

Yan Zhang.

**Members Absent:** Bill Edgington; Sam Souryal; Tamara Waggener.

**Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes from the January 22, 2009 meeting were approved as amended.

**Special Guest:**

Dr. David Burris spoke to Senate about our articulation agreements. There are five component areas: web-based articulation, reverse transfer, joint admission, cooperative agreements, and time-compressed degree programs. He indicated that the impact was significant in that 70% of our graduates have transfer credits and 70% of high school students are registered in junior colleges. We have over forty agreements and participate in greater than fifty transfer-majors. His enthusiastic presentation was well received.

**Chair's Report:**

• Dr. Payne meeting

- Dr. Payne has been diagnosed with cancer; please understand he has a repressed immune system.
- Our meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> dealt with calendar. Senate concerns were presented to the Provost in detail.
- Keri Rogers' proposal and our feedback about midterm grades were discussed.
- In his update on the proposed degree programs he told us that the doctorate in history turned down, the Engineering-Physics was approved at the planning level and our Nursing program was approved.
- University has purchased seven acres in Woodlands and SHSU has a letter of intent for a construction of a facility there.
- The Smith-Kirkley dormitory will be razed this summer.
- A building for Nursing program is in the approved Building plan and the intent is to move forward on this item as rapidly as possible in the current state fiscal climate.
- 
- programs are moving forward quickly but College of Education's EdD is progressing more slowly. The administration is currently evaluating contract details, financial commitments and risk obligations.
- Of the ten proposals for developmental leaves, eight were approved by the Provost.



- University Affairs:
  - See attachment 2: University Affairs Committee Report on the LSC Bookstore Survey
- Academic Affairs:

Attachment 1

Report to Senate on the February 4, 2009 Academic Policy C



## **Faculty Affairs Committee Report**

### **Report on the 2008 Pay Inequalities by Teaching Track**

**February 12, 2009**

#### **Overview of the Issue:**

- Beginning in the Fall semester of 2004 the University entered a transition period from a twelve hour-per-semester instructional load to a two-track system of either twelve or nine hours instructional load per semester. The transition was contingent on the availability of funding, and due to be completed at the end of the 2007-2008 academic year (see Academic Policy Statement 790601).
- The Faculty Senate expressed its concerns at the onset of the new policy, but was assured by the Provost that both tracks were equally important, and would be treated as such (see Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 2004).
- Now that the transition period has ended, the members of the Faculty Affairs committee were assigned the task of investigating the outcomes from this new system. It is clear that the *two-track* system introduced in 2004 has become a *two-tier* system. The two prior reports from this committee have shown that faculty on the nine-hour track received 85% of the merit increases, and 98% of the market adjustments in comparison to faculty on the twelve-hour track. This inequality is occurring within all colleges with the two track system, despite wide variability in FES scoring practices.

#### **Complicating Factors:**

- The number of faculty on the twelve-hour track is comparatively small (less than 20% of all tenure/tenure-track faculty), and will become increasingly smaller. (Older faculty who are near retirement age are disproportionately on the twelve-hour track, while all new faculty are placed on the nine-hour track.) Continued inequities isolated within one segment of the faculty will be an increasing strain on departmental collegiality.
- The Faculty Instructional Workload policy limits the movement of faculty to the nine-hour track based on research productivity, but allows free movement of faculty to the twelve-hour track regardless of teaching efficacy (see Academic Policy Statement 790601, Section 3.01c). Consequently, faculty who struggle with *both* research and teaching are eventually funneled to the twelve-hour track. This practice necessarily leads many to associate *all* faculty on the twelve-hour track as part of a “lesser” of two tiers.



## Faculty Affairs Committee Report

### Report on the 2008 Market Increases by Teaching Track October 16, 2008

- Overall, \$123,316 was awarded for Market Adjustments in 2008 for the 2007 FES year, representing approximately 1/6<sup>th</sup> the size of Merit pool.
- Excluding the \$23,286 that went to faculty administrators and \$1,530 that went to faculty in the Newton Gresham Library, \$96,000 (98%) went to faculty classified as being on the 3/3 teaching track, and \$2,300 (2%) went to faculty on the 4/4 teaching track.<sup>1</sup>
- Many more faculty are on the 3/3 track than the 4/4 track (81% and 19%, respectively). (Again excluding faculty administrators and faculty in the Newton Gresham Library.) Considering this, the average market adjustment among faculty on the 3/3 track was \$313. The average market adjustment for faculty on the 4/4 track was \$35. Faculty administrators received an average market adjustment of \$597, over 17 times greater than of faculty on the 4/4 track.<sup>2</sup>
- The chart below shows the breakdown of average merit and market increases by college and by track. The difference in total pay increase between faculty on the 3/3 track and faculty on the 4/4 track was greatest within the College of Education (+\$1,072), and least within the College of Arts and Sciences (+\$544). In all of the colleges, faculty administrators received total pay increases well above their peers on either the 3/3 track or the 4/4 track.