

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Tina Butcher, Rajeev Dabke, Michael Dentzau, Sherico Derico, Lisa Frander, Katey Hughes, Patrick Jackson, Michelle Jones, Krystal Kennel, Tesa Leonce, Paul Luft, Chris Markwood, Laurence Marsh, Ellen Martin, Chris McCollough, Clay Nicks, Carolina Pelaez-Morales, Yesem Peker, Andrew Puckett, Amanda Rees, Diana Riser, Brian Schwartz, Kim Shaw, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell, Kevin Whalen

Guests Present: Aisha Adams, Samuel Abegaz, Anil Banerjee, Richard Baxter, Alicia Bryan, Bridget Downs, Mark Flynn, Abraham George, Kimberly Gill, Shannon Godlove, Linda Hadley, Kristen Hansen, Susan Hrach, Floyd Jackson, Troy Keller, Mary LeVan, Judi Livingston, Kimberly McElveen, David Owings, Eliot Rendleman, Ellen Roberts, Dennis Rome, Mark Schmidt, Stephanie Speer, Uma Sridharan, Glenn Stokes, Kerri Taylor, Lashica Thomas, Brian Tyo, Tara Underwood, Wayne Van Ellis

- I. Call to order at 3:00 PM
- II. President's comments and announcements (00:41 time stamp) – Chris Markwood
 - a. Second international travel ban issued by President Trump: We still remain unaffected with regard to our students, faculty, and staff. We need to be sensitive to our students who may be concerned; let them know we value their presence and professional contributions. We are better because of them. There will be an event next week, and we encourage your participation.
 - b. Ongoing legislative session: Budget is looking very good with regard to higher education and Columbus State in particular. Currently, there are no changes to our proposed budget.
 - c. Meeting in Atlanta with USG and Technical college presidents and staff: Governor Deal came to present, and he indicated that the current campus carry legislation will likely pass. Some are concerned that prohibiting people from carrying guns makes them a target on campuses. He encouraged us to take extra precautions in parking lots and other walkways to and from classes. He stated that there are few examples of campus violence with guns. For several years, CSU has been one of the safest campuses in USG.
 - d. Chancellor priorities/task force
 - i. USG policies and procedures need to be reviewed
 - ii. Efficiencies, particularly administrative efficiencies
 - iii. Envisioning the future of higher education given the state of technology and information.
We will be looking for individuals to represent our campus. Any volunteers for policies and procedures? Brian Schwartz raised his hand.
- III. Provost's comments and announcements (8:50 time stamp) – Tina Butcher
 - a. Update on Open House: 248 students that attended (588 total guests), significant increase from last year.

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- b. Scholastic Honors Convocation: Will be held in Legacy Hall of RiverCenter on Friday, April 14. Only stage party participants will be required to wear regalia. There will be a shuttle between the campuses. Kristen Hansen has called for names for student awards by March 7.
 - c. Inclusion surveys: Focus groups are ongoing now. If you have not participated, please contact Johniqua Williams.
 - d. May 2nd save-the-date: New strategic plan presentation and faculty/staff awards presentation. Tentatively begin at 9:30 AM and will conclude after lunch.
 - e. Mildred Miller Fort Foundation Eminent Scholar Chair of International Education and Executive Director for the Center of International Education search is preparing to begin. The Executive Director of Admissions search is ongoing.
 - f. University Assessment Committee (new institutional committee): The committee will provide feedback to enhance institutional effectiveness, assessment and evaluation. The assessment committee that Kimberly McElveen is putting together will be very helpful for program coordinators and department chairs. She will be working on forming that committee.
- IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements (13:30 time stamp)—Deferred time based on agenda. Announced changes to agenda order.

Please note: The next discussed agenda item was the Salary Equity Report, located at the end of the agenda

V. Standing Committees

- a. Scholastic Honors Convocation (59:15 time stamp) – Kristen Hansen
 - i. Revised format to reflect the growing and expanding nature of the programs.
 - ii. April 14, 2 PM Legacy Hall at RiverCenter
 - iii. Most of the faculty/staff awards will be done on study day, except for Educator of the Year, Faculty Cup, Regents Awards, student of excellence by department, and cross-discipline awards. The other department-level awards should be presented at college-specific awards ceremonies. Reception to follow.
 - iv. Neal Thomson: We had discussion on student award selection; is it solely up to standards by that department? Kristen Hansen: How each department determines winners is totally up to the individual department. We will list all the award winners of the department awards in the program. Discussion on the way the awards are determined.
- b. Admissions Policy (35:40 time stamp) – Rick Gardiner
 - i. Committee is looking at admissions situation with our GOALS Program students under Dr. Blalock. Currently, they are admitted with special circumstances and audit their courses. We want to figure out how to award credit for the courses that the students pass, since they pay the same tuition. We will report back where we are in terms of that.
- c. Administrator Evaluations Committee (36:56 time stamp) – Shannon Godlove

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- i. Presentation attached: Revisions to Administrator Evaluation survey
- ii. Goal: improve the functionality of survey, shorten it if possible, and –
- iii. Proposed changes to survey questions themselves
 1. Remove No Opinion option (leave Don't Know option)
 2. Change numeric values so that positive responses resulted in more points.
 3. Streamlined wording of questions; reworded questions positively
 4. Uncoupled double-barreled questions
 5. Eliminated redundant questions
- iv. Other changes
 1. Streamlined sections from 5 to 3: Communications, Professional Behavior, and Planning. Adding comment boxes after each section (rather than just at the end).
 2. Questions and feedback?
 - a. Neal Thomson: Was any statistical analysis done on figuring out which questions are redundant? Discussion (Neal Thomson, Shannon Godlove, on potential statistical analyses and approaches, including which questions seemed repeated).
 - b. Rajeev Dabke: What to mark if you don't want to express opinions on a question? Can you leave it blank? Shannon Godlove (SG): Yes, the committee decided to eliminate it to encourage selection and it had a point value in the middle. Discussion (Brian Schwartz, Shannon Godlove, Diana Riser, Laurence Marsh, Clint Barineau, Neal Thomson, Joy Thomas) on positive/negative on Neutral option.
 - c. Diana Riser: for Don't Know, you can change it to Don't Know/Prefer Not To Answer. I would like to see a question about whether or not the person effectively balances the needs of faculty, students, and staff.
 - d. Katey Hughes: What is the timeline? SG: Planning to administer survey in April.
 - e. Shannon Godlove: Would like clarification on whether or not to evaluate Assistant Deans and Associate Deans. Brian Schwartz: I move that we delete Assistant and Associate positions from evaluations. Ellen Martin: second. Diana Riser: I would rather have the option to evaluate that person or select global option to not judge. Discussion on logistics of survey distribution (Neal Thomson, Shannon Godlove, Neal Thomson).
 - f. Vote: 11-13. Motion fails.

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- d. Student Course Evaluation (1:06:55 time stamp) – Paul Luft
 - i. Committee looked at how to improve our student response rates (typically see 40-50% response rate). Researched how other USG institutions operate student evaluations (i.e. Georgia State, University of North Georgia, Clayton State).
 - ii. The committee recommends that students who do not submit evaluations for all enrolled courses will not be able to see grades until the last day of Banner. Alan Tidwell: What about including an opt-out option? Paul Luft: Yes, we have included opt-out selection. Discussion (Amanda Rees, Neal Thomson, Diana Riser, Alan Tidwell, Brian Schwartz) on opt-out option. Brian Schwartz: Has the committee gotten feedback from students through SGA, for example? Paul Luft (PL): No, not from CSU students. Diana Riser: I heard feedback from students today about how the limited time window restricts students. Discussion (PL and Diana Riser) on ability to open and close evaluations. Glenn Stokes: Faculty can open it earlier. The Faculty Senate decided years ago to close it the last day of class. Patrick Jackson: It has closed earlier in the past. I would like to see it closer to end of term. Further discussion on restrictions. Anil Banerjee: Based on student feedback, I think we should shorten the evaluations. Patrick Jackson: What are the percentages of response rate of universities who use this format? PL: 88-91% at Clayton State (higher than our 40-50%), and they have the opt-out option. Discussion on comparison to paper evaluations. Neal Thomson: Even though the response rate is lower, my averages haven't changed. So is this even a problem that needs to be solved? Susan Hrach: Study from UCF suggested the same points. Amanda Rees: I think the way the questions are worded favor certain types of pedagogies over ones that are being promoted now. Joy Thomas: You can change the questions. Amanda Rees: You can add questions, but you cannot change the existing ones. Glenn Stokes: Departments can append any set of questions applied to a set of classes (i.e. can add to the ten standard questions).
- e. Student Research and Creative Endeavors (1:19:45) – Alicia Bryan
 - i. Funding for 2016-2017: \$25,000 (\$5,000 increase from previous year)
 - ii. Fall 2016: 69 initial submissions; \$16,771 granted (\$25,887 requested); \$11,499 claimed (as of 2/15/17). Given the money not claimed, the committee was given permission to over-award in the spring.
 - iii. Spring 2017: 55 initial submissions; \$22,693 requested, \$14,916 granted
 - iv. Other Committee Activities
 - 1. Hannah Israel held SRACE workshop.
 - 2. Committee updated evaluation rubric (separated into research, creative endeavors, and travel).

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- v. Grants tracking enhancement: will be required to submit a status report at the end of the academic term. Outlined the options the students have to present/publish outcomes.

VI. New Business (1:24:30 time stamp)

- a. Elect members of the Budget Advisory Committee
 - i. One faculty member from each college; 3 people serve 2 years, 2 serve 1 year (to achieve staggered terms).
 - ii. Nominees
 1. COA: Kevin Whalen (2 year)
 2. COEHP: Clay Nicks (2 year)
 3. COLS: Amanda Rees (2 year)
 4. Library: Michelle Jones (1 year)
 5. DATCOB: Neal Thomson (1 year)Ellen Martin made a motion to close nominations (seconded by Diana Riser). Vote: 21 approved slate of nominees. Motion passes.
- b. Provost Search and Selection Committee update (1:31:35 time stamp)– John Finley
 - i. John Finley was unable to attend (currently processing today's Skype interviews). The committee interviewed candidates today and will interview five candidates tomorrow (all Skype).
 - ii. Goal: Hold on-campus visits mid-April.
 - iii. Amanda Rees: People seem to be concerned about attendance at forums. Kim Shaw: I will pass that feedback along.
- c. Faculty Workload Policy (1:33:00 time stamp) - Tina Butcher and Glenn Stokes
 - i. Presentation attached
 - ii. Background of why to create workload policy
 1. Many sister institutions have workload policies while CSU does not.
 2. SACS standard requires us to discuss/justify having adequate faculty for offerings.
 3. Inconsistencies between colleges and within colleges; a basic workload policy at the university level will help go towards a consistent and equitable arena for all of us.
 4. Budget requests of new faculty lines to the system office require justification.
 - iii. Summary
 1. Started process in September with versions ranging from over 10 pages to 2 pages (current draft). This was the end result from discussion in the Council of Deans that was then approved for submission for discussion in the Faculty Senate.
 2. Summarized points in attached proposal draft
 - iv. Discussion

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

1. Clint Barineau: This policy is well written for areas that do not have labs or studios. There should be flexibility in how many hours count for labs/studios, and the policy should explicitly allow chairs, deans, and provost to work out differences in this regard. This policy would suggest that a six-hour field course lab would also be worth three hours. I will also note that when the University System in the Human Resources manual had to assign workload for the Affordable Care Act, they based it on contact hours, not credit hours. In alignment with that policy, would we be better off stating that workload hours are contact hours?
2. Rajeeve Dabke: Chemistry is accredited by ACS (American Chemical Society), and their guidelines state that those teaching in the classroom and laboratory must not teach more than 15 contact hours. Colleagues surveyed other universities in GA that are ACS approved; ones surveyed had no more than 12 contact hours. So are we going to follow the contact hours or another ratio? Glenn Stokes (GS): That wasn't my recommendation, so I'm not prepared to explain how it will be applied. This will be applied by the deans, specifically. They will be the ones to apply it to the colleges. If an accrediting body explicitly states how it is determined or measured, then that would trump any other policy. Tina Butcher agreed.
3. Neal Thomson: Semester-by-semester deliverables for a research process that typically takes years is untenable. For example, a colleague and I are starting a research project involving the Pastoral Institute, and we project that the project will be ready for publication in 2019. Every single person in my department is expected to do research. GS: Deliverable does not mean the end of what you are doing. Deliverable can include goals for that semester, not the entire project. Tina Butcher mentioned how that related to inconsistencies and the need to tighten up that piece.
4. Amanda Rees: The process of tightening—is that department assessment? Tina Butcher: That will be developed in the college policies. The College of the Arts already has one at the college level which deals with its complexities.
5. Chris McCollough: I was on the COA Executive Committee when we put this thing together. By in large, this proposal is our language. The 2:1 piece has a lot to do with ensembles and one-to-one student/faculty instruction. Deliverables and accountability measures would be negotiated by the individual faculty member first with the chair and then taken to the dean. Therefore, you are setting

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

realistic expectations upfront through the chair to the dean level; this is not a unilateral, top-down method.

6. Troy Keller: This could affect learning outcomes of students, particularly in the sciences, where they need these hands-on experiences. We have a brand new QEP that values and encourages this type activity that we have in a laboratory environment. For example, I am teaching a course this semester that has one hour of lecture and five hours of lab. Is that really fair? You will create more burdens on faculty. This workload policy proposal will achieve neither equality nor learning outcomes we set at this university.
7. Judi Livingston: Going back to the ACA-- ACA doesn't even list 5:5 on their matrix because you would be over the number of weekly hours (assuming 40 hour work week and 8.25 weekly work hours/course). Trying to improve retention and consistency/retention in composition instructors, especially in Area A, will not work with this policy. They stop that chart at 12 hours instead of 15, because they don't want to say that you would be at 104% of your time teaching. Twelve hours would be 83% of your time, and they don't list 15 hours. Tina Butcher: If you were teaching multiple of preps of English Comp, would it be the same amount of time? Judi Livingston: This issue is the massive amount of papers and grading, not the number of preps. That is where our demand is, and so we try to lighten that load so that we have faculty return. We do this so we don't lose our lecturers; so they don't burn out after a year or so and go somewhere else. To get consistency in that position, I feel ethically responsible to argue at all accounts to lighten that load, not to solidify it at 5:5. Patrick Jackson and Judi Livingston discussed number of papers and weekly grading hours in those courses. Any kind of learning we say we value in Area A is being offset by this.
8. Amanda Rees: How does this work with thesis/dissertation and independent studies? Tina Butcher: Theses and dissertations would be handled at the college level. Independent studies are agreed upon by faculty member with a student. Amanda Rees: Are we going to say no more independent studies for faculty with a 4:4 load? Brian Schwartz: Would the faculty get credit towards their load? Tina Butcher: No, there never has.
9. Clint Barineau: I think having a workload policy is certainly reasonable. There are certain policies that can have a blanket statement. There are other policies in which the diversity across the institution is so great that we allow a nuanced approach. A good example of that is student learning outcomes. There is a policy that

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

states the departments develop their own outcomes, and I would suggest that the workload policy be framed in recognition of how diverse we are and allowing the college flexibility in developing it.

10. Ellen Martin: It appears that adjustments can be made in all circumstances with approval up to the provost level. Has there ever been a time when these things have not been approved at that level?
Tina Butcher: I am a limited-term employee at this position, so I have not had that happen while in my position. I think that's where the college policies come in, explicating it for the diversity that exists within a college. Even though we are a diverse institution, it has to be equitable at some level, as challenging as that may be.
Glenn Stokes: The policy establishes a standard. Within your department, how are faculty meeting that standard either through releases, alternate teaching style, etc. The dean would make sure there is equity between individual departments. It puts the onus on the faculty and chairs to say this is where we consider the workload for our faculty and this is why.
Ellen Martin: In COEHP, there are classes where students go out into the schools and the faculty don't see them for six weeks, while in other classes they see them daily. That's a very different workload within one department. I can see the financial side as well. If I'm going on contact hours, and you're going on credit hours, that's very different.
11. Joy Thomas: How are U/G courses counted as contact hours? Some of us take on more students because we don't have the faculty to cover other courses. How much support will there be to rectify the issues higher than the college level? Will there be something we can put a budget to, or will we need to adjust the workload based on our current budget? I saw 80:20. Is that a standard across the university that there should be 80% teaching and 20% other? Will there be flexibility in allowing colleges to shift that around?
Tina Butcher: I do think that bringing equity to it will bring some fiscal changes, and there might be allocations to support some of the changes you addressed. I think that might be one of the benefits to working this out.
12. Kim Shaw: Point of Order—it is 5:02. Do we wish to continue this conversation beyond our normal meeting time?
13. Neal Thomson: I'm in a department where all faculty have expectations for journal article publication. According to our standards of excellence, if you are not generating sufficient publications, you are not going to get acceptable performance evaluations. If we go to an 80:20 system: I'm already over the 20%

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

for service, and that leaves nothing for research. We would then lose our accreditation. The mind-numbing amount of work it would take for each chair to go through the yearly deliverables for each faculty member would be onerous. I don't know what the benefit is.

14. Brian Tyo: The BOR uses the common denominator of contact hours on the BOR website. Discussion (Tina Butcher, Amanda Rees, Andy Puckett). Andy Puckett: I love that there's flexibility somewhere. The statement that 2 hours in a lab count as 1 hour: I was set up to teach five labs and a lecture. Does that count as 13 hours, which is the time I spend in the classroom, or does it count as 8? How many more classes would I have to teach? Should I adjust the way I teach my Physics classes to only be available to the students for one hour? I think that just emphasizes that there must be some huge difference between the courses that are being taught on the campus to call all of them 2:1. Should I change how I'm teaching?
15. Carolina Pelaez-Morales: We recently got an email about graduate certification. For those of us teaching graduate-level courses, there is an increased expectation of research. It seems inconsistent that we would list 80:20. We would want policies that are consistent including policies of the graduate-level certification.
16. Zdeslav Hrepic: I would back up the statements about credit hours vs. contact hours. We currently have physics labs that go on for 3 hours. Implementing this policy would greatly increase the load of a person teaching labs. Differences in load comes from variability in courses and offerings between semesters. Taking an average over year(s) and allowing for overload accumulation is more equitable than examining it semester-by-semester.
17. Anil Banerjee: Graduate programs with thesis options: 80:20 breakdown is incompatible with this type of program. Those departments with graduate programs would need a fair way to compensate faculty for these responsibilities. Am I understanding correctly that ACS (and other national accreditation bodies) requirements will be upheld? Other chemistry departments in and around Georgia lost ACS approval because they ignored ACS standards.
18. Brian Schwartz: What is the history/rationale for the credit hour/contact hour (1:2) proposal? As far as I know, that's not required by the Board of Regents. Tina Butcher: I don't know the history. The USG policy seems to align more so with traditional lecture courses than a lab course or other formats. I think that's something we need to work to. In my experience in having workload

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

assigned to me, we had courses with a large field component. The course would have three hours of lecture and four hours of lab (somewhere in the county), for a total of five credit hours. I was somewhere observing students during each lab period. I didn't write the 2:1 part; I'm just telling you I've experienced that part maybe more than some of you have. Glenn Stokes: I'm teaching a lab that is 3 hours long, and to be honest, I don't think the 2:1 is necessarily a fair way to assess the work I do in the lab. Tina Butcher: I had no idea when I was teaching that course that people across campus were getting seven hours for my five hours. We have to figure out a way to come to some kind of consensus.

19. Neal Thomson: Graduate program courses are generally more difficult to teach than undergraduate courses. Some institutions count a masters-level course as 1.5 times and a doctoral-level course as two times the credit of an undergraduate course. Shouldn't we be looking at this issue? Discussion (Glenn Stokes, Tina Butcher) on graduate-level teaching. Tina Butcher: Previously, we equated a graduate credit hour to 1.33 compared to 1 for an undergraduate credit hour.
20. Aisha Adams: What is the actual benefit/purpose of identifying a 2:1 in the lab? As a new faculty member here, how does the 80% teaching load affect my tenure and promotion and recruiting/retaining new faculty members when I go somewhere else? Chris Markwood: This is an important discussion on any campus. For regional institutions like ours across the country, typical faculty workloads start at 4:4, adjusted for research and other expectations at the individual and/or college level. What we expect of that "20%" is reflected in your standards of excellence. If you teach a 4:4 load, that will impact, most definitely, what you're able to produce. I don't think the individual standards of a department should be addressed in this general document. What we need for compliance is to give a broad document that generally defines expectations with the understanding of those clarifications at the college and departmental level. The campus decided to endorse AACSB accreditation, and that will be consistent and supported; the same for the chemists and all the other accreditations. The encouragement is to find that document that provides clarity, understanding that one size does not fit all. Most definitely, the college-level policies will include the equivalencies for graduate courses. Chris Markwood mentioned system-level policy

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

inconsistencies and the need for documenting our efficiencies at the legislature request.

21. Clint Barineau: The specific 2:1 contact hour to credit hour should be removed from the university document and state that workload to contact hours should be decided at the college level. That approach allows for all the diversity across the colleges.
22. Ellen Roberts: I wonder if there is a compromise: Give a 2:1 statement that can be modified at the college level and include things like preparation time or travel, etc. Tina Butcher: I think that's a good idea. I think our colleagues in the Arts have a lot of good ideas they can share since they've gone through this process. They will be a good resource to draw from as we move forward. As we move forward, the next step would be going to the college level to hash out specifics.
23. Troy Keller: CSU has, in the ten years I've been here, really changed in positive ways. We need to continue to be an aspirational institution that aims for higher ed goals that really benefit our students. We have shown in the classroom and the laboratory that we can achieve that. That's what the QEP is all about. We need to rethink that 2:1 statement. We need to give more flexibility to the deans to attract/retain the best faculty and get our students off to the world to be successful. That's the aspirational thinking we need. Let's not go back to how we were in the past; let's think about what we want to be in the future.
24. Katey Hughes: When we talk about the idea of how to give flexibility to the 2:1 statement: The best way to give flexibility is to say 1:1. The reason for that is that by leaving in the 2:1 policy, you are valuing what we do in lab at half of what we do in other experiences. That's what it comes down to. When you walk into our labs that are full of 24 students, and we are in there for the time allotted: I guarantee you that those of us who are teaching in those capacities will say, to a one, that we are working as hard in those environments as we are doing in other environments of teaching. Finally, given the way we're changed, we should be using the labels lecture and lab. We are giving our students active learning experiences in both. That's the direction we're going in, and that's the direction we need to continue.
25. Kim Shaw: We've had a really rich discussion. If you have other points, please feel free to send that feedback to me or to Dr. Butcher and Dr. Stokes. We will be glad to incorporate this feedback as they modify this document. We will continue this discussion with modifications of this document at the next meeting. Amanda Rees:

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

will the modifications be posted prior to the meeting? Kim Shaw:
Yes, more than a couple of days would be preferable. (To Tina
Butcher) Please encourage the deans to let us have a little more time
next time. Thank you for your patience.

- d. Salary Equity Study ***Please note the time stamp; this topic was one of the first agenda items discussed in the meeting*** – (14:17 time stamp) Alan Tidwell
 - i. Presentation included
 - ii. Presented how the committee (Frank Hardymon, Stephanie da Silva, Alan Tidwell) used IPEDS automatic group system to generate a comparison group of peer institutions. Thirty-two peer institutions were generated initially; committee trimmed to 20 peer groups to be used to calculate market salary for CSU faculty. The committee included University of West Georgia and UT Chattanooga in the final 20 (were not in the original comparison group due to enrollment size greater than 10,000). Explained factors that were used to determine index score that the committee used for comparison to CSU.
 - iii. Used CUPA coding for 2015-2016, verified with department chairs. Matched CUPA code with CUPA salary data based on 20 peer institutions, adjusted for rank and year in rank.
 - iv. On average, we have 8-10% differential from market, fairly systematic across gender and discipline. It is still in the draft stage, and we want to send it to the deans to correct any mistakes. Statistically, using a two-tailed t-test, there was not significant difference between male and female salaries compared to peer groups.
 - v. Questions?
 1. Diana Riser: What was the male and female number of faculty? Alan Tidwell: 142 (male) to 94 (female). This data does not include lecturers.
 2. Anil Banerjee: What does all of this mean for us? Alan Tidwell: Well, it means that we are at an 8-10% differential compared to market.
 3. Brian Schwartz: Is there a difference between males and females based on rank? Alan Tidwell: We haven't done that analysis yet. Discussion on statistical analysis and differentials.
 4. Kim Shaw: Would you explain the experience premium within rank? Alan Tidwell (AT): Estimated three years as the middle for each rank. If you are less than or greater than, the comparison was then adjusted \$1000 or so per year, with a cap of 5 or 6 years at the rank.
 5. Brian Schwartz: How fine-tuned are the CUPA codes? AT: That was vetted by the chairs, but I think it was pretty fine-tuned.
 6. Question from audience member: Does data account for cost-of-living? AT: No, it doesn't, unless that is adjusted in the IPEDS data.

March 06, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

7. Diana: Did you carry out the t-test by college rather than globally?
AT: No, we haven't done that yet. Discussion on further statistical analysis and sample size within colleges.
8. Brian Schwartz (BS): What is the range of the differentials? AT: I can't remember, but it went from about a 30% premium to about a 40% discount. BS: So individuals could be well below or above? AT: Sure, there were some like that. Most were right around that 50th percentile range
9. Tara Underwood: If there were errors that were reported by the chairs, when will that be corrected? AT: The next step is to send it back out to deans and chairs to check for errors. I don't expect any systematic errors.
10. Brian Schwartz: Was your task force to figure out where we are? AT: Yes, from here it goes to Dr. Markwood.
11. Chris Markwood: I want to thank the committee for what they've done. We will get a dollar figure for how far off we are for faculty expected salaries based on rank, years-in-rank, and discipline. We then need to put a plan together. There are important questions to ask, because we have a wide variety of results when we look at individuals. In layman's terms: If we had a pot of money to invest in this, who goes first? We need to have buy-in and understanding, and I don't think there is one right way. Some options:
 - a. Address those salaries furthest away from the expected salary first
 - b. Address lowest salaries first
 - c. Achieve a certain percentage of expected salary

We have a little time to decide, and the amount available will be based on the budget (which looks positive at this time). How do we go about investing it in an equitable, fair, and reasonable way? Fixing this problem and staff salaries will take time, but what I hope we have is a trusted mechanism to get to that desired percent level.

Because of that years-in-service/experience premium, the data can get updated every year or so, including promotions adjustments.

AT: Showed percentile over/under market and male/female data. In April we will have access to CUPA data for 2016-2017; therefore, optimistic that in the future we can get data out sooner.

Meeting adjourned at 5:28 PM