

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong Faculty Senate

2-21-2011

February 21, 2011 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes>

Recommended Citation

Armstrong State University, "February 21, 2011 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes" (2011). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 51.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/51>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Armstrong Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Armstrong Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of February 21, 2011
University Hall, room 158, 3:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: Senate President LeFavi called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.
Please see **Appendix A** for a roster of attendees.

- I. Approval of the Minutes of Faculty Senate January 10, 2011 meeting. Those minutes are posted for viewing on the University Faculty Senate website ([Appendix B](#)). The motion was made and seconded to approve the January minutes. The motion passed.

SENATE ACTION

- II. University Curriculum Committee. UCC Meeting Minutes from January 19, 2011. ([Appendix C](#)).

College of Liberal Arts:

The first items the UCC put forward to the Faculty Senate were from the Department of Art, Music, and Theatre. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, III, A, 3-6.) It was moved and seconded that modifications to MUSC 2390 and two programs of study be approved. The motion passed.

The UCC put forward items from the Department of Economics. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, III, C, 1-6.) It was moved and seconded that three new courses, ECON 3210, 3220, and 3230, be created and course and program modifications be approved. The motion passed.

The next items the UCC put forward to the Faculty Senate were from Gender and Women's Studies. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, III, D, 1-2.) It was moved and seconded that programs of study modifications be approved. The motion passed.

The next items the UCC put forward to the Faculty Senate were from the Department of History. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, III, E, 3-4.) It was moved and seconded that the creation of HIST 3920 and deletion of HIST 3820 and 3560 be approved. The motion passed.

College of Science and Technology:

The UCC put forward items from the Department of Biology. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, IV, A, 1-2.) It was moved and seconded that creation of a new course BIOL 3800 and program of study modification be approved. The motion passed.

The UCC put forward items from the Department of Chemistry and Physics. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, IV, B, 1-6.) It was moved and seconded that deletion of PHYS 3801 and 3801L, creation of PHYS 3801K, 3700K, and PHYS 1000, with course and program modifications be approved. The motion passed.

The next items the UCC put forward to the Faculty Senate were from the Department of Computer Science and Information Technology. (UCC Minutes 1.19.2011 linked above, IV, C, 1-3.) It was moved and seconded that these course modifications be approved. The motion passed.

- III. President Bleicken presented a report on changes in employees' compensation from July 1 through the end of 2010. Dr. Bleicken explained that 25 permanent increases in compensation and 64 temporary increases in compensation were given during this period. The president further explained that the permanent increases were for persons who had taken on additional responsibilities. Questions were answered and comments were made on the following topics: why those receiving permanent raises were staff and not faculty; that the dollar figures presented were skewed because they only encompassed six months; that faculty were told "we are all in this together;" that the university cut an academic department for financial reasons without a system-wide declaration of financial exigency; that all faculty were taking on greater workloads as well; and that faculty believed no one would be receiving a raise of any kind. Dr. Bleicken explained that developing an organized, equitable process to determine increases in compensation would be challenging. The Senate President reminded faculty that, while these conversations can be uncomfortable, they are necessary at the level of the Senate.
- IV. Alex Collier, representing the Faculty Welfare Committee, presented a Resolution proposing the formation of an ad hoc committee to conduct a faculty salary survey **(Appendix D)**. He presented a background report on the former Faculty Salary Study. It was suggested by the interim VPAA that membership on this committee be re-evaluated, perhaps to include a representative from the Office of Business and Finance or the Human Resources Department. It was moved and seconded that the resolution be approved. The motion passed.
- V. Dr. Skidmore-Hess presented the Constitution and Bylaws Committee items. Please see [Appendix E](#) to view the Constitution and Bylaws Committee Meeting Minutes from January 27, 2011. It was moved and seconded to approve the proposed amendment to the bylaws of the Graduate Affairs Committee. The motion passed.
It was moved and seconded to approve the proposed change to the University Curriculum Committee Bylaws regarding the Routing of Curriculum Issues in graduate programs. The motion passed.

SENATE INFORMATION

- VI. Graduate Affairs Committee items were presented to the Faculty Senate for information only. Please see [Appendix F](#) to view and print the January 11, 2011 meeting minutes.
- VII. Graduate Curriculum Committee items were presented to the Faculty Senate for information only. Please see [Appendix G](#) to view and print the January 28, 2011 meeting minutes.
- VIII. Graduate Coordinator Compensation Report presented by Senate President Lefavi. **Appendix H** contains the revised report. It was moved and seconded that the Faculty

Welfare Committee be charged with making recommendations. The motion to charge Faculty Welfare Committee failed. It was moved and seconded to send this report to the President Bleicken. The motion passed.

- IX.** Library Committee Report was presented to the Faculty Senate for information only. Please see [Appendix I](#) to view and print the January 21, 2011 meeting minutes.
- X.** Smoke-free Campus issue. Senate President Lefavi discussed the creation of an ad hoc committee to develop a smoke-free campus policy and called for volunteers to serve on this committee. The committee will ultimately consist of faculty, staff, and students.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- XI.** Dr. Anne Thompson introduced Mr. Lee Davis, University Counsel.
- XII.** Senate President Lefavi announced the need for a Senator to serve as liaison to part-time faculty and called for individuals to volunteer by contacting him via email.
- XIII.** Anne Fuller announced that the Faculty Welfare Committee will reintroduce bocce ball tournaments soon.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela Z. Sears
Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A--21 February 2011, Full Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Senators Present

College of Education

Linda Ann McCall
Jackie Kim
Greg Wimer
Beth Childress
Michael Mahan

College of Health Professions

Robert LeFavi
Bryan Riemann
Laurie Bryant
Charlotte Bates
Kathy Morris
Tonya Tyson
Carole Massey
Helen Taggart
Andi Beth Mincer
Laurie Adams
Rhonda Bevis

College of Liberal Arts

Pamela Sears
Kevin Hampton
Stephen Primatic
Becky daCruz
Daniel Skidmore-Hess
Jason Beck
Mike Price
James Todesca
Karen Hollinger
Chris Baker
Hans-Georg Erney

Teresa Winterhalter

Lane Library

Beth Burnett

College of Science and Technology

Austin Francis
Alex Collier
Scott Mateer
Traci Ness
Catherine MacGowan
Suzanne Carpenter
Daniel Liang
Priya Goesser
Sean Eastman
Sungkon Chang
Tim Ellis
Vann Scott

Senators Absent

College of Science and Technology

Lorrie Hoffman

Guests

Glenda Ogletree
Lee Davis

Ex-Officio Present

Anne Thompson, VPAA
John Kraft, AVPAA
Dr. Linda Bleicken

RESOLUTION: Reconstitution of the Faculty Salary Study Committee

BACKGROUND

On December 4, 2007 the VPAA's office charged the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee and Office of Institutional Research to conduct a Faculty Salary Study. The Committee used data from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) to compare AASU salaries to those of peer institutions. Their findings and recommendations can be found in the Executive Summary from the March, 20 2008 Faculty Salary Study (Appendix A). In 2008, based on their recommendations, the administration allocated funds to bring AASU salaries in better alignment with those of peer comparators.

The Faculty Welfare Committee was originally charged with reviewing the Faculty Salary Study and comparing it with CUPA-HR data from more recent academic years. The FWC compared salary data before and immediately following the salary adjustment of 2008 and shared our findings with Dr. Michael Toma, Co-Chair of the original Study Committee. His review highlighted numerous procedural issues and computational concerns regarding our analysis, including the following:

- 1) The constitution and bylaws adopted by the faculty indicate that it is not within the purview of the FWC to address individual cases for faculty members. The FWC can consider general policy matters regarding faculty welfare but not specific cases. This is why the VPAA's office created the ad hoc committee to study the matter.
- 2) The Study Committee recommended that the Salary Study be repeated in three year intervals and now is the perfect time to request that the ad hoc committee be reconstituted.

The Faculty Welfare Committee shares these concerns and recognizes the need to reestablish the Study Committee to repeat the Salary Study. At present, the impact of the 2008 salary adjustments remain unclear as do the status of particular recommendations made in their original report. In the years since the original study, AASU faculty salaries have been frozen with a complete lack of merit-based annual adjustments. It is of critical importance that we accurately compare salaries at AASU with those of peer institutions. This information can be used to formulate a long-term strategy to implement necessary adjustments to bring AASU salaries in alignment with those of peer comparators and further reduce instances of salary compression and inversion.

RESOLUTION

Faculty Welfare asks the Faculty Senate to request that the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research work with the representatives of the Faculty Senate to reconstitute the Faculty Salary Study Committee. Faculty Welfare recommends that this occur during the spring 2011 semester and specifically requests the following:

- 1) Reconstitute the original ad hoc Study Committee with identical membership (if possible).
- 2) The Study Committee should convene in a timely manner to ensure that their report is completed prior to the end of this semester. If possible, the Committee should present their findings and recommendations in May to a special session of the Faculty Senate.
- 3) In addition to other pertinent issues, the Study Committee should examine how changes in the current salary adjustments given at promotion and tenure could help offset salary compression at AASU.

Executive Summary

On December 4, 2007, Dr. Whitford, Vice President for Academic Affairs, charged the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee, a committee of faculty representing the four colleges of the university, along with the Office of Institutional Research, with conducting a Faculty Salary Study. The committee agreed to use data from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) to conduct salary comparisons between AASU and peer institutions.

The AASU Office of Institutional Research submitted the university's faculty salary data to CUPA-HR. After this data submission, the institution purchased CUPA-HR's DataOnDemand analysis tool to begin the process of reviewing salary data from AASU's peer group. The committee selected the peer group based on the following criteria: Public, Southern, Masters I, and Non-HBCU; including, for example, Appalachian State and College of Charleston. This returned a list of 45 institutions including AASU (Appendix A).

The analysis was run by discipline and rank. The resulting AASU means were then compared to the CUPA-HR means from our Comparator Group using the Multi-Discipline Report. The committee looked at areas in which the AASU salaries fell below the CUPA-HR mean. The committee employed a tiered approach that began considering those areas that were below 80% of the CUPA-HR mean, and assessing the cost to bring each of those areas up in 5% intervals. Example: Determine the level of funding required to bring those that were below 80% up to 80%; then that group would join the next tier, i.e. those below 85% of the CUPA-HR mean.

The committee also considered the cost of living in Savannah relative to the peer group. The most geographically comprehensive data on cost of living were available from Yahoo-Real Estate online. Based on this data, the cost of living in Savannah is 6% higher than the median cost of living in the remaining 44 institutions, and 2% higher than the mean for the 44 institutions. A 4% factor was applied to the salary adjustment computations.

The committee found that \$933,744 (not including benefits, but including a cost of living adjustment of 4%) would be required to bring all areas now below the CUPA-HR mean up to the mean of the comparison group. To bring all areas that are below 95% of the CUPA-HR mean up to 95% of the CUPA-HR mean would require \$440,692. To bring all areas that are below 90% of the CUPA-HR mean up to 90% of the CUPA-HR mean would require \$143,780. To bring all areas that are below 85% of the CUPA-HR mean up to 85% of the CUPA-HR mean would require \$44,200. To bring all areas that are below 80% of the CUPA-HR mean up to 80% of the CUPA-HR mean would require \$6,932. This report suggests ways that funds, whether they are new sources or redirections of existing funds, can be used to offset areas that are below the means of the peer group.

In particular, the Faculty Salary Study Committee found that 17 AASU faculty in nine discipline and rank groups had the lowest mean salary among their 44 peer comparator institutions. The committee strongly recommends that these areas receive top priority for review and allocation of equity adjustments in salary. All of the areas listed can be adjusted to within

90% of the CUPA-HR mean for approximately \$99,745 (not including benefits or the cost of living adjustment). The committee suggests that any supplemental funding for faculty salaries or redirection of institutional funds address the areas in a systematic way that will insure that AASU salaries better align with those of the peer comparators.

The committee reviewed salary compression and inversion as an element of its charge and found that salary compression is a problem of increasing concern at AASU. Salaries have become more compressed at AASU in the period from 1991 to 2006 as compared to AASU's sister institutions in the USG system. With respect to salary inversion, the committee identified 68 potential cases of inverted salaries (using rank-adjusted salary) that could require approximately \$160,000 to \$300,000 to remedy depending on whether the inversion warranted corrective action. The more pressing cases of potential cross-rank salary inversion would require approximately \$65,000 to address, should they all warrant corrective action.

In order to address a long term factor that contributes to salary compression and inversion at AASU, the committee recommends the administration and faculty jointly investigate the salary adjustment for promotion to associate professor and to full professor. At AASU, the adjustments are \$2,000 and \$2,500, respectively. The lower the AASU promotion-related salary adjustments are with respect to its peers, the more compressed AASU faculty salaries will become through time as compared with faculty salaries at peer institutions.

This salary study should not be interpreted to suggest that faculty members ought to be paid at precisely the mean salary of their rank and discipline. There may be mitigating factors underlying why certain faculty members are paid below or above the mean salary for their rank and discipline. The formulaic methodology used by the salary study committee could not and did not consider these various mitigating factors. The findings reported in this document should be viewed as a starting point for further investigation on a case-by-case basis by relevant administrators (department head, dean, and vice president for academic affairs) in the chain of authority for a given faculty member to assess whether a salary adjustment is warranted.

Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Coordinator Compensation

Answering the charge of Senate President Robert Lefavi to investigate compensation for graduate coordinators, the members of the Graduate Affairs Committee wrote descriptions of their duties and contacted people at cohort institutions with programs similar to theirs and asked them to provide the following information:

- \$ responsibilities as graduate coordinator
- \$ number of students taught (undergraduate and graduate) during a typical semester
- \$ kind of compensation received as graduate coordinator.

The data collected was sent to an ad hoc committee consisting of two graduate coordinators from each of the four colleges. The members included:

College of Education–Regina Rahimi, Joan Schwartz
College of Health Professions–Maya Clark, Bryan Riemann
College of Liberal Arts–Becky da Cruz, Christopher Hendricks
College of Science and Technology–Ray Hashemi, Stephen Jodis.

The members met to discuss and analyze the data. (See Appendix)

After lengthy discussion and examination of the collected data, the members of the ad hoc committee drew several conclusions.

- \$ While the study shows a wide range of compensation for graduate coordinators, the evidence is clear that with its standard four/four teaching load, Armstrong Atlantic has the highest base workload of all the schools surveyed. Even with lower base teaching requirements, graduate coordinators at other institutions still receive compensation for their administrative responsibilities. All coordinators, including those in undergraduate programs, should receive some form of compensation for work they do beyond the typical areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- \$ Because of the inherent differences in programs and duties, no one type of compensation is applicable in every situation. Compensation should be determined at the college level.
- \$ Ten-month employees whose programs involve student recruitment, acceptance, orientation, etc., and requires them to perform duties in the summer months, should receive additional compensation for the time involved. It may be appropriate to extend these positions to twelve-month contracts.
- \$ Compensation for coordinator duties during the fall/spring terms may take different forms, including course releases and financial remuneration. For programs with limited numbers of faculty where course releases would mean classes are simply not taught, an appropriate stipend should be added to the coordinator's salary. In such situations, strong consideration should also be given to providing administrative support beyond work study students to aid the coordinator.
- \$ Coordinators must have clearly delineated duties in writing which should be a consideration in the tenure and promotion process.
- \$ With the end of the School of Graduate Studies, the new decentralized scheme has meant additional work for many coordinators. Academic Affairs should look into removing some of the burden, assigning duties to administrative offices where appropriate.

The lack of compensation for some graduate coordinators at the university is serious. In

the last year, Armstrong Atlantic has lost at least one young, talented faculty member who left for another institution in large part because of this very issue.