LETTER FROM THE FACULTY SPEAKS EDITOR

Dear Colleagues,

My editorial assistant Charlene James and I present the Spring/Summer 2015 issue of Faculty Speaks.

This is my last issue as editor of Faculty Speaks, and so we decided to make this a “farewell” issue to those who are leaving the faculty senate. I have enjoyed my tenure as editor though I would have welcomed more faculty participation. My focus was to make faculty Speaks more of an intellectual forum along with sharing information about events at different colleges. Sometimes we were successful and sometimes we ourselves did not live up to our own expectations. However, we enjoyed what we did as a team.

I wish the next editor and the new senators the very best.

Nina Saha-Gupta.
Editor, Faculty Speaks

NOTES FROM THE FACULTY SENATE CHAIR

Dear Colleagues -

As most of you are aware during the last academic year, several of our faculty passed away, including my good friend and colleague, Dr. Kiran Chilakamarri who lost his battle with pneumonia in April. It was very difficult to say goodbye to someone who just days before had vehemently voiced his commitment to faculty rights at TSU.

None of us are promised tomorrow, so with great passion and commitment, we should take advantage of each second we are blessed with to do what is right and honorable.

In the past several months, many violations of the Faculty Manual have been reported to me by faculty members. After following proper protocol, which was ignored by Administration, I reported them to the Board of Regents at the June 12, 2015, meeting as stipulated in Section 1.3 of the Faculty Manual.

To date, no updates have been provided in this regard. For your information, the following is a brief description of the information presented to the Board:

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
The Deans of the Colleges/Schools have established and are enforcing By-Laws that have not been approved by any University Committees or the Board of Regents (Section 2.2).

The Deans of several colleges have recently established Grievance Committees to review **faculty vs. faculty** complaints. Deans are obligated to hear these issues (Section 2.6).

Department Chairs fail to include ALL their faculty members when:
- Preparing the budget;
- Planning summer school offerings;
- Teaching assignments; and,
- Recruiting new faculty (Section 2.9).

Some Department Chairs continue to remain in their positions past the 3-year term; no mandatory reviews by faculty have been initiated; nor has faculty been given the opportunity to vote on re-appointment of Chairs. Also, Department Chairs without proper credentials and qualifications are being hired. Furthermore, many Department Chairs that are Interim have served beyond the allowable 2-year term (Section 2.10).

Some Deans do not follow proper hiring protocol for Department Chairs (Section 2.11).

Some Chairs tamper with official university documents, but Dean(s) ignore faculty complaints of violations (Section 2.12).

Faculty members have been threatened with loss of university’s communication privileges for expressing their views about their Chairs, Deans, and Upper Administration for violations of the university’s rules. As a result, ALL faculty have recently lost this right of expression (Section 3.0).

Some Chairs, with Deans’ support, hire new faculty without proper credentials (3.2).

ALL School/Departmental faculty are not provided with candidate information, nor allowed to participate in the selection process of new faculty (Section 4.0).

The Dean of School of Public Affairs has hired several Administrators with faculty status who are now being awarded tenure, but do not meet the minimum qualifications in their prospective departments (Section 4.2).

Some Deans promote and award tenure to certain faculty members without regard to time-in-rank requirements (Section 4.11).

Some Chairs and Deans disregard the Faculty Workload mandate, thereby violating regular faculty’s rights, and creating an unpleasant atmosphere in the academic units (Section 5.1).

Faculty members have been terminated without proper due process (Section 7.1).

Some faculty’s rights to an **immediate investigation or speedy hearing** after suspension have been violated (Section 7.2).

Many grievances have been submitted to the Provost’s Office with no acknowledgments or resolutions being provided. This causes many faculty to seek remedies outside the university (Section 9.0).

Faculty participation is limited in most aspects of shared governance (i.e., President’s Cabinet, and different University Administrative Committees, etc. (Section 10.0)).

University Committees on which faculty have little or no input or participation (Section 10.2).

College Deans appoint faculty members for certain committees, instead of having an election/selection process at a duly convened faculty meeting for such purpose (Section 10.3).
Furthermore, the following concerns were addressed to the Board:
1. TSU’s Administration decided to cancel some summer 2015 classes one day prior to the start of classes. This has angered many of our students who may leave TSU, and financially damaged faculty who lost the opportunity to seek summer employment elsewhere.
2. Texas’ state law requires all faculty members to be proficient in spoken English. The University hires faculty members without regard to this statute. TSU’s students complain that they cannot understand their instructors’ accents, and in many cases, have dropped classes due to this problem. This is detrimental to students, both financially and academically.
3. The President, Provost, and other members of administration should be readily available and accessible to hear, address, and respond to Faculty, Staff, and Students issues.
4. The state of the University should be communicated to all employees continually on all matters to assure the existence of transparency at the university.

Dr. Rasoul Saneifard, Ph.D., P.E.
Chair, Faculty Senate / Assembly
January 29, 2015

Dr. James Ward, Interim Provost and
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Texas Southern University
3100 Cleburne Avenue
Houston, TX 77004

Re: Faculty Assembly Resolution Regarding One Stop Registration

Dear Provost Ward:

On January 16, 2015, during the Faculty Assembly meeting in the School of Public Affairs Auditorium, the Assembly passed the following Resolution with the request that the Administration resolve this issue:

WHEREAS, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty, Department Chairs, and Administrative Assistants in the Academic Units are to remain in their offices during One Stop Registration to better advise their students and facilitate their registration, as the student records are housed in the departments, the faculty have easy access to their computers, and the Administrative Assistants can immediately register students and enter them into the system. Also, the non-academic services should be located in several convenient locations, as well as the Student Recreational Center, so students needing these services can conveniently access them. Furthermore, during the registration period, extra personnel should be provided to help the Administrative Assistants to expedite the registration process to avoid frustrating students.

Finally, any academic unit that utilize professional advisors, and that do not involve faculty in the advisement process, can provide their services at any convenient location for students during One Stop.

Yours truly,

Rasoul Saneifard, Ph.D., P.E.
Chair, Faculty Senate/Assembly

CC: Dr. Vera Hawkins, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate/Assembly
    Dr. McKen Carrington, General Counsel of Faculty Senate
January 19, 2015

Dr. James Ward, Interim Provost and
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Texas Southern University
3100 Cleburne Avenue
Houston, TX 77004

Dear Provost Ward:

On January 16, 2015, during the Faculty Assembly meeting in the School of Public Affairs Auditorium at 11:15 a.m., the following Resolution was passed:

WHEREAS, BE IT RESOLVED, the Faculty Senate Chair is to request that the Provost’s Office resolve the time-sensitive issue outlined as follows: Dr. Lila Gheprri grieves that she has been overloaded with 28.5 hours of workload for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. This overloading was deliberately attained by lowering credit hours assigned for graduate classes, and by denying the 0.75 credit hours (assigned to be used in the mathematical formula) for each graduate research student as has been the practice in the past for many years at TSU. This violation of the provisions of the 2014 Faculty Manual (page 45) has been perpetrated by the Interim Chair of the Department of Computer Science, Dr. Wei Li, with the approval of the Dean of College of Science and Technology, Dr. Lei Yu. Additionally, it is our position (Faculty Assembly) that all unit leaders should follow this rule across the various university departments. Clearly Dr. Gheprri is very overloaded, and so are other faculty. Immediate attention to this matter is required by the Provost’s Office to correct this situation.

Dr. Gheprri’s current workload is illustrated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester 2014</th>
<th>Spring Semester 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate CS 551</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate CS 681</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement, CS 699 (2s)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement CS 698 (3s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement CS 699 (1s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yours truly,

Rasoul Saneifard, Ph.D., P.E.
Chair, Faculty Senate/Assembly

CC: Dr. Lei Yu, Dean of COST
Dr. Wei Li, Interim Chair, Department of Computer Science
Dr. Lila Gheprri, Associate Professor, Department of Computer Science
Dr. Vera Hawkins, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate/Assembly
Dr. Mcken Carrington, General Counsel of Faculty Senate
Texas Southern University
Board of Regents Retreat was held March 6-7, 2015.

The following is a summary of some of the presentations at the retreat.

**Degree Works** – presented by President Rudley. President Rudley reported on Faculty and student usage of Degree Works. Dr. Rudley indicated that 1071 students logged on to Degree Works in 2014 as compared to 40 Faculty/Advisors and that 786 students logged on during December 2014 as compared to 47 Faculty/Advisors.

Dr. Rudley also indicated that the post implementation plan included monitoring of usage of Degree Works, and that reports would be generated to note how many are logging on to the system.

**Low Producing Academic Programs** - presented by Provost Ward and Mr. E. Craig Ness, Vice President for Administration & Finance.

**Undergraduate Degrees:**
BS in Physics was phased out, but the THECB opted to allow TSU to join a consortium with 7 or 8 other universities to offer a degree in physics as part of the consortium.
BA in French will be phased out in 2016, with no plans to make it a concentration, which is a narrow path or focus or specialty within a major.
BA in Economics (moved from COLABS to the Business School and will be phased out in 2016; economics is now offered as a concentration instead of a major in JHJSB)
BSDIET in Dietetics will be phased out in 2017 and is now a concentration in Human Services and Consumer Sciences (HSCS)

**Graduate degrees eliminated due to LPP:**
MS in Health Administration will be phased out as a major in 2016 and will be offered as a concentration.
MS in Mathematics will be phased out in 2015.
MA in Fine Arts was phased out in 2014.
MS in Industrial Technology was phased out in 2014.

The THECB **denied several extensions** in 2011, but TSU **appealed** and the following programs were **approved for extensions**:

**Undergraduate Degrees:**
BA in Art (currently in good standing)

**Graduate Degrees:**
MA in English
MS in Chemistry

**Enrollment Trends Summary** – presented by Dr. Rudley
8109 students in Spring 2015.

**Number of Degrees Awarded** – presented by Dr. Rudley
Fall 2013 to Summer 2014 - 1567 degrees

*Summarized by Dr. Nina Saha - Gupta*
A Comparative Analysis of Texas Southern University Faculty Salaries with Texas Other Category I or Doctoral Institutions, 2014-15

By: Henry North, Ph.D.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First, it attempts to provide an “apples to apples, oranges to oranges” analysis of where Texas Southern University stands in comparison to its fellow or sister public state institutions that have the status of Category I or Doctoral institutions as found in the Academe Magazine, March-April 2015 relative to average salary and average compensation. Its second purpose is to “fact check” the information presented at the Spring 2015 Opening Faculty Meeting regarding this subject matter.


I am especially proud that our University for the first time to my knowledge has been included in this report. The University is making progress in its financial transparency. I was surprised for the same reasoning. For the over forty years that I have been a paid member of the University, this is the first time the University has gone public in that medium and I believe that this participation helps include us in our rightful place in the higher education professional community. However, one wonders or is curious to know why the “Benefits as a Percent of Average Salary” was not reported?

This year’s report is very timely in that it is a “report on the economic status of the profession that explores myths about higher education and presents data from a variety of sources, including the Faculty Compensation Survey, to bust them. It focuses on four common misperceptions: that faculty are to blame for higher tuition prices; that faculty are “ridiculously overpaid” compared to professionals working in “the real world”; that responding to “disruptive innovations” such as online and for-profit education requires reducing the number of tenure-track faculty; and finally, that if institutions of higher education could get faculty benefits under control, they would be better places for faculty and students.” (p. 1)

Additionally,

“In contrast to these misperceptions, this report shows that the erosion of private endowments and decline of state appropriations, not faculty salaries, have pushed average net price tuition upward. It also uses data on selected disciplines and their closest comparators in professional settings to challenge the notion that faculty are overpaid relative to their counterparts outside of academia. Even among increasingly rare tenured professors, salaries fail to keep up.” (p. 1)

However, the focus our analysis is to look at how this data can be used by us (TSU) in our ongoing budgetary and financial discussion and where we stand in terms of our faculty salaries.

The data analysis for this focus will be based primarily on the reported information found in the “Appendix I” section of the Academe Report on pages 70 – 73. We will assumed that the reported information in that Report is valid and was appropriately submitted by reputable university administrators with authority to release said data.
The purpose of this analysis is to assess where we (TSU faculty) stand compensation-wise in relation to our peers as categorized in this Academe Report by its institutional category as a Category I or Doctoral institution in comparison to our sister institutions with this designation or category status. At the Opening Faculty Meeting Spring 2015, it was brought to the faculty’s attention of how well we are paid and when our benefits were added to our salaries our compensations shows that we (the faculty) are very well paid. Thus, one important purpose of this analysis is to see where we (the TSU faculty) stand in relation or comparison to our peer (Category I) public institutions in relation to our “Total Faculty Compensation” and the implication that we should for lack of a better term-shut up and be thankful that we are working at TSU and not say at Clark Atlanta University.

Methodology:

The methodology of this study was to review the Texas Southern University Faculty Salaries with Others Category I or Doctoral Institutions in Texas as Reported in the March-April 2015 Academe Magazine of the American Association of University Professors Vol. 101, NO. 2 that focused on “Busting the Myths: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2014-15.”

Data gleaned from that Academe Report was analyzed comparatively in an “apples to apples, oranges to oranges” analysis to determine where Texas Southern University stands in comparison to her fellow or sister Category I or Doctoral institutions public state institutions.

For comparative reasons private institutions were limited in order to undertake a truer “apples to apples, oranges to oranges” analysis.

Moreover, “Comparison between public and private institutions can be somewhat problematic, because most public institutions follow Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) accounting principles, while most private institutions follow Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) accounting principles, which are slightly different in their assumptions and calculations.” (Academe, pp.7-8)

Findings:

The presented data in the Academe Report shows that thirteen (13) Texas schools are shown as category I (Doctoral) institutions. These schools are:

- Baylor U
- Rice U
- Southern Methodist U
- Texas A&M U
- Texas Christian U
- Texas Southern U
- Texas Tech U
- Texas Woman’s U
- U Houston
- U Texas-Austin
- U Texas-Dallas
- U Texas-San Antonio

The data in Appendix I are presented under ten (10) separate headings. The ten headings are:

1) Institutional Category
2) Ratings of Average Salary
3) Average Salary by Rank and for All Ranks Combined
4) Rating of Average Compensation
5) Average Compensation by Rank and for All ranks Combined
6) Benefits as a Percent of Average Salary
7) Percent of Faculty with Tenure
8) Percentage Increase in Salary for Continuing Faculty
9) Number of Faculty Members by Rank and Gender
10) Average Salary by Rank and by Gender
Our analysis will narrow its focus of the thirteen Category I schools and look at only the nine (9) state public Category I institutions. These nine state public Category I schools used in this analysis are:

Texas A&M U  
Texas Southern U  
Texas Tech U  
Texas Woman’s U  
U Houston  
U Texas-Austin  
U Texas-Dallas  
U Texas-San Antonio

Of these Category I schools this data analysis will focus on items (3), (5) and (6) above of Appendix I for comparative purposes as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>(3) PR AVG. SALARY ($1000s)</th>
<th>(3) AD AVG. SALARY ($1000s)</th>
<th>(3) AI AVG. SALARY ($1000s)</th>
<th>(3) IN AVG. SALARY ($1000s)</th>
<th>(4) PR AVG. COMPENSATION ($1000s)</th>
<th>(4) AD AVG. COMPENSATION ($1000s)</th>
<th>(4) AI AVG. COMPENSATION ($1000s)</th>
<th>(4) IN AVG. COMPENSATION ($1000s)</th>
<th>(5) BEN. as % of SAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M U</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern U</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>101.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech U</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s U</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Houston</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>169.3</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U North Texas</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Texas-Austin</td>
<td>149.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>118.6</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Texas-Dallas</td>
<td>151.4</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>183.2</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Texas-San Antonio</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on TSUs reporting status for 2) Ratings of Average Salary the top three faculty ranks reported a 5 and for the rank of instructor (IN) reported a 3. According to the “Explanation of Statistical Data” for Col. (2) Ratings of Average Salary (Academe, p. 37)

Each rating represents the percentile interval in which the institution's average salary in a given rank lies (1* is 95th percentile or above; 1 = 80th to 94.9th percentile; and the like). An average salary lower than the twentieth percentile is rated 5. The ratings have been assigned using the actual average salary, which is then rounded to the nearest hundred for publication in Col. (3).

Hence, we are discussing or arguing over low hanging fruit. Table 2 presents TSUs Ratings of Average Salary for the top three instructional ranks are reported on the Academe Report for average salary lower than the twentieth percentile.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>(1) CAT.</th>
<th>(2) AVG. SAL. RTG.</th>
<th>(2) PR</th>
<th>(2) AD</th>
<th>(2) AI</th>
<th>(2) IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average salary and average compensation for Category I faculty at public institutions for the academic ranks of professor (PR), associate professor (AD), and assistant professor (AI) in 2014-2015 (Dollars) along with a breakdown of such average salary and average compensation for Category I faculty at public institutions that are men and women as reported in the Academe Survey Report pages 23 and 24 are presented in Table 3 as follows:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Public SALARY</th>
<th>Public COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY I (Doctoral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>130,039</td>
<td>165,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>92,770</td>
<td>115,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>77,446</td>
<td>101,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>133,468</td>
<td>119,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>91,354</td>
<td>84,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>80,858</td>
<td>73,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Academe Survey Report breaks down or categorizes the West South Central Region as: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, Texas Southern University (TSU) is grouped with the South and more specifically West South Central. The average salary and average compensation for Category I faculty at public institutions in the (South) West South Central region for the academic ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor in 2014-2015 (Dollars) are reported in Table 4 below:

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY I (Doctoral)</th>
<th>South West South Central</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>130,496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>87,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>78,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>161,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>99,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the President’s salary is known, many faculty have raised questions about where does the TSU President’s salary stand relative to it university peers. Many faculty have raised questions about the Chief Academic Leader’s or President’s salary and since the Academe Report provided a comparison of the average salaries of Presidents and faculty for Category I institutions that question was addressed.
The following Table 5 presents the ratio of salaries, president to average full professor and the average presidential salary by medium, minimum, and maximum for Category I (Doctoral) public institutions. Given that in the “Professors: TSU & HBCU Peers” analysis and presentation Category IIA and IIB institutions are used; these categories are used for comparative purposes in the Presidential Average Salaries to Average Full Professor Faculty Salaries. These data are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Salaries of Presidents and Faculty for Category I (Doctoral) Institutions for 2014-2015</th>
<th>Ratio of Salaries, President to Average Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category I (Doctoral)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IIA (Master’s)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IIB (Baccalaureate)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Presidential Salary |
|---|---|
| | Public |
| | Median | Minimum | Maximum |
| Category I (Doctoral) | 430,343 | 240,000 | 1,053,735 |
| Category IIA (Master’s) | 273,255 | 163,000 | 494,000 |
| Category IIB (Baccalaureate) | 221,225 | 93,142 | 765,155 |

Of the nine (9) Texas Category I (Doctoral) institutions, Texas Southern University with a reported average salary of $103,500 for full professors ranked eighth out of the nine public state institutions or schools that ranged from a high average salary of $151,400 for full professors for the University of Texas-Dallas to a low average salary of $90,100 for full professors for the Texas Woman’s University. TSUs average faculty salary for full professors is $47,900 below the high average salary and $20,433 below the groups mean salary of $123,933 for full professor. The groups’ median salary is $119,300 for full professors and TSUs average salary is $15,300 below the groups’ median salary for full professors.

Of the nine (9) Texas Category I (Doctoral) institutions Texas Southern University with a reported average salary of $79,200 for associate professors ranked eighth out of the nine public state institutions or schools that ranged from a high average salary of $112,100 for associate professors for the University of Texas-Dallas to a low average salary of $71,100 for associate professors for the Texas Woman’s University. TSUs average faculty salary for associate professors is $32,900 below the high average salary and $8,778 below the groups mean salary of $87,978 for associate professors. The groups’ median salary is $84,800 for associate professors and TSUs average salary is $5,600 below the groups’ median salary for associate professors.

Of the nine (9) Texas Category I (Doctoral) institutions Texas Southern University with a reported average salary of $60,400 for assistant professors ranked eighth out of the nine public state institutions or schools that ranged from a high average salary of $105,200 for assistant professors for the University of Texas-Dallas to a low average salary of $60,000 for assistant professors for the Texas Woman’s University. TSUs average faculty salary for assistant professors is $44,800 below the high average salary and $17,344 below the groups mean salary of $77,744 for assistant professors. The groups’ median salary is $72,400 for assistant professors and TSUs average salary is $12,000 below the groups’ median salary for assistant professors.
Since TSU did not report any data for its “Average Compensation” or its “Benefits as a Percentage of Salary” no analysis could be made as any such analysis would be limited or of no importance or consequence. It is also noted that the data for average “Presidential Salary” utilized median data hence the faculty salary data should also be subjected to this methodology or treatment for comparative analysis.

Further, the data provided by the Office of Human Resources and Payroll Services proved unworthy given that that data or document did not follow the reporting requirements for same as it includes the summer teaching salary and thus skews the results for comparative analysis and equality.

Regarding the President’s salary to average full professors’ salary at TSU, it is easily determined that the President’s median salary is larger or greater than 3.75 times the reported average full professor’s average salary of $103,500. Additionally, the President’s salary is 3.75 times greater than the reported group median salary of $119,300 for full professors.

Discussion:

When I was a relatively young struggling junior professor, one senior professor of chemistry, Dr. Paul Thurston, would bemoan and argue against the administration giving monetary faculty raises and suggested that salary increments should be given in terms of benefit equivalents instead. In my youth, I would always challenge him that wealthy or relative wealthy individuals always seek or focus on the intangibles while the struggling individuals seek or focus on their primary need of obtaining real money to pay the bills. In the benefits versus salary argument with say Clark Atlanta University, we at TSU might be on the losing end as it appears Clark Atlanta University provides its faculty with “Benefits as a Percent of Average Salary” of 30.4%. Since TSU did not officially report its “Benefits as a Percent of Average Salary” based on a rough calculation of the “Employee Total Compensation Statement” sent out to faculty appears to be a “Benefits as a Percent of Average Salary” equal to or less than 16.5%. (p. 45) Without any further knowledge or data that 13.9 percentage advantage difference in benefits using Dr. Thurston’s argument could significantly offset the monetary difference in salary to make Clark Atlanta University from a strictly fiscal perspective the better choice or deal.

Regarding average faculty salaries, the data found that for comparative purposes and administrative redress should utilize median salary data. Based on that data, (1) TSU full professors’ average salary is $15,300 below the groups’ median salary for full professors of $119,300, (2) TSU associate professors’ average salary is $5,600 below the groups’ median salary for associate professors of $84,800, and (3) TSU assistant professors’ average salary is $12,000 below the groups’ median salary for assistant professors of $72,400.

Using that data and the numbers reported in the Academe Report for a faculty of 281 members by the first three academic ranks would need a sum total of $2,936,500 to level up the faculty to the Category I (Doctoral) median salary using (2014-2015) dollars. The amount need using current salaries would require an allocation of $1,667,700 for 109 full professors; $632,800 for 113 associate professors; and $636,000 for 53 assistant professors. Six (6) faculty members were shown for the rank of instructor for TSU and were thus not addressed as insignificant or small sample.
Given the variance or discrepancy or accuracy of the reported data presented in the Figure 1 shown below, we assumed the efficacy of the data to be highly suspect and not worthy of further analysis. The validity and reliability of any findings and results that accrue as a result of analysis of this data would be very questionable and untenable.

**Fact Check:**

As “The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession” is usually published in the March-April edition of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Magazine, the presentation given that showed that the “Summary of 2013-14 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Salary Survey” report was “Prepared: Fall 2014”, would naturally cause one to raise one’s eyebrow as to the authenticity of the reported data for 2013-14. With that knowledge, we decided to review that data and found significant differences in the data found in that presentation and the data reported in the Losing Focus: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession 2013-14.

Our analysis of that Report found the disparities in the data reporting and we thus generated the following Table 6 that reports the true data for the selected “Professors: TSU & HBCU Peers” TSUs data are shown in Figure 1 and these data are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Full professor avg. salary</th>
<th>Avg. Salary ($1000s) *</th>
<th>Category Rating or Ranking **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston main campus</td>
<td>$118,500</td>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>$96,100</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University at San Marcos</td>
<td>$95,800</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University</td>
<td>$95,400</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>$92,900</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>$86,800</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
<td>$75,400</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>$73,700</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>$70,900</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>$67,600</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.5</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N/R –Not Reported Data in Academe 2013-14 Salary Report Appendix I; used in Avg. Salary ($1000s) calculation
** Category IIA - (Master’s); Category IIB - (Baccalaureate)
It is worth noting that the information shared with the faculty from HR Communications or the Office of Human Resources and Payroll Services regarding their “Employee Total Compensation Package” that provided a detailed itemization of one’s total compensation, including benefits, during Calendar Year 2014 at Texas Southern University is inaccurately prepared relative to the commonly used reporting procedure or mechanism used by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Hence, that Report yields or paints a distorted picture of one’s total compensation package. The picture that it paints is more beneficial than a true or actual annual total compensation package would paint using AAUP format. With that said, it is worthy or good to read that one’s (your) “service and contributions to Texas Southern University are (is) greatly valued.”

NOTES:


Institutional Assessment, Planning & Effectiveness (IAPE), Summary of 2013-14 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Salary Survey, Texas Southern University, Prepared: Fall 2014

Office of Human Resources and Payroll Services, “Employee Total Compensation Package” Calendar Year 2014, Texas Southern University
Dr. Chilakamarri, beloved friend and colleague served as the Graduate School Senator from 2013 to 2015, and was an Associate Professor in the department of Mathematical Sciences from 2004 to present. He has served in countless roles and was an advocate for his students and his peers.

Dr. Chilakamarri’s career in Higher Education started in 1991, and he was a respected and sought after lecturer and researcher throughout his career. He was a regular invited visitor (with support) to DIMACS, an NSF Science and Technology Center for Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, during the Summers of 1992–1996. DIMACS is a cooperative project of Princeton University, Rutgers University, AT&T Bell Laboratories and Bellcore. During his visit to Bellcore he developed a mathematical method for analyzing any large network with a view to measuring relative interaction levels among various subsets of the network.

As an independent contractor working through UTC (Universal Technology Corporation, Dayton, OH) Dr. Chilakamarri developed a “Thermal-Acoustic fatigue damage accumulation model of random “snap-throughs”, with Dr. Jon Lee at AFRL (VASS), WPAFB. This work appears in the 8th ASCE Specialty Conference on Probabilistic Mechanics and Structural Reliability (PMC2000, July 2000, University of Notre Dame, IN, available on CD-ROM). In this work damage from random snap-throughs following a Poisson distribution and damage from random vibrations following white noise is combined to calculate total damage (non-linear combination).

Dr. Chilakamarri conducted a Literature Search on High Cycle Fatigue - Probabilistics, a survey done during December, 1999-April, 2000. The Final Report was submitted to AFRL/PRTC in April 2000. Dr. Chilakamarri taught two classes to the scientists at NASA (GRC) Cleveland, in August 2001. The classes were based on his research about “Error Estimation in Reliability Analysis”. Dr. Chilakamarri was a member of DYDAN a center for Dynamic Data Analysis for Homeland Security located at Rutgers University. With DYDAN his efforts are concentrated on data visualization and giant network visualization and developing similarity measures with in a large network.
WE WISH YOU A FOND FAREWELL…

The 2013 – 2015 school year was an important year for Texas Southern University, and the faculty. All of the senators and officers who are leaving the Faculty Senate will be missed. Many of them participated in the revisions to the Faculty Manual, and advocated for their peers on a variety of issues and concerns. A special recognition is due Dr. Lalita Sen, who is leaving the board after serving many years in the Faculty Senate, her most recent contribution being her service as Treasurer for two consecutive years.

Goodbye to These 2013 – 2015 Executive Officers

Dr. Lalita Sen
Treasurer

Dr. Nina Saha-Gupta
Faculty Speaks Editor

Dr. Emiel Owens
Parliamentarian

Dr. Rasoul Saneifard
will continue his tenure as Chair.

Dr. Vera Hawkins
begins her new position as Parliamentarian.

Dr. Jafus Cavil
will continue his tenure as secretary.

AND WE WELCOME NEW OFFICERS!

Welcome to our New 2015 – 2017 Executive Officers

Dr. Luis Perez-Feliciano
Faculty Speaks Editor

Dr. Edieth Wu
Vice-Chair

Dr. Olurominiyi Ibitayo
Secretary
THE IVORY TOWER COMES TO TSU

The thing about Balance is that it does not take much for it to make the ungainly transition into imbalance. This transition from Balance to Imbalance is taking the field of higher education on a roller coaster ride. The field itself is finding itself at a crossroads where student concerns have shifted to the ever increasing cost of attending college, without the assurance of a job at the end of the road. These life-long debts students incur as a result of ‘higher Education,’ has become a much discussed and dialogue phenomenon. In an effort to do it’s part to bring attention on this, the Texas Council of Faculty Senates joined with the TSU Faculty Senate for a viewing of the documentary, The Ivory Tower, followed by a Debt Workshop on School Loans. Thank you to everyone who came and helped make it a success!

CMJ

LUNCH, RELATIONSHIPS, AND ACTION PLANS

Spring semester the Faculty Senate made a bold statement when they started the Senate Social Hour. The Faculty Senate represents the faculty, but it became obvious to many senators that the faculty did not necessarily have opportunities to get to know their senators. The question then became, “How can we expect our constituents to a) seek us out when they have issues, and b) feel comfortable telling us the issue.

The Senate Social Hour grew from a need to give constituents access to their senators in an informal and relaxing environment. Marketed as an opportunity for faculty to come to the Library and stay for lunch with other faculty and senators, it’s success has been a matter of great pride. The Senate Social Hour is the 1st Wednesday of every month. It will resume in September, and with the help of all faculty members, it can form powerful alliances between senators and their constituents.

CMJ
It's hard to believe that the Fall Semester is upon us already, and with the end of summer, we can reflect on all that we want to accomplish this year.

As you make academic and personal plans for the upcoming year, it is important to reflect on the substantive role each of us has played to the success and growth of Texas Southern University.

We are branches to this tree that sustains and connects each of us to the other. TSU depends on each of us to sustain it as it does us.

This symbiotic relationship exists in nature so two different species can benefit from the interaction. It is a relationship that is fundamental to the survival of each.

As in nature, we each have our own relationship with TSU. Mine started as a preschooler in the early childhood development school with the amazing Ms. Dora Hodges, where I could often be found making my way across the hall to play piano in my Uncle Oddis’s office (Dr. Oddis Turner). This transitioned into my attendance in several summer camps, including Dr. Carol Hightower-Parker’s program and Dr. Hill’s REEP program, where I fell in love with science for the first time.

Years later, Mr. George Thomas took a chance on a college student from Virginia with big ideas who talked too much and gave me my first internship at KTSU. KTSU was there again when Dr. Hope-Thompson gave me, a recent graduate with more big ideas, my own radio show. With his support it became a success until his untimely death where he was taken from all of us too soon.

Now, as a doctoral student in the College of Education, it is no different. I am surrounded by administrators and faculty who are committed to excellence, and committed to me as they are to all of their students. Through my 20+ year relationship with Texas Southern University, it has become a “Home” and a family because it houses YOU: the faculty and administration. Each of you who takes time with your students, or sees potential and harvests it. Hats off to you all!

I feel strongly about doing my part to serve Texas Southern University as I have been served through the commitment of the faculty and staff throughout the years.

As the school year starts be encouraged to think of ways you can continue to serve. It might be joining a committee, or even saying something positive about TSU to those who are not a part of this ecosystem of diversity. Both of these are like water to the tree that is this great institution. It is said that like branches on a tree, we all grow in different directions, but like a root we are all fed by the same source.

As we meet new students, get settled back in if we’ve been gone for the summer, reflect on the root that is TSU: how it has served us, and what we can each continue doing to repay the favor.

Thank You For Your Service ....

Charlene M. James
Assistant Editor, Faculty Speaks