recurring problems with defined solutions</td>
<td>Applies concepts to resolve a variety of problems</td>
<td>Defines and solves advanced problems with non-standard solutions</td>
<td>Defines and solves the most complex problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discretion to determine a course of action with review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has authority to commit the University to a decision or outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Communication</td>
<td>Communication typically with those familiar with occupational discipline</td>
<td>Communicates to a broad audience that may be outside of occupational discipline</td>
<td>Communication of complex concepts as a regular and primary requirement</td>
<td>Communicates complex concepts to broad audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viewed as expert by those within and outside occupational discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td>Acquiring knowledge of University policies and systems</td>
<td>Working knowledge of University policies and systems</td>
<td>Potential impact is across multiple departments or even University-wide</td>
<td>Impact primarily at University-wide level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact limited to immediate work team</td>
<td>Impact is on work team or department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Influences others through subject-matter expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Education</td>
<td>May require a Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project/Program Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Project/Program Management Level I</th>
<th>Project/Program Management Level II</th>
<th>Project/Program Management Level III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Received</td>
<td>Works with close oversight of project/program accomplishments</td>
<td>Works independently with high-level oversight</td>
<td>Complete autonomy in work approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>May provide recommendation on analysis, project identification, design, communication, and integration for program</td>
<td>Provides recommendation on analysis, project identification, design, communication, and integration of programs</td>
<td>Develops processes and recommendation on analysis, project identification, design, communication, and integration for programs that require advanced technology or complex concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies and escalates potential project/program hurdles and pitfalls</td>
<td>Identifies and helps develop solutions to mitigate project/program hurdles and pitfalls</td>
<td>Develops processes, and is able to modify for unique conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manages University-wide programs, initiatives, or projects</td>
<td>Directs University-wide programs, initiatives, or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Communication</td>
<td>Single point of contact for programs, initiatives, or projects</td>
<td>Single point of contact for programs, initiatives, or projects</td>
<td>Provides advanced professional/technical leadership consultation and University-wide expertise within program area of focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single point of contact for a large program or a portfolio of projects or programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspires and mentors other Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td>Impact of projects/programs is short term (within current year) duration</td>
<td>Impact of programs is medium to long-term duration</td>
<td>Impact of programs is long-term duration involving large-scale initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program participation tends to be elective</td>
<td>Program participation tends to be required</td>
<td>Program participation tends to be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects/programs may be sub-sets of larger institutional initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Budget Responsibility</td>
<td>Recommends and administers program budget</td>
<td>Manages program budget</td>
<td>Defines and manages program budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program budget is small</td>
<td>Program budget is small to medium</td>
<td>Program budget is medium-to-large and complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Management</td>
<td>May have responsibility for up to two support staff FTEs</td>
<td>May have people management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>May have people management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Management Level I</th>
<th>Management Level II</th>
<th>Management Level III</th>
<th>Senior Management Level I</th>
<th>Senior Management Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Teams work within prescribed rules, guidelines, and policies and work is often transactional/routine/cyclical in nature</td>
<td>Applies concepts towards the development of new rules or policy development</td>
<td>Problems are often unclearly defined and fundamental principles may not apply Solutions must take into account future considerations</td>
<td>Problems are often unclearly defined and fundamental principles may not apply Solutions must take into account future considerations</td>
<td>Resolves complex issues with long-term impact Resolutions may lead to new ways of conducting operations or changes to University policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Communication</td>
<td>Adapts communication styles to differing audiences</td>
<td>Adapts communication style and uses persuasion in delivering messages</td>
<td>Typically reports to a department head Reconciles multiple stakeholder views</td>
<td>Typically reports to a department head Reconciles multiple stakeholder views</td>
<td>May report to an officer or executive director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td>Department/unit focused Work provided by the team has short-term (within one year) impact by nature Directs the application or existing principles</td>
<td>Ability to impact the development of existing principles and guides the development of new policies and ideas Work provided by the team generally has longer-term impact beyond the current year</td>
<td>Translates strategy into operational processes. May provide input into strategy of the department or function</td>
<td>Translates strategy into operational processes. May provide input into strategy of the department or function</td>
<td>Sets strategy for functional area or department in line with mission of the University Must be head of a department as defined and assigned by the University for Director designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Budget Responsibility</td>
<td>Takes action to monitor costs of work team May contribute to the department’s fiscal management</td>
<td>Provides input into the budgeting process and may be a sub-departmental budget owner or have responsibility towards the fiscal management</td>
<td>May develop and manage a budget</td>
<td>May develop and manage a budget</td>
<td>Has full oversight of budget for a department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Management</td>
<td>Manage teams typically comprised of technical/administrative support roles that are more homogeneous in nature May have people management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>Manages teams of technical/support and/or professional roles May have people management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>Manages teams of primarily professional roles; may supervise project management levels People management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>Manages teams of primarily professional roles; may supervise project management levels People management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>Provides direction for function/department/unit through other managers People management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Executive Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Executive Level I</th>
<th>Executive Level II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>▪ Resolves complex issues with long-term impact&lt;br&gt;▪ Resolutions may lead to new ways of conducting&lt;br&gt;operations or changes to University policy</td>
<td>▪ Resolves complex issues with long-term impact&lt;br&gt;▪ Resolutions may lead to new ways of conducting&lt;br&gt;operations or changes to University policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/ Communication</td>
<td>▪ Typically reports to an officer or executive director&lt;br&gt;▪ Integrates information from multiple functions or departments to inform the strategy of own area</td>
<td>▪ Reports to an officer or executive director&lt;br&gt;▪ Integrates information from multiple functions or departments to inform the strategy of own area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Impact</td>
<td>▪ Sets strategy for functional area or department in line with mission of the University</td>
<td>▪ Sets strategy for functional area or department in line with mission of the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/ Budget Responsibility</td>
<td>▪ Has full oversight of budget for a department</td>
<td>▪ Has full oversight of budget for a department or multiple departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Management</td>
<td>▪ Provides direction for function or department through other managers and senior managers&lt;br&gt;▪ Develops workforce plan and responsible for developing leadership within the function or department&lt;br&gt;▪ People management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
<td>▪ Provides direction for function or department through other managers and senior managers&lt;br&gt;▪ Develops workforce plan and responsible for developing leadership within the function or department&lt;br&gt;▪ People management responsibility for pay reviews, performance management, and resource planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>