

## Shared Governance Proposal

**Any constituent (individual or group) may submit a proposal into the shared governance process. In order to be considered, each proposal must contain the following and be directed to the Chairperson of the Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC).**

- I. **Date:** 9-25-19
  
- II. **Sponsoring Constituent:** Shared Governance Academic Budget Committee and Faculty Equity Task Force 2018-2019
  
- III. **Statement of the Issue:** (This should be in a format appropriate for submission to the ASU campus community): The A-State Academic Budget Committee was combined with the Faculty Equity Task Force in the fall semester of 2018 by the Provost and charged with examining the current Equity Salary Review policy and procedure outlined in the current A-State Faculty Handbook of Policies and Procedures. The current *Equity Salary Review* policy and procedure was deemed problematic in terms of the process and formula. The committee and task force were charged with making specific recommendations to address the above concerns and submit them for review through the A-State Shared Governance Process. The Shared Governance Academic Budget Committee 2018-2019 consisted of: Dr. John D. Hall, Chairperson, Psychology and Counseling; Kathy Hicks, Director of Budget and Planning (non-voting); Dr. Lynita Cooksey, Provost 2018-2019 (Ex-officio non-voting); Dr. Alan Utter, Provost 2019-2020 (Ex-officio non-voting); Dr. Xiankui Hu, Finance; Dr. Kris Biondolillo, Chair, Psychology and Counseling; Dr. Mary Jane Bradley, Dean College of Education and Behavioral Sciences ; Dr. Marika Kyriakos, Chair of Music; Dr. Susan Hanrahan, Dean College of Nursing and Health Professions; and Thomas Hamaker, Student Government Association. The Faculty Equity Task Force 2018-2019 appointed by the Provost consisted of the following members: Dr. David Newman, Animal Science Dr. Matt Hill, Finance; Dr. Paul Mixon, Electrical Engineering; Dr. Cherisse R. Jones-Branch, History; William Rowe, Art; Dr. Suzanne Melescue, Mathematics; Dr. Ron Johnson, Biology; Dr. Sarah Davidson, Nursing; Dr. Hai Jiang, Computer Science. The Academic Budget Committee and Faculty Equity Task Force by a vote of 13-0-1 recommended in favor of striking all of the current language on page 124 of the A-State Faculty Handbook of Policies and Procedures under the subheading *V.M. Equity Salary Review* as follows: ~~Salary inequity is defined as differences in salaries that are unjustified by qualifications, assigned responsibilities, or market forces. Qualifications include academic credentials, professional rank, service to the university and to academe, and meritorious performance. Market forces are reflected in the prevailing salary level among the various disciplines for equally qualified faculty within and external to the university. Faculty members who believe their salary may not be equitable, who have a minimum three-year merit history with the university, may request in writing an equity salary review. Faculty members should supply supporting documentation of the alleged inequity. An alleged salary inequity is first considered by the department promotion,~~

retention, and tenure (PRT) committee. The process may be initiated by the affected individual, by the chair of the department, or by the PRT Committee. The committee will forward its recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will make an independent evaluation and forward both recommendations to the dean. The dean, in turn, will make an independent evaluation and recommendation and recommend to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research whether or not the equity formula should be run. See Appendix B for equity adjustment formula. The outcome of the equity review will be communicated by the dean in writing to the faculty member, including the results of the equity formula if it is applied. If an equity adjust can be justified, but funds are not available for total adjustment in a budget the university will attempt to address at least a percentage of the inequity each year until it is eliminated.

The committee and task force recommend replaced the above text with the following highlighted text:

Salary inequity is defined as differences in salaries that are unjustified by qualifications, assigned responsibilities, or academic market forces. Qualifications include academic credentials, professional rank, service to the university and to academe, and meritorious performance. Academic market forces are reflected in the prevailing salary level among the various disciplines for equally qualified faculty within and external to the university. Faculty members who hold the academic rank of instructor with a minimum of five years of consecutive reappointments and annual evaluation history with the university who believe their salary may not be equitable are eligible for an Equity Salary Review and may request in writing an Equity Salary Review. Similarly, faculty members who hold the academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who believe their salary may not be equitable, who have a minimum three-year annual evaluation history with the university are eligible for an Equity Salary Review and may request in writing an Equity Salary Review. Faculty members must supply supporting documentation of the alleged inequity, which includes completing the *Request for Faculty Equity Review Form* available on the A-State Academic Affairs and Research webpage. This form and if desired an attached letter should describe the alleged salary inequity based on the salary and or salaries of similarly situated full-time teaching faculty (e.g., years of service, rank, etc.) in the program, department, or college referencing the current A-State budget. Applicants should provide productivity and/or merit reports from the three most recent academic years. A faculty member may request access to current College and University Professional (\*CUPA) data within their discipline for their code from the Office of Institutional Research. An alleged salary inequity is first considered by the department Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee. The committee will forward its recommendation as to the perceived inequity to the department chair. The department chair will make an independent evaluation and forward both recommendations to the college dean. An independent evaluation/recommendation is then made to the college dean and directed to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research for final consideration. Should the need exist to conduct the equity analysis; it will be completed through the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research. A minimum of 78% or higher of CUPA data based on available funds is the metric for analysis. The outcome of the equity review will be communicated by the dean in writing to the faculty member including the recommended adjustment. If an equity adjustment can be justified, but funds are not available for total adjustment in a budget year the university will attempt to address at least a percentage of the inequity each year until it is eliminated with the goal of completing or eliminating the inequity

within two years. Following the awarding of equity, a faculty member must wait a minimum of three academic years to request another equity review. Likewise, upon receiving promotion from associate professor to professor a faculty member must also wait a minimum of three academic years to request another equity review.

\*Note: "The *Faculty in Higher Education Survey* collects data from approximately 850 higher education institutions regarding nearly 260,000 full-time faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track), as well as academic department heads and adjunct (pay-per-course) faculty. Data collected for full-time faculty include: salary, supplemental salary and course relief (for department heads), discipline (by IPEDS CIP Code), rank, highest degree attained, gender, race/ethnicity, age, and years in rank." Retrieved 7/26/2019 from <https://www.cupahr.org/surveys/results/faculty-in-higher-education/>

#### Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Codes

A Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code is assigned to each faculty member upon their initial university employment through consultation with the dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research. A faculty member who later elects to request a change in their CIP code must provide written evidence to the PRT Committee supporting the proposed change. The committee will review the CIP code change request and forward its recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will make an independent evaluation and forward both recommendations to the dean. The dean, in turn, will make an independent evaluation and recommendation and recommend to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Research whether or not the requested change should be made. The outcome of the change in CIP code request will be communicated by the dean in writing to the faculty member.

- IV. **Rational for Proposal:** (Please include if this is a new or a modification of an existing policy or procedure): This is a modification of an existing policy or procedure in the current A-State Faculty Handbook on page 124 *Faculty Equity Review*.
  
- V. **Type of review (i.e., expedited, full, or extended):** Full review.