Faculty Senate Meeting  
November 7, 2007  
Call to Order 3:05  
  
Attending: Arts and Sciences: Kenneth Dorris, Mike Matthis, Steven Zani, Mary Kelley, Kyehong Kang, MaryE Wilkinson, Sheila Smith, Rose Harding, Jeremy Shelton, Ray Robertson, Dianna Rivers, Emma Hawkins, Terri Davis, Randall Terry, Hikyoo Koh, George Irwin, Chris Bridges, Kenneth Rivers Business: Alicen Flosi, Soumava Bandyopadhyay, Jai Youn Choi, George Kenyon, Celia Varick Education and Human Development: Elvis Arterbury, Fara Goulas, Joel Barton, Kim Wallet-Chalambaga, Lula Henry, Barbara Hernandez, Jane Irons Engineering: Che-Jen “Jerry” Lin, Mien Jao, Malur Srinivasan Fine Arts and Communication: Kurt Gilman, Ann Matlock, Nicki Michalski, Zanthia Smith, Monica Harn, Randall Wheatley, Sumalai Maroonroge, Library: Sarah Tusa, Jon Tritsch Developmental Studies: Umporn Tosirisuk Lamar State College Port Arthur: Mavis Triebel  
  
Absent: Arts and Sciences: Lloyd Daigrepont, David Castle, Nancy Blume, Don Owen, Chung-Lhih Li Engineering: John Gossage, Selahattin Sayil, Brian Craig, Paul Corder Fine Arts and Communication: Kurt Dyrhaug  
  
  
Larry Acker, Director of Public Relations  
o In March LU embarked on new branding campaign.  
o This involves an online graphic manual. It is attached to the LU website. It allows you to download the logos.  
o It tells you how to use and not use them. There are very specific rules about size, color, font, etc.   
o It is at www.lamar.edu/identity This will show you the institutional logo (the star) and the athletic logo (Big Red). It will tell you about PMS colors, etc.  
o We do this because we want Lamar to be easily identifiable to not only people on campus, but everywhere.   
o We want everyone to be on the same page and do the same things.  
o Anything that is going to be printed and sent out to the public now has to be sent through the PR office for review.  
o We no longer allow “Lamar is number 1” because there are 4 Lamars in the area. We no longer allow “Cardinals are number 1” because there are so many cardinal logos.  
o If you have questions or want to be walked through the process, please call or email.  
  
Donna Birdwell, Director of Lamar Honors Program  
o The Honors Program, with the support of the Honors Council, has made the proposal that we become the Honors College.  
o We are at 2.7% of undergraduate enrollment at Lamar. We are doing well with recruitment, enrollment, graduation.  
o We are not about only taking in the cream of the students and isolating them and watching them succeed. We provide a set of resources to increase their success even further. We do not isolate, we facilitate their interaction with others.  
o The undergraduate research, the honors thesis, the service in which they partake, help these students to get into med schools, etc.  
o 100% of schools that transition to an honors college say that it leads to recruitment of stronger students.   
o We already hit all of the criteria set by the NCHC for a fully developed honors program and we already do most of them for a fully developed honors college. There are three we do not meet and they are optional.  
o The head of the honors college should be a Dean, but many of them are actually directors.   
o The honors college should be an equal unit within a multi-college university. This is not realistic. It should be a respected unit, but it is not the same as a degree granting college.  
  
o We are not proposing any increased staff as a direct result of this change. We have a director, an assistant director and an administrative assistant. We have been requesting an advisor. We will need to add some faculty lines because of the number of students. We need another section of honors chemistry and will need another in philosophy.  
o Changing to a college will alleviate some administrative difficulties. We are currently basically a free floating department without a college. That causes confusion with paperwork. It would also make sure that Honors is in the loop. We often miss information that is sent to Deans for distribution.  
o I do not think it would dramatically change the student experience in the short term.  
o There is not a formal way that the director is required to write recommendations and reviews for faculty. This change would facilitate better acknowledgement by the director/dean of those faculty who work with the honors program.  
o I feel that this would help clear up the responsibilities and obligations of the incoming Honors Director for next year.  
o We do compensate faculty for working with the honors program.  
o We have an endowment that funds our scholarships, receptions, etc.   
o We are here primarily for the freshmen and sophomores. We expect and want the students to be fully engaged in their departments and majors by the junior year.  
o If you have any questions, please contact me.  
  
Mark Asteris, Report on Academic Computing Survey  
o Last spring, the distance ed committee suggested that it might be best if we moved Web CT to distance ed. The steering committee said they wanted to find out about academic technology in general before this decision.  
o We conducted a study of schools that may or may not have a center of academic computing.  
o Lamar is a bit behind the curve. Here academic computing was Web CT, and that’s it.  
o There is usually some design group, web ct, faculty training, etc. There is a large variety of services provided.  
o There have been surveys done in Mississippi State and the California systems about what faculty want and need. These surveys were used to create our survey.  
o 70% of our faculty feel comfortable or very comfortable with technology.  
o The survey response to “Suggest creative use of media to encourage students to use technology” was 70%  
o 55% said that having a single point of contact was essential. This comes up over and over again in all of the surveys examined.  
o Faculty training, development and time pop up in several of these questions. This is what people are interested in.  
o Web development, tech development in the classroom and email are high priorities.  
o Incorporating materials and learning multimedia are the top of the list in needs.  
o VCR, video projectors and wireless are the most requested items in the classroom.  
o Faculty need to have a reasonable expectation that if they walk into a classroom, the technology will work, the items will be uniform across campus, and they should be able to use it without a problem. It is not acceptable for faculty to have to haul equipment around to be sure they have working equipment.  
o Most of these services are on campus already but they are all over campus. If we could pull it all together, even with just a dotted line organization, it would make things work more smoothly. This sort of decision will have to come from the execs. The decisions about buying uniform equipment will also have to come from them.  
o We can get printed copies of the survey results to you next time. It will also be available on the web.  
  
Corrections to the minutes: Dr. Simmons asked for some grammatical changes in his report.  
  
Motion to accept the minutes was presented by Dianna Rivers, seconded by Sarah Tusa.  
  
President’s Report: Kurt Gilman  
• Assoc. Provost position—update: now separate from faculty development  
• Calendar to meet THECB—Required 2250 Contact Minutes for a 3 Semester Hour Course (handout)  
• Email/IT services, etc.: IT Tech. Services Reorganization; Michael Dobe will address the Senate at a future meeting   
• Summary of Core Curriculum Assessment Recommendations  
• Peer Review of Assessment of Department Plans and Reports: pilot with Thinktank; all online; Senate will be involved!  
• Promotion & Tenure Forms: Doblin revised; Lula Henry report  
• Reminders: Dist. Fac. Lecture: Mon. 11/12, 7 :30, Lee Thompson  
  
Nicki Michalski, Update on the Texas Council of Faculty Senates Meeting  
♣ The TSUS members met with Chancellor Matthews in the morning on Friday.  
o He discussed how new regents are trained and the three new regents.  
o He explained the alumni program he hopes to start. It would be a network of members from each of the TSUS schools that would contact alumni from their individual schools and request that they contact their legislators on behalf of certain higher education initiatives.  
o He was the primary force behind the new incentive program. It is based on a business model that rewards the achievement of certain goals. For instance, if your program increases graduates, it will receive money. If recruitment in certain programs goes up, it will receive incentivized money.  
o Angelo State did leave the TSUS system and join the Tech system. Chancellor Matthews believes this will be a mistake for them in the long run.  
o Catherine Parsonault, of the higher education coordinating board, gave a presentation.  
o There is a new set of standards she would like faculty to review and comment on. It is the higher education readiness standards. We have received a hotlink to the site in my.lamar.  
o Each school has the right in the final portion of the 6 drop rule to identify what it deems “acceptable” reasons for students to exceed 6 drops. The administration is responsible for making those decisions and publishing them.  
o Schools are required to have a plan in place for dealing with the IRS ruling about the 12 month pay cycle by January 1, 2008. As of October 18, our human resources office did not have a plan in place.  
o The AAUP gave a presentation about the increasing use of “contingent” faculty.   
o During the round up reports, it was obvious that we at Lamar share a much better relationship with our current administration than many other schools.  
  
Academic Issues: Jeremy Shelton  
o We are going to wait until the beginning of spring semester to survey the students about online evaluations.  
  
Faculty Issues: Lula Henry  
o Joann Baker is the nominee for the Piper Award  
o We are still reviewing Dr Doblin’s handbook revisions.  
o We are looking at the tenure and promotion paperwork and how to most effectively cut and paste them.  
o We are investigating whether department chairs should serve on committees.  
o We are meeting next Wednesday at 3:00.  
  
Budget and Compensation: Ann Matlock  
o The budget and compensation committee met on October 10, 2007. We elected a new vice chair for the committee, Barbara Hernandez. David Castle, our outgoing vice chair, will remain on the committee, so we will continue to have the benefit of his excellent analysis and perspective.  
o The committee began work on the study that we do every year of faculty salaries. The spreadsheets and equity information were distributed to committee members for analysis. We will put our studies together and prepare our report for the Faculty Senate during our meeting next week. We plan to distribute the report on our study at the December 5, 2007 meeting of the faculty senate.  
o The budget and compensation committee will meet next Wednesday, November 14, at 3:00 p.m. in conference room 204 of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building.  
  
Development and Research: Kurt Gilman for John Gossage  
o There are 10 applicants which is a significant increase.  
o The applications will be distributed next week.  
  
Distinguished Faculty Lecture: Fara Goulas  
o The lecture is next week, 7:30 by Dr. Lee Thompson.  
o This is sponsored by Faculty Senate, so please promote and attend this event.  
  
Old Business  
o The academic calendar was already discussed in the president’s report.  
  
New Business  
o The report for the Faculty Salary Equity Committee is published for review.  
o This committee was started at the request of faculty senate.  
o Most of the numbers work was done by Dave Castle.  
o The senate thought there needed to be a regular review. This is the 3rd year review.  
o The good news is that equity has really worked. The process has pulled us up equal and even sometimes slightly ahead of our peer institutions.  
o Please share this report with your colleagues.  
o What we are currently looking at is salary inversion and compression.  
o We will be looking at this information by discipline in the future.  
o Howell Lynch is the new chair.  
o The committee is also looking at a procedure for examining individual cases as necessary.   
  
o Thank you for your patience during long meetings. I know the presentations take up a significant amount of time. I try to limit them to ten minutes, but some continue to exceed the time suggested. Since we have opened up to administrators, many are afraid to take action without the approval of the faculty senate. A suggestion is made that if we are given the information in advance it might speed up the actual presentations in the future.  
  
Open Discussion and Comments  
o From pg 69 in the 06-08 catalog, Lamar University will accept the completed core curriculum from another university if it is marked on the student’s transcript. Some faculty members were not aware of this provision. Lamar cannot change this. Advisors need to be aware that the completed core must be accepted.  
o Please check out and comment on the College Readiness Standards.   
  
Movement to Adjourn: MaryE Wilkerson, seconded by Rose Harding.  
  
  
Appendix A  
  
PROPOSAL:  
The Honors College  
Of Lamar University  
To Be or Not…  
• UCC – Addresses the curricular and general academic implications of the move from Honors Program to Honors College.   
• Faculty Senate – Reviews the implications for faculty.   
• Administration – Reviews the structural, budgetary, academic, recruitment and student life implications of transforming Honors Program into Honors College.   
WHY an Honors College?  
• Subjective perception – Which ranks higher, an Honors Program or an Honors College?   
• What is the difference? (Sederberg 2002, 2003)  
– Honors Colleges are generally found at comprehensive universities, while Honors Programs are more characteristic of four-year colleges and community colleges.   
– Honors Colleges tend to be larger than Honors Programs...   
– An Honors College tends to be more solidly institutionalized within its University's structure.   
– Honors entities with their own courses and their own faculty tend to be Honors Colleges.   
WHY an Honors College?  
• When asked why their institution established an Honors College, a 1993 NCHC survey found the following responses:   
– 100%: Recruit stronger students  
– 91.4%: Improve overall campus academic quality  
– 88.6%: Improve the quality of honors educational opportunities  
– 85.7%: Raise the profile of honors within the institution  
• The increasing numbers of Universities instituting Honors Colleges suggest that these expectations are being met.   
• Our Honors Program has been very wary of the kind of premature action whereby some institutions have merely re-labeled a mediocre Honors Program for marketing purposes.   
• Lamar is ready to have an Honors College that can deliver on its promise.   
Honors Colleges in Texas  
• Which Universities in Texas have Honors Colleges?   
– Baylor University   
– Texas Tech   
– University of Houston   
– Prairie View A&M   
– University of North Texas   
– UT at Arlington   
– UT at San Antonio  
• There are also 31 Honors Programs in Texas – 9 of these are at community colleges.   
  
  
• As part of its stated vision for improved academic excellence, Texas State University - San Marcos has the creation of an Honors College as one of its top short-term goals.   
• Honors Colleges in Louisiana?  
– Northwestern State  
– LSU  
– McNeese  
– Southern Univ. A&M  
  
WHY an Honors College at LU?  
• In its new strategic plan, Lamar University establishes its intent to "expand recruitment efforts that target high ability students."   
• Establishing an Honors College at Lamar University would provide a clear indication to these potential high ability recruits of our commitment to offering them an education that will address their aspirations, engage them more fully, and assist them in their achievement of goals.   
Becoming an Honors College  
• This has been a stated goal of the Honors Program since 2004.   
• A resolution requesting this move was adopted unanimously by all voting members of the Honors Council on February 19, 2007.   
• It has also been endorsed by the Honors Student Association.   
Guiding Lights  
• During the past eight years, development of Lamar’s Honors Program has been guided by:   
– The nature and mission of Lamar University.   
– The vision and mission of honors education at Lamar University.   
– The “Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program” as formulated by the National Collegiate Honors Council and more recently by NCHC’s “Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors College.”  
Our University Mission  
• Lamar University is a regional state institution of higher education with a long-standing commitment to quality undergraduate education by faculty who are actively engaged with both their academic interests and the community in which they work.   
• The current mission statement for the University was approved in 2006 by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board:   
– “Lamar University is a comprehensive public institution educating a diverse student body, preparing students for leadership and lifelong learning in a multicultural world, and enhancing the future of Southeast Texas, the state, the nation and the world through teaching, research and creative activity, and service.”  
Honors History  
• Honors has been a component of Lamar’s undergraduate offerings since 1963, making it the oldest Honors Program in the Texas State University System.   
• Much of the current Honors curriculum was adopted in 1986, coinciding with University core revision.   
• Honors became a University-wide program in 1996.   
Honors Program Facts  
• Honors currently represents about 2.4% of Lamar students.   
• In fall 2007, we have 242 students enrolled in Honors.  
– 78 of these are FTIC freshmen  
– 103 live in Cardinal Village  
  
  
Honors Vision and Mission  
• 2000: “The University Honors Program at Lamar is designed to bring out the best in our academically talented students and to serve as a core of academic excellence within the University community.”   
• This goal is accomplished through several concrete tasks   
– curriculum  
– faculty engagement  
– academic leadership within the total university setting  
– practical support of students through scholarships and grants  
– advisement and mentorship  
– meaningful opportunities for the students to actively lead, create and innovate during their undergraduate years.   
  
Honors Curriculum  
• Honors options for required core curriculum classes  
• Upper level interdisciplinary classes (HNRS 4364 – Topics; SOCI 3360 – Human Nature and Human Condition)  
• One-credit “Honors Seminars” (HNRS 3161)  
• Independent Study (HNRS 3360)  
• “Honors Contracts”  
• Honors Thesis (HNRS 4360, 4361)  
Honors Core Classes  
• Honors Philosophy of Knowledge (PHIL 1360). This is for ALL incoming freshmen.   
• English – All 3 classes are Honors ENGL 1360, 1361, 2360).   
• History – Two Honors classes (HIST 1361, 1362).   
• Government – Two Honors classes (section 60).   
• Social science – Honors Psychology (section 60), or choose to petition for Honors in other options.   
• Lab sciences – Chemistry and Physics are offered as Honors (section 60 plus CHEM 1460).   
• Public Speaking – Honors (COMM 1360).   
• Math – Honors calculus (MATH 2460).   
• Fine arts – Honors options are rotated (section 60). Also, HUMA 1360, an interdisciplinary arts option.   
Upper Level Honors  
• Honors Topics – Faculty offer inter-disciplinary, innovative classes (sometimes team taught):   
– “Science Fiction and Fantasy”  
– “Literature of Redemption”   
– “History of Hell”   
• Honors one-credit Seminars – a varied array of short courses:   
– “Windows on the World”   
– “Comic Book Novels and Their Culture”  
– “Rhetorical Archetypes: Wizards and Warriors”  
– “Islam”  
– “Machine Intelligence”  
– “Cultural Studies: History of Rock ‘n’ Roll”  
  
Contracts & Independent Study  
• Honors Contracts permit the student to add an Honors component to classes in the major, tailoring the course toward his/her interests.   
• Independent Study pairs a student with a faculty mentor for an original research project:  
– “The Parisian Cityscape: An Insight to the French Soul” (with study abroad)  
– “History of ASL at Disney World”   
– “Electromagnetic Imaging of Footwear for Airport Security”  
HONORS THESIS  
• Students heading for graduate study or a specialized career path have the opportunity to demonstrate expertise in their area of interest.   
• Two semester project with faculty mentor and review committee. For example…  
– “Patient Access to Health Care: A Cross-Cultural Survey” (Pre-Med)  
– “Quantum Phenomena in Collisions Between Rare Gas Atoms” (Physics)  
– “Towards Adaptive Anomaly Detection in Cellular Mobile Networks” (Computer Science)  
– “Effect of a Natural Disaster on the Developmental Level of Children” (Nursing)  
  
HONORS Summer Read  
• Each year, incoming freshmen are provided with a “Summer Read” book.  
• The book is used in Honors freshman English, Philosophy of Knowledge, and Public Speaking courses.   
HONORS Summer Read  
• Beginning in 2006, the author of the book presented a lecture on campus.   
• Selection of the “Summer Read” is assisted by students in an Honors Seminar that reviews several nominated books.   
  
Honors Commitment to Faculty  
• Our mission statement commits Honors to encourage “faculty innovation” and to support faculty participation in Honors “by a system of fair compensation for teaching and supervision.”  
• We compensate embedded sections, petition classes, contracts, seminars, independent study and thesis supervision.   
  
Scholars Development Program  
• Scholars Development Seminar – HNRS 2160 – offered every spring semester.   
• Especially aimed at students contemplating graduate or professional school.   
• TOPICS include…  
– Research Experiences for Undergraduates  
– Study Abroad  
– Internships and Summer Programs  
– Research Opportunities  
– Application Writing  
– Interviewing  
– Competitive Scholarships and Fellowships  
HONOR CODE  
As a member of the Honors Program community of Lamar University, I, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, pledge myself to uphold the high standards of academic and personal integrity expected of this collection of scholars including, but not limited to, the following:  
η I will not engage in academic dishonesty such as plagiarism, lying, cheating, or stealing.  
η I will neither encourage nor condone any act of academic dishonesty.   
η I will avoid conduct that would bring dishonor to myself, to the Honors Program, or to Lamar University.  
By signing this document, I submit myself to the discretion of the Honors Program Director and Honors Council regarding any decisions pertaining to my continuation in the Program should I fail to uphold the above commitment.   
Honors and NCHC  
Honors programs are not accredited, but the National Collegiate Honors Council represents the collective wisdom of its more than 600 member institutions regarding the qualities of effective programs.  
  
NCHC “Characteristics”  
• The “Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program” were adopted by NCHC in 1994 and have served as benchmarks for the development of Lamar’s University Honors Program.   
• More recently, we have also been guided by the NCHC “Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors College,” adopted in 2005, but available earlier in draft form.   
• The Lamar Honors Director participated in discussions leading to the final statement adopted in 2005.   
Honors Program Characteristics  
• A fully-developed honors program should be carefully set up to accommodate the special needs and abilities of the undergraduate students it is designed to serve.   
• The program should have a clear mandate from the institutional administration   
• The honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.  
• There should be an honors curriculum featuring special courses, seminars, colloquia and independent study…  
• The program requirements themselves should include a substantial portion of the participants' undergraduate work, usually in the vicinity of 20% or 25% of their total course work and certainly no less than 15%.   
• The program should be so formulated that it relates effectively both to the … general education requirements and to the [major]  
• The program should be both visible and highly reputed throughout the institution …  
Honors Program Characteristics  
• Faculty participating in the program should be fully identified with the aims of the program.   
• The program should occupy suitable quarters …  
• The director or other administrative officer charged with administering the program should work in close collaboration with a committee or council of faculty …  
• The program should have in place a committee of honors students …  
• There should be provisions for special academic counseling …  
  
• The honors program, in distinguishing itself from the rest of the institution, serves as a kind of laboratory (for faculty)…  
• The fully-developed honors program must be open to continuous and critical review…  
• A fully-developed program will emphasize the participatory nature of the honors educational process …  
• Fully-developed two-year and four-year honors programs will have articulation agreements   
Honors COLLEGE Characteristics  
• A fully developed honors college should incorporate the relevant characteristics of a fully developed honors program.  
• A fully developed honors college should exercise considerable control over honors recruitment and admissions, including the appropriate size of the incoming class. Admission to the honors college should be by separate application.  
• An honors college should exercise considerable control over its policies, curriculum, and selection of faculty.  
• The curriculum of a fully developed honors college should offer significant course opportunities across all four years of study.  
  
• The curriculum of the fully developed honors college should constitute at least 20% of a student’s degree program. An honors thesis or project should be required.  
• Where the home university has a significant residential component, the fully developed honors college should offer substantial honors residential opportunities.  
• The distinction awarded by a fully developed honors college should be announced at commencement, noted on the diploma, and featured on the student’s final transcript.  
• Like other colleges within the university, a fully developed honors college should be involved in alumni affairs and development and should have an external advisory board.  
  
MORE Honors COLLEGE Characteristics  
• “The head of a fully developed honors college should be a dean reporting directly to the chief academic officer of the institution and serving as a full member of the Council of Deans, if one exists. The dean should be a full-time, 12-month appointment.”  
• At LU, our Honors Program Director reports directly to the Provost and is a member of the extended Academic Council.   
• At LU, our Honors Program Director is full-time for the nine months of the long terms and half-time during summer.   
MORE Honors COLLEGE Characteristics  
• “A fully developed honors college should exist as an equal collegiate unit within a multi-collegiate university structure.”  
• An Honors College might be an "equal collegiate unit" within the University, but it would not be an equivalent unit.   
• The 1993 NCHC survey of Honors Colleges found considerable diversity in the manner of articulating the Honors College within the University:   
– 68.6%: Centralized “overlay” structure   
– 14.3%: Free standing college, with own faculty and curriculum  
– 5.7%: Decentralized coordinating structure providing an honors core and departmental honors  
– 11.4%: Other  
• It is our expectation that LU would follow the majority model with the “overlay” type of structure. This represents NO conflict with existing degree-granting colleges and college loyalties.   
  
MORE Honors COLLEGE Characteristics  
• “The operational and staff budgets of fully developed honors colleges should provide resources at least comparable to other collegiate units of equivalent size.”  
– In reality, the primary consideration here is not how much the other colleges of the University get, but how much the Honors College would need to do its job well.   
– Since we are already accomplishing most of the tasks relevant to being an Honors College, we would be able to make the transition with modest initial additional input. (See BUDGET.)  
  
  
McMaster Honors Fund  
• Endowment fund of nearly $2 million.  
• Annual expenditures of over $100,000.  
• More than 70 Honors Program students currently receive McMaster scholarships.  
  
• Competitive grants are also given –   
– Internships  
– Field schools  
– Study abroad  
– Research projects  
• Fund supports Honors events and student travel to NCHC and GPHC.   
  
Honors College of LU  
Honors College of LU  
• Honors is most important to students in their first year –  
– Engagement with the University –   
• The institution  
• The faculty  
• Their peers  
– Personalized advisement  
– Awareness of research opportunities, etc.  
• By junior year, primary involvement is with the student’s degree-granting college.  
• Honors articulation with the degree-granting colleges is determined through collaboration with each college.   
Engagement: Honor Points  
• An Honors Program Graduate is expected to have at least 70 points.   
• These are collected in 5 categories –   
– Volunteer service  
– Cultural events  
– Honors Program participation  
– Leadership  
– Scholarly achievement  
• Reports are submitted at the end of each semester, on forms provided.   
Engagement: Honors Student Association  
• ALL Honors Program students are members.   
• OFFICERS this year include President Erin Tade (engineering), VP Kevin Stevens (engineering), Secretary Caitlin Kruger (political science), Treasurer Jeff Mitchell (business), SGA Rep. Daniel Whitton (history), Reporter Christi Grudier (communication).   
• Standing COMMITTEES:   
– Service  
– Events  
– Campus Involvement  
  
  
Questions?   
  
BUDGET Comparison: Honors Program/College  
  
  
PROGRAM COLLEGE DIFFERENCE  
  
BUDGET ITEMS FOR FY2008  
Site visit by NCHC officials $ 1,500 $ 1,500   
Evaluation questionnaire for 500 500  
Campus constituents  
\*Enhanced physical facilities 20,000 20,000  
New publications and 4,000 $ 4,000  
Recruitment materials  
TOTAL ONE-TIME OUTLAYS $22,000 $26,000 $ 4,000  
  
ONGOING ITEMS, BEGINNING FY2008 Current PROGRAM FY09 COLLEGE Difference   
Faculty compensation funds $20,000 $30,000 $30,000   
Honors Academic Advisor 27,000 27,000  
Salary for Honors College Director/ Dean 88,624 94,624 94,624  
Stipend and reassigned time for Asst. Dir./Dean# 2,080 8,160 10,000 $ 1,840  
Promotion of Admin. Assoc. Sr. to Exec. Asst. 24,564 25,055 28,000 $ 2,945  
Increased M&O and travel 2,000 4,000 4,000  
Student “Honors Community Relations Intern” 2,000 2,000 2,000  
Support for leader of Honors Peer Mentor team 2,000 2,000  
Honors Program M&O 4,000 6,000 6,000  
  
TOTAL ONGOING $ 143,268 $198,839 $203,624 $ 4,785  
  
FUTURE ITEMS  
Joint appointment professors – Endowments would be sought for named “Honors Professors,” whose position(s) would cover core Honors classes from a department such as History, English, Mathematics, etc. At the present time, these core Honors classes are offered by the home departments with no supplementary compensation.   
  
\*Enhanced physical facilities are necessarily an unknown at this point. Discussion has centered on moving the Honors Program to the building currently occupied by General Studies and McNair Scholars. Since this building does not belong to Lamar University it is unclear how much money could reasonably be allocated to configuring this building for Honors.   
# Current Asst. Director receives ¼ reassigned time, valued at $2,080. Recommendation is to increase this to ½ time ($4,160) and add a $4,000 stipend.   
  
Appendix B  
  
Report of the Lamar University Faculty Salary Equity Committee  
To the Faculty Senate  
October, 2007  
  
Pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate on March 3, 2004:  
  
Whereas Lamar University has demonstrated a commitment to correct the salary inequities, both internal and external, that have existed in the past, and Whereas this correction has substantially improved the fairness of the salary distribution for Lamar faculty, be it  
  
Resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the establishment of a permanent standing committee, elected, and under the direction of the office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, whose task it will be to oversee the evaluation of Lamar faculty salaries for equity every three years and to make recommendations on changes to salaries as well as to the process of evaluation of faculty salaries for the purpose of equity.  
  
The committee finds that Lamar University faculty salaries for the top three academic ranks are now competitive with those of peer universities identified in the original faculty salary equity study conducted in 2002. In that study the Ad Hoc Faculty Salary Equity Committee appointed by Lamar University President James M. Simmons identified, with input from the university faculty, a set of peer institutions nationwide. The Arthur Andersen consulting firm was retained to provide salary data from these public universities, and 57 peer institutions responded either through the Andersen special survey or by inclusion in data provided by the College & University Professional Association (CUPA). Fourteen of 17 Texas public universities identified as Lamar peer institutions were represented in the Arthur Andersen study.  
  
The study did not consider Texas and non-Texas peer institutions separately. Using FY 2001 faculty salary data, the consultants reported the following assessment of Lamar University faculty salaries for the first three ranks:  
  
Faculty Salary Comparisons, FY 2001  
  
Academic   
Rank Market Data  
Median Salaries Lamar University  
Median Salaries  
Professor $66,602 $54,737  
Associate Professor $53,409 $46,435  
Assistant Professor $43,461 $38,875  
  
Source: 2001 Faculty Compensation and Benefits Report for Lamar University. Andersen Human Capital. November 2001.  
  
The report also stated comparisons of market data and Lamar University salaries for the ranks of Instructor: $34,177 compared to $33,593, and Lecturer: $31,185 compared to $24,884.  
  
The Arthur Andersen study computed target market salaries for Lamar University faculty members based on academic discipline, rank, years in rank, and merit evaluations.   
The Ad Hoc Faculty Salary Equity Committee recommended—and President Simmons accepted—a faculty salary equity plan for salary adjustments over time totaling $2,832,534 for 281 faculty members. Annual salary equity adjustments through FY 2008 have reduced the remaining total salary equity adjustments to $481,849 for 74 faculty members. Has Lamar University kept pace with faculty salary changes at peer institutions since FY 2001?  
  
Without replicating the Arthur Andersen study, we can answer this question using aggregate data published by the National Center for Education Statistics and by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics allows users to select a set of peer institutions for comparison. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board provides salary data for all Texas public universities. The latest salary information available for the non-Texas Lamar University peer institutions is for FY 2006; Coordinating Board data for Texas universities for FY 2007 is available for comparison.  
  
An IPEDS analysis produces salary information for 32 of the 40 non-Texas peer institutions for FY 2006, and Coordinating Board data for the same year allows comparison of Lamar University to all 17 Texas peer universities.   
  
Faculty Salary Comparisons, FY 2006  
  
Academic  
Rank Non-Texas  
Peer Institutions Texas Peer  
Institutions Lamar  
University  
Professor $74,121 $77,150a $78,869b  
Associate Professor $59,654 $58,912 $58,698  
Assistant Professor $49,906 $49,308 $48,546  
  
Source: National Center for Education Statistics, and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.  
  
aThe Coordinating Board reports only mean salaries for full professors after FY 2005, but both mean and median salaries for other ranks. This value is the median of the means for 17 Texas public universities. Except for Lamar University professors, all other values in the table are medians.  
  
bThis is the mean salary. From FY 2001 through FY 2005 the median salary for Lamar University professors was, on average, just under $2,000 less than the mean professor salary.  
  
  
  
  
The table shows that by FY 2006, the combined effects of annual equity and merit raises at Lamar University had elevated faculty salaries for the three highest academic ranks to a competitive position compared to salaries at peer institutions. Comparisons of instructor and lecturer salaries are excluded because of the very small number of instructors employed at Texas public universities, and because the Coordinating Board does not report salaries for lecturers separately.  
  
FY 2007 salary data are available for Lamar University’s Texas peer institutions, but not yet available for non-Texas peer institutions. As the following table shows, however, Lamar University faculty salaries have kept pace with those at peer universities in Texas.  
  
Faculty Salary Comparisons, FY 2007  
  
Academic  
Rank Texas Peer  
Institutions Lamar  
University  
Professor $79,551 $78,636  
Associate Professor $61,142 $62,056  
Assistant Professor $50,546 $51,416  
  
  
As of FY 2007, average faculty salaries at Lamar University were within a thousand dollars above or below the average salaries for each academic rank in the group of 17 Texas public universities. This aggregate measure of external equity shows that Lamar University has caught up with our peer institutions, though this may not be true of all academic disciplines represented at the university. The data sources used in this report do not provide faculty salaries by discipline. It is also the case that, because the recommended Lamar University salary adjustments are incomplete, some individual faculty members still suffer from external faculty salary inequity.   
  
The matter of internal faculty salary equity at Lamar University should be studied. The Arthur Andersen report found no systematic bias in salaries based on gender, race, or ethnicity, and it is unlikely that such inequity has developed since FY 2001. However, another form of internal inequity—salary compression and inversion—may have increased at the university due to changing market conditions for particular disciplines.  
  
  
  
  
  
Appendix  
  
Lamar University Peer Institutions in the Arthur Andersen Study  
  
Appalachian State University Angelo State University  
Arkansas State University Sam Houston State University  
Austin Peay State University Southwest Texas State University  
Boise State University Stephen F. Austin State University  
Cleveland State University Sul Ross State University  
College of New Jersey Texas A&M International University  
Columbus State University Texas A&M-Corpus Christi  
East Carolina University Texas A&M-Kingsville  
Eastern Illinois University-Charleston Texas Tech University  
Eastern Kentucky University Texas Woman’s University  
Eastern Michigan University University of Houston-Downtown  
Eastern New Mexico University University of Texas-Arlington  
Marshall University University of Texas-El Paso  
Montana State University University of Texas-Pan American  
Northeastern Illinois University University of Texas-San Antonio  
Northern Arizona University University of Texas-Tyler  
Northern Michigan University West Texas A&M University  
Southeastern Louisiana University   
Southeast Missouri State-Cape Girardeau   
Southwest Missouri State University  
State University of West Georgia   
Tennessee Tech University   
University of Alabama-Huntsville  
University of Central Florida  
University of Central Oklahoma  
University of Minnesota-Duluth  
University of Nebraska-Omaha  
University of Nevada-Reno  
University of New Orleans  
University of North Carolina-Wilmington  
University of North Florida  
University of South Alabama  
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga  
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire  
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse  
University of Wisconsin-Superior  
West Virginia Institute of Technology  
Western Illinois University  
Winona State University  
Youngstown State University