

**SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2010  
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**Agenda**

Toby Boulet, President  
Joan Heminway, President-Elect  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate

Becky Jacobs, Parliamentarian  
Stefanie Ohnesorg, Information Officer

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)  
Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)  
Provost's Report (S. Martin)

**MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Meeting, November 16, 2009 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting, January 11, 2010 (information item)

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Budget and Planning Committee (D. Bruce)  
Committee on Nominations and Appointments (J. Heminway)  
Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Proposed change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws (J. Heminway) (information item)

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 16, 2009 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, January 11, 2010 (information item)  
Faculty Senate President's Report  
2008-2009 Faculty Salary Data Report  
2008-2009 OIRA Gender Equity Study  
Resolution on Summary Sheet Used for Tenure and Promotion  
Resolution on External Letters of Reference for Tenure and Promotion  
Proposed Change to Bylaws (information item)

**DISTRIBUTED BY:** Sharonne L. Winston, Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate  
812 Volunteer Boulevard  
974-2483

**PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:** Toby Boulet  
Department of Mechanical, Aerospace & Biomedical Engineering  
974-8376; [boulet@utk.edu](mailto:boulet@utk.edu)

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
November 16, 2009

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Roberto Benson, Caula Beyl, Bill Blass, Doug Blaze, Bill Bradshaw, Ernest Brewer, Jim Conant, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Michael Handelsman\*, Russel Hirst, Roxanne Hovland, Denise Jackson, Robert Jones, Yuri Kamyckov, Jun Lin, John Lounsbury, Norman Magden, Brent Mallinckrodt, Mary McAlpin, Lane Morris, Lynne Parker, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Jon Shefner, Michael Sims, Montgomery Smith, Carla Sommardahl, Marlys Staudt, Carrie Stephens, Sam Swan, Dwight Teeter, Matthew Theriot, Patricia Tithof, Pia Wood, Yang Zhong

\*Alternate Senators: Baldwin Lee for Michael Handelsman

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

#### Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet's report was distributed prior to the meeting. He drew attention to several items in his report. He said he was thinking of surveying contingent faculty about representation on the Senate. If a survey were conducted in the spring, there would be time over the summer to decide whether contingent faculty representation should be pursued. L. Craig pointed out that two of the five Senators from the College of Veterinary Medicine are non-tenure track. Boulet indicated he would look into it further.

- President Simek has proceeded with establishing a committee to study the optimum reporting line for athletics. T. Diacon will chair the committee that will have five UTK faculty members as members. There will be a press release.
- Boulet drew attention to the report on the status of academic freedom at UTK attached to the meeting materials. The report prepared by S. Simmons will be discussed at the January 11 meeting of the Executive Council. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has been pursuing the issue at the national level. He expected the President of the local AAUP, an at-large member of the Executive Council, would bring any local activities on the issue to the Executive Council.
- Boulet reported that various universities have created tobacco-free campuses. Human Relations is in the process of gathering information on how they did it. No decision has been made.
- He noted that the position of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs involved a redefinition and suggested that any questions about it be directed to the Provost during her presentation.
- In January Chancellor Cheek will meet with the Executive Council and the full Senate to discuss the ongoing reorganization of Human Resources.

J. Nolt endorsed the proposed exploration of the situation of contingent faculty noting that if they were not represented they could not speak.

### Provost's Report (S. Martin)

S. Martin explained that in order to plan for the 8% decrease currently being met by stimulus funds, the Provost's Office has been engaging in strategic planning meetings with Deans and their staffs. About half of the meetings have been held. Once the meetings are completed, she will report to various bodies (including the Senate) on the meetings.

Currently, the Program Review, Reduction and Reallocation (PRRR) report is being used to consider program reduction. Also, current offerings are being examined to see if greater efficiency could be achieved in offering General Education courses. She suggested the General Education Curriculum might be streamlined, up-dated, and courses fit to the Ready for the World initiative. She said the General Education requirements had basically been unchanged for about two decades.

She noted that formerly the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs position had focused more on operations. The search committee interviewed three candidates. She was waiting for their report. She said the position would focus less on tactics to increase retention and more on enhancing program excellence. The Vice Provost will work closely with the Undergraduate Council and also on promoting graduate programs.

## **MINUTES**

### *Faculty Senate Meeting*

The minutes of the October 19, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were moved and seconded. Minutes approved.

### *Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting*

The minutes of the November 2, 2009, meeting of the Executive Committee will be available on the web as an information item.

## **PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

There was no previous business.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### Graduate Council (M. Essington)

M. Essington reported on the electronically posted minutes of the October 22, 2009, Graduate Council minutes. Among the actions reported in the minutes was approval of a readmission policy that conformed with the undergraduate policy. Programs were approved. The Council voted against a change in the registration deadline that was also opposed by the graduate student organization. And, people were approved to direct dissertations. Courses that had not been taught were dropped. Birdwell moved approval and Koontz seconded. The Minutes were approved.

### Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)

The Minutes of the October 20, 2009, meeting required approval. D. Thompson said the committee reports were fairly standard, addressing some curricular changes, appeals and General Education courses. There had been some comments on the electronic digital software that will follow students throughout their academic careers. It is being tested in the College of Business Administration with the goal of it being available to all advisors in the fall. Notes can be placed in the file, so information/consultation is documented. It will be fully integrated with BANNER. Thompson said in the spring it would be able to handle transfer students and articulation agreements.

T. Wang asked whether it had anything to do with TUFS. Boulet said it did not. Thompson said the question was why it was so difficult to transfer from one public Tennessee institution of higher education to another. P. Crilly asked how maintenance of standards would be addressed.

Thompson said the system cannot address different grading standards. B. Lyons said rather than requiring the same courses everywhere, instead each institution's acceptance of completed General Education packages was the focus. Thompson said the question was how would the University establish that a student had completed the courses, as many students partially complete them. Birdwell moved approval of the minutes. Wang seconded. Minutes approved.

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council  
MINUTES  
January 11, 2010

Present: Marianne Breinig, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Donald Bruce (via phone), Chris Cimino, Jimmy Cheek, Rob Heller, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Lloyd Rinehart, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas, and Dixie Thompson

Guest: Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant)

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the November 2, 2009, meeting was to be distributed by email.

### **III. REPORTS**

#### President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet added to his written report that information about how to register for Safe Zone training at the Conference Center would be forthcoming. He also had brought a better copy of the Strategic Planning Model diagram. He indicated Chancellor Cheek had hired a consultant for the project.

#### Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

Chancellor Cheek drew attention to the Governor's announcement about the joint UT/ORNL Center. The interdisciplinary doctoral program in energy science would involve \$6 million in non-recurring start up funds. He also noted Governor Bredesen also announced he wanted UT to be a top 25 university. A gap analysis needed to be conducted, so that plans could be made about how to close gaps. Cheek said the Governor's declaration was a major step forward. The Governor also indicated that criteria for students transferring to UTK would be more stringent than to other institutions in the state. In addition, Bredesen addressed performance funding, particularly the need to focus more on the number of students graduating rather than the number enrolling. Although UTK's current graduation rate is the highest of all the state schools, it could do better.

*Athletics.* With regard to the Athletic Department's reporting structure, Cheek said B. Lyons had written a good epistle about athletics. He indicated he was aware that Boulet was working on the issue. In February, Cheek planned to speak to the Task Force.

*Efficiency.* Cheek said he had reduced his budget about 15%, partly by eliminating positions, e.g., Human Resources Director. During the same time period the University of Tennessee system was working on making some changes, notably changing the organization of Human Resources under Linda Hendricks. Cheek talked with President Simek about the lack of a human resources person in his cabinet. The result is he planned to appoint her to be Vice Chancellor for Human Resources for UTK, a no-cost appointment.

*Ombudsperson.* J. Nolt has pushed for resolution and a solution has been reached for at least one year with the appointment of Bill Nugent as faculty Ombudsperson. The Ombudsperson

Search Committee was informed that the search was on hold for a year and Cheek hoped that the temporary arrangement would work in the long run because of the tight budget.

*Budget.* Tuition has to be increased (e.g., by 9%) because that is the only available source of money, as the colleges' budgets cannot be raided further. Cheek said his major issue was faculty salaries. For three years there had been no raises. He did not know what could be done to change that but he was trying. If there were salary raises, there probably would be both a minimum amount and a cap set. He noted it was unlikely that raises would be forthcoming. There had been forward movement on setting differential tuition rates for three colleges. Another issue was full time enrollment. If UTK wants students to graduate in a timely manner, students need to pay for 15 hours. (Georgia made that move beginning with the current academic year.)

*Questions.* B. Lyons had a question about the appointment of Hendricks. He noted that last fall the Executive Council had discussed with the Chancellor the need for searches when filling Vice Chancellor positions. He expressed concern about what precedent her appointment might be setting. Cheek said there was no way to do a search. He needed someone at the cabinet level. She was the only person who could fill the position.

Lyons asked another question about the distribution of funds received from charging differential tuition rates, specifically whether the other colleges teaching 40% of the credit hours taken by the students in the three colleges would get any of the additional funds. Cheek said when he arrived on campus the plan was to reduce Nursing's enrolment by 50%. Students came to see him in the fall about the importance of maintaining enrollments in that College. Differential tuition appears to be the solution. He explained to Lyons that not enough money would come from differential tuition to solve the problems of the three colleges and to support the college providing 40% of their students' instruction, so it would only go to the three colleges.

Lyons also raised a question about the University's non-discrimination statement. He said the statement used for employees and the statements appearing in other locations, such as the commencement program were not the same. J. Heminway said the General Counsel was reluctant to change the non-discrimination statement because the University could not offer benefits to partners.

D. Birdwell said he was supportive of the Governor's goal of increasing the University's ranking and that it might be a good time to do so because outstanding people might be recruited from universities in states with severe economic problems, e.g., California. Birdwell asked about the categories used by Human Resources for approximately the past 8 years. The categories do not differentiate adequately among professionals. Birdwell said he had to go through special procedures and endless paperwork to appropriately pay people in research positions. Cheek said he would have Hendricks get in touch with K. Stephenson (Research Council) to work on the problem. He noted the categories also had been an issue with the Baker Center.

Birdwell said he was glad there would be a new program with ORNL, but he thought quality could be an issue. He asked whether there would be 200 people at the laboratory qualified to be on UTK's faculty. Cheek said there was a need to have a process similar to the one that involves [UC] Berkeley in the hiring of personnel. Birdwell suggested that after a time some deterioration in the lab personnel could occur due to the structure of the lab, i.e., the focus on

short term funding and the high cost of infrastructure there. He further argued that ORNL does not attract as high quality personnel as the University does and as a result caution has to be exercised to not starve campus programs. Cheek indicated there was a need to attract high quality students and see that they have high quality experiences, using Berkeley as a model. M. Breinig noted that her department, Physics, had experience working with ORNL. She said such arrangements are not free in that they require a lot of supervision from UTK faculty. It takes resources and time to supervise such programs and to prevent students in them from becoming alienated. Birdwell noted that one problem in the past with creating joint appointments had been that after a year or two the lab indicates it is going in another direction and the campus had to pick up 100% of the people's salaries.

L. Rinehart said achieving a top 25 ranking involves more than just money; it also involves cultural change. Cheek said the campus has to continue to emphasize its traditional strengths, but to make it clear that research and graduate training are critical. Birdwell said business processes were another critical area leading to the squandering of time.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

Senate's Position on Reporting of Athletics (T. Boulet & D. Bruce)

[D. Bruce participated via phone.] Bruce said he thought timing was the big issue for the Senate report and March 1 would be better than February 1. Bruce said he, through the work of the task force chaired by T. Diacon, had plenty of information and deliberations were going well. On February 5 Boulet will make a presentation to the task force. He noted there appear to be overwhelming sentiment for moving to the campus. J. Nolt said he was not clear about what advantage there would be in delaying the report until March, as the report could be an impetus to change in February. Bruce said it would be a bit awkward to recommend that the Faculty Senate "get ahead" of the task force in taking a position. He thought it would be more powerful for the Senate to pass a resolution supporting the recommendation of the task force. Nolt pointed out that changing the reporting structure was a long standing position of the Faculty Senate. Bruce said he thought that Boulet would make that point in his February 5 presentation. J. Heminway tried to create a compromise approach. Nolt moved that a resolution be discussed in February and that a vote be taken in March. Motion seconded. Lyons asked about the need for a specific resolution. Heminway explained that there would not be a specific resolution; instead Boulet would present the proposed position in anticipation of a vote on a specific resolution in March. Motion approved.

Boulet asked Bruce about an additional issue. According to C. Cimino, the Athletic Department budget is already part of the UTK budget. So, the issue is that the Athletic Department currently gets directives from both the campus and the system. Boulet planned to make that clear. Lyons noted that the Women's Athletic Department was on the E & G side of the budget, although state money was not spent on it. Birdwell said he was concerned about why gifts to academic units could not be considered. The answer was it was an IRS [Internal Revenue Service] issue.

#### Budget and Planning Committee: Salary Study (D. Bruce)

Heminway said she was concerned about the OIRA (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment) study of salaries. She thought there should be a better method for examining gender differences in salaries and noted S. Gardial had offered to pursue better methodological techniques with L. Gross. Heminway asked whether it was reasonable to ask the committee to pursue that issue.

Lyons asked Bruce about the living wage study. The Senate had resolved to have an annual snapshot. Bruce said he did not realize that there has been a resolution binding the Committee to obtaining such data. He said the committee already had a full agenda and because of the lack of salary raises nothing had changed. Lyons emphasized the need to look at the situation in terms of the Senate Bylaws.

#### Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas brought two resolutions from the Committee. One involved changing check boxes to signature lines. Some unofficial guidelines were incorporated into the formal text and some text was replaced. Heminway indicated she endorsed the resolutions. With regard to external letters of assessment, she thought there were already enough challenges finding appropriate reviewers in esoteric areas. Lyons said he thought part of the material sent to potential reviewers should be the written criteria for progression to the rank in question. As an outside reviewer he found such criteria very important. So, he suggested adding that the criteria being sent become a requirement. Rinehart said he preferred using his own standards. D. Thompson noted the document already stated that the criteria should be sent to reviewers. She noted departments need flexibility in selecting the institutions reviewers might come from. Thomas said he would like to proceed with the resolutions as submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee: a change in the signature format and a change in the requirements for external assessors. Both resolutions were approved.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Boulet noted that a gender neutral restroom resolution would be appearing before the SGA [Student Government Association]. Lyons proposed having a report. Boulet clarified that the goal was to have them included in new construction. Hodges Library would be the one existing building that would be at issue. Birdwell asked whether it should not just say new construction, as such restrooms should be in the plans.

Adjournment was moved by Birdwell, seconded by Heminway and approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.



## UTK Faculty Senate President's Report

February 1, 2010

1. Brown bag lunches with the Provost and the Faculty Senate President will be held again this term, but perhaps with specific themes. Dates will be available soon.
2. Safe Zone training will be conducted on Wednesday, February 24, from 8:30 - 11:30 a. m., in room 238 of the Conference Center Building. Interested faculty are encouraged to register. The latest edition of Training Pages, which is here [http://humanresources.tennessee.edu/eod/Publications/TP\\_Spring%202010.pdf](http://humanresources.tennessee.edu/eod/Publications/TP_Spring%202010.pdf) has details of the course (p. 15) and registration instructions (p. 2).
3. The campus has engaged a consultant to facilitate a rapid iteration of the strategic plan for UTK. The consultant, from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, is working closely with the Provost and has solicited input from both the Faculty Senate President and the Council of Deans.
4. On January 11, Chancellor Cheek met with the Executive Council and reported at length on the pending legislation on higher education, the proposed joint UTK-ORNL graduate program and the reorganization of Human Resources for the UT System and UTK.
5. On January 25, the UT Faculty Council met with UT Interim President Jan Simek in Nashville, for a frank discussion of current issues, including the recently passed legislation regarding higher education. More about the legislation is in item 7., below, and in the draft of the Council's minutes, which is available here: [http://web.utk.edu/~utfc/docs/minutes/FC\\_Meeting\\_12\\_Jan\\_25\\_2010.pdf](http://web.utk.edu/~utfc/docs/minutes/FC_Meeting_12_Jan_25_2010.pdf)
6. The task force considering whether Athletics should report to the UT System or to the UTK campus is hearing from a wide variety of constituents. At the task force's meeting on February 5, the Faculty Senate President will speak about the Senate's position on this issue. Based on comments received from the Senate thus far, the following points will be communicated to the task force.
  - (a) Since UTK athletic programs are part of campus operations, they should be controlled by the Chancellor of UTK.
  - (b) At almost all other major public universities, athletic programs are under campus control.
  - (c) Student-athletes are students first, athletes second. To serve their best interests, the Chancellor should outrank athletic directors and the Chancellor should control the budget for all campus programs, including athletics. The budget for Athletics is currently handled through UTK E-accounts.
  - (d) Since allocation of space for new facilities should not be a matter of competition between the campus and the Athletics departments, all athletics facilities should be part of the campus master plan, which is controlled by the Chancellor.
  - (e) The public needs to understand that athletic programs are part of the University, and not the other way around. To promote this understanding, control of communications about UTK and all of its programs, including Athletics, should rest with the Chancellor.

At its next meeting, on February 15, the Executive Council will consider drafting a resolution on this issue, to come before the Senate on March 1.

7. On January 27, the Faculty Senate President attended the latest meeting of the General Education committee of the Undergraduate Council. Sally McMillan, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the committee discussed the implications of the new legislation on higher education. Although several details are not yet known, it is clear that the legislation leaves the faculty in control of the curriculum and should facilitate transfer of students between UTK and other public colleges and universities in Tennessee. The legislation does not require the faculty to change degree requirements for any major.

## 2008-2009 Faculty Salary Data Report

(prepared Nov. 16, 2009)

Using the UT October 2008 payroll and data from the Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline (<http://vpaf.okstate.edu/IRIM/FacultySalary.html>), each fall the Budget Committee requests that the UT Office of Institutional Research & Assessment produce an Excel file which shows the following data for every rank (Lecturer, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor) in every unit in relation to our peer institutions.

The columns in the table refer to:

1. College
2. Department
3. Rank
4. 2008 UTK average salary
5. 2008 UTK average salary divided by 2007 UTK average salary
6. 2008 UTK median salary
7. 2008 UTK median salary divided by 2007 UTK median salary
8. UT average salary in ratio to the thirty Southern University Group institutions
9. UT average salary in ratio to the ten THEC Peer Institutions

Note that all data for SUG and THEC Institutions is from October 2008. For continuity we are comparing this data to October 2008 data from UT. In addition, we do not have median salary data for SUG and THEC institutions. This table does not include salary data for Library Faculty. Also, part-time faculty are not listed in this study. All salaries are calculated on a nine-month basis, include any longevity pay and administrative supplements, but do not include any extra service pay.

Since it began compiling an analysis of this salary data four years ago, the Budget and Planning Committee observed that the University of Tennessee needs a clearly articulated Faculty Salary Policy. While the disparity between salaries in different disciplines is an understandable consequence of market pressures, we think it might be unnecessary that some academic units fall much further below SUG or THEC averages than do other units. The practice of awarding salary pools to a given academic unit as a percentage of its base salary tends to perpetuate these differences. This report shows that the University needs to continue to address this.

### 2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL & EXTENSION EDUC	PROF	60,789	100.2%	60,789	100.2%	69.5	66.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL & EXTENSION EDUC	ASSOC	70,141	-	70,141	-	93.0	88.9
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL & EXTENSION EDUC	ASST	60,000	94.2%	60,000	94.2%	97.5	96.9
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS	PROF	100,310	98.3%	93,589	100.1%	98.1	97.0
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS	ASSOC	66,688	100.2%	66,688	100.2%	82.5	82.2
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS	ASST	64,203	103.3%	60,663	100.0%	88.9	85.4
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURE SCI & NAT RES	PROF	90,786	110.4%	90,786	110.4%	83.7	75.2
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	AGRICULTURE SCI & NAT RES	ASSOC	66,142	-	66,142	-	84.8	81.2

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ANIMAL SCIENCE	PROF	91,815	99.5%	95,105	108.8%	96.9	97.0
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ANIMAL SCIENCE	ASSOC	69,688	100.1%	70,315	100.1%	97.7	95.8
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ANIMAL SCIENCE	ASST	61,888	104.6%	60,614	102.4%	96.3	94.8
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ANIMAL SCIENCE	LECT	38,850	100.8%	38,850	100.8%	84.1	81.4
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	BIOSYSTEMS ENG & SOIL SCI	PROF	89,195	103.0%	92,029	100.1%	85.5	84.8
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	BIOSYSTEMS ENG & SOIL SCI	ASSOC	72,908	97.1%	70,327	96.7%	94.2	95.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	BIOSYSTEMS ENG & SOIL SCI	ASST	58,074	100.1%	58,074	100.1%	83.1	82.7
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ENTOMOLOGY & PLANT PATH	PROF	91,154	100.3%	92,237	104.3%	100.9	99.6
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ENTOMOLOGY & PLANT PATH	ASSOC	74,705	100.1%	78,751	100.1%	107.3	107.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	ENTOMOLOGY & PLANT PATH	ASST	60,387	100.2%	60,387	100.2%	99.9	99.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FOOD SCIENCE & TECH	PROF	90,449	91.2%	88,784	89.5%	96.2	97.2
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FOOD SCIENCE & TECH	ASSOC	64,165	94.8%	65,767	97.3%	91.7	92.8
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FOOD SCIENCE & TECH	ASST	61,764	100.2%	61,724	100.5%	100.5	99.7
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FORESTRY,WILDLIFE & FISHERIES	PROF	83,971	95.5%	85,589	99.1%	92.0	90.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FORESTRY,WILDLIFE & FISHERIES	ASSOC	64,287	100.3%	62,647	100.2%	93.2	92.0
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	FORESTRY,WILDLIFE & FISHERIES	ASST	57,267	100.1%	57,293	100.0%	97.2	97.4
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	PLANT SCIENCES	PROF	89,001	93.2%	80,656	84.9%	96.2	95.4
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	PLANT SCIENCES	ASSOC	66,456	96.8%	65,807	99.9%	96.0	96.3
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	PLANT SCIENCES	ASST	60,839	99.8%	60,839	99.0%	99.3	100.0
AGRI SCI & NAT RES	PLANT SCIENCES	LECT	34,356	-	34,356	-	72.8	69.1
ARCHITECTURE	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE	PROF	94,458	100.4%	89,892	98.4%	91.3	88.4
ARCHITECTURE	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE	ASSOC	79,990	99.1%	79,891	98.6%	106.1	103.5
ARCHITECTURE	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE	ASST	60,043	93.4%	62,100	97.7%	98.9	97.0
ARCHITECTURE	SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE	LECT	48,297	95.3%	48,000	100.0%	117.2	107.3
BUSINESS ADMIN	ACCOUNTING	PROF	150,465	99.0%	146,721	100.0%	92.9	84.7
BUSINESS ADMIN	ACCOUNTING	ASSOC	151,089	100.0%	151,089	100.0%	115.4	108.5
BUSINESS ADMIN	ACCOUNTING	ASST	138,467	100.0%	136,500	100.0%	101.0	92.0
BUSINESS ADMIN	ACCOUNTING	LECT	57,041	98.2%	50,250	99.1%	92.8	94.7
BUSINESS ADMIN	ECONOMICS	PROF	136,747	96.1%	137,445	100.1%	96.9	89.6
BUSINESS ADMIN	ECONOMICS	ASSOC	91,392	110.0%	85,419	101.7%	96.5	87.4
BUSINESS ADMIN	ECONOMICS	ASST	88,212	106.4%	87,605	106.3%	99.7	91.9
BUSINESS ADMIN	ECONOMICS	LECT	72,053	85.4%	72,053	85.4%	107.1	92.5

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
BUSINESS ADMIN	FINANCE	PROF	147,938	99.7%	146,797	101.9%	84.2	77.1
BUSINESS ADMIN	FINANCE	ASSOC	151,348	111.1%	131,318	113.0%	108.8	98.0
BUSINESS ADMIN	FINANCE	ASST	155,000	100.0%	155,000	100.0%	107.8	97.4
BUSINESS ADMIN	FINANCE	LECT	59,530	87.3%	59,530	87.3%	99.2	94.3
BUSINESS ADMIN	MANAGEMENT	PROF	136,415	100.1%	141,948	100.1%	81.8	74.5
BUSINESS ADMIN	MANAGEMENT	ASSOC	103,263	100.1%	105,800	100.1%	81.5	74.0
BUSINESS ADMIN	MANAGEMENT	ASST	83,339	124.7%	83,339	154.7%	68.7	62.5
BUSINESS ADMIN	MANAGEMENT	LECT	67,299	95.4%	70,412	104.3%	95.9	80.6
BUSINESS ADMIN	MARKETING LOGISTICS & TRANS	PROF	161,793	102.0%	171,745	100.1%	101.1	88.5
BUSINESS ADMIN	MARKETING LOGISTICS & TRANS	ASSOC	120,300	103.0%	117,067	113.1%	99.7	86.4
BUSINESS ADMIN	MARKETING LOGISTICS & TRANS	ASST	114,062	99.0%	114,863	96.2%	95.7	89.0
BUSINESS ADMIN	MARKETING LOGISTICS & TRANS	LECT	59,439	83.1%	59,215	83.4%	109.3	115.9
BUSINESS ADMIN	STATISTICS	PROF	119,959	98.2%	108,520	92.8%	90.2	88.3
BUSINESS ADMIN	STATISTICS	ASSOC	85,034	100.1%	82,793	100.1%	84.8	83.7
BUSINESS ADMIN	STATISTICS	ASST	94,570	100.0%	95,000	100.0%	110.7	111.8
BUSINESS ADMIN	STATISTICS	LECT	52,765	100.2%	52,765	100.2%	106.0	108.7
COMMUNICATIONS	ADVERTISING/PUBLIC RELATIONS	PROF	94,172	97.6%	95,296	99.8%	95.5	93.8
COMMUNICATIONS	ADVERTISING/PUBLIC RELATIONS	ASSOC	63,882	98.5%	63,882	98.1%	87.0	85.4
COMMUNICATIONS	ADVERTISING/PUBLIC RELATIONS	ASST	54,762	100.2%	54,220	101.6%	87.8	80.8
COMMUNICATIONS	COMMUNICATION STUDIES	ASSOC	73,381	100.6%	69,925	103.5%	105.6	98.5
COMMUNICATIONS	COMMUNICATION STUDIES	ASST	52,999	101.0%	50,000	100.0%	91.5	87.8
COMMUNICATIONS	COMMUNICATION STUDIES	LECT	31,707	91.7%	31,674	90.7%	86.0	82.9
COMMUNICATIONS	COMMUNICATIONS	ASSOC	87,608	100.1%	87,608	100.1%		
COMMUNICATIONS	JOURNALISM/ELECTRONIC MEDIA	PROF	100,236	100.1%	95,547	100.0%	95.0	89.2
COMMUNICATIONS	JOURNALISM/ELECTRONIC MEDIA	ASSOC	67,303	115.1%	67,772	103.2%	89.7	85.6
COMMUNICATIONS	JOURNALISM/ELECTRONIC MEDIA	ASST	54,428	100.5%	54,329	100.2%	90.3	88.3
COMMUNICATIONS	JOURNALISM/ELECTRONIC MEDIA	LECT	39,437	113.8%	39,437	107.2%	83.8	72.1
COMMUNICATIONS	SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES	PROF	96,474	95.2%	93,031	100.2%	92.5	90.7
COMMUNICATIONS	SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES	ASSOC	64,102	88.8%	64,102	94.0%	84.8	80.9
COMMUNICATIONS	SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES	ASST	60,408	104.0%	61,110	107.9%	93.5	87.1
EDUCATION	CHILD & FAMILY STUDIES	PROF	96,773	98.1%	94,475	94.0%	95.3	90.0
EDUCATION	CHILD & FAMILY STUDIES	ASSOC	78,820	100.1%	81,999	100.1%	109.0	107.6
EDUCATION	CHILD & FAMILY STUDIES	ASST	56,171	100.2%	62,401	103.1%	90.2	88.7
EDUCATION	CHILD & FAMILY STUDIES	LECT	35,735	100.2%	36,500	100.3%	104.1	86.5

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL LEADRSHP & P STDS	PROF	91,853	-	94,503	-	87.5	79.2
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL LEADRSHP & P STDS	ASSOC	79,969	-	79,969	-	111.5	104.2
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL LEADRSHP & P STDS	ASST	59,495	-	59,350	-	100.9	92.1
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL PSYCH & COUNSEL	PROF	90,619	96.2%	89,307	94.2%	90.5	86.5
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL PSYCH & COUNSEL	ASSOC	65,507	98.8%	65,580	96.5%	92.8	89.4
EDUCATION	EDUCATIONAL PSYCH & COUNSEL	ASST	58,874	92.3%	57,680	93.0%	101.1	96.7
EDUCATION	EXERCISE, SPORT & LEISURE STDY	PROF	99,448	114.0%	85,772	103.0%	101.9	99.4
EDUCATION	EXERCISE, SPORT & LEISURE STDY	ASSOC	60,770	98.0%	61,046	98.3%	88.1	85.6
EDUCATION	EXERCISE, SPORT & LEISURE STDY	ASST	59,746	101.5%	58,083	100.5%	101.3	95.6
EDUCATION	NUTRITION	PROF	96,190	93.2%	91,667	88.4%	85.3	78.1
EDUCATION	NUTRITION	ASSOC	73,386	87.9%	73,386	87.9%	96.9	92.7
EDUCATION	NUTRITION	ASST	60,983	97.2%	61,800	98.1%	94.1	84.8
EDUCATION	NUTRITION	LECT	41,072	93.3%	41,072	93.3%	84.5	81.3
EDUCATION	RETAIL HOSPITALITY & TOUR MGMT	PROF	91,958	99.1%	90,910	100.1%	92.6	92.0
EDUCATION	RETAIL HOSPITALITY & TOUR MGMT	ASSOC	82,937	91.9%	82,937	91.9%	106.2	113.5
EDUCATION	RETAIL HOSPITALITY & TOUR MGMT	ASST	69,226	94.7%	69,864	88.7%	107.5	106.5
EDUCATION	THEORY AND PRAC IN TEACHER ED	PROF	101,119	117.0%	102,084	100.1%	102.9	99.7
EDUCATION	THEORY AND PRAC IN TEACHER ED	ASSOC	64,373	97.0%	65,539	99.5%	90.9	88.4
EDUCATION	THEORY AND PRAC IN TEACHER ED	ASST	54,683	94.2%	54,800	98.6%	93.8	92.0
EDUCATION	THEORY AND PRAC IN TEACHER ED	LECT	46,630	119.1%	47,722	100.2%	100.8	97.7
ENGINEERING	CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	PROF	119,784	98.6%	104,576	110.4%	89.2	88.1
ENGINEERING	CHEMICAL ENGINEERING	ASSOC	90,797	95.7%	95,948	99.9%	98.3	95.0
ENGINEERING	CIVIL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGR	PROF	123,456	105.6%	114,891	107.7%	98.3	99.4
ENGINEERING	CIVIL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGR	ASSOC	86,628	99.8%	87,009	101.8%	97.2	94.8
ENGINEERING	CIVIL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGR	ASST	75,176	100.0%	73,921	100.2%	98.5	97.1
ENGINEERING	ELECTRICAL ENGR & COMPUTER SCI	PROF	127,621	95.2%	130,167	98.9%	93.6	93.8
ENGINEERING	ELECTRICAL ENGR & COMPUTER SCI	ASSOC	96,631	103.1%	96,618	101.9%	99.6	97.5
ENGINEERING	ELECTRICAL ENGR & COMPUTER SCI	ASST	79,430	101.4%	76,458	100.6%	92.5	90.5
ENGINEERING	INDUSTRIAL & INFORMATION ENGR	PROF	133,912	-	133,912	-	99.3	98.4
ENGINEERING	INDUSTRIAL & INFORMATION ENGR	ASSOC	89,611	100.1%	89,611	100.1%	96.6	91.3
ENGINEERING	INDUSTRIAL & INFORMATION ENGR	ASST	76,900	99.3%	76,300	96.7%	99.7	97.4
ENGINEERING	INDUSTRIAL & INFORMATION ENGR	LECT	68,641	-	68,641	-	138.4	140.2

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
ENGINEERING	MATERIALS SCIENCE & ENGR	PROF	114,351	91.7%	109,537	92.8%	82.2	82.1
ENGINEERING	MATERIALS SCIENCE & ENGR	ASSOC	88,980	102.3%	90,878	100.7%	98.5	95.6
ENGINEERING	MATERIALS SCIENCE & ENGR	ASST	77,071	98.2%	76,000	98.1%	104.4	110.2
ENGINEERING	MECHANICAL,AEROSPACE&BIOMED EN	PROF	110,279	101.1%	102,580	100.1%	85.0	83.9
ENGINEERING	MECHANICAL,AEROSPACE&BIOMED EN	ASSOC	89,371	106.9%	83,400	100.0%	97.5	95.6
ENGINEERING	MECHANICAL,AEROSPACE&BIOMED EN	ASST	77,245	94.0%	76,727	97.9%	98.1	98.7
ENGINEERING	MECHANICAL,AEROSPACE&BIOMED EN	LECT	59,831	-	60,400	-	110.7	106.6
ENGINEERING	NUCLEAR ENGINEERING	PROF	107,691	100.4%	109,647	102.9%	82.9	77.8
ENGINEERING	NUCLEAR ENGINEERING	ASSOC	84,752	100.1%	84,752	100.1%	85.9	83.8
ENGINEERING	NUCLEAR ENGINEERING	ASST	77,612	99.9%	77,500	99.7%	103.1	104.3
LAW	LAW	PROF	149,394	102.9%	142,822	100.2%	93.2	83.6
LAW	LAW	ASSOC	97,261	98.3%	95,472	96.7%	86.3	74.7
A & S - HUMANITIES	CLASSICS	PROF	84,809	86.3%	84,809	86.3%	85.8	84.9
A & S - HUMANITIES	CLASSICS	ASSOC	63,712	103.3%	63,360	102.7%	93.3	91.5
A & S - HUMANITIES	CLASSICS	ASST	51,428	94.2%	51,428	94.5%	90.4	86.9
A & S - HUMANITIES	CLASSICS	LECT	33,042	112.6%	33,042	112.6%	80.5	90.0
A & S - HUMANITIES	ENGLISH	PROF	84,214	98.3%	85,000	97.6%	84.8	81.3
A & S - HUMANITIES	ENGLISH	ASSOC	62,085	102.2%	61,216	100.2%	92.0	86.9
A & S - HUMANITIES	ENGLISH	ASST	54,715	100.7%	54,653	100.3%	98.0	91.8
A & S - HUMANITIES	ENGLISH	LECT	34,409	100.7%	34,448	100.8%	96.8	90.3
A & S - HUMANITIES	MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LIT	PROF	75,032	98.6%	72,143	99.4%	81.0	76.3
A & S - HUMANITIES	MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LIT	ASSOC	61,792	99.4%	60,161	99.7%	96.0	91.1
A & S - HUMANITIES	MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LIT	ASST	52,254	99.4%	52,083	98.6%	97.1	94.8
A & S - HUMANITIES	MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LIT	LECT	32,248	100.7%	32,000	100.0%	84.2	79.1
A & S - HUMANITIES	PHILOSOPHY	PROF	75,237	97.6%	77,389	96.8%	76.1	71.7
A & S - HUMANITIES	PHILOSOPHY	ASSOC	77,547	114.0%	77,547	113.4%	120.7	117.9
A & S - HUMANITIES	PHILOSOPHY	ASST	50,000	94.1%	50,000	100.0%	94.8	89.7
A & S - HUMANITIES	PHILOSOPHY	LECT	33,531	99.8%	32,000	97.5%	95.9	85.1
A & S - HUMANITIES	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	PROF	95,784	95.6%	98,735	96.2%	87.5	84.2
A & S - HUMANITIES	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	ASSOC	69,861	100.0%	71,566	101.1%	98.5	94.1
A & S - HUMANITIES	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	ASST	55,744	100.2%	55,744	100.2%	96.7	94.6
A & S - HUMANITIES	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	LECT	57,500	143.8%	57,500	143.8%	159.7	143.8
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF ART	PROF	79,507	99.3%	72,265	100.1%	92.0	86.9
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF ART	ASSOC	65,739	98.8%	63,037	100.2%	101.8	98.5
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF ART	ASST	52,858	99.9%	51,371	99.8%	100.4	95.6
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF ART	LECT	33,333	107.5%	32,000	103.2%	87.7	76.9

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF MUSIC	PROF	83,099	96.2%	76,967	100.1%	95.4	89.5
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF MUSIC	ASSOC	63,076	98.1%	59,641	97.3%	98.7	93.5
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF MUSIC	ASST	48,483	98.6%	47,477	98.9%	94.6	87.2
A & S - HUMANITIES	SCHOOL OF MUSIC	LECT	39,122	96.6%	35,850	99.6%	93.7	82.5
A & S - HUMANITIES	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	PROF	137,668	100.1%	137,668	100.1%	123.6	121.4
A & S - HUMANITIES	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	LECT	32,300	95.1%	32,300	52.7%	66.2	68.4
A & S - HUMANITIES	THEATRE	PROF	94,113	100.0%	83,106	100.0%	104.1	100.1
A & S - HUMANITIES	THEATRE	ASSOC	66,068	101.7%	67,217	105.3%	104.2	98.7
A & S - HUMANITIES	THEATRE	ASST	52,203	100.3%	52,506	100.4%	103.2	96.8
A & S - HUMANITIES	THEATRE	LECT	41,215	100.7%	41,215	100.7%	109.3	94.7
A & S - SOC SCI	ANTHROPOLOGY	PROF	79,076	96.9%	81,590	100.0%	77.9	74.3
A & S - SOC SCI	ANTHROPOLOGY	ASSOC	94,304	121.3%	94,304	121.3%	134.1	131.0
A & S - SOC SCI	ANTHROPOLOGY	ASST	56,189	96.6%	57,000	98.2%	95.6	93.5
A & S - SOC SCI	ANTHROPOLOGY	LECT	38,107	100.3%	34,137	100.3%	115.2	119.1
A & S - SOC SCI	AUDIOLOGY & SPEECH PATHOLOGY	PROF	119,136	93.0%	119,136	93.0%	115.8	116.5
A & S - SOC SCI	AUDIOLOGY & SPEECH PATHOLOGY	ASSOC	69,601	99.7%	68,583	100.3%	96.7	95.3
A & S - SOC SCI	AUDIOLOGY & SPEECH PATHOLOGY	ASST	59,263	100.1%	59,471	100.1%	101.4	97.8
A & S - SOC SCI	GEOGRAPHY	PROF	94,921	97.7%	99,900	103.9%	91.8	91.2
A & S - SOC SCI	GEOGRAPHY	ASSOC	78,599	98.0%	78,599	98.0%	107.9	105.0
A & S - SOC SCI	GEOGRAPHY	ASST	59,523	96.9%	59,740	96.8%	99.3	98.3
A & S - SOC SCI	GEOGRAPHY	LECT	36,238	-	36,238	-	87.4	70.2
A & S - SOC SCI	HISTORY	PROF	83,725	95.9%	81,608	98.0%	79.7	75.3
A & S - SOC SCI	HISTORY	ASSOC	68,211	99.3%	69,780	97.2%	98.1	92.8
A & S - SOC SCI	HISTORY	ASST	54,066	100.2%	54,098	100.4%	99.1	93.3
A & S - SOC SCI	HISTORY	LECT	35,265	101.4%	35,656	103.1%	97.0	74.6
A & S - SOC SCI	POLITICAL SCIENCE	PROF	81,559	95.7%	81,300	98.3%	68.4	63.4
A & S - SOC SCI	POLITICAL SCIENCE	ASSOC	70,651	96.4%	70,651	98.1%	89.8	85.3
A & S - SOC SCI	POLITICAL SCIENCE	ASST	56,238	100.2%	56,284	104.4%	87.6	82.0
A & S - SOC SCI	POLITICAL SCIENCE	LECT	35,638	104.2%	35,344	102.2%	58.8	54.1
A & S - SOC SCI	PSYCHOLOGY	PROF	85,227	95.7%	78,365	93.5%	75.1	72.6
A & S - SOC SCI	PSYCHOLOGY	ASSOC	71,520	103.7%	67,142	98.7%	100.3	96.6
A & S - SOC SCI	PSYCHOLOGY	ASST	59,540	101.6%	58,823	101.4%	95.5	90.9
A & S - SOC SCI	PSYCHOLOGY	LECT	41,008	107.7%	41,008	111.6%	89.8	75.8



2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
A & S - SOC SCI	SOCIOLOGY	PROF	98,211	97.6%	103,495	100.0%	88.7	82.8
A & S - SOC SCI	SOCIOLOGY	ASSOC	67,100	99.4%	64,570	99.7%	94.4	88.0
A & S - SOC SCI	SOCIOLOGY	ASST	55,933	100.2%	56,500	100.9%	94.8	87.1
A & S - SOC SCI	SOCIOLOGY	LECT	36,114	101.4%	36,296	101.0%	92.6	89.2
A & S - NAT SCI	BIOCHEM/CELL & MOLEC BIOLOGY	PROF	110,365	101.6%	105,176	105.1%	90.0	88.7
A & S - NAT SCI	BIOCHEM/CELL & MOLEC BIOLOGY	ASSOC	74,219	99.6%	74,226	100.0%	90.4	89.0
A & S - NAT SCI	BIOCHEM/CELL & MOLEC BIOLOGY	ASST	68,065	100.5%	68,000	100.3%	99.4	100.1
A & S - NAT SCI	BIOCHEM/CELL & MOLEC BIOLOGY	LECT	41,440	100.2%	41,440	100.2%	82.4	82.4
A & S - NAT SCI	CHEMISTRY	PROF	107,242	101.9%	95,122	96.4%	87.3	83.7
A & S - NAT SCI	CHEMISTRY	ASSOC	70,710	95.2%	70,710	95.2%	92.8	88.2
A & S - NAT SCI	CHEMISTRY	ASST	61,576	100.3%	60,776	101.3%	93.0	90.1
A & S - NAT SCI	CHEMISTRY	LECT	42,031	100.5%	42,031	104.1%	88.2	81.6
A & S - NAT SCI	DIVISION OF BIOLOGY	LECT	41,996	100.2%	44,457	100.2%		
A & S - NAT SCI	EARTH & PLANETARY SCIENCES	PROF	113,199	96.5%	102,986	94.6%	102.0	99.6
A & S - NAT SCI	EARTH & PLANETARY SCIENCES	ASSOC	71,221	100.2%	75,202	100.3%	93.9	87.1
A & S - NAT SCI	EARTH & PLANETARY SCIENCES	ASST	61,428	100.5%	61,285	100.2%	93.5	85.9
A & S - NAT SCI	EARTH & PLANETARY SCIENCES	LECT	38,891	100.3%	38,891	100.3%	98.5	89.3
A & S - NAT SCI	ECOLOGY & EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY	PROF	118,440	98.4%	111,385	98.7%	102.3	95.9
A & S - NAT SCI	ECOLOGY & EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY	ASSOC	70,767	101.8%	73,898	109.6%	85.9	79.2
A & S - NAT SCI	ECOLOGY & EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY	ASST	65,274	97.4%	65,500	98.5%	96.6	91.3
A & S - NAT SCI	MATHEMATICS	PROF	91,826	101.9%	93,206	100.7%	86.2	81.2
A & S - NAT SCI	MATHEMATICS	ASSOC	70,882	96.6%	71,627	99.9%	96.5	90.1
A & S - NAT SCI	MATHEMATICS	ASST	65,630	101.5%	65,000	100.1%	99.7	90.3
A & S - NAT SCI	MATHEMATICS	LECT	34,759	97.8%	33,838	98.8%	83.1	77.2
A & S - NAT SCI	MICROBIOLOGY	PROF	124,954	77.7%	102,985	56.8%	112.3	111.8
A & S - NAT SCI	MICROBIOLOGY	ASST	61,906	100.2%	64,752	100.2%	98.7	95.8
A & S - NAT SCI	MICROBIOLOGY	LECT	47,889	100.2%	47,889	100.2%		
A & S - NAT SCI	PHYSICS	PROF	114,226	99.3%	101,355	100.0%	102.3	100.2
A & S - NAT SCI	PHYSICS	ASSOC	83,997	97.2%	83,409	96.5%	107.8	104.5
A & S - NAT SCI	PHYSICS	ASST	74,534	104.3%	75,256	105.0%	107.3	103.8
NURSING	COLLEGE OF NURSING	PROF	91,053	99.5%	89,902	97.8%	90.6	80.6
NURSING	COLLEGE OF NURSING	ASSOC	76,932	99.7%	70,990	96.5%	101.9	95.1
NURSING	COLLEGE OF NURSING	ASST	61,637	98.2%	62,884	100.0%	96.0	91.9

2008-09 FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a percent of	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
SOCIAL WORK	SOCIAL WORK	PROF	119,096	96.8%	98,413	93.2%	110.2	102.1
SOCIAL WORK	SOCIAL WORK	ASSOC	71,745	98.5%	70,185	99.6%	97.2	94.5
SOCIAL WORK	SOCIAL WORK	ASST	57,471	100.3%	57,325	101.2%	98.2	94.8
SOCIAL WORK	SOCIAL WORK	LECT	37,901	98.6%	36,810	95.7%	78.9	75.8
VETERINARY MED	VETERINARY MEDICINE	PROF	99,551	98.1%	96,888	98.8%	94.1	93.2
VETERINARY MED	VETERINARY MEDICINE	ASSOC	85,306	100.4%	82,842	99.8%	102.9	102.5
VETERINARY MED	VETERINARY MEDICINE	ASST	69,791	98.1%	72,209	98.8%	94.2	93.8
VETERINARY MED	VETERINARY MEDICINE	LECT	44,014	100.2%	44,014	100.2%	79.3	77.2

**2008-2009 University Summary:**

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a	
			2008 Average	% of 2007	2008 Median	% of 2007	SUG	THEC Peers
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	PROF	102,353	98.7%	95,157	98.7%	90.8	87.0
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	ASSOC	78,107	100.1%	73,655	99.2%	96.8	92.2
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	ASST	64,121	99.3%	60,129	99.9%	96.4	92.7
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	LECT	38,789	100.4%	35,028	100.5%	91.5	84.9

**2007-2008 University Summary for Comparison:**

College	Department	Rank	UTK				UTK Average Salary as a	
			2007 Average	% of 2006	2007 Median	% of 2006	SUG	THEC Peers
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	PROF	104,319	107.3%	96,374	106.5%	94.6	91.0
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	ASSOC	77,820	106.3%	74,266	107.7%	99.1	95.0
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	ASST	64,297	107.4%	60,164	107.0%	98.7	95.3
UNIV SUMMARY	UNIVERSITY SUMMARY	INST	38,866	85.1%	34,837	77.8%	94.1	89.4

**SUG**, Southern University Group, is a data sharing consortium of primarily large public southeast institutions.

**THEC Peer** is our twelve THEC Peer institutions.

### **THEC Peer Institutions**

Auburn University  
Louisiana State University  
North Carolina State University  
Texas A & M University  
University of Florida  
University of Georgia  
University of Kentucky  
University of Maryland, College Park  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
University of Texas, Austin  
University of Virginia  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

### **SUG Institutions**

Arizona State University  
Auburn University  
Clemson University  
Florida State University  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Georgia State University  
Louisiana State University  
Mississippi State University  
North Carolina State University  
Oklahoma State University  
Texas A & M University  
Texas Tech University  
University of Alabama  
University of Alabama - Birmingham  
University of Arkansas  
University of Delaware  
University of Florida  
University of Georgia  
University of Houston  
University of Kentucky  
University of Maryland  
University of Mississippi  
University of North Carolina  
University of Oklahoma  
University of South Carolina  
University of Southern Mississippi  
University of Tennessee  
University of Texas  
University of Virginia  
Virginia Polytechnic & State University  
West Virginia University

**2008-09 STUDY OF FACULTY SALARIES  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE**

**April, 2009**

**DONALD A. CUNNINGHAM**

**OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE  
2538 DUNFORD HALL  
915 VOLUNTEER BLVD  
KNOXVILLE, TN 37996-4060**

**E01-0160-001-09**

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Table 1</b> Full-Time, Instructional Faculty by Rank, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09.....	7
<b>Table 2</b> Full-Time Faculty, Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	8
<b>Table 3</b> Full-Time Faculty, Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	9
Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources .....	9
Architecture and Design .....	10
Arts and Sciences – Humanities .....	11
Arts and Sciences – Natural Sciences.....	12
Arts and Sciences – Social Sciences.....	13
Business Administration .....	14
Communication and Information .....	15
Education, Health, and Human Sciences .....	16
Engineering .....	17
Law.....	28
Nursing.....	19
Social Work.....	20
Law Library.....	21
Main Library.....	22
<b>Table 4</b> Part-Time Instructional Faculty by Rank, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09.....	23
<b>Table 5</b> Part-Time Faculty, Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	24
<b>Table 6</b> Part-Time Faculty, Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	25
Architecture and Design .....	25
Arts and Sciences – Humanities .....	26
Arts and Sciences – Social Sciences.....	27
Arts and Sciences – Natural Sciences.....	28
Business Administration.....	29
Communication and Information .....	30
Education, Health, and Human Sciences .....	31
Engineering .....	32
Nursing.....	33
<b>Table 7</b> Full-Time, Average Faculty Salary by Rank and College, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09.....	34
<b>Table 8</b> All Instructional Faculty, Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09.....	35

<b>Table 9</b>	
Full-Time Instructional Faculty, Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	36
<b>Table 10</b>	
Part-Time Instructional Faculty, Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville — 2008-09 .....	37
<b>Appendix</b> .....	38
<b>Table 11</b>	
b-value and t-value Associated with the Variable Sex for Selected Subgroups, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2007-08 and 2008-09.....	39

**2008-09 STUDY OF FACULTY SALARIES  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE**

Since 1971, an annual study has been conducted which compares salaries of male and female UTK instructional faculty members. The 2008-09 study has been prepared at the request of the Office of Equity and Diversity and the Commission for Women and includes the same analyses as in previous studies. The purpose of the annual study is to ascertain whether female faculty are paid comparably to male counterparts with similar tenure status, degrees, rank, and years of experience.

Multiple regression analyses were performed on salaries of all instructional faculty (Table 8), with separate tables breaking out the figures for full-time instructional faculty (Table 9) and part-time instructional faculty (Table 10). Figure 1 summarizes the results for the study of faculty salaries from 1972-73 to 2008-09. The diamond shaped figure (◆) indicates that the variable “sex” is statistically significant for the corresponding faculty category and year.

**Figure 1**

Year	All (Full-Time & Part-Time)	Full-Time Only	Part-Time Only
1972-73			
1973-76	◆		
1976-79			
1979-81	◆		
1981-82		◆	
1982-83			
1983-89	◆	◆	
1989-90		◆	
1990-91			
1991-95	◆	◆	
1995-00			
2000-06	◆	◆	
2006-08	◆	◆	
2008-09	◆	◆	

In this 2008-09 study, the variable “sex” is statistically significant for both all instructional and full-time faculty.

The data contained in this report were provided to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment by Academic Affairs and from the UT Integrated R3 Information System (IRIS) for the following colleges:

- Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
- Architecture and Design
- Arts and Sciences (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences)
- Business Administration
- Communication and Information
- Education, Health, and Human Sciences
- Engineering
- Law
- Nursing
- Social Work
- Law Library
- Main Library

**Subjects:** Information was collected on all full-time and part-time faculty members and department heads at UTK.

**Procedure:** Data were gathered from an October version of the IRIS database and from Academic Affairs. The following information was secured:

1. **College:** Faculty were assigned to colleges according to their base account. The College of Arts and Sciences was divided into three areas:

Humanities	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences
School of Art Classics English Modern Foreign Languages and Literature Philosophy Religious Studies School of Music Theatre	Anthropology Audiology and Speech Pathology Geography History Political Science Psychology Psychological Clinic Sociology	Biochemistry, Cellular, and Molecular Biology Botany Chemistry Computer Science Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Earth and Planetary Sciences Graduate School of Genome Science and Technology Mathematics Microbiology Physics and Astronomy



2. **Rank:** An individual's rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer) was determined on the basis of his/her title code.
3. **Degree:** Faculty were classified according to the highest education level as follows: doctorate (academic), professional (e.g., M.D. or J.D.), educational specialist, master's, baccalaureate, and high school.
4. **Tenure Status:** This was determined by using three classifications: a) those faculty who have tenure; b) those faculty who are presently on a tenure track, but have not yet been granted tenure; and c) those faculty who are not eligible for tenure.
5. **UTK Experience:** Experience was defined as the number of years between the earliest year which delimits uninterrupted employment at UTK (as reported in IRIS) up to 2008. Consistent with IRIS reporting procedures, no differentiation was made between part-time and full-time experience or between faculty and nonfaculty status. (The reader who is unfamiliar with the manner in which the year of employment is determined in the Integrated R3 Information System should refer to IRIS documentation.)
6. **Salary:** Salaries for part-time and twelve-month appointments were equated to full-time, academic-year appointments. Percent full-time (for part-time employees) was extracted from IRIS. The factor of 0.818 used to convert twelve-month appointments to academic-year appointments is the nationally accepted standard for conversion. The formulae for converting salaries of part-time twelve-month appointments to full-time academic-year appointments were as follows:

Twelve-Month Appointment	Academic-Year Appointment
(budgeted salary ÷ percent full-time) x 0.818	(budgeted salary ÷ percent full-time) x 1.0

7. **Sex**
8. **Appointment:** Regular faculty were divided into two groups based on current appointment status--part-time and full-time.

## **Description of Tables**

**Overview:** The first seven tables contain summary statistics for full-time faculty (Tables 1, 2, 3, and 7) and for part-time faculty (Tables 4, 5, and 6). The last three tables contain results of multiple regression analyses for all instructional faculty (Table 8), for full-time instructional faculty only (Table 9), and for part-time instructional faculty only (Table 10). Faculty whose salary is funded from base accounts assigned to the Main Library or Law Library have been included in Tables 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, but were excluded from the regression analyses and Tables 1 and 4. Only those faculty in the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources whose base accounts are UTK accounts (i.e., rather than Institute of Agriculture) have been included in this study.

**Summary Statistics:** Table 3 presents another method of comparing salaries of full-time male and full-time female faculty within rank in the various colleges. In 22 instances, the average salary of females exceeds that of male counterparts; in 36 instances, the average salary of males exceeds that of female counterparts; and in 4 instances, the average salaries are the same. In 19 of the 36 instances where the average male salary exceeds the average female salary, five or more salaries are averaged for each gender group. Since the study and the techniques used are capable only of identifying areas in which quantitative analyses suggest additional review, the salaries of females in these 19 areas merit review.

**Regression Analyses:** Historically, the rationale for conducting the multiple regression analyses summarized in Tables 8, 9, and 10 has been to assess the relative contribution of each independent variable (in this case, college, rank, degree, tenure status, UTK experience, and sex) in predicting an individual's salary. On one hand, the simple correlations between salary and each level of each independent variable reflect the degree of association between the level of that variable (the greater the absolute value of the coefficient, the stronger the association) and salary without considering the confounding effects of the remaining independent variables. On the other hand, techniques of multiple regression allow one to "partial out" the effects of the remaining variables thereby giving a more accurate estimate of "pure" association.

The partial regression coefficients represent the dollar value of the presence of each level of each independent variable relative to the intercept, holding the effects of the remaining variables constant. The t-value for each partial regression coefficient summarizes the statistical test of the relative importance of the level of that variable in aiding salary prediction. Significant levels are indicated for both directional and nondirectional hypotheses.

**Caveats:** The reader should be aware that the models used in these regression analyses do not describe the actual salary determination process. Other factors that are important are:

1. University confirming degree  
Graduates from certain universities can command higher starting salaries.
2. Publication record (quality and quantity)  
Publications should be weighted by the prestige of the publishing journal.
3. Quality of instruction
4. Discipline  
Market pressure requires higher salaries for some disciplines.
5. Service to institution and community
6. Weighted variables  
Department heads may weigh variables differently, which would require different regression coefficients for the various departments.

Although these variables are recognized as being important, they are omitted from the analyses due to the inability to accurately quantify them. Since the models used in this study do not accurately describe the salary determination process, results from this study should not be interpreted as absolute dollar values. *The reader should be aware that the regression models used in this study are of necessity incomplete tools, and conclusions should be drawn with extreme caution.*

The reader should interpret the data in Table 8 (all instructional faculty) and Table 10 (part-time instructional faculty only) with appropriate care. The soundness of present procedures for converting the salaries of part-time appointments to full-time

appointments is marginal at best, so these two tables may be of uncertain validity-- particularly Table 10.

In considering the multiple t-tests reported in Tables 8, 9, and 10, it should also be remembered that when the null hypothesis is true and an alpha level of five percent is used, an average of one of twenty independent statistical tests will prove to be statistically significant on the basis of chance variation alone. When multiple tests are carried out during the investigation, the actual alpha level increases beyond the nominal level (i.e., five percent) with each test. Thus for the twenty-five t-tests carried out in each table, the effective alpha level is not five percent but at least  $1-(1-\alpha)^k$ , or seventy-two percent where  $k$  is the number of tests. Some statisticians would argue that seventy-two percent is conservative since these tests are not mathematically independent.

**Full-Time  
Instructional Faculty by Rank  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 1**

		Male					Female				
		N	Tenure	%	Average UTK Years of Experience	Average Salary	N	Tenure	%	Average UTK Years of Experience	Average Salary
Rank	Professor	314	311	99.0%	22.8	104,558	80	79	98.8%	20.6	91,839
	Associate Professor	175	157	89.7%	12.0	79,106	114	106	93.0%	11.3	73,887
	Assistant Professor	150	4	2.7%	3.5	67,050	135	3	2.2%	4.4	59,138
	Instructor	2	0	.0%	5.0		17	3	17.6%	9.1	51,926
	Lecturer	87	0	.0%	7.3	39,641	119	0	.0%	6.8	37,216
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>82,782</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>41.1%</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>62,506</b>

*Note.* The salaries are equated to full-time academic-year appointments. No average salary is given when  $N \leq 2$ .

**Full-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 2**

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	280	70	141	92	135	113			42	48
	Tenured	277	69	130	89	4	1			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	22.8	19.6	11.7	11.4	3.5	3.7			6.7	4.9
	Salary Ratio	87%		91%		88%				97%	
Professional	Total	11	1	7	11	2	5				
	Tenured	11	1	6	7	0	1				
	UTK Years of Experience	23.5	27.0	15.9	6.8	10.0	9.4				
	Salary Ratio	108%		88%		106%					
Master's	Total	23	16	28	31	19	27	2	17	39	67
	Tenured	23	16	23	29	0	1	0	3	0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	22.7	28.1	13.8	14.2	3.3	6.3	5.0	9.1	6.6	8.3
	Salary Ratio	91%		84%		95%		123%		96%	
Bachelor's	Total			4			1			6	4
	Tenured			3			0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience			15.0			1.0			16.2	3.0
	Salary Ratio									69%	
High School	Total				1						
	Tenured				1						
	UTK Years of Experience				20.0						
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3**

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	10		5	2	1	1				
	Tenured	10		5	2	0	0				
	UTK Years of Experience	19.7		19.8	13.0	.0	5.0				
	Salary Ratio			96%		93%					
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total			3				1	1	2	
	Tenured			2				0	0	0	
	UTK Years of Experience			15.7				7.0	9.0	.0	
	Salary Ratio							107%			
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Architecture and Design

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	2	1	1		1	1				1
	Tenured	2	1	1		0	0				0
	UTK Years of Experience	31.0	20.0	8.0		2.0	.0				.0
	Salary Ratio	95%				82%					
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total	4	1	5	2	1	2			1	
	Tenured	4	1	5	2	0	0			0	
	UTK Years of Experience	26.5	14.0	10.6	13.0	4.0	4.0			1.0	
	Salary Ratio	135%		100%		97%					
Bachelor's	Total			2						1	
	Tenured			1						0	
	UTK Years of Experience			19.0						4.0	
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.



## Arts and Sciences—Humanities

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	35	16	18	21	17	16			18	22
	Tenured	35	16	18	21	1	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	23.6	21.4	13.8	11.9	4.1	3.8			3.7	5.1
	Salary Ratio	101%		99%		106%				106%	
Professional	Total				1						
	Tenured				1						
	UTK Years of Experience				5.0						
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total	14	3	10	6	7	8	1		11	30
	Tenured	14	3	8	6	0	0	0		0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	21.7	28.0	13.5	17.8	2.9	2.1	3.0		3.7	8.4
	Salary Ratio	86%		94%		99%				95%	
Bachelor's	Total			2			1			2	1
	Tenured			2			0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience			11.0			1.0			23.0	4.0
	Salary Ratio									60%	
High School	Total			1							
	Tenured			1							
	UTK Years of Experience			20.0							
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Arts and Sciences—Natural Sciences**

**Full-Time Faculty**

**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**

**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	78	11	28	4	30	10	0	0	8	7
	Tenured	78	11	27	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	25.2	22.5	12.8	8.3	2.6	3.9			12.4	6.4
	Salary Ratio	92%		100%		97%				98%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total					1				13	12
	Tenured					0				0	0
	UTK Years of Experience					1.0				10.1	10.1
	Salary Ratio									101%	
Bachelor's	Total										1
	Tenured										0
	UTK Years of Experience										2.0
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Arts and Sciences—Social Sciences**

**Full-Time Faculty  
Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	34	9	21	15	21	17			8	10
	Tenured	33	9	21	15	0	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	24.0	20.7	8.1	11.7	2.3	2.4			5.5	4.4
	Salary Ratio	108%		89%		99%				98%	
Professional	Total						1				
	Tenured						0				
	UTK Years of Experience						2.0				
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total					1			2	4	1
	Tenured					0			1	0	0
	UTK Years of Experience					2.0			18.0	1.3	.0
	Salary Ratio									104%	
Bachelor's	Total									1	1
	Tenured									0	0
	UTK Years of Experience									5.0	.0
	Salary Ratio									104%	

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Business Administration

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	32	3	14	10	17	3			4	3
	Tenured	31	2	13	9	1	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	22.1	11.3	15.1	14.7	3.8	2.7			11.3	9.0
	Salary Ratio	87%		103%		108%				98%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total									5	7
	Tenured									0	0
	UTK Years of Experience									12.2	7.0
	Salary Ratio									82%	
Bachelor's	Total									1	
	Tenured									0	
	UTK Years of Experience									32.0	
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Communication and Information

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	11	7	2	9	6	12			1	2
	Tenured	11	7	2	9	1	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	18.3	18.0	14.0	11.3	9.3	1.6			2.0	4.0
	Salary Ratio	87%		90%		103%				85%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total			1		1	1		1	3	7
	Tenured			1		0	0		1	0	0
	UTK Years of Experience			22.0		4.0	5.0		23.0	5.7	7.1
	Salary Ratio					106%				123%	
Bachelor's	Total										1
	Tenured										0
	UTK Years of Experience										6.0
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Education, Health, and Human Sciences

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	21	16	9	15	14	35			1	1
	Tenured	21	16	8	14	0	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	24.8	20.6	5.9	9.5	3.8	3.0			3.0	.0
	Salary Ratio	95%		97%		98%				106%	
Professional	Total	1				1					
	Tenured	1				0					
	UTK Years of Experience	33.0				14.0					
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total	3	5		3	1	3		2		8
	Tenured	3	5		3	0	1		0		0
	UTK Years of Experience	18.0	29.6		11.7	3.0	17.7		3.5		9.9
	Salary Ratio	106%				99%					
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Engineering

### Full-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	48	1	38	3	25	4			2	1
	Tenured	47	1	31	3	1	0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	18.9	7.0	11.1	12.0	3.8	2.8			12.0	.0
	Salary Ratio	110%		101%		100%				91%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total			1		1			1		
	Tenured			1		0			1		
	UTK Years of Experience			13.0		.0			28.0		
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total									1	
	Tenured									0	
	UTK Years of Experience									10.0	
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Law**

**Full-Time Faculty  
Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	2	1								
	Tenured	2	1								
	UTK Years of Experience	31.5	8.0								
	Salary Ratio	95%									
Professional	Total	9	1	6	9						
	Tenured	9	1	5	5						
	UTK Years of Experience	24.8	27.0	14.5	6.9						
	Salary Ratio	100%		97%							
Master's	Total	2		3	1						
	Tenured	2		1	0						
	UTK Years of Experience	28.5		5.7	.0						
	Salary Ratio			93%							
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.



**Nursing**  
**Full-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total		4	1	5		9				
	Tenured		4	0	4		1				
	UTK Years of Experience		14.5	8.0	13.4		13.4				
	Salary Ratio			70%							
Professional	Total	1				1	4				
	Tenured	1				0	1				
	UTK Years of Experience	2.0				6.0	11.3				
	Salary Ratio					116%					
Master's	Total				1		2		9		
	Tenured				1		0		0		
	UTK Years of Experience				3.0		20.0		5.6		
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Social Work**  
**Full-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	7	1	4	7	3	5				1
	Tenured	7	1	4	7	0	0				0
	UTK Years of Experience	15.7	15.0	9.5	9.4	2.7	2.2				1.0
	Salary Ratio	74%		101%		101%					
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total								1		2
	Tenured								0		0
	UTK Years of Experience								1.0		1.5
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Law Library**  
**Full-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total			1	1						
	Tenured			1	1						
	UTK Years of Experience			24.0	8.0						
	Salary Ratio			53%							
Master's	Total		2		2	1	2				
	Tenured		2		2	0	0				
	UTK Years of Experience		30.5		13.5	1.0	4.5				
	Salary Ratio					98%					
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Main Library**  
**Full-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 3** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total				1						
	Tenured				1						
	UTK Years of Experience				7.0						
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total		5	5	16	5	9				
	Tenured		5	5	15	0	0				
	UTK Years of Experience		28.6	20.0	15.1	5.6	4.1				
	Salary Ratio			96%		107%					
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Part-Time  
Instructional Faculty by Rank  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 4**

		Male					Female				
		N	Tenure	%	Average UTK Years of Experience	Average Salary	N	Tenure	%	Average UTK Years of Experience	Average Salary
Rank	Professor	4	1	25.0%	19.0	71,560	0	0	.0%		
	Associate Professor	3	0	.0%	22.0	58,779	1	0	.0%	.0	
	Assistant Professor	1	0	.0%	17.0		4	0	.0%	13.0	55,754
	Instructor	2	0	.0%	5.0		11	0	.0%	1.8	46,019
	Lecturer	6	0	.0%	7.8	49,265	9	0	.0%	6.4	44,351
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>56,982</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>.0%</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>47,957</b>

*Note.* The salaries are equated to full-time academic-year appointments. No average salary is given when  $N \leq 2$ .

**Part-Time Faculty**  
**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 5**

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	4		2	1		3			2	4
	Tenured	1		0	0		0			0	0
	UTK Years of Experience	19.0		30.5	.0		17.0			14.5	9.0
	Salary Ratio			147%						101%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total			1			1	2	8	3	5
	Tenured			0			0	0	0	0	0
	UTK Years of Experience			5.0			1.0	5.0	2.1	5.3	4.4
	Salary Ratio							104%		71%	
Bachelor's	Total					1			3	1	
	Tenured					0			0	0	
	UTK Years of Experience					17.0			1.0	2.0	
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Architecture and Design

### Part-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total			1					1		
	Tenured			0					0		
	UTK Years of Experience			5.0					10.0		
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total					1				1	
	Tenured					0				0	
	UTK Years of Experience					17.0				2.0	
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Arts and Sciences—Humanities**

**Part-Time Faculty**

**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	1								1	
	Tenured	0								0	
	UTK Years of Experience	6.0								12.0	
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total									1	3
	Tenured									0	0
	UTK Years of Experience									9.0	4.7
	Salary Ratio									101%	
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.



**Arts and Sciences—Social Sciences**

**Part-Time Faculty**

**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	2		2			1				
	Tenured	1		0			0				
	UTK Years of Experience	34.5		30.5			3.0				
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Arts and Sciences—Natural Sciences**

**Part-Time Faculty**

**Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total									2	1
	Tenured									0	0
	UTK Years of Experience									14.5	6.0
	Salary Ratio									74%	
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Business Administration

### Part-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total										2
	Tenured										0
	UTK Years of Experience										9.0
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total									2	1
	Tenured									0	0
	UTK Years of Experience									3.5	2.0
	Salary Ratio										100%
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Communication and Information

### Part-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total										1
	Tenured										0
	UTK Years of Experience										6.0
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Education, Health, and Human Sciences

### Part-Time Faculty

#### Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total							1	1		
	Tenured							0	0		
	UTK Years of Experience							7.0	1.0		
	Salary Ratio							94%			
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Engineering

### Part-Time Faculty

#### Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total	1									
	Tenured	0									
	UTK Years of Experience	1.0									
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Bachelor's	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

## Nursing

### Part-Time Faculty Comparison by Sex of Selected Factors Associated with Rank and Degree Similarities The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09

**Table 6** (continued)

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Doctorate	Total			1		2					
	Tenured			0		0					
	UTK Years of Experience			.0		24.0					
	Salary Ratio										
Professional	Total										
	Tenured										
	UTK Years of Experience										
	Salary Ratio										
Master's	Total					1		1	6		
	Tenured					0		0	0		
	UTK Years of Experience					1.0		3.0	1.0		
	Salary Ratio							92%			
Bachelor's	Total								3		
	Tenured								0		
	UTK Years of Experience								1.0		
	Salary Ratio										

*Note.* Salary ratio equals average female academic salary divided by average male academic salary.

**Full-Time  
Average Faculty Salary by Rank and College  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 7**

		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Lecturer	
		N	Average Salary	N	Average Salary	N	Average Salary	N	Average Salary	N	Average Salary
College	Arts & Sci.-Humanities	68	\$80,614	59	\$62,950	49	\$51,755	1		84	\$34,035
	Arts & Sci.-Ntrl. Sciences	89	104,625	32	71,815	41	64,811	0		41	36,004
	Arts & Sci.-Social Sciences	43	84,588	36	69,241	40	57,102	2		25	36,056
	Agriculture	10	90,211	10	68,545	2		2		2	
	Architecture and Design	8	92,070	10	78,810	5	59,743	0		3	48,164
	Business Administration	35	138,010	24	113,759	20	107,780	0		20	59,623
	Communication & Info.	18	95,888	12	68,144	20	55,620	1		14	32,519
	Educ., Hlth., & Hmn. Sci.	46	92,710	27	68,187	54	58,306	2		10	41,580
	Engineering	49	116,134	42	89,444	30	77,020	1		4	61,509
	Law	15	147,168	19	96,435	0		0		0	
	Law Library	2		4	71,075	3	42,782	0		0	
	Main Library	5	66,738	22	53,058	14	37,331	0		0	
	Nursing	5	89,873	7	75,960	16	60,212	9	55,653	0	
	Social Work	8	117,546	11	70,781	8	57,321	1		3	37,901

*Note.* The salaries are equated to full-time academic-year appointments. No average salary is given when  $N \leq 2$ .



**All Instructional Faculty  
Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 8**

	Simple Correlation with Salary	Partial Regression Coefficient	t-Value for Partial Regression Coefficient
<b>Intercept</b>		52,221	14.78 ***
<b>College</b>			
Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources	-.01	4,507	1.28
Architecture and Design	-.00	13,144	3.87 ***
Business Administration	.32	47,325	23.68 ***
Communication and Information	-.08	4,964	2.11 *
Education, Health, and Human Sciences	-.05	6,840	3.73 ***
Engineering	.23	26,026	13.40 ***
Law	.24	46,510	10.23 ***
Arts and Sciences-Humanities	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Arts and Sciences-Social Sciences	-.11	2,572	1.44
Arts and Sciences-Natural Sciences	.04	13,099	8.02 ***
Nursing	-.08	13,298	4.23 ***
Social Work	.01	11,772	3.61 ***
<b>Rank</b>			
Professor	.60	32,618	10.57 ***
Associate Professor	.05	4,656	1.57
Assistant Professor	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Instructor	-.13	-5,760	-1.31
Lecturer	-.52	-15,371	-4.57 ***
<b>Degree</b>			
Doctorate	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Professional	.16	647	.15
Masters	-.32	-1,742	-1.14
Bachelor	-.10	-34	-.01
High School	-.02	-6,800	-.40
<b>Tenure Status</b>			
Tenured	.58	9,353	3.03 **
Not Tenured, on Tenure Track	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Not Eligible for Tenure	-.54	-5,534	-1.73
<b>Experience</b>			
UTK Years of Experience	.34	-395	-6.65 ***
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Female	-.31	-2,504	-2.21 *
<b>Appointment</b>			
Part-Time	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Full-Time	.13	2,978	.95

*Note.* The higher the absolute value of the t-score, the more statistically significant the variable subcategory is in the determination of salary.

- \* Significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\* Significant at the .01 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\*\* Significant at the .001 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- b** Reference group for each category.

**Full-Time Instructional Faculty**  
**Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 9**

	Simple Correlation with Salary	Partial Regression Coefficient	t-Value for Partial Regression Coefficient
<b>Intercept</b>		55,265	33.92 ***
<b>College</b>			
Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources	-.02	4,308	1.21
Architecture and Design	.00	11,753	3.24 ***
Business Administration	.33	47,739	23.13 ***
Communication and Information	-.08	4,859	2.03 *
Education, Health, and Human Sciences	-.05	6,951	3.72 ***
Engineering	.22	26,037	13.19 ***
Law	.23	46,119	9.98 ***
Arts and Sciences-Humanities	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Arts and Sciences-Social Sciences	-.12	2,499	1.37
Arts and Sciences-Natural Sciences	.04	12,970	7.79 ***
Nursing	-.05	12,884	3.78 ***
Social Work	.00	11,654	3.54 ***
<b>Rank</b>			
Professor	.59	33,453	10.27 ***
Associate Professor	.04	4,954	1.58
Assistant Professor	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Instructor	-.10	-2,769	-.53
Lecturer	-.52	-14,582	-3.95 ***
<b>Degree</b>			
Doctorate	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Professional	.16	1,077	.24
Masters	-.31	-1,497	-.95
Bachelor	-.09	1,767	.38
High School	-.02	-6,474	-.38
<b>Tenure Status</b>			
Tenured	.57	9,180	2.82 **
Not Tenured, on Tenure Track	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Not Eligible for Tenure	-.54	-6,408	-1.85
<b>Experience</b>			
UTK Years of Experience	.34	-421	-6.84 ***
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Female	-.31	-2,568	-2.22 *

*Note.* The higher the absolute value of the t-score, the more statistically significant the variable subcategory is in the determination of salary.

- \* Significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\* Significant at the .01 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\*\* Significant at the .001 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- b** Reference group for each category.

**Part-Time Instructional Faculty**  
**Simple Correlation and Partial Regression Coefficients**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2008-09**

**Table 10**

	Simple Correlation with Salary	Partial Regression Coefficient	t-Value for Partial Regression Coefficient
<b>Intercept</b>		43,841	4.47 ***
<b>College</b>			
Architecture and Design	.13	24,449	3.14 **
Business Administration	.35	37,640	7.81 ***
Communication and Information	-.19	5,548	.67
Education, Health, and Human Sciences	-.20	5,933	.61
Engineering	.45	42,757	4.17 ***
Arts and Sciences-Humanities	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Arts and Sciences-Social Sciences	.13	-677	-.08
Arts and Sciences-Natural Sciences	-.04	17,041	2.46 *
Nursing	-.01	17,680	2.18 *
<b>Rank</b>			
Professor	.42	9,909	1.17
Associate Professor	.21	7,100	1.23
Assistant Professor	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Instructor	-.24	-7,885	-1.56
Lecturer	-.25	-12,635	-1.62
<b>Degree</b>			
Doctorate	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Masters	-.32	-5,008	-1.02
Bachelor	-.12	-10,894	-1.65
<b>Tenure Status</b>			
Tenured	.27	20,862	2.06
Not Tenured, On Tenure Track	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
<b>Experience</b>			
UTK Years of Experience	.23	118	.61
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b</b>
Female	-.28	-455	-.12

*Note.* The higher the absolute value of the t-score, the more statistically significant the variable subcategory is in the determination of salary.

- \* Significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\* Significant at the .01 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- \*\*\* Significant at the .001 level using a two-tailed analysis.
- b** Reference group for each category.

## *Appendix*

The regression coefficient for full-time instructional faculty associated with the variable “sex” was -2,289 in 2007-08 and -2,568 in 2008-09 and the corresponding t-values changed from -1.96 to -2.22. The 2007-08 salary data have been modified to exclude administrative stipends to align these data with the 2008-09 salary data.

Since the differential between male and female salaries is sensitive to changes in faculty composition, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment analyzed full-time instructional faculty in three groups: continuing faculty, noncontinuing faculty, and new faculty. These breakdowns are contained in Table 11. Continuing faculty are defined as faculty members who were included in both the 2007-08 and the 2008-09 salary studies. Noncontinuing faculty are those faculty members who were included in the 2007-08 study, but were not included in the 2008-09 study. New faculty are those who were included in the 2008-09 study, but were not included in the 2007-08 study.

The analysis on continuing faculty resulted in a b-value for the variable “sex” of -2,375 for 2007-08 and -2,244 for 2008-09. While the b-value would indicate a slight decrease in the equality between male and female salaries, it is equally important to note that the associated t-values went from -1.93 in 2007-08 to -1.81 in 2008-09. Neither b-value was statistically significant.

Further analysis on continuing faculty was to test for significant differences in dollar salary increase and proportion of salary increase. Females appeared to have received a larger dollar salary increase, and a larger proportion increase than their male counterparts, but neither the salary increase nor the proportion increase was statistically significant.

Based on the available data, there is no evidence to suggest that for noncontinuing faculty there was a significant difference between male and female salaries. The b-value for this group was -1,649 in favor of males, with a corresponding t-value of -.38, which is not statistically significant.

There is no evidence of a statistical difference between male and female salaries for new faculty. The b-value for this group was -5,752 in favor of male salaries, with a t-value of -1.86, which is not statistically significant as is shown in Table 11.

**Full-Time Instructional Faculty**  
**b-value and t-value**  
**Associated with the Variable Sex for Selected Subgroups**  
**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville—2007-08 and 2008-09**

**Table 11**

	2007-08		2008-09	
	b-value	t-value	b-value	t-value
Faculty	-2,289	-1.96	-2,568	-2.22*
Continuing Faculty	-2,375	-1.93	-2,244	-1.81
Dollar salary increase			280	.90
Proportion increase			.058	1.01
Noncontinuing Faculty	-1,649	-.38		
New Faculty			-5,752	-1.86

*Note.* Since administrative stipends are not included in the 2008-09 data, they have been removed from the 2007-08 analyses. Therefore, these data differ from the 2007-08 report.

\* Significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed analysis.

The University of Tennessee does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, disability or veteran status in provision of educational programs and services or employment opportunities and benefits. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex or disability in the education programs and activities pursuant to the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

Inquiries and charges of violation concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, ADA or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) or any other referenced policies should be directed to the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), 1840 Melrose Avenue, Knoxville, TN 37996-3560, telephone (865) 974-2498 (V/TTY available) or 974-2440. Requests for accommodation of a disability should be directed to the ADA Coordinator, UT Human Resources, 600 Henley Street, Knoxville, TN 37996-4125.

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON  
February 1, 2010**

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review the form in *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* used for promotion and/or tenure recommendations and recommend adding to the form signature lines to clarify that the Chancellor makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees concerning tenure but confers promotion without the need for approval by the Board;

WHEREAS, as outlined on page 2 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, “[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* entitled “**Summary Sheet: Recommendation for promotion and/or Tenure**” and believes the requested change is reasonable and may be made by replacing the present check boxes on this form with signature lines; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* entitled “**Summary Sheet: Recommendation for promotion and/or Tenure**” is replaced with the form accompanying this resolution.

# Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure

Name of faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_

Present rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Candidate for:  Tenure  Promotion to \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Highest degree earned: \_\_\_\_\_

Original rank at UTK: \_\_\_\_\_ Subsequent promotions (year, rank): \_\_\_\_\_

## RECORD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

Date of original appointment as a full-time probationary faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_

Years of full-time teaching experience at instructor rank or above before UTK probationary period:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Years of full-time teaching at UTK, as of the May 31st prior to the review: \_\_\_\_\_

Total years of teaching: \_\_\_\_\_

Latest year for tenure review as stipulated in appointment letter: \_\_\_\_\_

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

Date of departmental discussion: \_\_\_\_\_

Result of discussion: For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): \_\_\_\_\_

Is there a dissenting report?  Yes (please attach)  No

Is there a response from the candidate  Yes (please attach)  No

### INTERDISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OR DIRECTOR (where appropriate)

For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ (Provide letter)

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_  
(Provide letter)

\_\_\_\_\_  
DEPARTMENT HEAD

Provide a statement on the professional record and a summary recommendation.

### COLLEGE COMMITTEE

For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Recuse (attach explanation for conflict of interest): \_\_\_\_\_

*A copy of the report of the departmental and college committees must also be attached. In cases where this report disagrees in any substantial way with the departmental recommendation, this report must go beyond a listing of the vote to indicate as fully as possible the reasons for the differences.*

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_  
(Provide letter)

\_\_\_\_\_  
DEAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHANCELLOR (RECOMMENDATION ON TENURE)

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHANCELLOR (DECISION ON PROMOTION)



**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
FACULTY SENATE TO BE HELD ON  
February 1, 2010**

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* concerning the process for obtaining external letters of assessment; and,

WHEREAS, as outlined on page 2 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, “[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, guidelines for obtaining external letters of assessment were revised in July 2007, were distributed and posted on the Provost’s website, and have been used on the Knoxville campus since that time but have never been formally incorporated in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that Part IV. B.4 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is deleted and replaced in full with the text accompanying this resolution.

#### **4. External Letters of Assessment**

The department head or designate (e.g., chair of a departmental tenure and promotion committee) is responsible for the process of obtaining letters from external evaluators. The head, or designate, should initiate the process of obtaining external letters of assessment far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to peer review committees and administrators at all levels of review. Candidates for tenure and promotion should not contact prospective or actual external evaluators under any circumstances.

a. **Qualifications of External Evaluators.** External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's research record and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Whenever possible, letters should be solicited from individuals at peer institutions or aspirational peer institutions, in particular, from faculty employed at AAU institutions. If individuals at non-peer institutions are solicited for letters, the department head must explain the reasons for the choice of these individuals (including without limitation evidence of the reviewer's exemplary experience and standing in the candidate's field). Evaluators will normally hold the rank of professor and must have attained at least the rank to which the candidate aspires. Evaluators must be able to furnish an objective evaluation of the candidate's work and may not be former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, or close personal friends of the candidate or others whose relationship with the candidate could reduce objectivity. If the evaluator has had a collaborative scholarly or research relationship with the candidate, the nature of that collaboration and the relative contributions of the candidate must be clearly described by the evaluator. A reviewer's appearance on an academic panel or roundtable with the candidate or attendance at a symposium or conference with a candidate, taken alone, does not constitute a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. Questions concerning the eligibility of potential evaluators should be referred to the office of the Dean and, where appropriate (e.g., where the department is a college or where the Dean is uncertain about how to resolve the matter), Provost well in advance of making a request from the individuals in question. Each evaluator will be asked to state expressly in his or her review letter the nature of any association with the candidate.

b. **Method for Obtaining External Assessments.**

- The department head or designate, in consultation with departmental faculty, assembles a list of potential external evaluators.
- The department head or designate requests the names of potential evaluators from the candidate.
- The department head or designate also requests names of individuals the candidate wants excluded and the reasons for the exclusions.
- The department head or designate will solicit 8-10 letters. No more than half of the letters solicited should come from the list suggested by the candidate.
- The dossier will normally include no fewer than five letters from external evaluators.

- All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves their removal from the review process.
- The dossier will include a log documenting all requests for letters from external evaluators. The log documents the date on which each external letter was requested by the department head or designate and the date on which the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained. The log will also indicate which evaluators come from the candidate's list and which are from the list of the department head or designate.
- The department head or designate will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning the candidate's research or creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate statements of criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

c. Letters from external evaluators must be submitted by regular mail on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. Letters submitted via e-mail or facsimile are acceptable in cases of critical timing, but they should be followed by a mailed original. The mailed original then should be cross-checked against the e-mailed or facsimiled copy, and when it has been established that there have been no changes, the mailed original should be included in the candidate's dossier.

d. The department head or designate is responsible for providing and including in the candidate's dossier a brief biographical statement about the credentials and qualifications of each external evaluator; special attention should be given to documenting the evaluator's standing in his or her discipline as part of the biographical statement.

## **Proposed Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws**

**February 1, 2010**

In Article II, Section 10 Election of Officers, in the qualifications for candidates for President-Elect, change

“prior service as an elected faculty member of the Faculty Senate within the last five years”  
to

“prior service on the Faculty Senate (as an administrative member, an elected faculty member, or a committee, council, or task force member, or in another elected or appointed capacity) within the last five years.”

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
FEBRUARY 1, 2010, 3:30 P.M.  
UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM  
President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376**