

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – May 3, 2022

Senators Present: Francisco Aguiniga, Polly Allred, Bart Ballard, Travis Braidwood, Lucy Camacho, Mauro Castro, Michael Cherry, Steven Chumbley, Steven Corbett, Jesus De La Rosa, Zhaoqi Fan, Manuel Flores, Michelle Garcia, James Glusing, Elizabeth Goode, Anders Greenspan, Norma Guzman, Brent Hedquist, David Hicks, Michael Houf, , Dongwook Kim, Anne-Marie Lelkes, Sarah Lucas, Tanner Machado, Lifford McLauchlan, Brian Menaker, Richard Miller, Mais Nijim, Kathleen Rees, Alex Sanchez-Behar, Hans Schumann, Amber Shipherd, Velda Soydas, Benjamin Turner, Daniella Varela, Subbarao Yeliseti, Thomas Zinninger

Senators Absent: All present

This meeting of the Faculty Senate was held through Zoom due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements. This meeting was not recorded.

I. Call to Order and Quorum Call.

At 3:30 p.m. President Machado asked the secretary, Elizabeth Goode, if enough members were present for a quorum. Senator Goode replied in the positive.

II. Presentation-

None arranged for today

III. Approval of Minutes from February 2022 Faculty Senate Meetings.

President Machado asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 5th, 2022 meeting; Motion made to move, motion seconded. Minutes were approved.

IV. Report of Officers

a) President's report - President Tanner Machado

Below are items discussed with the President and Provost on April 26, 2022.

- Graduate Admissions: Currently TAMUK is behind in processing the admissions of graduate students. Dr. Hallmark and Dr. Reinisch are aware of the issue and have been taking steps to address graduate admissions. Part of the challenge is the office that is currently handling all admissions is down a couple of positions. Dr. Reinisch will be contacting the College Deans to determine alternative methods for the fall.
- Sr. Faculty Reinvestment Program: In 2015 the Faculty Senate created a committee that generated a report with three priorities for promoting continued professional growth and development. The exact document was distributed to all senators prior to the May meeting. There were three items:
 - Funding for re-engagement activities: This topic has been brought to Dr. Hallmark and Dr. Reinisch's attention before when there was a transition in the VP of Research position. Dr. Reinisch will be bringing this up to the Interim VP of Research to determine if funding is available.
 - Professional Development Leave program: The committee outlined a pay structure for the Professional Development Leave. Dr. Hallmark and Dr. Reinisch stated that the university already has a protocol for Professional Development Leave and it is the Academic Operating Procedure 2 (AOP2). Both individuals support Professional Development Leave.
 - Creation of a Distinguished Professor of Service Award: This topic has more recently been discussed with the senate's Faculty Benefits Committee chaired by Dr. Miller. The administration still wants this topic to be more thoroughly developed by the Faculty Senate before considering implementation.

- **Equity in Faculty Salaries:** Dr. Hallmark stated that there is a plan in place to attempt to address the equity of faculty salaries. This adjustment to faculty salaries is scheduled to occur September of 2023. As of now, in March of 2023 there will be another 3% merit raise for all of the university, and then in September 2023 they will strategically provide additional raises for those positions that are deemed to be not equitable. Dr. Hallmark did admit that they may not be able to address all positions. In 2017, the Faculty Senate created an ad hoc committee to evaluate equity in faculty salaries and generated a detailed report which was submitted to President Dr. Tallant. I suggested that we could again form another committee to update the report. Dr. Hallmark and Dr. Reinisch stated that any additional information they can receive to aid in the process they would graciously receive. Dr. Jieming Chen was on that ad hoc committee and the statistician for the report. Dr. Chen has agreed to once again serve on that committee. Other volunteers are welcome.
- **Evaluating Summer Salaries:** Dr. Reinisch suggested the formation of a Faculty Senate Committee to evaluate TAMUK's methodology compared to other universities within the A&M system other than College Station. Dr. Reinisch believes that the summer salaries should be comparable to other universities of similar size. Dr. Hallmark volunteered his office in College Station to gather all the information of summer salaries from the other universities and provide the TAMUK Faculty Senate Committee with that information. Volunteers for this committee are welcome.

Topics brought forth from the President and Provost

- Dr. Hallmark brought up the subject of Research Computing, and was seeking input on where this needs to be improved on campus. He believes it needs to be addressed, yet doesn't know how much funding should be designated towards it as well as which faculty on campus or programs on campus need improvement in Research Computing capabilities. Senators should approach this subject with their respective department/college and find out so that information can be shared with the university President.
- Dr. Reinisch is seeking ways to enrich the Faculty Community. Some faculty members have approached the Provost about starting a Faculty Lounge. Dr. Reinisch is open to all suggestions and would like to do something for the faculty. Dr. Reinisch requests that the Faculty Senate provide input on things that can be done to enrich the Faculty Community.

V. Standing Committee Reports

- Committee on Committees** – Needs to read the email and assign people left to committees
- Resolutions and By-Laws Committee** – No report
- Election Committee**
Senator Goode reported that we need to do one election for Mechanical and Industrial Engineering and we will be completing it in August before the first Fall meeting

VI. Reports from Committees Reporting to the Senate

- Administrator Evaluation Committee** – President Machado reported that the committee was looking at should they use the same questions? Should they even do it? And he let us know it would be done later in May
- Annual Faculty Lecture Committee** – Was very successful this Spring. Senator Richard Miller will be doing it in the Fall. Senator Amber Shipherd won 2022.
- Faculty Benefits Committee** – No report
- Faculty Evaluation Committee** – No report
- Faculty Handbook Committee** - No report

f) Piper Award Committee

Senator Miller reported that one portfolio was completed and turned in. The applications are closed but Senator Miller will still speak with them.

g) Policy Revision Committee – No Report**h) Task force on Reassigned Time for Research and Scholarship – No Report****VII. Old Business****a) Faculty reinvestment funds**

President Machado included this in his report from the President (See above, page 2, IV.A)

VIII. New Business**a) Meeting structure for fiscal year 2022-2023 -**

Senator Miller opened a motion for in person only meetings. Senator Rees agreed and said it is time to get back to normal. Senator Guzman spoke about the opportunity to have a hybrid option so the faculty in the valley, at the Citrus Center, and the RELIS campus may also be able to participate. Senator Miller called a motion to accept the amendment of having a hybrid model instead of just doing face to face. Senator Goode seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. Senator Castro spoke about his preference for face to face. President Machado talked about speaking with Dr. Rolando Garza the director of the Center for Academic Technology about different rooms to use. Senator Goode offered to be responsible for running the computer for the hybrid meetings. Senator Young talked about some of the rooms not being good quality, that it would have to be the right room. Senator De La Rosa said they preferred face to face. Senator Velez made a motion to hold a vote. Motion is to adopt a coflex format for Senate meetings 2022-2023. The motion passed twenty-three to four.

b) Administration Evaluation –

Senator Rees spoke about evaluations of Deans and the general success of the evaluation process. Having a N/A (Not applicable) option used to be a part of the evaluation and was discussed bringing back. The value was debated and we ultimately were torn between fine-tuning the evaluation or just getting it done this semester. Motion put to the floor. Motion is written as Administration evaluation will be conducted this semester utilizing the previous survey. The motion passed twenty-four to zero in favor of moving forward this semester. Motion was put to the floor and stated as N/A is included as a response on the administrator evaluation. The motion passed twenty-three to one for including N/A.

c) Salary Equity Committee (see handout)

President Machado asked for volunteers for the committee. Senator Chumbley asked what the charge of this committee would be. President Machado said they would be looking at different demographics and checking salaries so that realignments can be made. Dr. Jieming Chen has offered to help analyze the data. Senator Chumbley volunteers. Senator Allred asks will this committee also work on checking salaries for non-tenured faculty. Senator Sanchez volunteers. Senator McLaughlan asked if we would be looking at similar institutions and President Machado responded it would remain an internal study. President Machado will also find information on the budget. Senator Rees suggested the committee on committee make a working group for this. Senator Flores says the system did this previously and inquired whose survey is this and whom will be receiving the results of it. President Machado will be sending out a report on salary equity.

d) Faculty Community –

President Machado brought up the Provost's idea of the need for faculty community. Senator Garcia doesn't think it will boost morale. Senator Rees said the wine tasting the Provost held last Spring was very popular. Senator Miller suggested a faculty dining hall. President-elect Houf suggested a once a month mixer. The decision was made to table it and go back to our departments for discussion.

IX. Adjournment

Motion was made to end the meeting at 5:20, Motion was seconded and the meeting was adjourned

Report from Gender Equity and Salary Compression Task Force

Do Gender Inequity and Income Compression Exist Among Full-Time Faculty? A Statistical Analysis

Introduction

The ad hoc Committee on gender equity in income and salary compression, appointed by Dr. Miller, the President of TAMUK Faculty Senate during the last meeting of 2017, conducted some preliminary analysis of the most recent 9-month salary distribution of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members at Texas A&M University – Kingsville (TAMUK). Gender equity in income here refers to the fairness in income for female and male professors within the same rank and discipline category. Salary compression here refers to lack of differences in salary among faculty of different ranks. Data used for the analysis were provided by the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment. The results of the preliminary analysis are provided below. The total of full-time faculty members is 403.¹

Results

I. Basic Patterns

The basic patterns of distributions of faculty members by gender, rank, and disciplines are presented in the Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Distribution of Full-time Faculty by Rank and Discipline, Texas A&M University - Kingsville, 2017

		rank									
		1.00 Professor		2.00 Associate Prof.		3.00 Assistant Prof.		4.00 Senior Lecturer		Total	
		Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %
jobcat7	1.00 Math & Physical Science	39	9.8%	14	3.5%	29	7.3%	19	4.8%	101	25.4%
	2.00 Socia Science	10	2.5%	6	1.5%	12	3.0%	21	5.3%	49	12.3%
	3.00 Humanities & Library	10	2.5%	6	1.5%	10	2.5%	27	6.8%	53	13.4%
	4.00 Engineering & Computer	23	5.8%	15	3.8%	28	7.1%	13	3.3%	79	19.9%
	5.00 Education	8	2.0%	14	3.5%	15	3.8%	11	2.8%	48	12.1%
	6.00 Business and Public Administration	5	1.3%	5	1.3%	14	3.5%	4	1.0%	28	7.1%
	7.00 Arts	6	1.5%	13	3.3%	10	2.5%	10	2.5%	39	9.8%
	Total	101	25.4%	73	18.4%	118	29.7%	105	26.4%	397	100.0%

The results from Table 1 show that the proportion of faculty in the rank of associate professor is relatively low. This may reflect the fact that the university has been more active in recent years in recruiting faculty members.

¹ Please note that tenured administrators are not included in the study. Also, to avoid biases introduced by incomplete data, we excluded from the study cases in which lecturers made less than \$20,000 and tenured and tenure-track faculty less than \$40,000 for 9-month period.

Table 2. Distribution of Full-time Faculty by Gender and Discipline, Texas A&M University - Kingsville, 2017

		gender_r					
		.00 Female		1.00 Male		Total	
		Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %	Count	Table N %
jobcat7	1.00 Math & Physical Science	29	7.3%	72	18.1%	101	25.4%
	2.00 Socia Science	21	5.3%	28	7.1%	49	12.3%
	3.00 Humanities & Library	26	6.5%	27	6.8%	53	13.4%
	4.00 Engineering & Computer	8	2.0%	71	17.9%	79	19.9%
	5.00 Education	30	7.6%	18	4.5%	48	12.1%
	6.00 Business and Public Administration	15	3.8%	13	3.3%	28	7.1%
	7.00 Arts	10	2.5%	29	7.3%	39	9.8%
	Total	139	35.0%	258	65.0%	397	100.0%

The results in Table 2 show that overall there are about twice as many male faculty members as female ones (65.0% vs. 35.0%) at the university. The gender imbalance is especially pronounced in STEM related disciplines. However, gender balance has been achieved among the disciplines of education, humanities, and business and management.

II. Income Gaps by Gender, Rank and Disciplines

Tables 3 and 4 present the results of the analyses of the 9-month salary income gaps, by gender, rank, and disciplines, of the full-time faculty at the university.

Table 3. Income Distribution (9-Month Salary) of Full-time Faculty by Rank and Discipline, Texas A&M University - Kingsville, 2017

		@9monthSalary											
		rank											
		1.00 Professor			2.00 Associate Prof.			3.00 Assistant Prof.			4.00 Senior Lecturer		
		Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
jobcat7	1.00 Math & Physical Science	86981.0	63973.0	113775.0	67117.2	51972.0	82758.0	62827.1	52000.0	88400.0	45600.5	38348.0	56118.0
	2.00 Socia Science	80000.7	41868.0	103532.0	63199.0	59350.0	68236.0	56830.0	49000.0	65000.0	34941.5	24000.0	43674.0
	3.00 Humanities & Library	72149.9	51938.0	87928.0	60267.3	56012.0	71526.0	52308.5	49000.0	68604.0	33974.4	24000.0	39416.0
	4.00 Engineering & Computer	104185.9	83250.0	142286.0	88887.9	75244.0	103980.0	78831.2	70000.0	108000.0	57711.5	33002.0	126000.0
	5.00 Education	83082.0	68836.0	96966.0	69893.7	58064.0	87896.0	58826.1	53618.0	67404.0	34252.3	20700.0	51174.0
	6.00 Business and Public Administration	114050.4	100088.0	144208.0	91986.8	56250.0	118238.0	86153.4	49354.0	129544.0	55166.5	42840.0	67493.0
	7.00 Arts	76438.3	64286.0	89554.0	60222.2	50522.0	74314.0	50873.6	48346.0	57200.0	36429.3	32000.0	44048.0
	Total	89408.3	41868.0	144208.0	71713.6	50522.0	118238.0	66399.6	48346.0	129544.0	41108.9	20700.0	126000.0

Table 3 shows that, as expected, substantial differences exist in income for faculty of different disciplines. Also, within each of all disciplines, the differences in average income for full, associate, and assistant professors are roughly in the range of \$10,000 to \$20,000, which appears to be the norm in the nation's market. However, across all disciplines, there are faculty members whose 9-month salaries are significantly lower than the average of the lower ranks. For instance, in the mathematics and physical science disciplines, the salaries of some associate professors are lower than the average of assistant professors in the same disciplines (\$51,972 vs. \$62,827).

Table 4. Income Distribution (9-Month Salary) of Full-time Faculty by Gender and Discipline, Texas A&M University - Kingsville, 2017

		@9monthSalary								
		gender_r								
		.00 Female			1.00 Male			Total		
		Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
jobcat7	1.00 Math & Physical Science	62590.0	39220.0	87158.0	74536.3	38348.0	113775.0	71104.9	38348.0	113775.0
	2.00 Socia Science	47334.5	24000.0	68236.0	62205.0	33280.0	103532.0	55885.0	24000.0	103532.0
	3.00 Humanities & Library	47029.0	24000.0	87928.0	49262.0	32500.0	74794.0	48238.5	24000.0	87928.0
	4.00 Engineering & Computer	87662.8	70290.0	111192.0	84687.2	33002.0	142286.0	84992.4	33002.0	142286.0
	5.00 Education	63085.7	23407.0	86812.0	67839.1	20700.0	96966.0	64940.7	20700.0	96966.0
	6.00 Business and Public Administration	81844.5	49354.0	129544.0	98668.4	42840.0	144208.0	90256.4	42840.0	144208.0
	7.00 Arts	54681.0	44048.0	77068.0	59669.6	32000.0	89554.0	58110.7	32000.0	89554.0
	Total	60807.3	23407.0	129544.0	73056.6	20700.0	144208.0	68893.9	20700.0	144208.0

In Table 4, the results show unmistakably that gender gap exists for almost all disciplines, except for the engineering discipline. In engineering, the average income of female professors is significantly higher than that of their male colleagues.

III. Multivariate analysis

Contingency table analysis and regression analysis were used to investigate the issue of gender inequity and salary compression. Results in Table 5 present complete distributions of average incomes of faculty by gender, rank and academic discipline.

Table 5. Income Distribution (9-Month Salary) of Full-time Faculty by Gender, Rank and Discipline, Texas A&M University - Kingsville, 2017

		@9monthSalary							
		rank							
		1.00 Professor		2.00 Associate Prof.		3.00 Assistant Prof.		4.00 Senior Lecturer	
		gender_r		gender_r		gender_r		gender_r	
		.00 Female	1.00 Male	.00 Female	1.00 Male	.00 Female	1.00 Male	.00 Female	1.00 Male
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
jobcat7	1.00 Math & Physical Science	80739.7	88346.2	66366.5	67417.5	60675.5	63687.7	46735.3	43784.8
	2.00 Socia Science	.	80000.7	65052.0	62272.5	56212.3	58065.5	32126.3	38226.0
	3.00 Humanities & Library	73054.2	71019.5	62026.7	58508.0	49250.0	53073.1	32065.7	36056.7
	4.00 Engineering & Computer	105653.0	104046.1	90368.0	88782.1	79925.6	78593.3	.	57711.5
	5.00 Education	76297.0	89867.0	69342.2	70886.4	59062.9	58471.0	38769.7	20700.0
	6.00 Business and Public Administration	101573.0	122368.7	104544.0	88847.5	75628.8	112465.0	.	55166.5
	7.00 Arts	72641.0	78337.0	52810.0	61569.8	50372.0	51375.2	44048.0	32620.0
	Total	81607.8	91637.1	68466.5	73114.3	63254.1	68511.6	36900.4	44454.2

In general, male faculty make more than female faculty. Controlling for rank, and for most disciplines, the gender differences still exist. However, there are exceptions. For associate professors in social science, associate professors in humanities, full professors in engineering, assistant professors in education, and associate professors in business and management, the average income for female faculty is higher than male faculty.

Multiple regressions were run to examine the overall net effects of gender and rank. A nested model approach was used to investigate the mediator effects of rank, disciplines and possibly duration of work on gender differences in income. The table provided below (Table 6) reports results of OLS regression analysis of salary on gender, rank, discipline, and years of employment. To reduce skewness, log transformation was performed for the salary variable. The purpose of the analysis is to estimate the effect of gender and rank, net of other variables in the models.

In model 1, the gender variable is statistically highly significant ($p < 001$), and the regression coefficient suggest that overall male professors make 20% or more than female professors ($e^{.190} - 1 = 21\%$). In model 2, once the effects of rank and disciplines are controlled, the gender effect

still exist ($p < .001$), but is reduced to .046. In other words, after the influences of rank and discipline are taken into consideration, overall male faculty members still make some 5% more than female professors ($e^{.046} - 1 = 4.7\%$). The results in model 3 shows that the duration of service at TAMUK does not change the basic pattern.

Another significant feature of the full model that is also worth mentioning is that the model fit the data remarkably well, explaining 80% of variation of the income. Rank and discipline are clearly by far the most powerful predictors of income at a university setting.

**Table 6. Determinants of 9-Month Salary of Full-time Faculty at TAMUK
(Unstandardized Coefficients of OLS Regression)**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
Gender:						
(Female)						
Male	.190***	.038	.046**	.019	.048**	.019
Academic Rank:						
(Lecturer)						
Assistant Prof.			.410***	.025	.416***	.025
Associate Prof.			.527***	.028	.507***	.029
Full Prof.			.721***	.026	.674***	.031
Discipline						
(Math & Physical Science)						
Social Science			-.126***	.030	-.122	.030
Humanities & Library			-.191***	.029	-.186***	.029
Engineering & Computer			.209***	.025	.210***	.024
Education			-.051	.031	-.051	.030
Business and Public			.261***	.036	.260***	.035
Administration						
Arts			-.171**	.033	-.174***	.033
Years of employment at TAMUK					.003**	.001
Intercept	10.956***	.031	10.608***	.028	10.589***	.029
Adjusted R ²	.063		.798		.802	
Number of cases	403		403		403	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Note: (1) The dependent variable is the log of 9-month salary. (2) The categories in parentheses are omitted reference categories.

Conclusions and Discussions

The overall gender gap clearly exists. However, the gap is not universal for all academic disciplines and rank combinations. Within some disciplines and ranks, indeed the gender gap is reversed, that is, male professors make less than female ones.

Part of the overall gender gap in income can be explained by the fact there are more male faculty members in the disciplines that command high average salary (e.g., engineering). Still, after controlling for gender imbalance in different disciplines, gender gap in income still exists. Overall, controlling for the effects of rank and discipline, male faculty members make about 5% more than female ones.

The differences in average income across different disciplines, which is largely determined by the national market, are also quite noticeable among TAMUK faculty.

Within each discipline, differences in average income across different ranks are in the range of \$4,000 to \$20,000. Whether this amounts to income compression is subject to the decision of what criteria to use. On the other hand, there are cases where a faculty member in the ranks of associate or full professor makes even less than the average of those of lower ranks.

Recommendations

The issue of gender inequity. As we already mentioned before, the overall gender differences in income at our university do exist. However, after the effects of rank and discipline are taken into consideration, the gender gap in income is substantially reduced. This pattern suggests that much of the overall gender differences can be attributed to the differences in rank and discipline. In addition, it implies that the university's hiring practice in general has been sound and reasonable with respect to gender equity. Without clear operational definition of what constitutes serious gender inequity, we are not able to generate a list of individual cases for remedy. However, to further minimize the gap, the committee recommends that at the initial hiring of new faculty members, the hiring authorities, department chairs and school deans in the main, be more cognizant of the importance of reaching complete gender equity.

The issue of income compression. Income compression occurs when the average income of a specific rank is close or even lower than that of the lower rank. Understood as such, there is no serious income compression at our university. However, as we mentioned before, there are individual cases where a faculty member's 9-month salary is lower than the average of the lower rank in the same discipline. When we operationalize income compression as such, we have found 15 such cases (see Appendix). We recommend that the administration examine these cases and see if some adjustment in income is warranted.

Committee Members: Drs. Marion Blake (Chair), Rudolf A. Bohm, Jieming Chen

Prepared by Jieming Chen
Date of Final Revision: 4/24/2018

Merit and Equity Task Force
Systemic Plan for Faculty Salary Merit and Equity
January 2018

1. Step I: Systemic Plan for Faculty Salary Compression/Inversion
 - a. Tenure-Track Faculty
 - i. Promotion to Associate Professor– Candidate will receive a \$5,000 salary increase or the median salary for the new rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - ii. Promotion to Professor - Candidate will receive a 10% salary increase or the median salary for the new rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - iii. Successful Post Tenure Review for Associate Professors - Candidate will receive a \$2,500 salary increase or the median salary for the current rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - iv. Successful Post Tenure Review for Professors - Candidate will receive a \$5,000 salary increase or the median salary for the current rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - b. Non Tenure-Track Faculty
 - i. Promotion to Associate Professor– Candidate will receive a \$5,000 salary increase or the median salary for the new rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - ii. Promotion to Professor - Candidate will receive a \$7,000 salary increase or the median salary for the new rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - iii. Successful Contract Renewal (standard or above) for Associate Professors - Candidate will receive a 1% salary increase for each year of the contract renewal or the median salary for the current rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
 - iv. Successful Contract Renewal (standard or above) for Professors - Candidate will receive a 1% salary increase for each year of the contract renewal or the median salary for the current rank based on salary benchmark data*, whichever is greater.
2. Step II: Equity Plan for Existing Faculty Salary Compression/Inversion
 - a. Equity Option I
 - i. For FY 2018-19 contracts, we propose increasing the annual salary of every associate professor \$2,000 and every full professor \$4,000.
3. Step III: Merit Pay
 - a. Merit pay should continue to reward faculty based on performance.

* Salary benchmark data will be determined by the College and University Professional Association (CUPA) and will include like and aspiring institutions. Alternate salary benchmark data may be considered with approval of the Provost.

Report from Gender Equity and Salary Compression Task Force

Do Gender Inequity and Income Compression Exist Among Full-Time Faculty? A Statistical Analysis

Appendix: Cases of Possible Income Compression

	First Name	Last Name	Title	Discipline	@9monthSalary
1	Maria	Ayala-Schueneman	Professor	LIBRARY SCIENCE	33851.0
2	Jose	Cabezas	Professor of Practice	ENGINEERING	83250.0
3	Lavonne	Fedynich	Professor	EDUCATION	68836.0
4	Ann	Fronckowiak	Associate Professor	VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS	50522.0
5	James	Glusing	Associate Professor	ENGINEERING	75244.0
6	John	Nelson	Professor	SOCIAL SCIENCES	3001.0
7	Victoria	Packard	Professor	LIBRARY SCIENCE	51938.0
8	Gonzalo	Rivera	Associate Professor	BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT, MARKETING, AND RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES	79906.0
9	Elda	Sanchez	Associate Professor	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	58518.0
10	Arieh	Sherris	Associate Professor	EDUCATION	58064.0
11	Manuel	Soto	Associate Professor	BIOLOGICAL AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES	51972.0
12	Randy	Stanko	Professor	NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION	63973.0
13	Eric	Swartz	Associate Professor	HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS	61958.0
14	Robert	Villa	Associate Professor	PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIAL SERVICE PROFESSIONS	56250.0
15	Weimin	Xi	Associate Professor	BIOLOGICAL AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES	60692.0

Report Issued: April 24, 2018

TAMUK Faculty Senate Recommendation for Policy on Summer Salary

In an effort to provide more summer and intersession options for students, and fair compensation for faculty members, the Faculty Senate recommends the following revision. The Summer Salary Policy should be included in the Faculty Handbook.

Current Policy:

Summer and Intersession Pay Plan, Effective May 2012

Options

Faculty with professorial rank may choose which compensation model they prefer:

Plan A—Flat amount per credit hour, step by rank

Professor	\$1,650
Associate Professor	\$1,550
Assistant Professor	\$1,400

OR

Plan B—Base salary times 1/15 for a three-credit course, with a cap of \$6,000.

Adjuncts and lecturers are contracted by colleges at the current summer stipend.

Labs will be compensated at \$1,500 and practicums at \$1,000 for the first three students. For each additional three students in a practicum, an additional \$1,000 will be paid.

Compensation for independent study, special problems, thesis and dissertations will not be made. For dissertations, an exception will be \$2,000 if more than six students are enrolled (\$2,000 per each six student group).

Proposed Policy:

Summer and Intersession Pay Plan, Effective May 2018

Adjuncts and unbudgeted lecturers are contracted by colleges at the current stipend.

Labs will be compensated at \$1,500 and practicums at \$1,000 for the first three students. For each additional three students in a practicum, an additional \$1,000 will be paid.

Compensation for independent study, special problems, thesis and dissertations will not be made. For dissertations, an exception will be \$2,000 if more than six students are enrolled (\$2,000 per each six student group).

Faculty with professorial rank and permanent/budgeted lecturers may choose Plan A or Plan B.

Plan A—Flat amount per credit hour, step by rank

Professor	\$1,650
Associate Professor	\$1,550
Assistant Professor	\$1,400
Budgeted Lecturer	\$1,250

OR

Plan B—Nine-month base salary times 1/12 for a three-credit course, with a cap of \$7,000.