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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 20th, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS   DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA   DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES   DR. LEAF
   January 16, 2013 Meeting
4. PRESENTATION FROM BAIT   DR. RACHAVONG
5. PRESENTATION ON SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION   DR. SCOTCH
6. PRESENTATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS   DR. MICHAELSON
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT   DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT   DR. LEAF
6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT
7. ADJOURNMENT   DR. DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
JANUARY 16TH 2013

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, John Barden, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, John Geissman, Lev Gelb, Tobias Hagge, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Jessica Murphy, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Zhenyu Xuan,

ABSENT: David Daniel, Kurt Beron, R. Chandrasekaran, Simon Warren Goux, Umit Gurun, D. T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller, B.P.S. Murthi, Monica Rankin, Tim Redman, Robert Taylor, Kang Zhang

VISITORS: Nate Fairbank, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Emily Tobey, James Marquart, John McCaskill, Inga Musselman, Rochelle Pena, Sheila Pineres, Mary Jo Venetis,

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. There has not been any negative news come out of the legislature. One of the University’s special items has been institutionalized. The university no longer is required to apply for it. The state matching money fund has been reauthorized. If the state financial situation for the past six months was good then one could anticipate no more damage. The follow up question would be, ‘how much of the prior damage could be repaired.’ The answer from neutral parties is that there is plenty of money to repair the prior damage with possibly a little left over.

The president will be presenting a variety of building projects, in particular a request to the regents to present to the legislature a tuition revenue bond for a major building. The regents are not in session and it must go through the regents before it goes to the legislature. What the legislature does from there is still up in the air. There were no questions.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Speaker Leaf asked for a motion to change the agenda to add the appointment of the ad hoc election committee and to move the presentation on the UTD Handicap parking policy to before item seven on the agenda. Cy Cantrell made the motion. Joe Izen seconded. The motion passed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Speaker Leaf presented the previous minutes. Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Cy Cantrell seconded. The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. **Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf**
   1. The most prominent item we talked about at the beginning of the year that we have not yet addressed is stating clearly that a chaired professor is a professor with a chair. Being appointed with a chair does not relieve one of the obligations of one’s peers of the same rank who do not have chairs, unless there is a specific contractual arrangement to the contrary associated with the chair. As we get through other related matters, the focus on this should get clearer.
   2. I have redrafted our suggested changes for the guidelines to university school bylaws to include the changes the Council agreed on, and circulated it to the Council. The Council has tabled discussion until next month. In the meantime, Provost Wildenthal will fill in some information related to annual administrative cycles that faculty and administration need to work together on, and circulate it to the deans for feedback. We should then be able to decide whether to bring it directly to the Senate or first form a Senate and Dean working group to go over it. The first bylaws guidelines were focused only on the faculty organization in the schools. These will say much more about the relation between faculty and administrative bodies and functions, so we need to have wider agreement.
   3. The Council also tabled discussion of a proposed charge for a Faculty Personnel Review Committee, and a small amend to our policy on promotion and tenure that would be necessary if the Faculty Personnel Review Committee charge were approved. We should have them ready for consideration next month.
   4. A problem came up since our last meeting concerning a student who was clearly erratic and somewhat disruptive, although apparently not dangerous. The question that this raises is whether such a circumstance will activate the BAIT. I have discussed this with Dr. Rachavong. Her answer is that they are involved. They appear to be doing all they can. This may be a situation in which the main problem is insufficient feedback to the concerned faculty. When we discussed in Council last week, my sense was that we needed to form a working group to develop some more detailed protocols—what to do when. Dr. Rachavong has offered to join the next Council meeting to discuss these issues, and I have agreed that it would be helpful. So it will be on the next Council agenda.
   5. With the Council’s agreement, I have asked Ravi Prakash to take charge as chair of our Information Security Advisory Committee, to call them together. Ravi has set the first meeting January 22, at 11 am. Please communicate with him if you have matters the committee should recognize and be concerned with.

5. **FAC Report – Murray Leaf**
   a. I have circulated my paper on Issues Related to Encryption to the FAC and to the System administration. As I noted in an email I sent to you earlier today, Tim Allen and I met with Pedro Reyes and others concerned this past Friday, January 11, in Austin. Tim is at UTHSC Tyler, past Chair of the FAC, and has a JD. I have circulated a response to my issues paper that Barbara Holthaus provided at the Friday meeting. We can talk about when we discuss the issues paper on the agenda.
   b. The FAC has also been asked to join the Chancellor for a conference call tomorrow, the 17th. The topic is that the Chancellor wants to combine the Conflict of Interest Policy, the Conflict of Commitment Policy, and the outside employment policy. I think this is a good idea, if the combined policy can be simplified and made more manageable. There seems to be some confusion, however, if the purpose is to begin a discussion of how to do this or if it has somehow already been done at the system level. We will see.
6. **Student Government Liaison Report**  
Raj Dwivedi was unable to attend. Nate Fairbank, Vice President of student government reported the Pub hours were extended. On February 1, they will be open Monday through Thursday until 1 AM. On Friday, they will be open until 11 pm. On Saturday, they will be open 3-8 pm. In general, the student body is getting back into the swing of things.

7. **Presentation on Disabled Sticker Policy**  
Dr. Jamison presented an update on the current UTD disabled parking registration policy. Previously, disabled students, faculty, and staff were required to register in person at the parking office to obtain a UTD disabled parking permit. The registration process consists of providing a valid driver’s license and a state issued disabled placard in the name of the person requesting the disabled permit (the state placard is obtained at any State of Texas DMV office). The placard number and associated license information is kept at the parking office. The UTD registration expires on the date that the state issued disabled placard expires. Disabled users do not have to pay additional fee to register. If users have purchased a UTD parking permit, they may return the permit and obtain a refund if the price of the original permit exceeds that of the disabled permit, $93.

The proposed policy that is expected to be implemented on January 31 will be that disabled students, faculty and staff will be able to register with the parking office and purchase disabled permits online. The system will allow the user to attach a copy of the driver’s license and state issued disability placard. The user will be able to pay via credit/ debit card. The permit will be mailed to the UTD office mailing address within 2-3 business days. Dr. Jamison noted that because the numbers are so small his office has been hand delivering them.

The reason they are doing this process is that the demand for disabled permits have gone up, as have abuses. The most common is that a person drives up to a disabled spot, uses their parents/grandparents placard, and runs to class. This causes a shortage of spots for those that really are disabled. In their study, they have found the abuses with not only students and staff, but also faculty. If the policy says, ‘state has responsibility for ____.’ The university is the ‘state’ in that instance. This policy will be enforced, and all fines that it entails will be carried out.

8. **CEP Proposals**  
A. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the Undergraduate catalog. Jessica Murphy seconded. The changes in the catalog were just clean up and the medical withdrawal policy added. The CEP had no objections to the changes. The motion carried.

B. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the undergraduate teacher certification. Richard Scotch seconded. The only changes to the document were in regards to cleaning up the process. There were no issues in the CEP. The motion carried.

C. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the UNIV Courses. There were no problems. The only changes were to replace the RHET 1101/ general courses. The honors collage wanted reading courses so that students in C5 could meet their honors requirements. Courses were added under a university wide prefix. The CEP noted it was a desirable change as the function was added to the label. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.
D. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the Graduate catalog as circulated. Currently the maximum number of semester credit hours a graduate student may register for is 12. They would like to raise the limit to 15. There are two reasons. The first is that it will reduce the time to graduation and enhance the graduation rate, especially in some areas such as the management degrees. The second is that it will take significant load off the graduate dean’s office, as he will have far fewer waivers to the 12-hour rule. Peter Assmann seconded.

The other change of note was the changing of the definition of part time graduate student from 4.5 credit hours per semester to five credit hours. The university does not offer half credit hour courses, and thus the change was made.

Ravi Prakash requested for further clarification on the 15 credit hours. Dr. Cantrell assured him there were students who were routinely requesting for permission to additional graduate hours. There are doctoral students in engineering who are taking 12 hours, getting an A and are saying they are ‘bored’.

Jessica Murphy was concerned that this will make students take more classes. There are a number of graduate programs in which students could easily over-load themselves. A student may wish to graduate faster by taking more classes not be capable of managing the higher course load. She recommends that there be someone knowledgeable of the program to prevent students from overloading themselves. Speaker Leaf recommends that the graduate advisors handle it. An advisor is responsible to inform students that normally they should only take X many hours per semester. Richard Scotch commented that Graduate students might enroll on their own without visiting an advisor. It is plausible for an unwise student to take 15 hours unless there were restrictions put on them by the advisor. Could an advising office routinely say ‘in this program a student needs our permission to take routinely more than 12 hours?’ Dr. Cantrell responded by saying yes, the advisor can. They can also put a registration hold until the student meets with them. Richard Scotch agreed as long as that is done, it should not be an problem. There will be a program director or someone who can say ‘you cannot do more than so many hours your first year without consulting with an advisor.’ Speaker Leaf noted that ultimately it is the student’s choice to take a number of hours. The advisor may advise them but the student has to decide whether to take the advice. Dr. Cantrell feels that it is a degree program decision.

The motion passed.

9. Amendment to UTD 1064 Concerning Procedures Governing PPE

Speaker Leaf noted that the changes were mainly incorporating the new language from the regents’ rules requiring four levels of evaluation instead of just two. The one other change is that it now links to the annual reviews so that they are taken into account in the to the periodic performance evaluation (PPE). This translates into the general position that if someone has been getting good annual reviews it should be a surprise if they had a bad PPE, although this is not a rigid requirement. There could be legitimate reasons for such an apparent change in evaluation, but now it is clear requirement that such a change should be clearly explained.
Another change concerns the peer review component. In the current policy there is a requirement for an elected School Personnel Review Committee. This provides faculty review of the dean’s preliminary findings in PPE and serves as an appeal body if the faculty member objects to the PPE. In the new policy these functions were assigned to the Faculty Personnel Review Committee (FPRC). The FPRC is a very similar committee that is called for in our promotion and tenure policy. It is also an elected body of faculty. Its responsibility is to look over the faculty and make recommendations for who to consider for tenure or promotion. The current allows the schools to assign the FPRC functions and the SPRC functions to the same committee but does not require it. We are recommending that there be just one committee, and that it will be called the FPRC. With both functions combined, the FPRC will necessarily become a single elected faculty body in each school that provides oversight for the entire system of administrative review.

Cy Cantrell supported the role of the faculty in this process. Faculty concern with faculty involvement in the post tenure review process goes back to 1997, when post tenure review was first discussed. The routine involvement of the faculty is very important, particularly if there is an adverse finding.

Speaker Leaf commented that adverse findings, i.e. ‘unsatisfactory’, should be rare and documented very carefully. Such a finding, under this policy, does not in itself result in termination. Consideration for termination requires a different procedure, defined by a different policy. But it could result in remedial recommendations, renegotiating or reestablishing contract obligations, or beginning the process that could lead to termination.

Cy Cantrell noted that in other discussions it has been argued that faculty might need additional warning before a finding of unsatisfactory is triggered. The intent of the present wording, as he understands it, is that a finding of “below expectations” is supposed to be that type of warning. He feels that the annual reviews should be done in a way if it looks like a faculty member is heading towards a “below expectations” evaluation at the PPE, the annual review needs to anticipate that. The annual review needs to identify the problem and begin corrective procedures at that time. Joe Izen asked if this has this been the case historically. Dr. Cantrell responded that it has not. This policy does not change much except for including the System mandated changes, but we also have the new annual review policy and with the two policies taken together there should be a concern with doing the annual reviews more carefully.

Speaker Leaf said that a major reason for the annual review and the PPE together is to provide ongoing feedback to faculty without dissolving into periodic Borgia courts characterized by sudden assassinations. Under the the policy, the faculty is constrained to be helpful to each other and is formally committed to be helpful to each other. If there is a problem, we are committed to straightforwardly say there is a problem, and to do the best we can to help do something about it. As with our promotion and tenure policy, in the end the faculty cannot make decisions for each other. Faculty members have to make their own decision, but if we can give an individual what seems to be good collective advice, we should do so. Richard Scotch moved to accept the policy as circulated. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion passed.

10. Issues Regarding Encryption
Speaker Leaf had circulated his statement on the issue as well as Barbara Holthaus’ response. Her response does not call for an action. Cy Cantrell moved to endorse the recommendations on encryption as circulated. Jessica Murphy seconded. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

11. **AD HOC ELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBER NOMINATIONS**
Speaker Leaf moved that an Ad Hoc Election committee be formed. David Cordell is to be the chair of the committee. R. Chandrasekaran, Dinesh Bhatia, and Jennifer Holmes were volunteered to be committee members. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: _____________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
Managing Difficult Student Behavior

Guidelines for Faculty and Staff

Maintaining an Effective and Safe Learning Environment

Faculty and staff may face behavior from students that is difficult for them to manage. Faculty and staff may be confronted with troubling, disruptive or threatening behavior. Many student services exist to support faculty and staff with difficult situations. Your supervisor or department chair, the Dean of Students Office, the Counseling Center, Student AccessAbility and the campus police are some of the departments available for this kind of assistance.

If you feel a student is behaving inappropriately or is making you feel uneasy, you may find it helpful to talk over your concerns. Just speaking with another professional will sometimes clarify issues and help you resolve the problem. In addition, the University has created the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT) to assist with problematic student behavior.

The Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT)

The purpose of BAIT is to assist in protecting the health, safety and welfare of the UT Dallas community. BAIT:

- Reviews incidents when students' behavior may be disruptive or harmful to themselves or the UT Dallas community.
- Coordinates the University response to incidents.
- Develops strategies to manage threatening and disruptive behavior.
- Makes recommendations to University officials on appropriate action.

Student Stress

Starting college and other major life transitions are challenging and sometimes difficult to navigate. During this period, students encounter stress for a variety of reasons, including academics, family and romantic relationships, social situations, work and financial concerns.

While most students cope successfully with the demands of college life, some become overwhelmed.

What Can Staff and Faculty Do?

Interest and concern shown by a faculty or staff member may be a critical factor in helping a struggling student
reestablish emotional equilibrium. Your willingness to respond to students in distress will be influenced by your personal style and beliefs about the limits of responsibility for helping students. Some students may be more open to assistance than others. Class size and the nature of your relationship with the student will also have an impact. It’s important to be realistic about what you can offer when making a decision about how you can help.

Types of Problematic Student Behavior

- Troubling Behavior
- Disruptive Behavior
- Threatening Behavior

Troubling Behavior

Troubling behavior often causes us to feel worried, upset or alarmed. Faculty and staff members often feel concerned for the student’s well-being when they encounter these behaviors. Examples of troubling behavior include:

- A dramatic drop in grades.
- Statements that FBI agents are following them.
- Comments or jokes about killing themselves or someone else.
- Excessively seeking out a faculty or staff member.
- Fragmented and disjointed writing, as if they cannot keep a logical thought sequence.
- Rambling and incoherent emails.
- Inexplicable emotional outbursts.
- Extended conversations out loud while alone.

Additionally, students with Asperger’s disorder or high functioning autism may lack social skills, display unusual language, avoid eye contact or have low stress tolerance. If the student has special accommodations, faculty may consult with Student AccessAbility about understanding and working with the student. If not, you may consult with the Student Counseling Center to help determine if the behavior is harmless or might require intervention. Despite having special needs, students who behave oddly must conform to the UT Dallas Student Discipline and Conduct.

Interventions for Troubling Behavior

If you choose to approach a student you are concerned about, or if a student seeks you out:

- Talk to the student in private when both of you have time and are not rushed.
- Give the student your undivided attention. Just a few minutes of effective listening on your part may be enough to help the student feel comfortable about what to do next.
- Be direct and non-judgmental. Express your concern in behavioral, nonjudgmental terms, e.g. "I’ve noticed you’ve been frequently absent from class and I’m concerned," rather than "Why have you missed so much class lately?"
- Listen sensitively to the students’ thoughts and feelings. Communicate understanding, summarizing the essence of what the student has told you. For example, "It sounds like you have felt depressed and it has affected your performance." Remember to let the student talk.
- Refer. Point out that help is available and that seeking help is a sign of strength. Inform students about places to go for help. In preparation, familiarize yourself with campus services.
- Follow Up. Following up is an important part of the process. Check with the student later to find out how he or she is doing. Provide support as appropriate.
Disruptive Behavior

Disruptive behavior is behavior that interrupts or interferes with daily functions of the University or the educational process. Disruptive students may resist corrective action or intervention.

Examples of disruptive behavior include:

- A student who verbally intimidates others.
- A student who is excessively demanding of faculty or staff.
- Interrupting in class by:
  - Making hostile remarks out of turn.
  - Aggressively taking over the lecture.

Interventions for Disruptive Behavior

- Request that the student stop the disruptive behavior.
- If the problem continues, ask the student to leave the area or class.
- Speak with the student privately, preferably in the faculty or staff member's office. If you are uncomfortable meeting with the student alone, ask a colleague to join you.
- Apprise the student of the inappropriateness of the behavior.
- Explain the consequences if the behavior does not change.
- Document the content of the meeting.
- When indicated, provide the student with a written copy of the requirements and consequences.
- If the behavior continues, consult with the Dean of Students regarding your next step.

If you don't feel comfortable managing a disruptive student or if you are unsure whether or not to report the student for a violation of the Student Discipline and Conduct, contact the Dean of Students.

Threatening Behavior

At times a student's behavior can cause others to be concerned for their personal safety.

Examples of threatening behavior include:

- Direct threats to others or themselves.
- Displaying a weapon or firearm.
- Physically attacking someone.
- Harassing or stalking faculty, a staff member or another student.
- Threatening correspondence (letters, emails, text messages, etc.) to others.

Interventions for Threatening Behavior

The top priority is the safety and well-being of the campus community.

- Immediately contact the UTD Police at 972-883-2222.
- Notify the Dean of Students and submit a student behavior complaint.
- You may contact the BAIT chair, Dr. Darrelene Rachavong, VP for Student Affairs at 972-883-6236.
- To debrief or get support and advice, you may wish to contact:
  - A colleague.
  - Your department chair.
- The Student Counseling Center.
- The Dean of Students.
Policy Statement

Chapter 52. Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team Procedures

Section 01: Policy Statements

01.01 - The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to providing a learning environment that is conducive for students to develop to their fullest potential. In furtherance of this commitment and to encourage members of the University community to work collaboratively to promote the health, safety and welfare of our students, UT Dallas has established the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team.

Section 02: Purpose

02.01 - This policy establishes the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT) and sets forth BAIT responsibilities and operations.

02.02 - This policy also outlines procedures for team consultation with UT Dallas faculty and staff who are concerned about the behavior of a student and its potential impact on the health, safety and welfare of members of the University community. At the beginning of each long semester, the Vice President for Student Affairs will send a notice to faculty and staff through appropriate communication channels, stating that the team is available for consultation when they are concerned about potentially harmful, threatening, or disruptive behavior of a student or students.

Section 03: Team Purpose and Responsibilities

03.01 - The purpose of the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team is to review behavioral incidents and assist in the development of a strategy to address situations involving students whose behavior may be disruptive or harmful to the UT Dallas community, including situations where the disruptive or harmful behavior may be a result of a mental, emotional or psychological health issue.

Specifically, the charge for this team is to:

1. Assess situations involving a student whose behavior may be disruptive or harmful to the UT Dallas community.
2. Consult with administration, faculty, staff and other students affected by the inappropriate behaviors of a disruptive student.
3. Coordinate the University response to address the situation.
4. Monitor the cases that have come to the attention of the BAIT.
5. Make recommendations to responsible University officials on appropriate action consistent with University policy and procedure statements and with state and federal law.

Section 04: Team Composition

04.01 - The team reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

04.02 - The team is chaired by the Vice President for Student Affairs or designee and core members include:

1. Dean of Students
2. Dean of Undergraduate Education
3. Director of the Student Counseling Center
4. UT Dallas Chief of Police or designee
5. Associate Dean(s) of Students
6. Director of Residential Life

04.03 - The team will consult with the UT System Office of General Counsel (OGC) or University Attorney as needed. A representative from OGC or University Attorney will serve on the team in situations where there are obvious legal issues and concerns.

04.04 - Referrals to BAIT

• A.1 - Anyone in the campus community observing an incident of behavior threatening to others, property damage, disruption to campus activities, or other violation(s) of the law, should contact the UT Dallas Police Department (UTDPD) immediately. The UTD Police will assess the situation to determine if police action is warranted.
• A.2 - Anyone in the campus community observing an incident of a violation of an institutional rule should contact the Dean of Students immediately.
• B - Anyone in the campus community who observes concerning or disruptive behavior but is unsure of where to refer the matter or how to address it, should refer the matter to the BAIT chair or any BAIT member directly.

Section 05: Operations and Procedure Guidelines for Case Management

05.01 - Upon receiving notice of a case that a team member deems time-sensitive, the team member may call a special team meeting of the BAIT.

05.02 - All meetings of the BAIT will be chaired by the Vice President for Student Affairs or designee.

05.03 - The BAIT, team at its discretion, may meet with affected members of the University community to discuss the situation, including: administrators, faculty, staff and other students who may have been witness to or impacted by specific behaviors of the student; the student who is the subject of the referral; the parent or guardian or other family member, if appropriate; or mental health or other medical professionals as may be permitted by law.
05.04 - Members of the team will recommend to the affected members of the University community, to the Vice President for Student Affairs, and to UT Dallas administration, a coordinated strategy for addressing the situation taking into account the Student Standards of Conduct and/or appropriate document(s). Specific issues for consideration include identifying the specific behavior of concern; identifying the context of the behavior; assessing potential violence and or danger to the university community including the nature, duration and severity of any risk; reviewing evidence of health issues, including mental health issues, as the potential cause of the behavior; assessing whether reasonable accommodations will mitigate risk; and identifying appropriate resources to assist in addressing the situation.

05.05 - BAIT recommendations will be made through the chair of the BAIT or his/her designee through appropriate administrative channels.

05.06 - When a violation of the Student Code of Conduct is identified, the Dean of Students will pursue the matter in accordance with Policy UTDSP5003, Student Discipline and Conduct.

05.07 - Following a case management evaluation and subsequent recommendation, the team will meet to debrief and evaluate the outcome of the situation.

**Section 06: Case Information and Confidentially Procedures**

06.01 - BAIT records are confidential and will not be released except in accordance with applicable legal and professional standards of confidentiality, including the Texas Public Information Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA). FERPA does allow the release of student education records in accordance with health and safety emergencies when release is necessary to protect the health and safety of the student or other individuals.

06.02 - If the student who is the subject of the BAIT review is already a client of the Student Counseling Center or the Women's Center and/or is a patient of the Student Health Center, information about that student's contacts may not be obtained by the team from those agencies without written authorization of the student in question, in accordance with federal and state law. Federal and state laws that govern the privacy and confidentiality of students' health and mental health information and records include:

1. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (Federal)
2. Psychologists Licensing Act (Texas)
3. Texas Health and Safety Code, Title 7, Ch. 611 Mental Health Records
4. Texas Health and Safety Code, Title 2, Ch. 181 Medical Records Privacy

**Policy History**

- Issued: March 21, 2008
- Revised: April 1, 2008
- Revised: August 6, 2012
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- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdsp5008
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdsp5008
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdsp5008
An analysis of current UTD salary patterns suggests that salary compression and inversion are appear to be problems that affect all parts of the university, with salaries for faculty members with longer term appointments not keeping pace with rising salaries for those more recently hired. Accordingly, the Academic Senate resolves that the university should develop policies and allocate sufficient funding to significantly respond to this problem in the coming years. A committee of faculty and university administrators be convened to analyze available data and make recommendations for addressing any salary disparities. The Senate Budget Advisory Committee shall work with the President and other senior administrative officials in the development and monitoring of any new salary such policies.
Salary Compression and Inversion at UTD

(by Robert Serfling, December 2012)

This analysis is based on the spreadsheet provided to the UTD Senate Budget Advisory Committee by Dr. Redlinger, October 2012. The spreadsheet provides for each t/tt faculty at UTD the school, the rank, the AY 2012-2013 salary, and the year of appointment.

The key issue is whether compression and/or inversion of t/tt faculty salaries is present at UTD and, if so, to what extent this exists and which units are involved.

Salary compression and inversion arise due to external market conditions in hiring, combined with internal decisions and other exacerbating conditions. Salary compression occurs when the differential between junior and more senior faculty salaries is relatively small when still positive or alternatively is actually negative with any magnitude. The latter extreme is called salary inversion. The possibility of compression or inversion is investigated by comparing salaries both across ranks and within ranks. Because salary scales differ across disciplines, it is important to look at this separately within UTD schools and, if possible, separately within departments or programs.

With the given data set, one can look at this globally over UTD and separately within schools. To look at it at department or program levels, one would need to augment the given data set with the department or program information for each faculty member. This is highly desirable but is deferred to a later study.

We may explore the issue of compression/inversion by addressing two questions:

- Is there substantial overlap among Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor salaries?
  
  Method: compare salaries across ranks. For example, are the middle halves of these groups separated and following an increasing order?

- Does salary, on the average, decrease with years at UTD? That is, are the salaries of new (1-3 years) Assistant Professors higher on average than for the less recent (4-6 years) Assistant Professors? How do the salaries of Associate Professors with 1-6 years at UTD, 7-14 years at UTD, and 15+ years at UTD compare on average? How do the salaries of Full Professors with 1-6 years at UTD, 7-14 years at UTD, and 15+ years at UTD compare on average?

  Method: examine linear regressions of salary versus years at UTD. Is the slope of this line positive, constant, or negative?

If there is no compression or inversion, average salary should increase with years at UTD to keep apace with inflation and market levels, and also average salary should increase with rank. If, on the other hand, average salary versus years remains constant or decreases, or if there is substantial overlap among ranks, or if average salary follows a decreasing order as rank increases, then compression is present. In extreme cases, there is inversion.
With these perspectives in mind, the given data set was explored. For purposes of analysis, a few cases with incomplete information were eliminated. Also eliminated were 2 Assistant Professors with 15 and 22 years at UTD, whose roles at UTD are different from the usual t/t Assistant Professors, who leave this rank after 6 or so years.

This report provides:

- An overview of salary compression at UTD looking at all faculty combined,
- Separate studies of salary compression in each of the schools A&H, BBS, ECS, EPPS, JSOM, and NSM, and
- A concluding summary of the findings, with comments.

_The findings are provided objectively without opinions about causes, without evaluative characterizations, and without recommendations for policy actions. All of that is for others to pursue._

Methods of the data analysis consist primarily of 1) _regressions of salary versus years at UTD, by school and rank_, and 2) _boxplot comparisons of salary, by school, by rank, and within ranks by years at UTD_. We note that _regression methods are sensitive to outliers_, while _boxplots by design are not_. It is advantageous to use both approaches together.

**OVERVIEW**

A first look at the entire data set (after these eliminations) shows lots of scatter but nevertheless clear indication that average salary is _not_ increasing as years at UTD increase.
The next plot repeats the preceding plot with the addition of the fitted linear regression equation and 95% confidence bands for the “true” linear regression line.

![Fitted Line Plot, All Ranks and Schools](image)

This plot indicates that overall, on the average, salaries do not increase with years, a clear indication of the presence of compression. However, there is a great deal of scatter due to differences across ranks and across schools. To eliminate this source of variation and obtain a more useful perception regarding compression, we look at salary versus years by ranks, by schools, and, in finer detail, by schools and ranks.

Interpreting the negative slope in the above regression line. Given that individual salaries invariably increase with years at UTD, it is at first counterintuitive that the slope of the line in the above plot can be negative. Indeed, this is symptomatic of the presence of compression/inversion. If there were no compression or inversion, and if all salaries for a given rank started at the same baseline, then we would see a positive slope in the above line. The negative slope results when, in fact, the baselines for a given rank are increasing with new hires and there is no adjustment of baselines for existing faculty.
Another way to view the compression across and within ranks is via a plot of the average salary by rank and years at UTD:

![Mean salary of UTD faculty, by rank and years at UTD](image)

For Associate Professors and Full Professors, average salary is generally decreasing with years at UTD. For Assistant Professors, the same pattern holds except for an anomalous group in the range 7-9 years at UTD.

The above plot clearly shows compression of average salary within ranks at UTD. Further, the proximity of the three line plots of averages suggests that there is considerable overlap of the distributions of salary within the ranks, which corresponds to salary compression across ranks. The latter will be shown in other ways in what follows in this report.

The next display employs “boxplots” for visual comparisons across ranks and across schools.

**Interpreting boxplots.** For a given boxplot, the top of the box marks the 3rd quartile, the horizontal line inside the box marks the median (2nd quartile), and the bottom of the box marks the 1st quartile. The vertical distance between the top and bottom of the box is the interquartile range (IQR). In short, the box tells the location (median) and spread (IQR) of the middle half of the given data set. Lines above and below the box extend to the farthest points that may be regarded as nonoutliers. Asterisks mark data points regarded as outliers lying relatively far afield of the main body of the data.
The above display shows that the middle halves of the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks at UTD virtually coincide. *This represents substantial compression with also presence of inversion.* However, the apparent differences are confounded with the variation in salary scales across schools. Hence later we look at this separately by school.

The following display shows the aforementioned variation of salary scales across schools. *We later eliminate this factor by making comparisons separately within schools.*
Next we provide two quick overviews of salary by school and rank. The first shows scatterplots for salary versus years, the second boxplots of salary.

**Scatterplot of salary vs years, by school and rank**

![Scatterplot of salary vs years, by school and rank]

Panel variables: school, rank

**Boxplot of salary, by school and rank**

![Boxplot of salary, by school and rank]

Before commenting on these two overview plots, we first create more suitable versions by dropping the IS and UGE schools, whose combined total of 5 faculty is insufficient data for analyses by schools. The above plots then become replaced as follows.
It is roughly clear from the above scatterplot panels that the decreasing slope in the fitted line plot for salary versus years at UTD seen earlier for all schools and ranks combined is also a pattern *within schools and ranks*. We examine these panels separately later.
The above display shows for each school the interplay among the middle halves of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor salaries. Findings:

- **A&H.** The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired.

- **BBS.** The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves lie below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially. *This indicates substantial compression and inversion, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

- **ECS.** The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired.

- **EPPS.** The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially, with the Associate Professor middle half falling completely within the upper part of the Assistant Professor middle half. *This indicates substantial compression and inversion, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

- **JSOM.** The Associate Professor middle half falls below the Full Professor middle half but falls completely within the Assistant Professor middle half. Further, the Assistant Professor middle half overlaps with the Full Professor middle half, even when the Associate Professor group does not. *This indicates striking compression and inversion, with both the Associate and Full Professor ranks being seriously impacted.*

- **NSM.** Although the Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half, the Assistant Professor middle half falls in the middle of the Associate Professor middle half. *This indicates striking compression and inversion, with the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*
Apart from the above findings based on comparisons across ranks, we also look within ranks. The following two scatterplots show, for all three ranks at UTD, that average salary decreases as years at UTD increases, indicating compression and inversion within each rank.

For the Associate and Full Professor ranks, we examine these panels more closely, with 95% confidence bands included, as follows.
The overall findings of compression and inversion within the Associate and Full Professor ranks indicated by the preceding two plots are confounded by school-to-school variation. Later we look at similar plots within schools.

For investigation of compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank, with years at UTD of relatively short duration (see dotplot below), it is more effective to compare the two subgroups for years 1-3 and 4-9 using boxplots. This will be carried out later.
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, starting with all Assistant Professors at UTD.

It is evident that the median salary for Assistant Professors in years at UTD 1 to 3 is considerably higher than for those in years 4 to 9. Also, the 1st quartile for the recently hired group is substantially higher for the recently hired group, although the reverse is true for the 3rd quartiles.

*This indicates serious salary compression within the Assistant Professor rank at UTD.*

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.
Next we compare *Associate Professors* across the three subgroups of years at UTD 1 to 7, 8-14, and 15+, and likewise we compare Full Professors across the same subgroups.

It is seen from the above display that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is a bit higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 1\textsuperscript{st} quartiles. Particularly relevant is the comparison between the first and second subgroups, since the third group is unlikely to be promoted to Full Professor and plays a different type of role at UTD.

*Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank at UTD.*

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 1st quartiles and for 3rd quartiles. Strikingly, even the 3rd quartile for the years at UTD 15+ group is below the medians for the other groups. We note that there is almost no difference between middle halves of the years at UTD 1 to 7 and the years at UTD 8 to 14 Full Professors. Further, the middle half of the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two middle halves.

It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank at UTD.

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.

The foregoing treatment has provided an overview of salary compression and inversion at UTD as a whole. We now proceed to look within each school.

Note that, in this analysis, the numbers of faculty for the schools are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>A&amp;H</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES (A&H)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, A&H, by rank](image)

The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired. *This suggests an absence of compression across ranks in A&H.*

*In using boxplots, the comparative sizes of the boxes do not correspond to the actual counts.* For the above plot, the corresponding numbers of faculty in the three ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next we examine *scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands,* for salary versus years at UTD, for *Associate and Full Professors in A&H.* These are *diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in A&H.* *In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.*

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
**Fitted Line Plot, A&H Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD**

salary\_Associate = 83593 - 481.3 years\_Associate

- **Regression**: $S = 12928.0$
- **R-Sq**: 4.9%
- **R-Sq(adj)**: 0.0%

**Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in A&H, by range of years at UTD**

Panel variable: group\_Associate

- I: 1 to 7 years
- II: 8 to 14 years
- III: 15+ years
Next we use *boxplots* for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
It is evident that the middle half (1st quartile to 3rd quartile) of salaries for Assistant Professors in years at UTD 1 to 3 is concentrated around the median level for those in years 4 to 9. These groups number 3 and 17, respectively.

*This indicates an absence of salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in A&H.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which on the other hand is considerably less than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 1st quartiles are all about the same for these three groups. However, the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is substantially higher than the others. The groups number 5, 5, and 3, respectively.

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in A&H. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is a bit higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 3rd quartiles, indicating that the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two. The groups number 6, 5, and 17, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in A&H. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves lie below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially. This indicates some compression across ranks in BBS, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBS Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in BBS. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in BBS. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, BBS Associate Professors, salary by years at UTD

salary_Associate = 94476 - 1345 years_Associate

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in BBS, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The entire middle half of Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD lies below the median for the group in years 1-3. Further, the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is about 25% higher than that for the 4-9 year group. The groups number 12 and 3, respectively.

*It is evident that there is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in BBS.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the middle halves of the three subgroups are completely separated but ordered in the reverse of the desired order. The numbers in the three subgroups are small (3, 4, and 2, respectively), but even so this is a striking departure from the desired norm.

**Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in BBS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.**
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+, although it is lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two. The three groups number 5, 4, and 19, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in BBS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, ECS, by rank](image)

The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired. *This suggests an absence of compression across ranks in ECS.*

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine *scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands*, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in ECS. These are *diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in ECS. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.*

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
**Fitted Line Plot, ECS Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD**

\[
salary_{\text{Associate}} = 116434 - 712.9 \times \text{years}_{\text{Associate}}
\]

- **S** = 11860.3
- **R-Sq** = 14.2%
- **R-Sq(adj)** = 11.7%

**Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in ECS, by range of years at UTD**

- Panel variable: group_{Associate}

**Legend**:
- I: 1 to 7 years
- II: 8 to 14 years
- III: 15+ years
Next we use *boxplots for comparisons within ranks*, separately by ranks.
The entire middle halves of Assistant Professors in years 1-3 at UTD and in years 4-9 are very comparable, with the 3rd quartile slightly higher for the years 4-9 group. These groups number 13 and 9, respectively.

*There appears to be an absence of salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in ECS.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 3rd quartiles are all about the same for these three groups. The groups number 13, 17, and 6, respectively.

_Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in ECS. This is supported by the fitted line plots._
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is higher than the median salaries for the years at UTD 8 to 14 and years at UTD 15+ groups, which are about equal. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls behind the other two. The three groups number 16, 26, and 21, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in ECS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND POLICY SCIENCES (EPPS)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, EPPS, by rank](image)

The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially, with the Associate Professor middle half falling completely within the upper part of the Assistant Professor middle half. *This indicates some compression and inversion across ranks, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPPS Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine *scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands*, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in EPPS. These are *diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in EPPS*. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
**Fitted Line Plot, EPPS Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD**

\[
\text{salary}_{\text{Associate}} = 91825 - 390.8 \times \text{years}_{\text{Associate}}
\]

- **Regression**
- **95% CI**

\[
S = 9674.82 \\
R\text{-Sq} = 6.9\% \\
R\text{-Sq(adj)} = 1.4\%
\]

**Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in EPPS, by range of years at UTD**

Panel variable: group_{Associate}
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The entire middle half of Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD lies below the median for the group in years 1-3, with the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is considerably higher than that for the 4-9 year group. The counts in these groups are 4 and 7, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in EPPS.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably lower than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, although these are both considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+ (which numbers only 2, however, in comparison with counts of 9 and 8 for the first two subgroups, respectively).

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is no salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in EPPS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is just below the median salary for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group and much higher than that for the years at UTD 15+ groups. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls behind the other two. The three groups number 1, 6, and 11, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in EPPS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

The Associate Professor middle half falls below the Full Professor middle half but falls completely within the Assistant Professor middle half. Further, the Assistant Professor middle half overlaps with the Full Professor middle half, although the Associate Professor group does not.

This indicates striking compression and inversion across ranks, with both the Associate and Full Professor ranks being seriously impacted.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSOM Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in JSOM. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in JSOM. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, J SOM Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

salary_{Associate} = 183567 - 2116 years_{Associate}

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in J SOM, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_{Associate}
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The median salary for Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD compares with the 1st quartile for the group in years 1-3, and the 3rd quartile for the 4-9 year group is considerably lower than even the median for recently hired. The counts in the years 1-3 and 4-9 groups are 12 and 17, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in JSOM.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is slightly higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is higher the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 1st quartiles also decrease sharply in the same fashion. The 3rd quartile for the recently hired is very much higher than that for the second subgroup. The counts for the three groups are 9, 14, and 6, respectively.

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in JSOM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is slightly higher than the median salary for the years at UTD 15+ group, although quite lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 1st quartiles follow a similar pattern. The 3rd quartiles are about equal for all three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group largely falls behind the other two. The three groups number 11, 11, and 13, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in JSOM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS (NSM)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, NSM, by rank](image)

Although the Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half, the Assistant Professor middle half falls in the middle of the Associate Professor middle half. *This indicates some compression and inversion, with the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSM Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in NSM. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in NSM. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, NSM Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

salary_Associate = 95549 - 778.3 years_Associate

Regression

95% CI

S      12759.2
R-Sq   25.7%
R-Sq(adj)  22.7%

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in NSM, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The 3rd quartile for Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD is below the median for the group in years 1-3, and the 1st quartile for the 4-9 year group is considerably lower than that for the recently hired. The counts in the years 1-3 and 4-9 groups are 11 and 14, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in NSM.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably higher than that for years at UTD 15+. The 1st and 3rd quartiles also follow this pattern.

_Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in NSM. This is supported by the fitted line plots._
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is substantially higher than the median salary for the years at UTD 15+ group, although a bit lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 3rd quartiles follow a similar pattern. The 1st quartiles decrease across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group largely falls behind the other two. The three groups number 15, 4, and 30, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in NSM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, WITH COMMENTS

1. It is evident that there does exist substantial salary compression and inversion at UTD, within each of the schools A&H, BBS, ECS, EPPS, JSOM, and NSM.

2. It is present both across ranks and within ranks.

3. The patterns and extents of the salary compression vary across schools.

The following table summarizes the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Across Ranks</th>
<th>Within Assistant Professor Rank</th>
<th>Within Associate Professor Rank</th>
<th>Within Full Professor Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Just as the pattern and extent of salary compression varies across schools, undoubtedly it also varies across programs within schools. Actions taken on the basis of the above findings would be carried out by extension of this study to the program level.

5. The variable “years at UTD” is somewhat indeterminate in the Associate and, especially, the Full Professor ranks. Some faculty come to UTD with previous years elsewhere in these ranks. We could also look informatively at “years since PhD” and “years in current rank”. In fact, after this report was finished, we did acquire data on these variables. However, a preliminary inspection indicates that the message presented in this report will not change in substance when these additional variables are incorporated into the analysis, but the report would double in length. We deem it not worth the effort to bother with an extended analysis. For purposes of policy decisions, the present report suffices. If any actions were to be decided upon, then detailed analyses within programs and units would be required, the present report having served its purpose in bringing attention and documentation to the existence and magnitude of salary compression and inversion at UTD.
Teaching/Learning Centers at the institutions listed as “benchmark universities” in UTD’s 2010 Strategic Plan

Virginia
  Teaching Resource Center  trc.virginia.edu
  Director Dr. Marva Barnett  marva@virginia.edu
  Additional staff: 8 full-time plus grad. associates

UNC Chapel Hill
  Center for Faculty Excellence  cfe.unc.edu
  Director Dr. Eric Muller  emuller@email.unc.edu
  Additional staff: 11

Georgia Tech
  Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning  cetl.gatech.edu
  Director Dr. Donna Llewellyn
  Additional staff: 3

UC San Diego
  Center for Teaching Development  ctd.ucsd.edu/
  Director Dr. Beth Simon
  Additional staff: 2

UC Santa Barbara
  Instructional Development  id.ucsb.edu
  Director George Michaels  george@id.ucsb.edu
  Additional central staff: 5
  Instructional consultation: 8 (not 100% clear on website)

UC Irvine
  Teaching, Learning and Technology Center  tltc.uci.edu
  Director Dr. De Gallow  dgallow@uci.ed
  Additional staff: 10

U Pittsburgh
  Center for Instructional Development & Distance Education  cidde.pitt.edu
  Staffing not obvious from website
Clemson
Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation  clemson.edu/OTEI/
Director Dr. Linda Nilson  nilson@clemson.edu
Additional staff not obvious from website

Connecticut
Institute for Teaching and Learning  itl.uconn.edu
Director Dan Mercier  dan.mercier@uconn.edu
Two more in central staff, 19 additional in writing center, tech, etc.
Faculty advisory board of 11

Delaware
Center for Teaching and Learning  cte.udel.edu
Director Dr. Deborah E. Allen  deallen@udel.edu
Additional staff: 5

UC Santa Cruz
Center for Teaching and Learning  ctl.ucsc.edu
From the website: Services provided by the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) have been suspended for budgetary purposes until further notice.

U Iowa
Center for Teaching  centeach.uiowa.edu
Director Dr. Jean Florman  jean-floram@uiowa.edu
One staffperson

List compiled by Pat Michaelson, Feb 2013