

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

April 21, 2011

Members Present:

Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Len Breen (CoE), Carl Brewer (CoBA), Donald Bumpass (CoBA), Erin Cassidy (NGL), Jeff Crane (CHSS), Donna Desforge (CHSS), Mark Frank (CoBA), Debbi Hatton (CHSS), Renee James (CoAS), Bill Jasper (CoAS), Gerald Kohers (CoBA), Paul Loeffler (CoAS), Drew Lopenzino (CHSS), Joyce Mc Cauley (CoE), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (CoAS), Dwayne Pavelock (CoAS), Ling Ren (CoCJ), Sheryl Serres (CoE), Tracy Steele (CHSS), Doug Ullrich (CoAS), Ricky White (CoAS).

Members Not Present:

Rebecca Bustamante (CoE), Chad Hargrave (CoAS), Hee-jong Joo (CoCJ).

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 by Senate Chair Frank.

Special Presentation:

Provost Payne was honored for his work with the Senate since joining the campus in 1997. In his remarks, Chair Frank highlighted some of the changes at SHSU under Provost Payne's tenure including - the university's enrollment increasing from 12,564 in 1996 to 17,236 last fall, an increase of about 40%. The number of degrees conferred rose from 2,276 to 4,032, an increase of almost 80%. The number of faculty, of all ranks, went from 530 to 789, an increase of 50%. Moreover, the campus added many new additions including the SAM Center, the American Democracy Project, and is now classified as a Carnegie Doctorial Research University.

Special Guest: *Bill Angrove, Assoc. Vice-President for Distance Learning and Jacob Spradlin, Assistant Director of On-line Course Development*

On March 30th the Distance Education Committee, a committee which advises the Provost on the initial formation and review of academic policy dealing with distance education concerns, voted unanimously to retire BlackBoard as the campus' Learning Management System(LMS). The decision was made because of the high cost associated with maintaining two LMS systems on campus.

To facilitate a smooth transition to SHSUon-line, DELTA will fund a faculty liaison for each college, publicize training workshops in newsletters and emails, and migrate full courses from Blackboard to SHSUon-line including setting up the grade book. Additionally, DELTA will host a faculty training conference in August, provide one-on-one in-office assistance, host weekly workshops and is creating a faculty development lab. *Senator Crane recommended that DELTA fund a liaison for each department instead of each college.*

The latest version of SHSUon-line has many upgrades including: Tegrity remote exam proctoring, Exam Guard and integrated Turn-it-in. Additional enhancements coming this fall include Social Interface, Grademark, an upgraded grade book (not ready for primetime until spring 2012) and Peermark for Turn-it-in. Within the next year, the system will be integrated

with Gmail, Google Docs and Windows 365. A mobile app has been developed for SHSUon-line which will allow for post and read discussion board, automatic date notifications and will allow students to check their grades on their mobile device. This app will be integrated with the SHSU mobile app.

Members of the Senate had many questions concerning the migration process and SHSUon-line. The exchange appears below:

How can a faculty member incorporate all the enhancements into their course? Computers will need to be outfitted with cameras, microphones and speakers. If a faculty member has a machine that is not up to specs and they would like to use Skype for example, they should contact DELTA who will secure the needed equipment.

What if a faculty member wants to record their lectures for podcasting instead of videocasting, is this possible with SHSUon-line? Yes, the faculty member always has complete control over their course delivery. If someone prefers the audio over the video, DELTA will supply a high-grade microphone and not one that is purchased off the shelf. Just contact DELTA for the equipment.

What if a faculty member is an early adopter and wants to shift their courses to SHSUon-line before their scheduled migration, is this possible? Yes, people can begin moving their courses any time they like. It is advisable that people move early so they have time to learn how to maximize the components of SHSUon-line.

As an early adopter, I have developed a format that I prefer to use. Do I have to change my course to fit some prescribed template? No. DELTA encourages different models for different people, department or course. DELTA does not want to take over the course. They value quality over quantity.

Early in your presentation you mentioned that the move to SHSUon-line is being undertaken as a cost saving measure what is the cost savings for moving to SHSUon-line and away from Blackboard? Basically the cost is about the same but as SHSU online grows the cost for SHSUon-line will grow.

What is the annual income from on-line courses? Approximately \$4.5 million with half the money going back to the colleges.

What percentage of students who enroll in on-line courses drop out without completing the course? How does this compare to the dropout rate for classroom based courses?

100 level course completion rate = 71%	400 level course completion rate = 81%
200 level course completion rate = 77%	500 level course completion rate = 88%
300 level course completion rate = 74%	600 level course completion rate = 88%

How do I contact DELTA if I need help or have a problem? DELTA@shsu.edu or 294-2780.

In consideration for the large amount of issues facing the Senate, the discussion was ended. Members of the DELTA team may be invited back at a later date if SHSUon-line remains a concern of the faculty.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion to approve minutes from April 7, 2011 meeting approved unanimously.

Chair's Report:

Meeting with Provost Payne, April 12, 2011

1) Provost Payne was presented with the Faculty Workload and Guiding Principles for Budget Cuts resolutions. He was supportive of both positions and stated that he feels that if salary cuts are necessary, the administrators should take a larger cut than the faculty. The resolutions will now be forwarded to President Gibson.

2) Provost Payne has decided to create an Excellence in Civic Engagement award which will bring the number of faculty Excellence awards to four. This award will recognize a faculty member who excels in community engagement. It will follow the same procedure as the original Excellence awards and will be presented annually. Provost Payne requested that the Senate review the current procedures and guidelines for the Excellence awards. The Faculty Affairs committee has been asked to take on this task.

3) Funding for Summer School has been secured from the President's fund balance. This money will need to be paid back by the end of the summer which should be possible once the summer tuition and fees have been paid.

Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs Search Committee

The search committee has completed the first stage of reviewing and narrowing the pool of 87 initial applicants down to two groups. Candidates in group A will be invited to the campus for an on-site interview; while those in group B will serve as alternates if a candidate from group A withdraws from the process or is unable or unwilling to future participation. The initial pool consisted of both internal and external candidates. The committee will meet with President Gibson to discuss their rankings before the names are made public. The committee expects to conduct on-site interviews in June.

Provost's "Breakfast Talk"

A draft of the Provost's expectations for tenure has been posted on the Senate's webpage under the title: *Faculty Senate Report on the Standards for Tenure*.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs-The Academic Affairs committee had completed its assignments.

Committee on Committees-Report presented by Gerald Kohers, committee chair

A) Results of the Faculty Senate Annual Survey- The Senate's by-laws establishes that it surveys the campus' faculty annually. The statistical results of the 2011 survey are attached to these minutes. While the responses varied by College, the following items ranked the highest and the lowest.

Highest results:

1. Faculty feel physically safe on campus (4.34/5)
2. The faculty are happy with the selection process of faculty at SHSU.(4.19/5)

3. The services provided to faculty by the NGL library rated amongst the top in the university. (4.15/5)
4. The work environment at SHSU is well maintained and pleasant.(4.13/5)
5. The NGL is doing a good job supporting the departments' curricula. (4.04/5)

Items resulting in the lowest rating:

1. The selection process of administrators at SHSU. (2.44/5)
2. Faculty felt salaries at SHSU do not compare well to compatible universities. (2.45/5)
3. The accuracy of the IDEA system is questioned by the faculty. (2.48/5)
4. There is a perception that market adjustments are not fairly applied across the campus. (2.62/5)
5. Two items tied for the fifth slot – adoption of SHSUon-line (2.65/5) and clarity in the tenure system at the college level (2.65/5)

In addition to the quantitative responses, the survey provides the faculty an opportunity to record comments. A summary of the written opinions recorded on the Annual Faculty Senate Survey comments section indicate:

1. There is a high distrust of the IDEA faculty evaluation system. Faculty seem concerned about its validity and possible abuses of the instrument's results including its weight in the tenure and promotion process, the possibility of teachers to "dumb down" their courses to pander to students in order to receive higher evaluations and the possibility that the instrument discourages creative approaches to andragogy.
2. While some faculty voiced appreciation for the assistance they have received from the staff at DELTA, there is an enormous outcry against implementing SHSUon-line across the campus. Faculty members feel that the decision to switch to SHSUon-line was made without support from the faculty who use the system, that the new system is inferior in the upload and usability to Blackboard, and that the roll out has been overly focused on the technical aspect on distance learning and less about ensuring high quality among the course offerings.
3. In the same vein as the concerns with SHSUon-line, the faculty voiced many problems with information technology services/computer services. These concerns resound the displeasure in the lack of faculty involvement in decisions on Banner. Additional non-academic services, including the Registrar, Financial Aid and Purchasing, were singled out as not being faculty friendly.
4. Many comments stem from concerns surrounding the tenure process including unclear standards and requirements, lack of clarity in communication between the DPTACs, deans and provost and shifting criteria.

5. Another topic which received a lot of attention is the salary discrepancy between incoming, newly hired and established faculty.

B) Annual Senate Elections - The Senate held its annual elections. Eight members were elected to begin their three year tenure on the Senate. The newly elected Senators are:

Randall Garner – CoCJ
Pamela Zelbst – CoBA
Debra Price – CoED
Kevin Clifton-CFAMC
Javier Pinell- CFAMC
Sheryl Murphy-Manley - CFAMC (Re-elected to a new term)
Jeff Crane – CHSS (Re-elected to a new term)
Drew Lopenzina - CHSS (Re-elected to a new term)

C) Terms for CFAMC Senators - With the creation of the College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication, three senators were elected to represent the college's faculty. There is a need to stagger the Senators terms to ensure future consistent representation. Based on vote count Kevin Clifton will serve a 3 year term, Sheryl Murphy-Manley a 2 year term, and Javier Pinell a 1 year term.

D) Results from survey to expand the Senate - A motion to expand the size of the Senate by five members was placed to the full faculty. The motion passed overwhelmingly with a vote of 182 in support of expanding and 11 against. Senate chair Frank and chair-elect Hatton will take the motion to President Gibson for final approval.

Faculty Affairs-Report presented by Donna Desforge, committee chair

The Faculty Senate has under its purview the Faculty Excellence awards including Excellence in Teaching, Excellence in Research and Excellence in Service. It has become apparent that there are no clearly defined guidelines for the administration and selection of the recipients of the awards which amount to \$5,000 each. Provost Payne has requested that the Senate develop guidelines for each of the awards. Since the semester is nearing its conclusion and the Excellence committees have already began the selection process for 2011, the Faculty Affairs committee requested that the charge be extended to the fall semester in order to provide adequate time to complete a comprehensive review and formulate guidelines. The Senate accepted the committee's request for an extension on the assignment. If Provost Payne requests the guidelines earlier than the fall, an ad hoc committee will be convened to complete the assignment.

University Affairs- The University Affairs committee had completed its assignments.

Old Business:

Calendar Committee

Chair Frank has received a confirmation email from Dick Eglsaer and Teresa Ringo that the 2011-2012 and the 2012-2013 calendars will be changed to reflect the 42 hour format requested by the Senate.

Eglsaer asked that the faculty include in their syllabi a statement of how the course will incorporate the additional 3 hours of out-of-class assignments. The March 19, 2009 Faculty Senate minutes indicates approval of the following statement for inclusion in syllabi:

Recommended Academic Calendar Policy Statement:

To promote academic excellence, Sam Houston State University encourages innovative approaches to the mastery of learning outcomes. To this end, campus instruction will be enhanced with structured support projects such as library instruction, service, field, and internet-based learning activities. Each faculty member will design curriculum-supported, out-of-class activities which will appear in the course syllabus and be subject to review. Assignments will require engagement by students and will be evaluated by the instructor. These exercises will serve as an opportunity for the students to bridge mastery of course content with application while meeting accreditation requirements.

Preferences for Budget Cuts

After the April 7th Faculty Senate meeting, Dean de Castro emailed Chair Frank and Chair-elect Hatton requesting the Senate to solicit input from the faculty concerning potential budget cutting items. The responses gathered were informative and enlightening. Faculty members welcomed the opportunity to voice their opinions on the items. While there was a concern that sharing the information with the faculty as a whole would result in panic or alarm, none of the responses indicated this reaction. In fact, the opposite occurred with faculty voicing that rumors and lack of communication concerning the issue caused more anxiety than seeing the items under review. Comments on the Faculty Senate Annual Survey indicated a rising level of concern of the lack of communication surrounding the budget. The comments gathered by the Senators were distributed to the college deans and Provost Payne. Items supplied to the faculty include:

- 1) Decrease O&M budgets
- 2) Decrease Travel budgets
- 3) Reduce summer compensation per course from 1/12 to some smaller fraction of nine month salary
- 4) Decrease the number of summer courses offered but retain the same compensation level per course
- 5) Freeze most hiring
- 6) Reduce the number of courses and sections offered in each department

- 7) Furloughs
- 8) Across the board salary reductions
- 9) Reduce course releases for administration and research
- 10) Reduce departmental allocations of distance learning fee distributions
- 11) Decrease the number of TA appointment
- 12) Terminate low producing programs
- 13) Combine small departments into larger units to reduce administrative costs
- 14) Alternative suggestion
- 15) Alternative suggestion

After extensive discussion and examination, the Faculty Senate concluded that while cuts to the budget were necessary, the core mission of the university resides in the academic affairs division and as such in times of economic hardship the University should strive to shield the division from the deepest cuts. In support of this position, the Senators passed the following resolution which will be presented to Provost Payne and forwarded to President Gibson.

Faculty Senate Resolution Regarding Guiding Principles for Budget Cuts

WHEREAS the division of Academic Affairs is the core element serving the mission of Sam Houston State University and generating its revenue;

BE IT RESOLVED that, should budget cuts be necessary, the division of Academic Affairs should receive substantially less of a cut than other components of the university.

Meeting Closed:

The meeting was called to a close at 5:44pm.

This is the last planned meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year. Senate Chair Frank announced that the Senate may be convened in a special summer session, if needed.

Respectfully Submitted, Debbi Hatton

Approved, May 6, 2011 (on-line)

Attachments:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| -Quantitative Results of the Annual Survey | -CFAMC Faculty Budget Comments |
| -CHSS Review of Cost Cutting Options | -CoED Comments on Budget Items |
| -CoS Budget Shortfalls | -Letter in Support of Adjunct Faculty |

Canvassing the CFAMC Faculty Results:
School of Music and Art, Theatre/Dance Departments
Report for Faculty Senate, April 21, 2011

General Comments and Suggestions for the Administration to consider in addition to their list that they presented to the Senate.

-Several faculty members wanted to point out that 8 of the 13 cuts directly affect faculty compensation and/or workload.

-Only 1 item from the Dean actually suggests a cut that impacts the administration.

-Administrator Budgets DO NOT EQUAL reduced faculty compensation for anything.

-Reduce Administrative costs. Administration is the only cost at the University that does not produce direct value. That is not to minimize the need for Administration, rather, it needs to be efficient and lean. The administration typically looks at this cost last, but it needs to be looked at first.

-Add to the list for consideration: Re-evaluate the bureaucratic structure and downsize and combine the many "offices" on campus, such as "University Advancement", "Student Services," "Student Life", "Student Recruitment", "Student Retention", "PR", and many others.

-Reduce or eliminate non-academic programs.

-Two faculty members would want to see across the board budget cuts (not just O&M) so that the administrators, computer services, physical plant— *everyone* will have their budgets cut as well. This is simple logical and fair –so entities with a hidden agenda won't like this.

-The Faculty is being asked to sacrifice personal payments and compensation while the Administrators are not. Administrators should be asked to do the same.

-I think a panel that had more faculty than administrators would perhaps come up with a few more suggestions to reduce the budget. I think there are probably more ways to limit spending than the ones that have the most dramatic impact on faculty compensation and morale.

-Do away with the 3/3 load. This is being abused.

-Shared Sacrifice was stressed repeatedly in the comments.

Faculty Senate Survey Results for 2010 - 2011

Table of Contents

	pages
University Results	1 - 2
Arts & Sciences Results	3 - 4
Business Administration Results	5 - 6
Criminal Justice Results	7 - 8
Education Results	9 - 10
Humanities & Social Sciences	11 - 12
Newton Gresham Library Results	13 - 14
Across Colleges Comparison	15 - 16
Previous Years Comparison	17 - 18

University Results 2010 - 2011

Number of Respondents 182
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 493
 % Returned 36.9%

% Respondents
 not answering

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1					%						
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1 President Gibson	150	3.39	1.13	24	16%	53	35%	41	27%	21	14%	11	7%	32	18%
2 VPAA Payne	173	3.03	1.29	23	13%	45	26%	50	29%	24	14%	31	18%	9	5%
3 VP/EM Thielmann	103	3.28	1.00	10	10%	34	33%	40	39%	13	13%	6	6%	79	43%
4 VP/O Powell	103	3.22	1.07	8	8%	38	37%	36	35%	11	11%	10	10%	79	43%
5 VP/SS Parker	118	3.81	0.87	25	21%	53	45%	34	29%	4	3%	2	2%	64	35%
6 VP Advancement Holmes	107	3.37	1.06	13	12%	41	38%	33	31%	13	12%	7	7%	75	41%
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglisaer	145	3.78	1.05	41	28%	53	37%	33	23%	14	10%	4	3%	37	20%
8 Assoc. VPAA Tayebi	137	3.51	1.14	30	22%	43	31%	39	28%	17	12%	8	6%	45	25%
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	108	3.79	0.98	28	26%	41	38%	29	27%	8	7%	2	2%	74	41%
10 Assoc. VPR&SP Davis	82	3.20	1.19	13	16%	18	22%	33	40%	8	10%	10	12%	100	55%
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	129	2.87	1.23	12	9%	30	23%	39	30%	25	19%	23	18%	53	29%
12 Deans and Associate deans differ per c	181	3.82	1.25	73	40%	44	24%	34	19%	18	10%	12	7%	1	1%
13 Deans and Associate deans differ per c	295	3.77	1.10	89	30%	99	34%	69	23%	25	8%	13	4%		
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept	178	2.94	1.52	38	21%	42	24%	15	8%	38	21%	45	25%	4	2%
17 Selection of Admins.	169	2.44	1.40	18	11%	27	16%	28	17%	34	20%	62	37%	13	7%
18 Selection of Faculty	178	4.19	1.06	91	51%	51	29%	20	11%	10	6%	6	3%	4	2%
19 Strategic Planning in College	164	3.08	1.38	35	21%	31	19%	37	23%	34	21%	27	16%	18	10%
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	169	3.74	1.29	62	37%	47	28%	30	18%	14	8%	16	9%	13	7%
21 SAM Center Mentoring	137	3.90	1.11	54	39%	34	25%	35	26%	9	7%	5	4%	45	25%
22 SAM Center Advising	144	3.50	1.30	44	31%	29	20%	39	27%	19	13%	13	9%	38	21%
23 Physically Safe on Campus	180	4.34	0.80	90	50%	69	38%	16	9%	3	2%	2	1%	2	1%
24 LSC facilities adequate	167	3.77	0.95	39	23%	67	40%	48	29%	9	5%	4	2%	15	8%
25 LSC Services adequate	155	3.72	0.96	35	23%	58	37%	48	31%	11	7%	3	2%	27	15%
26 Aamark Services adequate	165	3.19	1.13	18	11%	54	33%	51	31%	26	16%	16	10%	17	9%
27 Human Resource Dept	163	3.56	1.12	35	21%	58	36%	44	27%	16	10%	10	6%	19	10%
28 HKC	130	3.97	0.91	38	29%	61	47%	22	17%	7	5%	2	2%	52	29%
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	159	3.54	1.16	36	23%	53	33%	42	26%	17	11%	11	7%	23	13%
30 Information Resources (UCS)	176	2.98	1.32	23	13%	49	28%	39	22%	32	18%	33	19%	6	3%
31 DELTA Services adequate	134	3.10	1.26	19	14%	36	27%	38	28%	21	16%	20	15%	48	26%
32 Library Services	175	4.15	0.91	71	41%	71	41%	25	14%	4	2%	4	2%	7	4%
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	171	4.04	0.92	57	33%	78	46%	26	15%	6	4%	4	2%	11	6%
34 Blackboard	171	3.89	1.04	50	29%	76	44%	30	18%	6	4%	9	5%	11	6%
35 E-College	104	2.65	1.43	13	13%	19	18%	26	25%	11	11%	35	34%	78	43%
36 Recruiting Quality Students	174	3.03	1.09	16	9%	43	25%	59	34%	42	24%	14	8%	8	4%

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37 Teaching Load is fair	174	3.86	1.12	60	34%	59	34%	32	18%	16	9%	7	4%	8	4%
38 Recognition for teaching	171	3.30	1.32	37	22%	49	29%	35	20%	28	16%	22	13%	11	6%
39 Recognition for research	175	3.36	1.21	35	20%	50	29%	48	27%	27	15%	15	9%	7	4%
40 Recognition for service	174	3.08	1.34	33	19%	36	21%	44	25%	34	20%	27	16%	8	4%
41 Clerical Support	169	3.43	1.35	43	25%	53	31%	28	17%	23	14%	22	13%	13	7%
42 Collegial Support in dept.	174	3.95	1.20	74	43%	55	32%	18	10%	17	10%	10	6%	8	4%
43 Work environment	179	4.13	1.01	81	45%	61	34%	20	11%	14	8%	3	2%	3	2%
44 Free from intimidation/discrimination	178	4.01	1.32	93	52%	39	22%	16	9%	14	8%	16	9%	4	2%
45 Parking	176	2.91	1.43	30	17%	41	23%	29	16%	36	20%	40	23%	6	3%
46 Faculty Senate	153	3.36	1.25	29	19%	53	35%	31	20%	24	16%	16	10%	29	16%
47 Research Resources	176	3.41	1.21	34	19%	62	35%	38	22%	27	15%	15	9%	6	3%
48 Graduate Program Resources	156	2.92	1.27	19	12%	36	23%	40	26%	35	22%	26	17%	26	14%
49 Travel Allocation	176	3.07	1.36	27	15%	53	30%	36	20%	25	14%	35	20%	6	3%
50 IDEA Administered	172	2.76	1.40	21	12%	40	23%	36	21%	26	15%	49	28%	10	5%
51 IDEA Accuracy	172	2.48	1.32	12	7%	35	20%	33	19%	35	20%	57	33%	10	5%
52 Chair evaluation of my teaching	163	3.74	1.23	53	33%	55	34%	26	16%	17	10%	12	7%	19	10%
53 FES Instrument is adequate	175	3.15	1.27	28	16%	50	29%	39	22%	37	21%	21	12%	7	4%
54 Merit System is applied fairly	172	3.01	1.41	31	18%	44	26%	27	16%	36	21%	34	20%	10	5%
55 Market Adjustments applied fairly	156	2.62	1.32	16	10%	27	17%	36	23%	35	22%	42	27%	26	14%
56 Promotion System is applied fairly	164	3.21	1.34	31	19%	47	29%	37	23%	23	14%	26	16%	18	10%
57 Tenure System is applied fairly	174	3.76	1.26	61	35%	55	32%	29	17%	13	7%	16	9%	8	4%
58 Tenure Process clear at univ. level	177	2.64	1.45	27	15%	31	18%	24	14%	42	24%	53	30%	5	3%
59 Post Tenure Review	131	3.75	1.29	48	37%	37	28%	24	18%	9	7%	13	10%	51	28%
60 Salary at SHSU	178	2.79	1.22	17	10%	38	21%	43	24%	51	29%	29	16%	4	2%
61 Salary other Universities	177	2.45	1.22	12	7%	27	15%	37	21%	54	31%	47	27%	5	3%
62 Reassigned time	124	3.16	1.30	23	19%	30	24%	32	26%	22	18%	17	14%	58	32%
63 Faculty Research Fund <5000	148	3.60	1.14	36	24%	49	33%	41	28%	12	8%	10	7%	34	19%
64 Enhancement Grant for Research	145	3.57	1.18	38	26%	41	28%	42	29%	14	10%	10	7%	37	20%
65 Adequate support for online courses	146	3.06	1.31	27	18%	30	21%	33	23%	37	25%	19	13%	36	20%
66 University Center facilities	111	3.75	1.13	31	28%	43	39%	22	20%	8	7%	7	6%	71	39%
67 University Center staff	107	3.80	1.04	33	31%	32	30%	34	32%	4	4%	4	4%	75	41%
68 Communication with Admin.	173	2.77	1.26	16	9%	38	22%	45	26%	38	22%	36	21%	9	5%
69 President values faculty	138	3.22	1.28	26	19%	36	26%	37	27%	21	15%	18	13%	44	24%
70 Provost values faculty	159	2.87	1.36	22	14%	35	22%	39	25%	27	17%	36	23%	23	13%
71 Dean values faculty	178	3.66	1.27	54	30%	61	34%	29	16%	17	10%	17	10%	4	2%
72 Chair values faculty	166	3.98	1.23	75	45%	47	28%	21	13%	11	7%	12	7%	16	9%
73 Satisfied at SHSU	180	3.87	0.98	51	28%	75	42%	37	21%	13	7%	4	2%	2	1%

A&S Results 2010 -2011

Number of Respondents 54
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 158
 % Returned 34.2%

Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

%
 Respondents
 not answering.

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 President Gibson	46	3.39	1.16	8	17%	16	35%	11	24%	8	17%	3	7%	8	15%
2 VPAA Payne	52	3.06	1.26	8	15%	9	17%	22	42%	4	8%	9	17%	2	4%
3 VP&M Thiemann	31	3.42	0.89	3	10%	11	35%	14	45%	2	6%	1	3%	23	43%
4 VPFO Powell	33	3.21	1.05	3	9%	10	30%	14	42%	3	9%	3	9%	21	39%
5 VPSS Parker	34	3.91	0.79	8	24%	16	47%	9	26%	1	3%	0	0%	20	37%
6 VP Advancement Holmes	35	3.23	1.09	2	6%	16	46%	8	23%	6	17%	3	9%	19	35%
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglseer	39	3.72	1.02	9	23%	15	38%	12	31%	1	3%	2	5%	15	28%
8 Assoc. VPAA Tayebi	38	3.37	1.13	5	13%	15	39%	10	26%	5	13%	3	8%	16	30%
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	38	3.92	1.05	14	37%	11	29%	10	26%	2	5%	1	3%	16	30%
10 Assoc. VPR&SP Davis	27	3.33	1.21	6	22%	5	19%	10	37%	4	15%	2	7%	27	50%
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	31	3.03	1.22	3	10%	8	26%	13	42%	1	3%	6	19%	23	43%
12 Dean Hebert	53	4.38	1.11	36	68%	8	15%	5	9%	1	2%	3	6%	1	2%
13 Assoc. Dean Cook	41	4.12	0.90	16	39%	16	39%	8	20%	0	0%	1	2%	13	24%
14 Assoc. Dean Nicolay	40	4.00	1.06	15	38%	15	38%	7	18%	1	3%	2	5%	14	26%
15 Assoc. Dean Plaisance	21	3.81	1.12	7	33%	6	29%	6	29%	1	5%	1	5%	33	61%
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	53	3.11	1.58	15	28%	11	21%	4	8%	11	21%	12	23%	1	2%
17 Selection of Admns.	53	2.38	1.44	7	13%	6	11%	8	15%	11	21%	21	40%	1	2%
18 Selection of Faculty	53	4.34	0.92	31	58%	12	23%	7	13%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%
19 Strategic Planning in College	45	2.96	1.43	9	20%	8	18%	9	20%	10	22%	9	20%	9	17%
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	53	3.68	1.27	18	34%	13	25%	14	26%	3	6%	5	9%	1	2%
21 SAM Center Mentoring	41	3.51	1.14	9	22%	12	29%	14	34%	3	7%	3	7%	13	24%
22 SAM Center Advising	45	2.76	1.19	4	9%	7	16%	16	36%	10	22%	8	18%	9	17%
23 Physically Safe on Campus	53	4.25	0.92	25	47%	20	38%	5	9%	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%
24 LSC facilities adequate	53	3.58	1.03	10	19%	19	36%	19	36%	2	4%	3	6%	1	2%
25 LSC Services adequate	50	3.54	0.97	9	18%	16	32%	19	38%	5	10%	1	2%	4	7%
26 Anamark Services adequate	49	3.12	1.13	4	8%	16	33%	17	35%	6	12%	6	12%	5	9%
27 Human Resource Dept.	49	3.20	1.08	6	12%	12	24%	21	43%	6	12%	4	8%	5	9%
28 HKC	42	3.79	0.95	9	21%	20	48%	9	21%	3	7%	1	2%	12	22%
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	48	3.69	1.19	15	31%	13	27%	13	27%	4	8%	3	6%	6	11%
30 Information Resources (UCS)	53	2.30	1.34	3	6%	11	21%	6	11%	12	23%	21	40%	1	2%
31 DELTA Services adequate	31	3.10	1.30	4	13%	10	32%	7	23%	5	16%	5	16%	23	43%
32 Library Services	52	3.92	0.99	15	29%	24	46%	9	17%	2	4%	2	4%	2	4%
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	51	3.90	0.92	13	25%	25	49%	9	18%	3	6%	1	2%	3	6%
34 Blackboard	53	3.81	0.98	12	23%	26	49%	10	19%	3	6%	2	4%	1	2%
35 E-College	22	2.41	1.37	2	9%	2	9%	8	36%	1	5%	9	41%	32	59%
36 Recruiting Quality Students	51	2.75	1.11	1	2%	14	27%	16	31%	11	22%	9	18%	3	6%

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37 Teaching Load is fair	54	3.74	1.29	19	35%	17	31%	8	15%	5	9%	5	9%	0	0%
38 Recognition for teaching	53	3.28	1.39	13	25%	13	25%	11	21%	8	15%	8	15%	1	2%
39 Recognition for research	53	3.26	1.27	11	21%	13	25%	13	25%	11	21%	5	9%	1	2%
40 Recognition for service	52	2.96	1.40	11	21%	7	13%	12	23%	13	25%	9	17%	2	4%
41 Clerical Support	51	3.10	1.42	10	20%	13	25%	10	20%	8	16%	10	20%	3	6%
42 Collegial Support in dept.	50	3.72	1.23	16	32%	17	34%	7	14%	7	14%	3	6%	4	7%
43 Work environment	53	3.92	1.09	20	38%	17	32%	9	17%	6	11%	1	2%	1	2%
44 Free from intimidation/discrimination	53	3.85	1.61	32	60%	4	8%	3	6%	5	9%	9	17%	1	2%
45 Parking	52	2.98	1.43	9	17%	13	25%	10	19%	8	15%	12	23%	2	4%
46 Faculty Senate	44	3.07	1.25	4	9%	16	36%	10	23%	7	16%	7	16%	10	19%
47 Research Resources	53	3.00	1.32	6	11%	18	34%	8	15%	12	23%	9	17%	1	2%
48 Graduate Program Resources	45	2.33	1.26	2	4%	8	18%	9	20%	10	22%	16	36%	9	17%
49 Travel Allocation	51	2.65	1.32	4	8%	12	24%	11	22%	10	20%	14	27%	3	6%
50 IDEA Administered	53	2.68	1.36	5	9%	13	25%	9	17%	12	23%	14	26%	1	2%
51 IDEA Accuracy	53	2.32	1.28	3	6%	8	15%	12	23%	10	19%	20	38%	1	2%
52 Chair evaluation of my teaching	51	3.69	1.32	18	35%	13	25%	12	24%	2	4%	6	12%	3	6%
53 FES Instrument is adequate	53	3.25	1.41	12	23%	15	28%	9	17%	8	15%	9	17%	1	2%
54 Merit System is applied fairly	51	3.18	1.55	13	25%	14	27%	5	10%	7	14%	12	24%	3	6%
55 Market Adjustments applied fairly	44	2.45	1.39	5	11%	7	16%	5	11%	13	30%	14	32%	10	19%
56 Promotion System is applied fairly	47	3.32	1.18	7	15%	17	36%	11	23%	8	17%	4	9%	7	13%
57 Tenure System is applied fairly	51	3.78	1.17	19	37%	11	22%	14	27%	5	10%	2	4%	3	6%
58 Tenure Process clear at univ. level	53	2.68	1.41	8	15%	9	17%	7	13%	16	30%	13	25%	1	2%
59 Post Tenure Review	37	3.49	1.54	14	38%	7	19%	6	16%	3	8%	7	19%	17	31%
60 Salary at SHSU	53	2.91	1.18	5	9%	12	23%	16	30%	13	25%	7	13%	1	2%
61 Salary other Universities	54	2.59	1.14	3	6%	8	15%	18	33%	14	26%	11	20%	0	0%
62 Reassigned time	38	3.32	1.25	8	21%	10	26%	9	24%	8	21%	3	8%	16	30%
63 Faculty Research Fund <5000	42	3.55	1.31	12	29%	12	29%	10	24%	3	7%	5	12%	12	22%
64 Enhancement Grant for Research	40	3.70	1.29	13	33%	13	33%	7	18%	3	8%	4	10%	14	26%
65 Adequate support for online courses	38	2.84	1.31	5	13%	8	21%	7	18%	12	32%	6	16%	16	30%
66 University Center facilities	19	3.37	1.21	3	16%	7	37%	5	26%	2	11%	2	11%	35	65%
67 University Center staff	17	3.59	1.18	5	29%	3	18%	7	41%	1	6%	1	6%	37	69%
68 Communication with Admin.	51	2.65	1.26	5	10%	8	16%	13	25%	14	27%	11	22%	3	6%
69 President values faculty	44	3.25	1.26	8	18%	13	30%	9	20%	10	23%	4	9%	10	19%
70 Provost values faculty	45	2.98	1.27	5	11%	12	27%	13	29%	7	16%	8	18%	9	17%
71 Dean values faculty	53	4.23	0.99	25	47%	21	40%	3	6%	2	4%	2	4%	1	2%
72 Chair values faculty	50	3.66	1.41	19	38%	13	26%	6	12%	6	12%	6	12%	4	7%
73 Satisfied at SHSU	54	3.80	1.07	16	30%	20	37%	10	19%	7	13%	1	2%	0	0%

COBA Results 2010 -2011

Number of Respondents 26
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 70
 % Returned 37.1%

Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1
 Respondents not answering: %

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5					4				3			2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1 President Gibson	20	3.85	0.75	4	20%	9	45%	7	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	23%				
2 VPAA Payne	24	3.00	1.22	1	4%	10	42%	5	21%	4	17%	4	17%	4	17%	2	8%				
3 VP&M Thielmann	18	3.11	1.08	1	6%	7	39%	4	22%	5	28%	1	6%	8	31%						
4 VPFO Powell	13	3.31	1.11	1	8%	6	46%	3	23%	2	15%	1	8%	13	50%						
5 VPSS Parker	17	4.12	0.70	5	29%	9	53%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	9	35%						
6 VP Advancement Holmes	18	3.22	1.11	2	11%	6	33%	5	28%	4	22%	1	6%	8	31%						
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglisaer	21	3.52	1.08	4	19%	8	38%	4	19%	5	24%	0	0%	5	19%						
8 Assoc. VPAA Taybei	17	3.24	0.83	1	6%	5	29%	8	47%	3	18%	0	0%	9	35%						
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	10	3.60	0.84	1	10%	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	16	62%						
10 Assoc. VPR&Adm Davis	9	3.11	1.45	1	11%	4	44%	1	11%	1	11%	2	22%	17	65%						
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	20	3.10	1.21	2	10%	7	35%	4	20%	5	25%	2	10%	6	23%						
12 Dean Muehsam	26	3.88	0.91	8	31%	8	31%	9	35%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%						
13 Assoc. Dean Ashorn	25	3.12	1.09	3	12%	5	20%	11	44%	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%						
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	24	2.63	1.50	4	17%	4	17%	2	8%	7	29%	7	29%	2	8%						
17 Selection of Admins.	23	3.04	1.46	5	22%	5	22%	3	13%	6	26%	4	17%	3	12%						
18 Selection of Faculty	24	4.42	0.65	12	50%	10	42%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%						
19 Strategic Planning in College	25	3.84	1.11	8	32%	9	36%	5	20%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%						
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	23	4.39	0.78	12	52%	9	39%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3	12%						
21 SAM Center Mentoring	19	4.37	0.83	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	7	27%						
22 SAM Center Advising	21	4.33	1.06	13	62%	4	19%	3	14%	0	0%	1	5%	5	19%						
23 Physically Safe on Campus	26	4.58	0.58	16	62%	9	35%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%						
24 LSC facilities adequate	24	3.92	0.78	6	25%	10	42%	8	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%						
25 LSC Services adequate	21	3.86	0.91	6	29%	7	33%	7	33%	1	5%	0	0%	5	19%						
26 Armark Services adequate	24	3.54	1.06	4	17%	10	42%	6	25%	3	13%	1	4%	2	8%						
27 Human Resource Dept.	23	3.43	1.27	5	22%	7	30%	7	30%	1	4%	3	13%	3	12%						
28 HKC	17	4.06	0.83	5	29%	9	53%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	9	35%						
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	17	3.47	0.94	3	18%	4	24%	8	47%	2	12%	0	0%	9	35%						
30 Information Resources (UCS)	23	3.13	1.36	4	17%	6	26%	6	26%	3	13%	4	17%	3	12%						
31 DELTA Services adequate	20	3.10	1.07	2	10%	5	25%	7	35%	5	25%	1	5%	6	23%						
32 Library Services	25	4.00	0.91	9	36%	8	32%	7	28%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%						
33 Library good for Dept Curriculum	26	4.12	0.82	9	35%	12	46%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%						
34 Blackboard	25	4.12	0.97	10	40%	10	40%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%						
35 E-College	15	2.33	1.45	1	7%	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%	7	47%	11	42%						
36 Recruiting Quality Students	24	2.92	0.97	2	8%	3	13%	11	46%	7	29%	1	4%	2	8%						

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37 Teaching Load is fair	25	4.04	0.98	10	40%	8	32%	5	20%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%
38 Recognition for teaching	25	3.52	1.08	4	16%	10	40%	8	32%	1	4%	2	8%	1	4%
39 Recognition for research	24	3.54	1.10	6	25%	5	21%	10	42%	2	8%	1	4%	2	8%
40 Recognition for service	24	3.21	1.22	4	17%	6	25%	7	29%	5	21%	2	8%	2	8%
41 Clerical Support	25	3.44	1.26	6	24%	7	28%	6	24%	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%
42 Collegial Support in dept.	25	4.48	0.77	15	60%	8	32%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%
43 Work environment	25	4.20	0.96	12	48%	8	32%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%
44 Free from intimidation/discrimination	25	4.56	0.71	16	64%	8	32%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%
45 Parking	24	4.08	1.14	11	46%	8	33%	2	8%	2	8%	1	4%	2	8%
46 Faculty Senate	24	3.83	1.17	8	33%	9	38%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%	2	8%
47 Research Resources	25	3.68	1.14	7	28%	9	36%	3	12%	6	24%	0	0%	1	4%
48 Graduate Program Resources	22	3.14	1.17	3	14%	5	23%	8	36%	4	18%	2	9%	4	15%
49 Travel Allocation	26	4.15	0.67	8	31%	14	54%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
50 IDEA Administered	26	2.69	1.35	2	8%	7	27%	5	19%	5	19%	7	27%	0	0%
51 IDEA Accuracy	26	2.42	1.27	1	4%	5	19%	7	27%	4	15%	9	35%	0	0%
52 Chair evaluation of my teaching	22	3.86	0.99	6	27%	10	45%	3	14%	3	14%	0	0%	4	15%
53 FES Instrument is adequate	25	3.00	1.08	2	8%	6	24%	9	36%	6	24%	2	8%	1	4%
54 Merit System is applied fairly	25	3.40	1.12	5	20%	6	24%	9	36%	4	16%	1	4%	1	4%
55 Market Adjustments applied fairly	24	3.29	1.12	4	17%	5	21%	11	46%	2	8%	2	8%	2	8%
56 Promotion System is applied fairly	23	3.61	1.08	6	26%	6	26%	7	30%	4	17%	0	0%	3	12%
57 Tenure System is applied fairly	25	4.04	1.02	9	36%	11	44%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%
58 Tenure Process clear at univ. level	24	2.13	1.33	2	8%	3	13%	1	4%	8	33%	10	42%	2	8%
59 Post Tenure Review	19	4.00	1.11	8	42%	5	26%	5	26%	0	0%	1	5%	7	27%
60 Salary at SHSU	25	3.20	1.32	5	20%	6	24%	6	24%	5	20%	3	12%	1	4%
61 Salary other Universities	26	2.50	1.39	3	12%	4	15%	4	15%	7	27%	8	31%	0	0%
62 Reassigned time	15	3.53	1.25	4	27%	4	27%	4	27%	2	13%	1	7%	11	42%
63 Faculty Research Fund <5000	17	4.00	1.06	6	35%	7	41%	3	18%	0	0%	1	6%	9	35%
64 Enhancement Grant for Research	18	3.67	1.14	5	28%	5	28%	6	33%	1	6%	1	6%	8	31%
65 Adequate support for online courses	21	3.10	1.26	3	14%	5	24%	7	33%	3	14%	3	14%	5	19%
66 University Center facilities	23	3.70	1.15	6	26%	9	39%	4	17%	3	13%	1	4%	3	12%
67 University Center staff	23	4.13	0.81	8	35%	11	48%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	3	12%
68 Communication with Admin.	25	3.12	1.13	3	12%	6	24%	9	36%	5	20%	2	8%	1	4%
69 President values faculty	18	3.61	1.14	5	28%	4	22%	7	39%	1	6%	1	6%	8	31%
70 Provost values faculty	22	2.64	1.14	1	5%	4	18%	7	32%	6	27%	4	18%	4	15%
71 Dean values faculty	25	3.88	0.88	6	24%	12	48%	5	20%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%
72 Chair values faculty	25	4.28	0.79	11	44%	11	44%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%
73 Satisfied at SHSU	25	4.08	0.76	7	28%	14	56%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%

CJ Results 2010 -2011

Number of Respondents 13
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 39
 % Returned 33.3%

% Respondents not answering.

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1										N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 President Gibson	10	3.70	1.42	4	40%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	3	23%
2 VPAA Payne	11	3.55	1.21	2	18%	5	45%	2	18%	1	9%	1	9%	2	15%
3 VP/EM Thielemann	4	4.25	0.50	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	69%
4 VPFO Powell	6	4.33	0.52	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	54%
5 VPSS Parker	5	4.00	0.71	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	8	62%
6 VP Advancement Holmes	4	4.50	0.58	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	69%
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglisaer	10	4.30	0.67	4	40%	5	50%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%
8 Assoc. VPAA Tavebi	8	3.13	1.13	1	13%	2	25%	2	25%	3	38%	0	0%	5	38%
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	11	4.00	0.63	2	18%	7	64%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%
10 Assoc. VPR&Adm Davis	6	4.33	0.52	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	54%
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	9	4.11	0.78	3	33%	4	44%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
12 Dean Webb	13	4.08	0.95	5	38%	5	38%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
13 Assoc. Dean Mullings	13	4.23	0.93	6	46%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	13	2.85	1.21	1	8%	3	23%	4	31%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%
17 Selection of Admins.	13	2.54	1.27	0	0%	4	31%	3	23%	2	15%	2	15%	4	31%
18 Selection of Faculty	13	4.08	0.95	5	38%	5	38%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
19 Strategic Planning in College	12	3.08	1.51	3	25%	2	17%	2	17%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	13	3.08	1.61	4	31%	1	8%	3	23%	2	15%	3	23%	0	0%
21 SAM Center Mentoring	9	4.11	0.93	4	44%	2	22%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
22 SAM Center Advising	9	4.22	0.83	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
23 Physically Safe on Campus	13	4.38	0.87	7	54%	5	38%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
24 LSC facilities adequate	10	3.60	0.97	2	20%	3	30%	4	40%	1	10%	0	0%	3	23%
25 LSC Services adequate	8	3.50	1.07	2	25%	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	5	38%
26 Aramark Services adequate	10	3.30	1.34	2	20%	3	30%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	3	23%
27 Human Resource Dept.	12	3.92	0.90	3	25%	6	50%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
28 HKC	8	4.38	0.52	3	38%	5	63%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	12	3.75	1.42	5	42%	3	25%	1	8%	2	17%	1	8%	1	8%
30 Information Resources (UCS)	12	3.33	1.15	2	17%	3	25%	5	42%	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%
31 DELTA Services adequate	9	4.44	0.73	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
32 Library Services	13	4.00	1.15	5	38%	5	38%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	13	3.92	1.12	4	31%	6	46%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
34 Blackboard	13	3.92	0.95	4	31%	5	38%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
35 E-College	8	4.13	0.83	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%
36 Recruiting Quality Students	11	3.73	1.10	3	27%	4	36%	2	18%	2	18%	0	0%	2	15%

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37 Teaching Load is fair	13	3.62	1.04	3	23%	4	31%	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%
38 Recognition for teaching	12	3.50	1.45	3	25%	5	42%	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%	1	8%
39 Recognition for research	13	3.69	1.18	3	23%	6	46%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
40 Recognition for service	13	3.62	1.19	3	23%	5	38%	3	23%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
41 Clerical Support	13	4.31	0.63	5	38%	7	54%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
42 Collegial Support in dept.	13	4.15	1.14	6	46%	5	38%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
43 Work environment	13	4.38	0.51	5	38%	8	62%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
44 Free from intimidation/discrimination	13	4.15	1.07	5	38%	7	54%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
45 Parking	13	3.00	1.53	2	15%	5	38%	0	0%	3	23%	3	23%	0	0%
46 Faculty Senate	7	3.71	1.11	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	6	46%
47 Research Resources	13	4.00	0.82	3	23%	8	62%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
48 Graduate Program Resources	13	3.54	1.13	3	23%	4	31%	3	23%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%
49 Travel Allocation	12	3.08	1.51	3	25%	2	17%	2	17%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%
50 IDEA Administered	13	3.54	1.39	4	31%	3	23%	4	31%	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%
51 IDEA Accuracy	13	2.69	1.44	1	8%	4	31%	2	15%	2	15%	4	31%	0	0%
52 Chair evaluation of my teaching	13	3.92	1.26	5	38%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
53 FES Instrument is adequate	13	3.54	1.27	3	23%	5	38%	2	15%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%
54 Merit System is applied fairly	13	3.54	1.20	3	23%	4	31%	4	31%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
55 Market Adjustments applied fairly	11	3.09	1.30	2	18%	1	9%	6	55%	0	0%	2	18%	2	15%
56 Promotion System is applied fairly	13	3.46	1.20	3	23%	3	23%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
57 Tenure System is applied fairly	13	3.85	0.99	4	31%	4	31%	4	31%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
58 Tenure Process clear at univ. level	13	3.62	1.19	3	23%	5	38%	3	23%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
59 Post Tenure Review	10	3.90	1.29	4	40%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	3	23%
60 Salary at SHSU	13	2.69	1.44	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%	4	31%	3	23%	0	0%
61 Salary other Universities	13	2.77	1.42	2	15%	2	15%	3	23%	3	23%	3	23%	0	0%
62 Reassigned time	11	3.27	1.42	3	27%	2	18%	2	18%	3	27%	1	9%	2	15%
63 Faculty Research Fund <5000	13	3.85	1.28	5	38%	4	31%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
64 Enhancement Grant for Research	13	3.85	1.28	5	38%	4	31%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%
65 Adequate support for online courses	10	4.00	1.25	5	50%	2	20%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	3	23%
66 University Center facilities	9	4.56	0.53	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
67 University Center staff	9	4.56	0.53	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%
68 Communication with Admin.	13	3.69	1.11	3	23%	5	38%	4	31%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
69 President values faculty	11	3.82	1.25	4	36%	3	27%	3	27%	0	0%	1	9%	2	15%
70 Provost values faculty	12	3.75	1.06	2	17%	7	58%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%
71 Dean values faculty	13	4.15	0.80	5	38%	5	38%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
72 Chair values faculty	12	4.00	0.95	4	33%	5	42%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%
73 Satisfied at SHSU	13	3.92	1.12	4	31%	6	46%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%

COE Results 2010-2011

Number of Respondents 33
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 86
 % Returned 38.4%

Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

% Respondents not answering.

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5					4				3			2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1 President Gibson	29	3.41	1.12	5	17%	10	34%	7	24%	6	21%	1	3%	4	12%						
2 VPAA Payne	32	3.31	1.38	7	22%	10	31%	6	19%	4	13%	5	16%	1	3%						
3 VP/EM Thielemann	20	3.40	0.82	2	10%	6	30%	10	50%	2	10%	0	0%	13	39%						
4 VP/FO Powell	18	3.22	0.88	1	6%	5	28%	10	56%	1	6%	1	6%	15	45%						
5 VPSS Parker	24	3.58	0.97	4	17%	9	38%	9	38%	1	4%	1	4%	9	27%						
6 VP Advancement Holmes	21	3.62	0.92	4	19%	7	33%	8	38%	2	10%	0	0%	12	36%						
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglisaeer	29	4.10	0.86	11	38%	11	38%	6	21%	1	3%	0	0%	4	12%						
8 Assoc. VPAA Taybei	29	3.93	0.96	8	28%	14	48%	5	17%	1	3%	1	3%	4	12%						
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	19	3.47	0.96	3	16%	6	32%	7	37%	3	16%	0	0%	14	42%						
10 Assoc. VPR&Sadm Davis	15	3.27	0.96	2	13%	2	13%	10	67%	0	0%	1	7%	18	55%						
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	27	2.59	1.05	1	4%	4	15%	9	33%	9	33%	4	15%	6	18%						
12 Dean Brown	33	3.21	1.39	8	24%	7	21%	6	18%	8	24%	4	12%	0	0%						
13 Assoc. Dean Ilby	33	3.33	1.38	8	24%	9	27%	7	21%	4	12%	5	15%	0	0%						
14 Assoc. Dean Smith	33	3.61	1.00	8	24%	8	24%	13	39%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%						
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	32	2.66	1.47	4	13%	8	25%	3	9%	7	22%	10	31%	1	3%						
17 Selection of Admins.	30	2.37	1.33	2	7%	5	17%	6	20%	6	20%	11	37%	3	9%						
18 Selection of Faculty	33	4.06	1.17	15	45%	11	33%	3	9%	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%						
19 Strategic Planning in College	31	3.00	1.44	7	23%	4	13%	8	26%	6	19%	6	19%	2	6%						
20 3/3 4/4 Handled fairly	33	3.85	1.37	15	45%	7	21%	6	18%	1	3%	4	12%	0	0%						
21 SAM Center Mentoring	26	4.00	1.17	14	54%	1	4%	8	31%	3	12%	0	0%	7	21%						
22 SAM Center Advising	26	3.65	1.23	10	38%	3	12%	7	27%	6	23%	0	0%	7	21%						
23 Physically Safe on Campus	33	4.42	0.90	20	61%	9	27%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%						
24 LSC facilities adequate	31	4.19	0.83	13	42%	12	39%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	2	6%						
25 LSC Services adequate	30	4.23	0.86	14	47%	10	33%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%						
26 Atarmark Services adequate	30	3.33	1.15	5	17%	9	30%	9	30%	5	17%	2	7%	3	9%						
27 Human Resource Dept.	32	4.09	0.82	11	34%	14	44%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%						
28 HKC	26	4.19	0.85	11	42%	10	38%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	7	21%						
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	31	3.61	1.05	5	16%	15	48%	7	23%	2	6%	2	6%	2	6%						
30 Information Resources (UCS)	33	3.42	1.17	7	21%	9	27%	10	30%	5	15%	2	6%	0	0%						
31 DELTA Services adequate	30	3.17	1.26	5	17%	7	23%	10	33%	4	13%	4	13%	3	9%						
32 Library Services	30	4.33	0.76	14	47%	13	43%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%						
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	31	4.35	0.71	15	48%	12	39%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%						
34 Blackboard	29	4.03	1.15	12	41%	11	38%	3	10%	1	3%	2	7%	4	12%						
35 E-College	24	2.92	1.32	3	13%	6	25%	5	21%	6	25%	4	17%	9	27%						
36 Recruiting Quality Students	33	3.52	1.09	7	21%	10	30%	10	30%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%						

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37	33	4.09	0.91	13	39%	12	36%	6	18%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
38	32	3.47	1.34	9	28%	9	28%	5	16%	6	19%	3	9%	1	3%
39	32	3.63	1.16	8	25%	11	34%	8	25%	3	9%	2	6%	1	3%
40	32	3.28	1.37	8	25%	7	22%	7	22%	6	19%	4	13%	1	3%
41	31	3.74	1.32	11	35%	11	35%	1	3%	6	19%	2	6%	2	6%
42	32	4.50	0.72	19	59%	11	34%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%
43	33	4.27	1.10	19	58%	9	27%	1	3%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%
44	32	4.00	1.32	17	53%	6	19%	3	9%	4	13%	2	6%	1	3%
45	33	2.39	1.32	3	9%	4	12%	7	21%	8	24%	11	33%	0	0%
46	30	3.37	1.40	8	27%	8	27%	5	17%	5	17%	4	13%	3	9%
47	33	3.64	1.19	9	27%	11	33%	7	21%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%
48	31	3.29	1.19	4	13%	12	39%	7	23%	5	16%	3	10%	2	6%
49	33	3.39	1.39	7	21%	13	39%	5	15%	2	6%	6	18%	0	0%
50	33	2.61	1.34	4	12%	3	9%	12	36%	4	12%	10	30%	0	0%
51	32	2.38	1.36	3	9%	4	13%	7	22%	6	19%	12	38%	1	3%
52	32	4.06	1.01	13	41%	12	38%	3	9%	4	13%	0	0%	1	3%
53	31	3.35	1.20	5	16%	11	35%	8	26%	4	13%	3	10%	2	6%
54	32	2.69	1.33	4	13%	5	16%	7	22%	9	28%	7	22%	1	3%
55	31	2.39	1.31	2	6%	6	19%	4	13%	9	29%	10	32%	2	6%
56	32	3.38	1.50	9	28%	9	28%	6	19%	1	3%	7	22%	1	3%
57	32	3.81	1.40	13	41%	11	34%	1	3%	3	9%	4	13%	1	3%
58	33	3.06	1.43	6	18%	9	27%	6	18%	5	15%	7	21%	0	0%
59	24	4.29	0.81	12	50%	7	29%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	9	27%
60	32	2.47	1.24	1	3%	8	25%	5	16%	9	28%	9	28%	1	3%
61	32	2.06	1.19	2	6%	2	6%	5	16%	10	31%	13	41%	1	3%
62	24	2.92	1.44	4	17%	4	17%	9	38%	0	0%	7	29%	9	27%
63	30	3.53	1.01	6	20%	8	27%	13	43%	2	7%	1	3%	3	9%
64	30	3.57	1.10	7	23%	8	27%	12	40%	1	3%	2	7%	3	9%
65	30	3.07	1.34	6	20%	6	20%	5	17%	10	33%	3	10%	3	9%
66	25	4.20	0.96	11	44%	10	40%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	8	24%
67	23	3.35	1.27	5	22%	5	22%	9	39%	1	4%	3	13%	10	30%
68	33	3.06	1.34	4	12%	12	36%	5	15%	6	18%	6	18%	0	0%
69	26	3.27	1.22	5	19%	6	23%	8	31%	5	19%	2	8%	7	21%
70	31	3.06	1.50	8	26%	4	13%	8	26%	4	13%	7	23%	2	6%
71	33	3.18	1.38	8	24%	5	15%	10	30%	5	15%	5	15%	0	0%
72	33	4.39	0.93	21	64%	6	18%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
73	33	4.03	0.81	9	27%	18	55%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%

H&SS Results 2010-2011

Number of Respondents 49
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 126
 % Returned 38.9%

Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

% Respondents not answering. N/A

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5					4					3					2					1					N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
1	40	3.03	1.19	3	8%	13	33%	12	30%	6	15%	6	15%	9	18%															
2	47	2.68	1.34	5	11%	9	19%	11	23%	10	21%	12	26%	2	4%															
3	27	3.00	1.21	3	11%	6	22%	10	37%	4	15%	4	15%	4	15%	22	45%													
4	30	3.07	1.11	1	3%	12	40%	9	30%	4	13%	4	13%	4	13%	19	39%													
5	35	3.69	0.96	7	20%	14	40%	11	31%	2	6%	1	3%	1	3%	14	29%													
6	26	3.27	1.12	3	12%	8	31%	11	42%	1	4%	3	12%	3	12%	23	47%													
7	41	3.51	1.19	10	24%	12	29%	10	24%	7	17%	2	5%	8	16%															
8	42	3.50	1.33	14	33%	6	14%	13	31%	5	12%	4	10%	7	14%															
9	27	3.78	1.09	8	30%	9	33%	7	26%	2	7%	1	4%	22	45%															
10	23	2.70	1.18	2	9%	2	9%	11	48%	3	13%	5	22%	26	53%															
11	39	2.49	1.27	3	8%	6	15%	9	23%	10	26%	11	28%	10	20%															
12	49	3.49	1.29	13	27%	14	29%	11	22%	6	12%	5	10%	0	0%															
13	45	4.00	0.95	16	36%	17	38%	8	18%	4	9%	0	0%	4	8%															
14	44	3.64	1.12	10	23%	18	41%	8	18%	6	14%	2	5%	5	10%															
16	49	3.02	1.61	12	24%	13	27%	2	4%	8	16%	14	29%	0	0%															
17	46	2.13	1.34	3	7%	7	15%	5	11%	9	20%	22	48%	3	6%															
18	48	4.00	1.30	24	50%	12	25%	4	8%	4	8%	4	8%	1	2%															
19	45	2.69	1.29	6	13%	5	11%	12	27%	13	29%	9	20%	4	8%															
20	46	3.59	1.29	13	28%	16	35%	6	13%	7	15%	4	9%	3	6%															
21	40	3.95	1.15	16	40%	13	33%	6	15%	3	8%	2	5%	9	18%															
22	41	3.61	1.28	13	32%	10	24%	11	27%	3	7%	4	10%	8	16%															
23	48	4.27	0.71	20	42%	21	44%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%															
24	44	3.61	0.97	7	16%	20	45%	11	25%	5	11%	1	2%	5	10%															
25	41	3.54	0.90	3	7%	22	54%	12	29%	2	5%	2	5%	8	16%															
26	45	2.98	1.14	3	7%	13	29%	15	33%	8	18%	6	13%	4	8%															
27	40	3.60	1.15	9	23%	16	40%	7	18%	6	15%	2	5%	9	18%															
28	32	3.84	0.99	8	25%	15	47%	6	19%	2	6%	1	3%	17	35%															
29	46	3.30	1.24	8	17%	15	33%	11	24%	7	15%	5	11%	3	6%															
30	48	3.33	1.21	7	15%	19	40%	10	21%	7	15%	5	10%	1	2%															
31	40	2.68	1.27	3	8%	8	20%	12	30%	7	18%	10	25%	9	18%															
32	49	4.29	0.82	22	45%	21	43%	5	10%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%															
33	49	3.96	1.00	15	31%	23	47%	7	14%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%															
34	48	3.77	1.12	12	25%	22	46%	9	19%	1	2%	4	8%	1	2%															
35	33	2.36	1.48	4	12%	4	12%	7	21%	3	9%	15	45%	16	33%															
36	48	2.88	1.02	3	6%	10	21%	16	33%	16	33%	3	6%	1	2%															

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A	
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
37 Teaching Load is fair	47	3.77	1.13	14	30%	17	36%	9	19%	5	11%	2	4%	2	4%
38 Recognition for teaching	47	2.98	1.31	7	15%	11	23%	10	21%	12	26%	7	15%	2	4%
39 Recognition for research	48	3.04	1.22	6	13%	12	25%	14	29%	10	21%	6	13%	1	2%
40 Recognition for service	48	2.73	1.28	5	10%	8	17%	15	31%	9	19%	11	23%	1	2%
41 Clerical Support	45	3.20	1.36	8	18%	14	31%	10	22%	5	11%	8	18%	4	8%
42 Collegial Support in dept.	48	3.50	1.40	15	31%	13	27%	7	15%	7	15%	6	13%	1	2%
43 Work environment	48	4.21	0.90	22	46%	17	36%	6	13%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%
44 Free from intimidation/discrimination	48	3.85	1.27	20	42%	12	25%	9	19%	3	6%	4	8%	1	2%
45 Parking	47	2.57	1.38	5	11%	10	21%	5	11%	14	30%	13	28%	2	4%
46 Faculty Senate	43	3.26	1.20	6	14%	15	35%	10	23%	8	19%	4	9%	6	12%
47 Research Resources	45	3.27	1.07	5	11%	14	31%	18	40%	4	9%	4	9%	4	8%
48 Graduate Program Resources	43	2.91	1.23	6	14%	7	16%	12	28%	13	30%	5	12%	6	12%
49 Travel Allocation	48	2.58	1.27	3	6%	10	21%	12	25%	10	21%	13	27%	1	2%
50 IDEA Administered	47	2.77	1.51	6	13%	14	30%	6	13%	5	11%	16	34%	2	4%
51 IDEA Accuracy	48	2.69	1.36	4	8%	14	29%	5	10%	13	27%	12	25%	1	2%
52 Chair evaluation of my teaching	45	3.44	1.32	11	24%	15	33%	7	16%	7	16%	5	11%	4	8%
53 FES Instrument is adequate	47	2.85	1.25	5	11%	12	26%	7	15%	17	36%	6	13%	2	4%
54 Merit System is applied fairly	45	2.60	1.40	4	9%	13	29%	2	4%	13	29%	13	29%	4	8%
55 Market Adjustments applied fairly	42	2.43	1.31	3	7%	7	17%	9	21%	9	21%	14	33%	7	14%
56 Promotion System is applied fairly	44	2.64	1.45	6	14%	8	18%	8	18%	8	18%	14	32%	5	10%
57 Tenure System is applied fairly	47	3.45	1.46	13	28%	16	34%	6	13%	3	6%	9	19%	2	4%
58 Tenure Process clear at univ. level	48	2.23	1.48	7	15%	4	8%	4	8%	11	23%	22	46%	1	2%
59 Post Tenure Review	38	3.45	1.31	9	24%	13	34%	6	16%	6	16%	4	11%	11	22%
60 Salary at SHSU	48	2.60	1.12	3	6%	8	17%	11	23%	19	40%	7	15%	1	2%
61 Salary other Universities	47	2.36	1.15	1	2%	10	21%	6	13%	18	38%	12	26%	2	4%
62 Reassigned time	35	2.94	1.26	4	11%	9	26%	8	23%	9	26%	5	14%	14	29%
63 Faculty Research Fund <5000	43	3.44	1.08	7	16%	15	35%	13	30%	6	14%	2	5%	6	12%
64 Enhancement Grant for Research	42	3.33	1.14	8	19%	10	24%	14	33%	8	19%	2	5%	7	14%
65 Adequate support for online courses	45	3.02	1.34	8	18%	9	20%	11	24%	10	22%	7	16%	4	8%
66 University Center facilities	33	3.42	1.17	6	18%	11	33%	10	30%	3	9%	3	9%	16	33%
67 University Center staff	33	3.79	0.93	10	30%	7	21%	15	45%	1	3%	0	0%	16	33%
68 Communication with Admin.	45	2.22	1.13	1	2%	6	13%	10	22%	13	29%	15	33%	4	8%
69 President values faculty	35	2.69	1.35	3	9%	8	23%	9	26%	5	14%	10	29%	14	29%
70 Provost values faculty	44	2.43	1.42	5	11%	7	16%	6	14%	10	23%	16	36%	5	10%
71 Dean values faculty	47	3.09	1.38	7	15%	16	34%	7	15%	8	17%	9	19%	2	4%
72 Chair values faculty	45	3.82	1.37	19	42%	12	27%	7	16%	1	2%	6	13%	4	8%
73 Satisfied at SHSU	48	3.69	1.07	13	27%	14	29%	16	33%	3	6%	2	4%	1	2%

NGL Results 2010 -2011

Number of Respondents 7
 Number of Tenured/Tenure-Track 14
 % Returned 50.0%

% Respondents not answering.

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number and % Responding 5, 4, 3, 2, 1										N/A	%
				5	4	3	2	1	n	%	n	%	n		
1 President Gibson	5	3.60	0.55	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
2 VPAA Payne	7	3.14	0.69	0	0%	2	29%	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
3 VP EM Thielemann	3	3.33	0.58	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
4 VPFO Powell	3	2.33	1.53	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	4	57%
5 VPSS Parker	3	3.67	0.58	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
6 VP Advancement Holmes	3	3.67	0.58	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
7 Assoc. VPAA Eglisaer	5	4.60	0.55	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
8 Assoc. VPAA Tayebi	3	4.00	1.00	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
9 Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	3	4.00	0.00	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
10 Assoc. VPR&SP Davis	2	3.50	0.71	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
11 Assoc. VP DL Angrove	3	3.33	0.58	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
12 Director Holder	7	4.00	1.15	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	7	3.71	1.25	2	29%	3	43%	0	0%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%
17 Selection of Admins.	4	3.50	1.00	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%
18 Selection of Faculty	7	4.29	0.95	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
19 Strategic Planning in College	6	4.17	0.75	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	1	4.00		0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%
21 SAM Center Mentoring	2	4.00	0.00	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
22 SAM Center Advising	2	4.00	0.00	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
23 Physically Safe on Campus	7	4.29	0.49	2	29%	5	71%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
24 LSC facilities adequate	5	4.00	0.71	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
25 LSC Services adequate	5	3.60	1.14	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	2	29%
26 Aramark Services adequate	7	3.14	0.90	0	0%	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%
27 Human Resource Dept.	7	3.29	1.38	1	14%	3	43%	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%
28 HKC	5	4.20	0.84	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	5	3.60	0.55	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
30 Information Resources (UCS)	7	2.57	0.79	0	0%	1	14%	2	29%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%
31 DELTA Services adequate	4	3.75	0.50	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%
32 Library Services	6	5.00	0.00	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	1	5.00		1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%
34 Blackboard	3	3.67	0.58	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
35 E-College	2	3.50	0.71	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
36 Recruiting Quality Students	7	3.14	0.69	0	0%	2	29%	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
37 Teaching Load is fair	2	4.50	0.71	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	5		4		3		2		1		N/A		
				n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
38	Recognition for teaching	2	4.50	0.71	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
39	Recognition for research	5	4.00	0.71	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
40	Recognition for service	5	4.40	0.55	2	40%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
41	Clerical Support	4	4.75	0.50	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%
42	Collegial Support in dept.	6	4.00	1.26	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	1	14%
43	Work environment	7	3.86	1.46	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%
44	Free from intimidation/discrimination	7	4.00	1.15	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
45	Parking	7	3.00	0.58	0	0%	1	14%	5	71%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
46	Faculty Senate	5	4.00	0.71	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
47	Research Resources	7	4.43	0.79	4	57%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
48	Graduate Program Resources	2	4.00	1.41	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
49	Travel Allocation	6	4.00	0.89	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
50	IDEA Administered	0			0		0		0		0		0		7	100%
51	IDEA Accuracy	0			0		0		0		0		0		7	100%
52	Chair evaluation of my teaching	0			0		0		0		0		0		7	100%
53	FES Instrument is adequate	6	3.50	0.84	1	17%	1	17%	4	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
54	Merit System is applied fairly	6	3.67	1.37	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	1	14%
55	Market Adjustments applied fairly	4	2.75	0.96	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%	3	43%
56	Promotion System is applied fairly	5	3.60	0.89	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	2	29%
57	Tenure System is applied fairly	6	4.33	0.82	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
58	Tenure Process clear at univ. level	6	3.33	1.03	1	17%	1	17%	3	50%	1	17%	0	0%	1	14%
59	Post Tenure Review	3	4.33	0.58	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
60	Salary at SHSU	7	3.43	0.98	1	14%	2	29%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
61	Salary other Universities	5	3.20	1.30	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	2	29%
62	Reassigned time	1	4.00		0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%
63	Faculty Research Fund <5000	3	4.00	0.00	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%
64	Enhancement Grant for Research	2	3.50	0.71	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
65	Adequate support for online courses	2	3.00	0.00	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
66	University Center facilities	2	4.00	0.00	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
67	University Center staff	2	4.00	0.00	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	71%
68	Communication with Admin.	6	2.83	0.98	0	0%	1	17%	4	67%	0	0%	1	17%	1	14%
69	President values faculty	4	4.00	0.82	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%
70	Provost values faculty	5	3.60	0.89	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
71	Dean values faculty	7	3.86	1.46	3	43%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%
72	Chair values faculty	1	5.00		1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%
73	Satisfied at SHSU	7	4.00	0.82	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Comparison Across Colleges/Library

#	Question	Total	A&S	COBA	CJ	ED	H&SS	Library
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
23	Physically Safe on Campus	4.34	4.25	4.58	4.38	4.42	4.27	4.29
18	Selection of Faculty	4.19	4.34	4.42	4.08	4.06	4.00	4.29
32	Library Services	4.15	3.92	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.29	5.00
43	Work environment	4.13	3.92	4.20	4.38	4.27	4.21	3.86
33	Library good for Dept. Curriculum	4.04	3.90	4.12	3.92	4.35	3.96	5.00
44	Free from intimidation/discrimination	4.01	3.85	4.56	4.15	4.00	3.85	4.00
72	Chair values faculty	3.98	3.66	4.28	4.00	4.39	3.82	5.00
28	HKC	3.97	3.79	4.06	4.38	4.19	3.84	4.20
42	Collegial Support in dept.	3.95	3.72	4.48	4.15	4.50	3.50	4.00
21	SAM Center Mentoring	3.90	3.51	4.37	4.11	4.00	3.95	4.00
34	Blackboard	3.89	3.81	4.12	3.92	4.03	3.77	3.67
73	Satisfied at SHSU	3.87	3.80	4.08	3.92	4.03	3.69	4.00
37	Teaching Load is fair	3.86	3.74	4.04	3.62	4.09	3.77	4.50
12	Deans	3.82	4.38	3.88	4.08	3.21	3.49	4.00
5	VPSS Parker	3.81	3.91	4.12	4.00	3.58	3.69	3.67
67	University Center staff	3.80	3.59	4.13	4.56	3.35	3.79	4.00
9	Assoc. VPR&SP Cook	3.79	3.92	3.60	4.00	3.47	3.78	4.00
7	Assoc. VPAA Eglisae	3.78	3.72	3.52	4.30	4.10	3.51	4.60
24	LSC facilities adequate	3.77	3.58	3.92	3.60	4.19	3.61	4.00
13	Assoc. Deans	3.77	4.01	3.12	4.23	3.47	3.82	
57	Tenure System is applied fairly	3.76	3.78	4.04	3.85	3.81	3.45	4.33
59	Post Tenure Review	3.75	3.49	4.00	3.90	4.29	3.45	4.33
66	University Center facilities	3.75	3.37	3.70	4.56	4.20	3.42	4.00
20	3/3 4/4 handled fairly	3.74	3.68	4.39	3.08	3.85	3.59	4.00
52	Chair evaluation of my teaching	3.74	3.69	3.86	3.92	4.06	3.44	
25	LSC Services adequate	3.72	3.54	3.86	3.50	4.23	3.54	3.60
71	Dean values faculty	3.66	4.23	3.88	4.15	3.18	3.09	3.86
63	Faculty Research Fund <5000	3.60	3.55	4.00	3.85	3.53	3.44	4.00
64	Enhancement Grant for Research	3.57	3.70	3.67	3.85	3.57	3.33	3.50
27	Human Resource Dept.	3.56	3.20	3.43	3.92	4.09	3.60	3.29
29	Support from Contracts and Grants	3.54	3.69	3.47	3.75	3.61	3.30	3.60
8	Assoc. VPAA Tayebi	3.51	3.37	3.24	3.13	3.93	3.50	4.00
22	SAM Center Advising	3.50	2.76	4.33	4.22	3.65	3.61	4.00
41	Clerical Support	3.43	3.10	3.44	4.31	3.74	3.20	4.75
47	Research Resources	3.41	3.00	3.68	4.00	3.64	3.27	4.43
1	President Gibson	3.39	3.39	3.85	3.70	3.41	3.03	3.60

#	Question	Total Mean	A&S Mean	COBA Mean	CJ Mean	ED Mean	H&SS Mean	Library Mean
6	VP Advancement Holmes	3.37	3.23	3.22	4.50	3.62	3.27	3.67
39	Recognition for research	3.36	3.26	3.54	3.69	3.63	3.04	4.00
46	Faculty Senate	3.36	3.07	3.83	3.71	3.37	3.26	4.00
38	Recognition for teaching	3.30	3.28	3.52	3.50	3.47	2.98	4.50
3	VP&EM Thielmann	3.28	3.42	3.11	4.25	3.40	3.00	3.33
69	President values faculty	3.22	3.25	3.61	3.82	3.27	2.69	4.00
4	VPFO Powell	3.22	3.21	3.31	4.33	3.22	3.07	2.33
56	Promotion System is applied fairly	3.21	3.32	3.61	3.46	3.38	2.64	3.60
10	Assoc. VPResAdm Davis	3.20	3.33	3.11	4.33	3.27	2.70	3.50
26	Aramark Services adequate	3.19	3.12	3.54	3.30	3.33	2.98	3.14
62	Reassigned time	3.16	3.32	3.53	3.27	2.92	2.94	4.00
53	FES Instrument is adequate	3.15	3.25	3.00	3.54	3.35	2.85	3.50
31	DELTA Services adequate	3.10	3.10	3.10	4.44	3.17	2.68	3.75
40	Recognition for service	3.08	2.96	3.21	3.62	3.28	2.73	4.40
19	Strategic Planning in College	3.08	2.96	3.84	3.08	3.00	2.69	4.17
49	Travel Allocation	3.07	2.65	4.15	3.08	3.39	2.58	4.00
65	Adequate support for online courses	3.06	2.84	3.10	4.00	3.07	3.02	3.00
2	VPAA Payne	3.03	3.06	3.00	3.55	3.31	2.68	3.14
36	Recruiting Quality Students	3.03	2.75	2.92	3.73	3.52	2.88	3.14
54	Merit System is applied fairly	3.01	3.18	3.40	3.54	2.69	2.60	3.67
30	Information Resources (UCS)	2.98	2.30	3.13	3.33	3.42	3.33	2.57
16	Budget Decision Participation in Dept	2.94	3.11	2.63	2.85	2.66	3.02	3.71
48	Graduate Program Resources	2.92	2.33	3.14	3.54	3.29	2.91	4.00
45	Parking	2.91	2.98	4.08	3.00	2.39	2.57	3.00
70	Provost values faculty	2.87	2.98	2.64	3.75	3.06	2.43	3.60
11	Assoc. VP DL Angrove	2.87	3.03	3.10	4.11	2.59	2.49	3.33
60	Salary at SHSU	2.79	2.91	3.20	2.69	2.47	2.60	3.43
68	Communication with Admin.	2.77	2.65	3.12	3.69	3.06	2.22	2.83
50	IDEA Administered	2.76	2.68	2.69	3.54	2.61	2.77	
35	E-College	2.65	2.41	2.33	4.13	2.92	2.36	3.50
58	Tenure Process clear at univ. level	2.64	2.68	2.13	3.62	3.06	2.23	3.33
55	Market Adjustments applied fairly	2.62	2.45	3.29	3.09	2.39	2.43	2.75
51	IDEA Accuracy	2.48	2.32	2.42	2.69	2.38	2.69	
61	Salary other Universities	2.45	2.59	2.50	2.77	2.06	2.36	3.20
17	Selection of Admins.	2.44	2.38	3.04	2.54	2.37	2.13	3.50

Faculty Senate Survey Results - University Previous Comparison

Evaluate the Following:

	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07	06-07	05-06	04-05	03-04	02-03	01-02
1 President	3.39	4.19	4.05	3.74	3.91	3.91	3.89	3.45	3.31	3.48	3.62
2 VPAA	3.03	3.31	3.31	3.31	3.34	3.34	3.16	2.59	2.50	2.77	2.96
3 VP&EM	3.28	3.37	3.40	3.55	3.35	3.35	3.34	3.02			
4 VPFO	3.22	3.58	3.52	2.97	3.04	3.04	3.09	3.20	2.89	2.62	2.38
5 VPSS	3.81	3.89	3.88	3.84	3.80	3.80	3.87	2.34	1.99	2.08	1.92
6 VP Advancement	3.37	3.47	3.24	3.26	3.24	3.24	3.19	2.76	2.57	2.78	2.66
7 Assoc. VPAA	3.78	3.78	3.63	3.68	3.68	3.68	3.69	3.55	3.54	3.73	3.78
8 Assoc. VPAA & Dean Grad.	3.51	3.73	3.80	3.70	3.58	3.58	3.67	3.60	3.39		
9 Assoc. VPR&SP	3.79	3.77	3.71	3.06	3.16	3.16	2.50	2.53	2.20	2.41	2.71
10 Assoc. VPR&S Admin	3.20	3.41									
11 Assoc. VP D.L.	2.87	3.26									
12 Dean	3.82	3.96	3.88	3.89	4.21	4.21	4.07	3.62	3.43	3.26	3.17
16 Budget Decision Participation in Dept.	2.94	3.18	3.21	2.98	3.13	4.05	3.19	2.34	2.26	2.16	2.24
17 Selection of Admins.	2.44	2.73	2.72	2.52	2.64	3.58	2.55	2.11	1.98	2.07	2.27
18 Selection of Faculty	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.14	4.33	4.17	4.50	3.48	3.34	3.20	3.40
19 Strategic Planning in College	3.08	3.27	3.28	3.26	3.40	3.90	3.31	2.47	2.29	2.40	2.46
20 3/3 4/4 handled fairly	3.74	3.62	3.42	3.59	3.75	3.59	3.54	3.48	3.39	3.09	3.09
21 SAM Center Mentoring	3.90	3.83	3.61	3.64	3.82	3.60	3.97	3.87	4.03	3.89	
22 SAM Center Advising	3.50	3.65	3.50	3.44	3.64	3.65	3.92	3.81	4.02	3.95	
23 Physically Safe on Campus	4.34	4.36	4.33	4.23	4.37	4.37	4.53	3.61	3.66	3.60	3.21
24 LSC facilities adequate	3.77	3.74	3.68	3.61	3.65	3.82	3.66	3.58	3.44	3.46	2.47
25 LSC Services adequate	3.72	3.71	3.69	3.49	3.60	3.64	3.63				
26 Aramark Services adequate	3.19	3.12									
27 Human Resource Dept.	3.56	3.60	3.69	3.21	3.50	3.40	3.50	3.12	3.03	3.34	3.43
28 HKC	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00	4.05	4.33	4.25	3.55	3.44	3.66	3.63
29 Support from Contracts and Grants	3.54	3.53	3.17	2.89	3.02	2.64	3.03	2.56	2.61	2.73	3.00
30 Information Resources (UCS)	2.98	3.10	3.09	2.63	3.58	3.13	3.65	3.63	3.73	3.78	3.74
31 DELTA services adequate	3.10	3.13									
32 Library Services	4.15	4.23	4.17	4.12	4.17	3.75	4.32	4.05	3.98	3.93	3.74
33 Library good for Dept. Curriculum	4.04	4.18	4.02	3.95	3.90	3.08	4.06	3.93	3.88	3.80	3.73
34 Blackboard	3.89	3.81									
35 E-College	2.65	2.72									
36 Recruiting Quality Students	3.03	3.16	3.14	3.07	3.08	3.71	3.46	3.17	3.09		

	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07	06-07	05-06	04-05	03-04	02-03	01-02
37	Teaching Load is fair	3.86	3.76	3.63	3.65	3.71	3.23	3.80	3.20	3.11	
38	Recognition for teaching	3.30	3.45	3.27	3.13	3.23	3.46	3.30	2.77	2.69	
39	Recognition for research	3.36	3.60	3.52	3.32	3.46	3.11	3.54	3.02	3.06	
40	Recognition for service	3.08	3.24	3.03	3.03	3.11	3.40	3.21	2.79	2.58	
41	Clerical Support	3.43	3.42	3.49	3.31	3.40	3.93	3.89	3.16	3.24	
42	Collegial Support in dept.	3.95	3.99	3.95	3.92	3.93	3.81	3.89	3.60	3.72	
43	Work environment	4.13	3.88	3.98	3.66	3.81	3.44	3.70	3.31	3.46	
44	Free from intimidation/discrimination	4.01	4.06	3.99	3.87	3.86	3.48	3.87	3.47	3.62	
45	Parking	2.91	2.40	2.52	3.11	3.44	3.25	3.27	2.78	2.72	
46	Faculty Senate	3.36	3.36	3.23	3.16	3.25	2.74	3.42	3.25	3.34	3.36
47	Research Resources	3.41	3.25	3.13	3.17	3.10	3.02	2.94	2.41	2.24	2.17
48	Graduate Program Resources	2.92	2.96	2.74	2.72	2.74	3.08	2.53	2.54	2.58	2.32
49	Travel Allocation	3.07	3.14	3.07	3.05	3.08	2.77	2.95	2.50	2.25	2.04
50	IDEA Administered fairly	2.76	2.92	2.81	2.82	2.77	2.47	2.90			2.04
51	IDEA Accuracy	2.48	2.63	2.42	2.56	2.47	3.64	2.66	2.48	2.22	2.41
52	Chair evaluation of my teaching	3.74	3.68	3.81	3.60	3.64	3.12	3.78	3.49	3.67	3.62
53	FES Instrument is adequate	3.15	3.08		2.93	3.12	3.86	3.20	2.56	2.43	
54	Merit System is applied fairly	3.01	2.98	3.08							
55	Market Adjustment is applied fairly	2.62	2.78	3.01	2.91	2.92	3.74	2.96	2.55	2.56	2.74
56	Promotion System is applied fairly	3.21	3.28		3.25	3.27	3.71	3.24	2.71	2.71	2.82
57	Tenure System is applied fairly	3.76	3.72	3.29							
58	Tenure System is clear at Univ. level	2.64	3.01	3.66	3.47	3.74	2.59	3.60	3.32	3.54	3.46
59	Post Tenure Review	3.75	3.82	3.91	3.67	3.71	2.32	3.68	3.30	3.51	3.63
60	Salary at SHSU	2.79	2.89	2.79	2.64	2.59	2.92	2.60	2.57	2.61	2.53
61	Salary other Universities	2.45	2.57	2.39	2.46	2.32	3.27	2.23	2.24	2.13	2.14
62	Reassigned time	3.16	3.22	3.17	3.07	3.15	3.15	3.16	2.94	3.03	2.82
63	Faculty Research Fund <6000	3.60	3.38	3.39	3.09	3.07	3.07	3.02	2.93	2.73	
64	Enhancement Grant for Research	3.57	3.44	3.34	3.06	3.03	3.03	3.03	2.82	2.57	
65	Adequate support for online courses	3.06	3.03	2.82	2.75	2.90	2.90	2.81			
66	University Center facilities	3.75	3.57	3.60	3.50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
67	University Center staff	3.80	3.68	3.80	3.72	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
68	Communication with Admin.	2.77	3.00	3.01	2.82	2.96	2.96	2.94	2.35	2.25	
69	President values faculty	3.22	3.71	3.75	3.54	3.80	3.80	3.82	3.22	2.98	
70	Provost values faculty	2.87	3.19	3.31	3.30	3.39	3.39	3.40	2.58	2.52	
71	Dean values faculty	3.66	3.78	3.96	3.90	4.39	4.39	4.39	3.64	3.42	
72	Chair values faculty	3.98	3.97	4.16	3.96	4.22	4.22	4.19	3.78	4.07	
73	Satisfied at SHSU	3.87	3.92	4.01	3.71	4.07	4.07	4.02	3.53	3.57	3.66

-Reduce all office staff--from the President's Office on down.

-Has the administration increased in size over the past 5-10 years? It is hypocritical of the administration to tell us, "You're going to have to make do with less" while seeming unwilling to do the same. Apart from their individual budgets, what is the administration sacrificing?

-Could we save money by finding a more reasonable company than Aramark to run food services? Just an idea.

Responses to the List from the Deans:

1) Decrease O&M budgets

-appropriate to cut -This cut seems to make the most sense -Yes—do this -Acceptable to cut -Appropriate, but do not cut permanently -Appropriate to cut -Appropriate to cut; we could get by with fewer new purchases.

2) Decrease Travel budgets (NOT A SEPARATE FUND FROM O&M)

-appropriate to cut -Painful, but perhaps necessary -Yes, cut these before the other salary type items -If this is cut it will limit some of the faculty who are 3/3 loads. Make them 4/4

loads before you cut this. -This will affect those seeking tenure. Requirements placed upon them must

be changed, or some travel allowed for them. -Appropriate to cut, but this MUST INCLUDE ATHLETICS! -Would hurt our students and faculty

3) Reduce summer compensation per course from 1/12 to some smaller fraction of nine month salary

-Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -What is the net in comparison to FTE generated in the summer? -Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable; This is a dangerous precedent.

4) Decrease the number of summer courses offered but retain the same compensation level per course.

-Appropriate to cut -Appropriate -Unacceptable to cut -What is the net in comparison to FTE generated in the summer? -Unacceptable to cut -We could alternate who teaches in the summer

5) Freeze hiring (THESE ARE IN ADDITION TO THE ONES WE FROZE THIS YEAR)

-Appropriate to cut -Should not be across the board. Each case should be determined individually -Understandable, but the Art Dept. is in the process of seeking NASAD accreditation and unless we hire an art historian, this will be impossible. -Must be on a case-by-case basis -Unacceptable to cut; must be on an individual basis -This seems inevitable.

6) Reduce the number of courses and sections offered in each department.

-Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut; this will have a negative impact on students and faculty -Unacceptable for the art department -This must be done on a case-by-case basis. We cannot freeze students in a holding pattern for their degree plan because we want to save money by not offering a course in a timely fashion.

-Yes—offer only the courses needed for a degree plan. All other “fluff” courses must be eliminated no matter how interesting they are. Curriculum must represent what is required for degrees. . . . period.

-This could cause us problems with accreditation.

7) Furloughs

-Unacceptable to use -Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -No—never -No—not a shared burden; faculty would suffer more and possibly not return in better times. Dangerous.

8) Across the board salary reductions

-Okay—BUT, only if cuts are TRULY across the board with all administrators and university executives. This should be a percentage, not a dollar amount in this case.

-Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -Unacceptable to cut -No! Never! -No. We are already at the low end of faculty salaries across the state in our CFAMC.

9) Reduce course releases for administration and research

- Appropriate to cut
- Okay, but should not be a permanent fix—only use during difficult economic time
- Appropriate to cut
- Yes, do away with the 3/3 load and have everyone teach 4 courses. In response to this, make adjustments in the research and service requirement for the faculty. We do after all, pride ourselves in “teaching”.
- Yes—Most faculty need to be returned to the 4/4 workload which will reduce the number of adjuncts significantly. Other Universities have done this already. The 3/3 load is a luxury we cannot afford.
- This might help overall and show the administrations willingness to take part of the burden.

10) Reduce departmental allocations of distance learning fee distributions

- Unacceptable to cut
- Okay, but not a great fix, and shouldn't be permanent
- Unacceptable to cut
- Unacceptable to cut
- Unacceptable; this could hurt us in the future and would stymie growth in this area for the university.

11) Decrease the number of TA appointments (GRADUATE STUDENTS, ADJUNCTS -NOT CERTAIN)

- Unacceptable to cut
- Unacceptable to cut
- Unacceptable to cut
- How do you reduce faculty and have less GA's? It seems as if more GA's, not less, will result in savings.
- Unacceptable to cut
- The number of Adjunct faculty will need to increase to fill the void caused by the other—more expensive faculty positions that are not filled. The Curriculum must be delivered and adjuncts will be required to do more of the work at a cheaper rate of pay than tenure track positions.
- If adjuncts are included, then this would definitely hurt us, so no.

12) Terminate low producing programs

- Appropriate to cut
- This might be an option that we have to consider seriously
- How is “low producing” defined? I could support this if it were viewed holistically. Some low producing programs support high producing programs. We need a careful analysis of the interdependencies, not a simple numeric enrollment standard. -Appropriate to cut

-This seems drastic and some could see Art as “low producing” because of our small class sizes.

13) Combine small departments into larger units to reduce administrative costs

-Appropriate to cut -Unacceptable to cut -Appropriate to do this -Unacceptable to cut; this will also lower the quality of education and support for our departments -This should be the highest priority. -Absolutely, yes! -Yes. This should be done anyway.

COMMENTS ON COST CUTTING OPTIONS

This document is comprised of comments from faculty from CHSS, and NGL.

SUMMER COMPENSATION

These two items were grouped for easy comparison because they both focus on options for handling budget shortfalls during summer school. The preference seems to be for reducing the number of sections/classes instead of reducing the amount paid per class. There is also support for an established rate per class.

DECREASE THE NUMBER OF SUMMER COURSES OFFERED BUT RETAIN THE SAME COMPENSATION LEVEL PER COURSE—(Preferred method between two options)

Seven people agreed this was an acceptable option.

- NO,NO,NO – we use the summer courses to recruit new majors so our department would be greatly impacted if we cut summer school.
- This is a workable solution for summer but it doesn't do much for the long term budget.
- Decrease the number of summer courses offered but retain the same compensation level per course - how does this help? If you have enough students enrolled in the class they are generating revenue.
- I would favor this option. Summer teaching is a self-reinforcing black hole that diminishes research and grant activity. However, it is perceived by many senior (non-research) faculty as a veritable entitlement and sinecure. If the University is to morph further into the research focused realm then eventually the back has to be broken of the present arrangement that effectively supports a twelve month salary for teachers. Summer teaching attracts a strange bipolar population of students comprised of those too stupid to work and pass their classes in the long semesters and those who see university level education as almost entirely about acquiring lots of course credits but who consummately fail to recognize that education actually also involves smelling the roses along the way, perhaps by means of "other" activities in the summer break. In my opinion summer teaching and summer courses running for six weeks or so are an affront to education and to higher learning. They should be modified and streamlined to represent educational priorities rather than faculty sinecure priorities.
- This option decreases revenue to the university.
- Cut summer courses before summer changing pay system. I oppose anything that is a PERMANENT change

REDUCE SUMMER COMPENSATION PER COURSE FROM 1/12TH TO SOME SMALLER FRACTION OF THE NINE MONTH SALARY

- Four people agreed this was the best option for handling summer compensation.
- This is my third choice BUT it must be negotiated as temporary until the budget crunch is over.
- I think this is a bad idea. It would be better to cut the number of classes because the pay in the summer is not that great anyway.
- This makes sense. While I was at other institutions each summer course was paid at a set rate no matter the base salary of the professor.
- This could definitely be a reasonable compromise. Summer school needs to be reassessed. What do we as a university, a college, and a department want to accomplish during a summer session? Which courses are vital? What are the acceptable number of courses to offer?
- Reduce the summer salaries and people may not want to teach in the summer.
- All faculty should refuse to teach summer school if there are pay cuts.
- NO to salary reductions. The cost of living has already increased, and the cost of fuel and food is growing. Inflation is hurting the already existing income.
- Who is going to tell the people who came here, accepted a smaller salary for 9 months, with a pretty strong assurance that summer teaching is available that they will be making less. I don't speak for myself, but I've talked with people who had choices in their job offers. Ours looked good because of the summer pay. It feels like it's a slap in the face.

ALTERNATIVES

- Setting summer compensation at 5000 per course for all tenured professors, and slightly less for newer hires; lower for non-tenured or non-tenure track individuals. Maybe limiting to one course for any faculty in the "high pay" range.
- Adjust compensation for summer teaching (the \$5K per course seems about right to me). And let the market (i.e., enrollment) determine how many courses are to be offered.
- Because the formula is based on a percent, perhaps reducing or eliminating the courses taught by tenured faculty making larger salaries would be a wise solution for a portion of cuts, since the lower salaried faculty are more likely the ones needing extra teaching anyway
- Reduce summer compensation BUT tell departments to preferentially staff those courses with the lower-paid members of the department.
- I would try to be more "equal" than the mathematical numbers. For instance: professors already being paid \$70,000 or more, for the 9 months, should probably not teach in the Summer. There are plenty, and equally capable, Tenured and tenure-track faculty members being paid 50,000 and less, who actually NEED the Summer teaching compensation.
- We've got a senior faculty member teaching TWO summer courses to the tune of \$16K or so. Replace him and other high-dollar folks in summer courses with the more junior faculty and give those junior faculty a pass on research expectations for the year. Take a good hard look at each faculty member's "value" - SCHs and grant overhead compared to

compensation - and require some to step up in the SCH department. I realize this is an ugly sounding prospect, but it's a reality that is likely to hit us soon.

- Beginning summer 2012. Offer summer courses based on seniority in the following order: a) tenured; b) tenure-track; c) adjuncts. 2) Keep the same summer compensation but allow only one course per faculty and adjunct so that everybody can practice "shared sacrifice."
- Make the Summer compensation EQUAL for all Tenured and tenure-track professors, of any rank. Say \$9,000 for two courses (that was done at UC-Santa Barbara-Graduate Summer Language Schools in 2003). The savings will be quite serious. Two courses: no more no less. For Pool Faculty, keep it at \$3,500 per course.
- To start saving next year, we may think Summer 2012. Classes should be assigned by rank and seniority, but Full professors to teach only one class. Other ranks should remain teaching the same load of classes. There is a big difference in salary between Full professor and other ranks
- Reducing Summer courses can save money. But it must be done well. Only one section of one course per Summer, and only those courses that are necessary--required--for continuing or completion.

The remaining items are organized in the order of preference as indicated by the number of positive/negative responses. The items with the most support appear first in the list with those items receiving the least support as cost cutting measures lower in the rank.

COMBINE SMALL DEPARTMENT INTO LARGER UNITS TO REDUCE ADMIN COST-

- Twelve people cited this as an appropriate option for cutting cost on campus.
- Reluctantly I will select this as my choice. It really isn't fair to burden well ran and highly productive departments.
- I am not sure this would be a cost efficient solution but it is not fair that faculty are expected to take pay cuts while out of date departments are allowed to remain on campus. Departments should be asked before they are forced to take on supporting a smaller department to ensure collegiality among the faculty.
- This won't save much money and will create factions, better option to terminate
- Yes, this only makes good business sense. A sense of autonomy is important but not the end all for a program or department. Programs, however, should not be combined without significant linkage. Faculty need to see how the disciplines work together.
- Maybe combine some colleges too.
- Most businesses would terminate the product that doesn't make a minimum profit. While schools aren't businesses, if it means remaining solvent, perhaps we should be practicing good business until we find more sources of money. I certainly would support termination of low producing programs (at least temporarily).
- I've taught at 8 different universities, and I feel comfortable saying that most universities have excessive fat in the administrative areas. Not only are their salaries frequently out of line with faculty, but they are grossly inflated for the amount of work and type of work they perform. Since administration benefits from successful programs, they should also be held accountable when programs suffer.
- We combined departments and now we are uncombining and to create a new college. When does it stop?
- I am in favor of this option. We have employed this option previously and it worked. I believe it would again.
- This should be done in the streamlining process. It doesn't reduce the number of teachers and it returns chairs back to the classroom which would help cover courses.
- ANOTHER OPTION THAT SHOULD BE OFF THE TABLE. THE AMOUNT OF SAVINGS WOULD BE VERY LOW
- Would overload the department that it merges with. Some are taxed as is it and would just result in another person being hired eventually, always does. Looks good on paper but it will not last long. It's an accounting illusion.

-This decimates the integrity of both departments. All programs lose their sense of self when they are combined with similar programs.

REDUCE COURSE RELEASES FOR ADMINISTRATION AND RESEARCH-

- Eleven people endorsed this option in a time of budget cuts.
- NO. Who choose these options? It says administration but they don't teach so how are they going to participate.
- I support this move. There are faculty on 3/3 track who produce very little research but enjoy the benefits of a reduced work time.
- Not a good option if the administration expects faculty to maintain a research program
- This is an option if the university truly recognizes this and recognizes the reduction in research demand for tenure-track faculty when applicable.
- WILL ULTIMATELY HARM THE UNIVERSITY'S NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL STANDING SHOULD BE OFF THE TABLE
- How does this help, it doesn't affect salaries, they would be teaching instead of release time, the pay is the same either way
- Most acceptable of listing
- I'd rather do more work for the same money than get less money. My household budget can't take any more hits, and it's not as though I'm going to get a part time job to make up the difference. I suspect most folks are in that boat.
- What exactly does this mean? How many will be affected by this option? Could faculty go to a 4/3 schedule?
- I am in favor of this option. Put the teachers back into the classrooms.
- This is a good option because I favor freezing hiring administrators.
- If there's a reduction or loss of reassigned time for research, will the criteria for tenure and promotion change to reflect the increased time in class preparation and presentation?
- Not wise. This would lower research productivity and service functions
- Reducing course releases makes sense in times of economic problems. The problem is how to apply it in a just and fair manner. If a faculty member is working and dedicating extra time to administrative functions, teaching two courses instead of three seems fair. What it is not fair is the "merit" assigned to those administrative functions and services--as it seems to be happening now--for those functions were already compensated by teaching one course less than the other faculty members

TERMINATE LOW PRODUCING PROGRAMS -

- My first choice - should be done regardless if we have or do not have a budget crisis. The university cannot continue to support programs that are a drain on the rest of us. It is demoralizing to ask us to continue to support programs that are not producing students.
- I thought this decision was being made by THCB. It definitely should be done first.
- As long as a program generates a profit (even a small one) keep it, otherwise it needs to go

-Yes. A research project I am conducting with a departmental colleague investigates disseminating or dissolution of programs in the US. Though this investigation we have found literature based on the whole of a university. Low enrollment programs (who defines low enrollment?) are being examined and/or eliminated. This only makes good sense. Misplaced faculty can be reassigned or assisted to make other transitions.

-THIS OPTION SHOULD NOT BE ON THE TABLE. OF ALL THE OPTIONS, THIS ONE WOULD CREATE THE GREATEST HAVOC

-Least acceptable option

-When does this become a method to eliminate programs that have fallen out of favor with the administration?

-I would be in favor of this option. It would be difficult but it is better to cut low producing programs than to hinder ones that are growing.

-To some extent, programs ought to be expected to carry their own weight in as much as they should bring in enough revenue to sustain them and add to the revenue of the university. If not they should be dissolved.

- In whose opinion? The student's or administration's? I vote we get rid of _____, no one like it anyway, too fuzzy and no job options for its graduates.

DECREASE THE NUMBER OF TA APPOINTMENTS

-Of the options provided, eight people agreeing it should be considered for cutting.

-The graduate students do not receive enough money for us to bother worrying about this option.

- Irrelevant. No substantial savings.

- For departments with large numbers of TAs only

- Bad for the university as a whole. Decreases number of SHSU grad students and eventually lowers academic prowess of SHSU

- While the positions are good for graduate students to make money, they aren't necessary to many of the classes in which they are used. Of course, they are a necessity in some classes, meaning that they couldn't be eliminated all together, so it may not make much difference in the budget

- MANY TA APPOINTMENTS SHOULD BE THE FIRST TO SEE REDUCTIONS

- Our graduate programs are already at a competitive disadvantage in many cases regarding TA's, so any reduction either in number or stipend level would have severe consequences to our graduate programs. SHSU should make every effort at least to maintain the current level of TA support

-This one is a good idea. In my experience they don't really assist the faculty as much as they should and you can always use a mentorship course to take up some of this slack

-This is a very important component of graduate programs. Graduate students learn by assisting as teachers. I allow them to earn a small salary so it is helpful to both parties.

-We just started our graduate program so we do not have any TAs but we could use some.

REDUCE THE NUMBER OF COURSES AND SECTIONS OFFERED IN EACH DEPARTMENT

- NO, NO, NO. We cannot allow the students to bear the hardship of these cuts and if we start cutting classes and they can't graduate we will lose them to UH.
- This seems like a bad idea for so many reasons – we will lose our competitiveness, the changes to the core curriculum due and it will reduce our revenue stream.
- Only if there are an excessive number of sections offered now. AND only if the courses are not writing enhanced or performance based.
- In my department this would be an undesirable because we schedule classes sequentially to meet student graduation requirements.
- WOULD ADVERSELY IMPACT DEPARTMENTS WITH PERFORMANCE OR WRITING COURSES
- Again well and good for larger departments, but smaller ones cannot afford this, it will lead to them being merged or disappearing altogether
- Somewhat acceptable.
- Many of us are already at the bare minimum now. We have NO FLUFF to cut.
- Here again, reduces revenue to the university and makes the situation worse.
- When the students begin feeling the pain of these cuts they will complain to their parents who will in return complain to the politicians who will finally fix the problem of funding for education. As long as we protect the students we are missing our best leverage.
- We have done this already!
- Reduce the number of courses and sections offered in each department.
- Increase number of students per class but do not reduce the number of courses offered in areas where enrollment is low.
- Reduce the number of courses and sections offered in each department and get rid of the adjuncts to improve the quality of our degrees.
- Increasing the number of students in classes would not solve any problem. The number of students in a seminar-like class could be 50 or 100 without compromising any academic standard and without giving less to the students. In a language class the "ideal" number was said to be 15, but, realistically, most universities have language classes of 25-27. And the level and amount of work teaching (really TEACHING) a 25 student language class is much greater than a seminar class (upper levels) of 50-100.

FREEZE MOST NEW HIRING-

- Five people listed this as an acceptable option.
- NO. This could be disastrous to the campus.
- Isn't this already being done? We have four lines that we couldn't hire this year and we needed them but were told due to cuts we couldn't advertise.
- No, unless there are sufficient existing faculty to cover a vacant position. Tenured faculty on a 3/3 could go to a 3/4 to cover open positions.

- Freezing the # of faculty makes no sense from a business standpoint. You hire faculty based on the number of students. It's just formula. On the other hand, approving classes that have only a few people enrolled is equally senseless.
- This is already happening to some extent, and I guess it depends on what positions you freeze as to how much overall difference it will really make. It would only make a noticeable difference in really high paying positions. Which is better freezing high paying positions or stability for the people who are employed here? Shouldn't not include the infrastructure needed to keep things going.
- We need to freeze hiring administrators and get rid of the redundant positions and offices because this is where there is a huge waste of funds --the addition of a new college does not change the student experience. Dividing up the College of Arts and Sciences appears to be self-serving since anyone who watches the news knew that budget cuts were forthcoming.
- Place a hiring freeze on departments that are 'in the red.'
- We need to be careful not to decimate our programs by freezing essential faculty and staff.
- This is a given. Sounds like we can't pay everyone now.
- Freeze the hiring of administrators and staff positions. Faculty should be exempt from this because they are necessary to the mission of the university. This university has become top heavy .
- I am in favor of this IF the administration is the first place we freeze.
- This needs to be the VERY VERY last option. In this economy, cutting salaries or furloughing can spell disaster. At this time as much as ever before, employees need to believe we can rely on the administration to make the best decisions and keep our best interest at heart.
- This has happened de facto.
- I'd go with the freeze on most hiring, particularly all the new Vice -Presidents, Associate Vice-Presidents, and Assistant Vice-Presidents that seem to be materializing from somewhere.
- Freeze hiring (except for absolutely essential positions, which will vary from one department to the next), with an absolute guarantee from the administration that a frozen position will be restored to its department, once the economy improves.
- To compensate freeze all hiring, temporarily, everyone with exception of a Chairperson should teach 3 classes, regardless any special assignment. After all those activities have been compensated with different types of benefits and either salary or special travel stipends, etc.

DECREASE TRAVEL BUDGETS-

- Seven people agreed this was an acceptable option.
- This could be acceptable if the amount for tenure-track faculty is not negatively impacted.
- I don't think this is a good idea because we need to go to conferences to present our research if we have any hope of getting tenured.
- Don't cut - Equalize it, so each faculty member is ensured travel funds for at least one major conference per year. Local conferences may have to be covered as part of doing business as

an academic as in business. If the University is to support tenured faculty at an disproportionate level then tenure-track, SHSU will lose faculty.

- Travel isn't a necessity and is frequently abused as many cases could easily be sighted. I would think a big portion of this budget could be cut.
- NOT SEPARATE FROM O&M BUT NO RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE PLACED ON SPENDING OF O&M
- Needs to be cut again at the administrative level – how many faculty members travel internationally vs the number of administrators.
- Reduce travel to minimum. No departmental funds if grants are available
- This is a viable option that should be considered on an individual department basis.
- This one hurts my heart but may be a necessary evil. Opportunities to present research at on-line conferences are increasing rapidly and may flourish further in the lean economic times. The administration needs to recognize these outlets as respectable.
- The international travel bit may seem picky, because there are lot of good conferences that faculty attend abroad. I'd really not like to see legitimate travel curtailed, but there it is.
- Maintain travel commitments for untenured (that is, tenure-track) colleagues, but reduce travel for tenured faculty, especially for full profs.
- Curtail international travel for the short term, restoring it after we've weathered this particular storm.
- Decrease travel budget but make sure FES ranking for attending conferences, etc. will actually take into consideration this important factor.
- Travel has been reduced from \$1,000 in 1990s (some \$2000 in today's money) to \$850. We can go as low as \$800 to allow for ONE Conference attendance per year. Less than that would make it very unfair and discriminatory for those faculty members earning about \$50,000.

DECREASE O&M-

- Six people agreed this option should be considered as a place to cut.
- Must be temporary and must be done in a fair manner. The administration could do irrevocable damage to departments by cutting the budget severely.
- Definitely an option. I know of several places our department could cut back if necessary.
- Should be a standard percentage across the university. Each department can probably tighten its budget by 2-5% and not be significantly impacted.
- Cutting O&M is a viable option since operating costs are either rising or staying at comparable levels.
- This should not be across the board. Each department should be evaluated independently so that programming is not impaired.
- First, I don't believe cutting O&M is a viable option since operating costs are either rising or staying at comparable levels. However, travel isn't a necessity and is frequently abused
- Decrease operating budgets for all offices on campus, including administrative, academic, and support units.

- We may stop our program abroad, temporarily, and allocate the money of scholarship for O&M budgets.

REDUCE THE DEPARTMENTAL ALLOCATIONS OF DISTANCE LEARNING FEES –

- Five people agree this is a good idea at this time.
- Do we get any now? Honestly, I teach on-line sections and we get so little that it really wouldn't matter if they took all.
- Reduce? Why are we not receiving all the funds? We are doing the work while DELTA gets all the money.
- Acceptable choice if we get a majority of the funds. Right now the teaching department seems to be an after-thought in the food chain.
- Departments have earned these funds by developing on-line courses. What would help departments is to broaden the use of these funds from "direct" support of on-line to "departmental" support of on-line. This would free up some departmental funds and not force department to make frivolous purchases simply because they need to spend the money.
- Revisiting the process is a good idea, but simply reallocating funds using the same philosophy isn't going to be much help. In fact, it might perpetuate the problems
- Maybe, since we are so limited as to what we can actually spend that money on anyway
- Not sure how much is allocated to departments now because we do not do on-line courses.
- No. This money is used to offset cuts to O&M because you can use the money to buy equipment and travel.
- Personally, I don't think this university has a very good grip on the distribution of distance learning funds. Revisiting the process is a good idea, but simply reallocating funds using the same philosophy isn't going to be much help. In fact, it might perpetuate the problems.

FURLOUGHS –

- While many did not understand the concept of furloughs, this option ranked just above across the board cuts to salaries.
- Temporary fix but should be considered. Everyone including the president should be expected to participate.
- After closing the non-producing programs, this would be my second choice. It seems temporary because I know they are not going to cut the number of days we work.
- Not a good option
- A very undesirable option. Degenerates loyalty to SHSU
- A LAST RESORT
- Least acceptable option
- My 10th choice for cuts
- New term for developmental leave? What is the goal here?
- Who will be furloughed?

- Should be administrators because if a teacher is furloughed no one will be there to teach will upset the students.
- If this becomes a reality then the faculty must demand that the day be one they are actually in the classroom. I have friends at other institutions who have adopted this approach but the teachers must take the day off when they are not teaching so no one notices except the teacher who sees the reduction in their pay check. Faculty CAN NOT WORK FOR FREE.
- People who are furloughed should demand to have a reduction in the teaching, research and service scores necessary for tenure.

ACROSS THE BOARD SALARY REDUCTIONS—

- This ranked last among every person who responded.
- NO, NO, NO and NO. This will demoralize the younger faculty who make the least so they will leave.
- Are you kidding me? My salary is already lower than people I graduated with who teach at SFA and Texas State. The administration should be forced to take a larger cut than faculty.
- Not a good option. AND IF there are salary reductions they better be the same percentage for everyone this includes all administrators!
- Totally disagree since faculty and employees in lower salary brackets take the greatest hit. A higher percentage (reduction) should be taken from those who make higher salaries.
- Certainly a last resort possibility, but someone would need to develop a formula that didn't put the primary burden on the lower end faculty. They're the ones least capable of handling a cut anyway
- A LAST RESORT
- Some can't afford this and will the percentage of cuts be the same that they have based increases on in the past few years?
- Least acceptable option
- My last choice
- Freeze salaries; do NOT reduce salaries
- How is this affected by tenure and time in grade? How do we keep quality people and attract top-notch students if we are unwilling to pay faculty and staff. Could we freeze merit and market for a year or two instead?
- Could cause a decrease in research and therefore grants equals less revenue.
- This should be a last resort because it decreases morale and assumes we are willing to work for less.
- The administrators should lead the way.
- This should be the very last resort. If salary reductions become a necessity a sliding scale should be used so that highly paid administrators take larger reductions in salary than lower paid faculty. This is especially important for being able to retain bright, motivated young faculty who have not received tenure.
- If we MUST have pay cuts, then we should all take them including administrators. If absolutely necessary, summer school pay should be \$5000 per course per person no matter their rank.

- Not an option unless it is truly across the board.
- It should not be any salary reduction. Cost of living is getting so high (food and gas prices are going up every day)
- The across the board salary reductions sounds mathematically correct, but it is not. Even the increases done that way do not accommodate to the individual reality of cost of living. If a \$50,000 salaried professor has to pay \$4.00 for a gallon of gas, a \$100,000 salaried professor should pay \$8.00. And that still is an incorrect calculation, for the "necessities of life" are not in mathematical proportion. The reduction of salary should be similar to the way the IRS calculates paying taxes. Of course, the idea would be unpopular, but much closer to fairness.
- My suggestion is that chair stipends not be added to the base salary. A chair earns an extra 5K for heading a department; he/she should get the money, but it should not be awarded as merit as it currently is. The result is that their base salary goes up by that amount each year. So, a chair who serves 10 years, ups his/her salary by 50K. Then they go back to teaching and keep that base salary. Therein lies a problem with the summer pay situation, too. It's all related. Give them the stipend while they serve, but do not add it to their salary. That seems a fair compromise, especially since the admin wants to cut summer pay and continues to tell us that it's a perk, not part of our salaries. I also want to know what administration is doing to their own salaries in order to save money. If a summer pay cut is one the table, then some kind of percentage should be on the table for administrators as well. If we are all in this together then we should "all be in this together."

ALTERNATIVES:

- 1) Fire half the administrators. We have more than we need because they all have the same ideas so we only need a few.
- 2) Pay one amount per class for teaching in the summer or limit the number of summer courses a professor can teach to one.
- 3) Implement energy assessment across the campus.
- 4) Go to 4 day weeks with a skeleton administrative crew on Fridays.
- 5) I'd like to see the number of adjuncts drop.
- 6) Raise course fees.
- 7) Eliminate 1/3 of administrative assistants, etc, since they do not produce SCH's
- 8) Eliminate summer courses entirely. Skeleton crew on administrative functions.
- 9) Reduce paper usage across the campus. We use a LOT of paper.
- 10) Increase our on-line presence to generate more distance learning fees for the departments.
- 11) Implement college fees.
- 12) Stop the creation of the College of Arts and keep the College of Arts and Sciences
- 13) It's already been shown that 4 day work weeks are effective in reducing operating costs. Why it's not being considered must be either politics or foolishness.
- 14) Reduce the number of Associate and Assistant Vice-Presidents. Reduce administrative cost and salaries across the board.
- 15) Exploring new methods of information distribution, such as modified class meetings (hybrid of conventional and online), offering certification programs & re-evaluate the financial support to the various non academic groups and functions.

- 16) No mandatory retirements? There are a lot of people on campus, administrative and faculty, who could retire comfortably with a severance package to make it more attractive
- 17) Get rid of Banner and the new VP for Banner. So many new people have had to be hired to accommodate Banner, another reason to get rid of it. Notice all the new positions related to Finance, it's overwhelming
- 18) Less adjunct/pool. In some departments this is abused terribly b/c some professors just don't want to teach entry level
- 19) Streamline the administrative structure to eliminate waste and reduce the top-heavy management.
- 20) There is perhaps another area that Senate should investigate (and I do appreciate that what I am about to suggest appears probably self-serving...). The demographics of the University in terms of faculty, impressionistically at least (I have no data) is that there was significant recruitment in the seventies and early eighties. These people are senior and now high cost (like me!). Would it be to the short term advantage for the University to offer some sort of incentive for 'just-slightly-earlier-than-perhaps-planned-for-retirement'? Such a measure would protect some of the potentially and actually already highly productive "young turks" while helping those already thinking of (if not actually detailed planning for) retirement to shuffle out to pastures green a couple of years early. Clearly it would need to be a genuinely free choice issue (otherwise there would be issues of ageism) and it would need to address issues of money and health benefits.
- 21) Reducing overhead is just as effective as cutting programs when it comes to lowering the budget. If we pay less for lights, heating, air conditioning, etc., the result will be less spending. I see excessive waste everyday resulting from air conditioning blasting the temperature down into the 50 degree range, to lighting up much of the building for an entire weekend when there is no one around. How much fuel is wasted on the people cruising around in golf carts, making noise with leaf blowers, running the pumps that power the fountains and so on? Instead of cutting people, cut out the stupidity.
- 22) Of course a good portion of the problem with budgeting is the people who make the decisions. They have little or no real understanding of resource application. Decisions are often made from either subjective perspectives or lack of understanding. No one wants to enact a policy that will take anything from their own pocket or program.
- 23) On several trips to Dallas I have seen billboards and heard radio advertising for UNT. SHSU seems to be very reluctant to conduct such an advertising program. During Dr. Gibson's faculty luncheons last fall, we discussed how many students SHSU faculties can physically accommodate. She indicated 23,000 students would be the cap. With the UC student number increases and the encouragement for on-line course development, potential student enrollment can grow to perhaps 25,000 or more without the addition of new buildings except for those programs/departments which have continued high enrollment. Within FCS we are looking at ways to offer our design based courses on-line, following a national trend. SHSU's growth may occur outside bricks and mortar
- 24) Investing in existing or new programs that have future growth potential. Criminal Justice has done an excellent job of this and is widely known. Other programs don't have the numbers for

growth, but each could probably identify an additional new program for growth. In FCS we have considered the addition of a hospitality management program. We have the facilities, faculty and courses in place with the exception of a few courses to complete a curriculum. Because of SHSU's close location to Houston metro SHSU programs should be developed that take advantage of the 4th largest city in the US with offerings at the UC and Huntsville.

- 25) My personal suggestions that are not being considered. It's already been shown that 4 day work weeks are effective in reducing operating costs. Why it's not being considered must be either politics or foolishness.
- 26) Exploring new methods of information distribution, such as modified class meetings (hybrid of conventional and online), offering certification programs & re-evaluate the financial support to the various non academic groups and functions.
- 27) Of course a good portion of the problem with budgeting is the people who make the decisions. They have little or no real understanding of resource application. Decisions are often made from either subjective perspectives or lack of understanding. No one wants to enact a policy that will take anything from their own pocket or program.
- 28) Create a program to seriously reduce energy consumption on our campus.
- 29) Number one cut: no administrator or professor should earn more than 99,000. We are public servants, not corporate executives. I fully agree and support Governor Perry in this matter and agree with him that we must provide an affordable education to Texas students which we could do by invoking the 99,000 limit. If people don't like that, let them seek employment in corporate America.
- 30) Reduce the size of administration above the department level.
- 31) Get rid of the First year Experience! The students in the cohorts in my class HATE IT! They feel like the classes treat them as morons with no interest in anything but following the syllabus. They would have to prove they are successful with some real facts Not their pie in the sky "we're saving hundreds of thousands of students"
- 32) Stop adding new administrators. (3 comments)
- 33) Reduce the number of courses taught by adjuncts in favor of having these courses taught by regular faculty. The expectation is that this would reduce money spent on compensation for adjuncts.
- 34) Increase building temperatures in the summer to save on electricity.
- 35) Turn off every-other light fixture in hallways and other common areas to save electricity.
- 36) Not adding any new vice presidents at this time.
- 37) Save utility costs by closing buildings on Fridays and making MWF courses "hybrid" courses, with Friday being an online instructional day. This could be tried first with a subset of classes with maybe one or 2 buildings closed on Fridays, then expand across campus if it works well. Staff in those buildings could be switched to 10-hour/day M-Th schedules.
- 38) And finally.... Find a wealthy donor willing to give us lots of money.
- 39) Become adopted by a millionaire then have him leave us all of his money in his will (after he "mysteriously" passes away).
- 40) Hold a bake sale. (These three were added to make us all laugh because we need to)

**Ideas from 24 CoED faculty members
(Only ideas that were suggested by more than three people.)**

1. Thin administration/ Eliminate some administrative positions/ Reduce administrative salaries (11 suggestions)
2. Reduce/ Eliminate budgets for social events: dinners, receptions, and banquets. (7 suggestions)
3. Combine small departments into larger units to reduce administrative costs. (5 suggestions)
4. Eliminate or defer the new 6th college of mass communication (4 suggestions)

To: Senate Chair and Chair Elect

From: Senator Loeffler

Subject: Requested Faculty Comments

Date: 20 April 11

The following are comments related to the Deans' list of options which were presented as a response to Senate's resolutions standing in opposition to these same ideas when previously presented. Personally and professionally I find the exchange disingenuous and defocused in that it does not represent open and honest discourse. More meaningful information must be shared by the administration if they truly want faculty assistance in resolving this matter.

However, in response to your request, faculty have been contacted and comments have been compiled for consideration. Hopefully these efforts will provide some insight and offer guidance as the Deans approach their decisions. Considerate review will reveal that the general consensus is that all of these are exceptionally bad ideas that are not worthy of ranking. They are all tied for last place. None of these options are viable! We faculty stand opposed to budget cuts in budgets that support the academic mission of the university.

One could also surmise that faculty expectation is that the Deans should be defending their colleges and faculty. They should be petitioning the Provost to join them in fighting to not only preserve the academic side of the institution but to take this as an opportunity to infuse funds into academics. Strengthening the core mission of the university, while administrators at sister schools are foolishly accept the intellectually inferior path of "across the board cuts," can only make Sam Houston a better university after this crisis has passed.

Follows are various ideas and comments as you have requested.

The current items being discussed are:

1) Decrease O&M budgets

So, how about O&M? We don't use these funds frivolously. I suppose we could change the mode of shipping for various supplies and make sure that it is always ground (and not overnight), but that really doesn't save much money. It isn't a significant percentage of our budget. If we made a significant cut to O&M, we would probably first cut travel, and if the cut was very significant we would be forced to under stock our department. The cutting of travel funds would adversely impact tenure-track faculty and curtail their ability to present their research at regional, national and international meetings.

No more than 5 percent, but with ALL O&M budgets cutting, this will add up. I mean ALL. ALL means all of the CJ centers, all of the Deans, all of the student services, all of athletics, all of the finance and operations crew, all of the physical plant, all of the VP's and their assistants, associates, etc. etc. In other words, all.

Decreasing O&M budgets is a reasonable action if taken as X% across all administrative and instructional offices.

Attacking the O&M budgets might seem logical for the academic departments but my bet is that these dollar figures pale in contrast to those budgets in the non-academic departments. From my perspective other budgets should be zeroed before academic departments' O&M budgets are reduced.

2) Decrease Travel budgets

There isn't a separate travel budget—it is part of O&M. However, I can understand the politics of suggesting that it is separate.

No, travel budgets are insignificant except for the occasional and inexplicable trips to China or other overseas destinations by administrators for "recruiting" purposes. I would cut these trips out completely. I acknowledge that many of these trips are paid for by the host country as, much of faculty travel is covered by grant activity. However, travel "looks" bad, but it has minimal impact on the overall budget.

Decreasing Travel Budgets could be more readily handled on the instructional side by not compensating travel in which the instructional personnel does not actually present (paper or display) and a sliding scale of 50%-90% compensation based on the nature of the conference and the number of papers(&/or posters) to be presented. On the administrative side, limit travel to necessary training for institutional operations, and only required state meetings.

This seems like a nickel and dime issue designed either as a threat or a punishment. If administration thinks that travel is a perk or a privilege they should consider that the instructional work continues even when the faculty member is working off campus. Alternate assignments have to be prepared and they have to be graded. I'd much rather be lecturing than traveling; there is less work involved. Please throw me in that briar patch!!

3) Reduce summer compensation per course from 1/12 per 3-SCH course to some smaller fraction of nine month salary

What! Are you kidding? It is already twice the work at half the pay! Faculty work very hard to generate SCH for the school.

Please if summer is a problem, then close the ENTIRE University for three months. Furlough all 12-month employees that are above the skeleton crew need for admissions, registration and safety/security. Moth-ball the buildings, turn off power to most of the campus and set the thermostats at 80° to save energy costs.

Absolutely NOT. Not negotiable. Why is my time less valuable in the summer? It is in fact worth MORE. I am insulted by this suggestion.

Summer school issues might be very significant at the college level, but not at the departmental level—our summer offerings operate “in the black” and the only thing likely to be achieved by cutting summer pay is to make faculty less willing to teach the courses (which will lower our profit).

The actual work for the period of a summer class is far in excess of the same class over a normal semester, so summer classes are relatively under compensated already.

In regard to items 3 & 4: In our department, we have limited summer offerings, and we allow the sections to get as large as possible. It is relatively difficult to find individuals who are willing to teach the courses. If we reduce the compensation level specifically for summer courses, I suspect fewer courses would be offered, which would result in loss of revenue for the University.

I don't know for certain if this applies. But use of funds from federal grants require us to follow the FAR and NSF or NIH guidelines which restrict summer salary to that of corresponding university policies. This may further discourage faculty considering proposal preparation if they perceive that they will earn even less for the greater effort associated with external funding.

4) Decrease the number of summer courses offered but retain the same compensation level per course

If the instructional faculty were actually paid from the tuition generated by the summer classes, there would be no need to reserve faculty salary during the long terms. If necessary, this summer's tuition could be used to compensate next summer's instructional staff.

Look at the summer courses that have high enrollment, and offer them. If a course loses money, don't offer it.

Look at historical summer enrollment trends compared with salary obligations and actually budget for summer. Project the number of courses and reserve funds to invest in this revenue generating activity, summer teaching.

I've never understood why summer courses are viewed as especially expensive propositions. I think raising (and/or enforcing) the bar for how large a summer class needs to be to 'make' may be useful in preventing the expense of very small sections that some departments might be offering. I've never seen it in our department though, here or at my previous institution. I would sure think that cutting back summer offerings would lose the university money.

5) Freeze most hiring

We haven't hired anyone in the past two years.

Since most hiring on this campus has had little to do with the instructional mission of the University, freezing most hiring university-wide would not impede the mission of the university.

Yes. This is how budget crunches work in the real world. Our department has had the enrollment for another faculty member for several years, but we haven't hired one because of the budget. If someone retires, you keep the position on the books, but you don't fill it in this biennium. Handle exceptions on a case-by-case basis using your best judgment.

Item 5: what hiring?

It might be very significant to have a hiring freeze for the entire college, but it has no impact on most departmental budgets.

6) Reduce the number of courses and sections offered in each department

This is an ambiguous choice, because it is not very clear. If it refers to the number of courses taught each semester, then fewer but larger sections would be more cost efficient. But the need to ensure that the students have the courses available to pursue and complete their degree plans is paramount. Reducing the course inventory for a department is equivalent to reducing the potential benefit to the students.

In regard to item 6, similarly to summer school, in the long semesters, because of room limitations, we generally have reduced the number of courses and sections offered. To reduce it further either means that we forego the income provided by students paying tuition, or we have faculty teaching less than a full load (but for full pay).

Yes, if this means combining three sections of 20 students into two sections of 30 and hiring one less adjunct in high-volume, core courses only.

With various other “tweaking” of loads, class sizes and such, the only savings would come if we cut enough to do away with one of our adjunct positions (the positions that actually generate the largest profit margin). These positions may be responsible for the instruction of 300+ students per semester. Not a good thing to cut—the loss of revenue would exceed the salary “saved”.

This means increasing faculty productivity through larger classes, more frequent use of Scantron exams, less frequent one-on-one mentoring, and reducing the onerous burden of written discussion questions that assess students' abilities to evaluate, critique, defend and justify (those higher order thinking skills.) This will help with enrollment and retention as the sophomore traits of identifying, listing and recognizing (characteristics readily evaluated by multiple choice tests) will be all that's needed for our BS-minimi. Yet another great contribution to our strategic plan!

This can work but do some planning here also. We all know that class enrollment decreases early in the semester so plan for an overage, over subscribe the room, so that we fill the seats just like the airlines fill their planes. Allow the departments to administratively drop the no-shows and disinterested. Pack the rooms with the interested and those committed to the course.

7) Furloughs

Not unless they begin with non-teaching personnel first. Student Services and all overhead-supported offices are on the table too as the first individuals to be considered for furloughs. Faculty, as revenue-generating individuals, should be last.

Furloughs are the appointed fat-cat cheap way to pad their position by the imposed sacrifice of underlings.

In regard to 7 & 8, they amount to the same thing. One impacts students, but the other doesn't.

The largest portion of the budget is spent on salaries, so the biggest obvious target is to lower salaries. If one considers "furloughs", I think the general idea is "unpaid vacation"—no pay, no work. For instructors, this either reduces the number of days of instruction (or the days for preparation and grading) or the days are taken from our holiday breaks. The former is a big problem. If it is the latter, this is no different from an across the board salary reduction.

If we suggesting offering hybrid courses with on-line work to make up for the coordinating board's required 45 semester hours, then who is going to manage the distance ed. component during this furlough period? Are you suggesting assigning "coaches" and under-credentialed, cheaper assistants to each faculty member for this part? Why would they manage this in an uncompensated manner? Are we going to a non-traditional model for the U.? Where is the savings?

This is the same as reducing faculty compensation. A bad idea is we want to continue addressing our strategic objectives. The university will not function without the faculty. Administrators and faculty as well as staff must be partners, not opponents.

8) Across the board salary reductions

I ask the administration to make their decisions on the principle that budget burdens must be shared. If Academic Affairs makes cuts, then the Finance Side makes cuts, too. Student Services makes cuts; Athletics makes cuts. If faculty and departments make cuts, then administration, from chairs all the way to the President, makes cuts too.

Only if the across the board goes all the way up the chain to highest compensated administrator.

No. But if it gets to this, the cuts should be across the WHOLE board from the Janitors to the President. If it is EVERY employee, then 1% would add up to a huge sum of money.

If we are discussing faculty salary reductions because the state's faculty salary funding is deficient, then consider ways to increase funds for faculty salaries. Does "state law" say that faculty salaries can not be supplemented from other sources? I don't think so. Transfer money into this part of the budget. Why not use the faculty salary budget more efficiently, such as not paying administrators (like chairs, assistant deans, associate whatevers) out of this budget but out of academic support funds.

No, just start zeroing the salaries of individuals who are not generating SCH. That will reduce the university salary commitments well enough to avoid an "across the board" approach.

9) Reduce course releases for administration and research

Actually this is reassigned time rather than released time but we get the dean's point. Good idea. I would include eliminating releases for student service and support service personnel too. No one holding a masters degree and above should be employed at the university without SCH-generating duties. Find persons on campus who are simply overhead, cost centers and make them generate support for themselves and the university as a whole.

This would be tough, but fair if all faculty went to 12 hour loads, but I would require ALL credentialed members of the university to teach one course in their discipline including the President. This would reduce the need for lecturers and adjuncts, too. There must be a reduction in the expectation of research and service productivity if the faculty all went to 12 hour loads.

Yes.

In regard to item 9. Interesting that it is the opposite to 6—how can both lead to savings? For our department, the chair has been teaching an unpaid overload for the past 4 years, so there is no savings there. For research, that means that we would increase the load on those seeking tenure. This is counterproductive over the long range. In the short range, it doesn't really impact our budgets, so there is no savings.

Don't offer release from instructional duties for administrative assignments. Pay for the instructional percent out of faculty salary budgets and the administrative fraction of the workload out of administrative or instructional support funding.

10) Reduce departmental allocations of distance learning fee distributions

IMHO, this is an exacerbation of the already time-intensive, distance-learning environment.

I have no idea what this is, so I cannot speak to it. Is this a cash cow for some departments?

We don't receive any distance learning fees, so it has no impact on us.

What does this mean? Isn't the distance learning fee predominately distributed to VP Angrove and company? Why not increase the departmental allocation?

11) Decrease the number of TA appointments

It is also worth noting that some options, like cutting back TA positions which would harm the graduate programs, don't appear to hurt undergraduate education but really do. When we had our departmental external review before I left my previous university, we were surprised how emphatic our undergraduates were to the external reviewers that our graduate research was a major part of their decision to do their undergraduate work there - this was true even for students not planning research careers.

Absolutely not! The cost effectiveness of many of our programs depend upon the TA's who assist with laboratory contact hours for about 1/3 to 1/4 of the cost of a faculty member or adjunct.

If we reduce TA appointments, we gut our graduate programs—an extremely bad choice for us. Also, TA's are among the cheaper appointments, so for programs where graduate TAs are instructors of record, they save the University money.

Does not really address the issue because in lab intensive areas hourly people would still be necessary and the overall effect would probably be a near sum-zero total. If faculty must in lab teach without a TA then this measure would have an enormous cost increase associated.

Killing the TA appointments will kill the graduate programs and kill our newly attained status as a Carnegie Doctoral University! It will also kill our masters-level graduate programs, our research groups, etc. and allow us to go back to the 12-12 appointments of SHSTC. This will help encourage all of those expensive faculty who received market adjustments (presumably so we could keep them here) to seek employment at "real" universities. The cheaper, non-marketworthy faculty might stay and we can hire more \$1800/course adjuncts. Great savings!

Teaching assistants are exceedingly efficient revenue generating centers. This would be counter productive.

12) Terminate low producing programs

Do we have any such programs? Would we be looking for the lowest producing program and cutting it first? Then the second lowest producing program gets cut second? I am hugely opposed to this approach. If the University feels that some programs should no longer be a part of the curriculum, then it should cut those programs—but not just to save money. If we are going to cut programs to save money, rather than just considering “low completion” we should also factor in the cost of program/credit hour. I still think this is ill advised.

Define low producing first, then let's talk. Some disciplines are, by their nature, going to have few majors because of the needed talent, discipline, work-ethic, or some combination thereof. These areas will have proportionally few majors even on very good university campuses.

How much do low producing programs actually cost? Take a look at the placement of the graduates of those programs. If their graduates languish after graduating, then cut the program. Along a similar line of reasoning, can we cut whole athletic teams that do not make at least 50% win-loss performance (not just hire a new coach, but cut the whole team)? That is what cutting a program is like, but if a program really is superfluous, then cut it. Our department's graduates do quite well when they graduate because the program is traditional and it has high standards.

What do you mean? Are the nonproductive programs ones like the many counter productive centers (writing center, math center, counseling center and advising center) that do the student's work, coddle them and distract them from the tasks associated with becoming mature adult learners? If so, then you are "right on." These are non-producing programs. Cut them.

13) Combine small departments into larger units to reduce administrative costs

NO way should we combine academic departments. I lived through this at another university. It caused a terrible rift between faculty and administration. A few years before I arrived, 80% of the faculty voted to get rid of the President who combined departments while renovating the president's mansion. Our department was the "Mathematics, Physical Sciences, Engineering Technology, Fire Safety and Protection Department". I am not kidding. It was a complete embarrassment. It eliminated our ability to recruit faculty. **DID YOU HEAR WHAT I JUST SAID? IT ELIMINATED OUR ABILITY TO RECRUIT FACULTY.** Aside from what the public is beginning to think, and what Rick Perry apparently thinks, the faculty (not the students) are the life blood of the university. When you loose the ability to recruit the best faculty, you are left with hiring faculty **WHO HAVE NO OTHER EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS.** They are the worst of the worst, or the greenest of the green. The students pick up on this the first week of school when they get a whiff of incompetence. The best students leave after the first semester to "go to a better school", and the faculty who can, leave as soon as they can for the same reason. That is exactly why I left that school.

There is an idea, except let's recombine colleges to really reduce the administrative requirements. Perhaps we could combine the colleges of Science, Fine Arts and Whatever, as well as Humanities and Social Sciences into one characteristic of institutions that value the Liberal Arts, a College of Arts and Sciences. We could also combine Criminal Justice, Business and Education into the College of Applied Letters and Career Training.

In regard to 13, it might make some sense not just at the departmental level, but also at the college level. This wasn't the best time to split off a college of liberal and performing arts. However, the savings at the departmental level are small. The "chair" stipend is \$1,800 on a 9 month basis for the smallest departments (Category A). The second smallest departments (Category B) has a stipend of \$2,700. As an example, consider the savings if physics were combined with geography and geology. The avg FTE (the basis for chair stipends) for physics is 10.63 and for geography and geology is 14.16. Combing them gives 24.79, which moves them up to Category C, with a stipend of \$3,600—a saving of \$900! It is unlikely that staff could be reduced (since it would double the workload of the remaining staff).

14) Items and general comments added by faculty

Some of these suggested "cuts" do not yield any savings (and, in some cases, add to the problem).

Eliminate the two tier faculty and go back to 12 hr course-load FTE's. In most disciplines, the extra course (non-writing enhanced) will not be an extravagant burden if it is an additional section of a course already being handled.

Redo classrooms such that all classes can have 50 or more students and only classes required for majors or graduating seniors may have less than twenty enrolled.

If this is a budget issue because of reduced E&G funding why not think about ways to increase the inflow of funds? Note that for the faculty, most externally generated funding is subject to an indirect cost (IDC) surcharge. It used to be 78% of salaries, wages and fringe benefits that were taken away, meaning for \$178,000 in external funds, \$78,000 were "recovered" as IDC and according to university policy, 50% of this went into the general E&G funds. Why not place an IDC surcharge on ALL externally generated funds, such as athletic tickets sold as our teams entertain the local folk. I don't know if student services collects money from outside sources, but why not them too? If the academic community supports E&G through their external funding efforts, then why not all of us?

Bar access to facebook and other social networks. Student addiction to these sites is preventing students who need legitimate study related network access from utilizing their fee paid for computer use.

If one wants to combine units and save face, then combine some of the many Vice President offices and eliminate a dozen or so assistants/associate/apprentice VP positions. All of these employees are academically credentialed, and they can go back into the classroom on 12 hour, 9 month appointments. This will save 25% of those FTE line items, and will solve many of the attrition rehire problems as well as reduce adjunct expenses.

I have never been a "we vs. they" employee. Administrators and faculty have unique and important roles. Athletics and student services also have their place. But if the cuts only come out of the faculty piece of the pie, then the line was drawn by the administration, and it will be up to them to defend their decisions. They will have poisoned the well that supplies us all. It will take a long time for the water to sweeten, and I pray that they have the sense to recognize this fact.

I fundamentally disagree that "higher education is governed for the comfort of tenured faculty, and administration should take action to change that so that the needs of students, taxpayers, and employers take center stage." It is obvious from my many years in Higher Education that the governing principle is the entertainment and comfort of the student. Examples include the Health and Kinesiology Center, the Lowman Student Center, the Sam Center, the Reading Center, the Writing Center, the Math Center, the Financial Literacy Center, the Student Government Association, the Dean of Students, the Vice President of Student Services, the formal and informal Recreational Services, and on and on. Is there a Faculty Center? Is there a Faculty Club on campus? Is there a Faculty Reading Room? Is there ANY service, privilege, perk, or package that is expressly for the "comfort of the tenured faculty"? No. Am I lobbying for faculty perks? No. They are a waste of money. I am merely pointing out the absurdity of the claim that we have built a comfy country club on the backs of the students and taxpayers.

Why are the faculty the principal targets of the proposed budget cuts?

My main input is that the damage should be spread over as many of those categories as possible so that no individual item has to take too devastating a hit.

The University has been divided into three parts: instruction and academics, administration and management, as well as, the "four-year-summer-camp" component. Only one addresses the principal mission of the University. In my decades on this campus I have seen the laugh-n-play component severely impede the progress of the majority of our kids who don't even know that they should be students who study, who spend 60 hours a week investing in their futures and not every waking moment involved in the distractions provided by "student disservices." The number of kids burdened with their part-time jobs disguised as "athletic scholarships" has resulted in a bloated faction of the campus that is singularly self-serving. The top-heavy growth in administration here at SHSU has been unbelievable. If our mission is education, then find the cuts elsewhere. If our mission is to have the most enjoyable and entertaining " four-year summer camp" directed by a gaggle of VPs then cut away at the heart of what used to be the university, the faculty who serve the needs of the students and invest in their futures.