



TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR STUDENT, FACULTY, AND STAFF CAMPUS LIFE COMMITTEE

Committee Meeting: 8/7/2003
U. T. Health Science Center - San Antonio

Judith L. Craven, M.D., Chairman
Rita C. Clements
Robert A. Estrada
Woody L. Hunt
A. W. "Dub" Riter, Jr.

	Committee Meeting	Board Meeting	Page
Welcome and Opening Remarks	<i>12:00-1:30 p.m.</i> <i>(lunch provided)</i> <i>Vice-Chairman</i> <i>Riter will chair the meeting</i>		
1. U. T. System: Faculty Satisfaction Survey Summary Report	Discussion <i>Dr. Nelsen</i>	Not on Agenda	312
2. U. T. System: Social Security Number Task Force Initiative Update	Report <i>Ms. Mayne</i>	Not on Agenda	317
Adjourn			

1. **U. T. System: Faculty Satisfaction Survey Summary Report**

PURPOSE

Dr. Robert Nelsen, Chair of The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council, will summarize the results of the 2003 Faculty Satisfaction Survey using the PowerPoint presentation beginning on Page 313. The Survey was designed to measure the work life satisfaction of U. T. System faculty and to provide institution-specific data to faculty and administrators for each of the U. T. System campuses.

KEY POINTS/ POLICY ISSUES

The survey conducted by Digital Research, Inc. concludes that in general the U. T. System faculty are moderately satisfied with their jobs. Faculty are most satisfied regarding autonomy with respect to decisions about teaching, research and service. Job security, retirement and health benefits, and opportunities for advancement within academic and administrative careers were moderately satisfying to satisfying.

In fact, most aspects included in the Survey were moderately satisfying to satisfying for respondents, although the rankings differed across institutions. Teaching and research climate measures - proxies for somewhat intangible aspects of work life, such as the intellectual stimulation derived from teaching and interactions with colleagues, as well as institutional policies that mitigate faculty scholarship, generally achieved higher ratings. Institutional climates for women and members of historically underrepresented ethnic/racial minority groups were also satisfactory and the treatment of women and minorities was perceived as equitable. Faculty satisfaction with their jobs – opportunities, benefits, salary, and autonomy, varied in relation to where they are employed. So, too, did satisfaction with instrumental resources provided to support their professional activities. The effectiveness of faculty governance and responsiveness of institutional leaders to faculty was consistently among the least satisfying aspects of respondents' work lives.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Faculty Satisfaction Survey was conducted by Digital Research, Inc. as a follow up to the 1993 faculty survey. It was designed to measure the work life satisfaction of U. T. System faculty and to provide institution-specific data to faculty and administrators for each of the U. T. System campuses. The survey was requested by the Faculty Advisory Council and approved by the Chancellor's office.

*The University of Texas System
Faculty Satisfaction Survey: June 2003*

**FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
INITIAL REPORT**

TO
The University of Texas System Board of Regents

Robert S. Nelson, PhD
The University of Texas at Dallas

**FACULTY WORKLOAD
AND JOB SATISFACTION**

	UT System		Instructional Support		
	Total	UT-Orange 1	UT-Orange 2	Orange 3	
Teaching	36.43	26.84	26.97	29.26	13.79
Teaching/mentoring	12.74	16.42	16.72	11.25	19.23
Peer Consult	2.76	2.58	2.62	2.14	2.87
Administration	7.81	7.17	6.92	7.34	7.22
Faculty Workload	4.06	4.06	3.72	4.67	3.92
Student Work Services	2.81	2.84	2.88	2.88	2.81
Public Services	1.28	1.26	1.25	1.25	1.26
Total (from Faculty Survey)	69.87	66.82	65.32	65.73	64.09
Administration with 24h*					
Faculty	4.20	4.41	4.20	4.20	4.20
Faculty	2.20	2.70	2.52	2.22	2.22
Health Benefits	2.64	4.20	4.20	2.22	4.20
Health Services	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20
Healthcare	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20
Health Self Annual Problem	4.41	3.87	4.20	4.20	4.20
Opportunities-Advancement	4.54	2.52	2.47	2.57	4.72
Opportunities-Research	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20
Opportunities-Teaching	2.21	2.21	2.21	2.21	2.21
Opportunities-Student Work	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20
Salaries and Fringe Benefits	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20
Salaries in Research	2.21	2.21	2.21	2.21	2.21
Salaries in Service	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20
Complimentary Compensation	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20

*Faculty 1 listed at all institutions; Faculty 2-4 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 5-6 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 7-8 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 9-10 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 11-12 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 13-14 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 15-16 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 17-18 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 19-20 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 21-22 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 23-24 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 25-26 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 27-28 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 29-30 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 31-32 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 33-34 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 35-36 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 37-38 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 39-40 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 41-42 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 43-44 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 45-46 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 47-48 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 49-50 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 51-52 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 53-54 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 55-56 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 57-58 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 59-60 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 61-62 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 63-64 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 65-66 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 67-68 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 69-70 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 71-72 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 73-74 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 75-76 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 77-78 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 79-80 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 81-82 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 83-84 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 85-86 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 87-88 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 89-90 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 91-92 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 93-94 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 95-96 listed at UT-Orange 1-3
Faculty 97-98 listed at UT-Orange 1-2
Faculty 99-100 listed at UT-Orange 1-3

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS :
OVERALL SATISFACTION**

- As a group, the U. T. System faculty are *moderately satisfied with their jobs* (M= 4.54 on a 7 point scale).
- Faculty are most satisfied regarding *autonomy with respect to decisions about teaching, research and service.*
- *Job security, retirement and health benefits, and opportunities for advancement* within academic and administrative careers were moderately satisfying to satisfying.
- In response to a question about "*If I had to do it all over again, I would still accept a faculty position at this institution*," faculty say that they would choose to work within the U. T. System.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS :
OVERALL SATISFACTION**

- *Faculty in Health Institutions* demonstrated the greatest overall job satisfaction.
- *Faculty at UTB, UTPA, UTPB, UTTYL* are the least satisfied.
- *Non-tenure track faculty* are more satisfied than tenure track faculty.
- *Faculty in arts and humanities* are least satisfied with their jobs.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS :
OVERALL SATISFACTION**

- *African-Americans* are noticeably more satisfied than other racial/ethnic groups.
- *Hispanics* are noticeably less satisfied than other racial/ethnic groups.
- *Men and women* are about equally satisfied; however, women are less satisfied than men with job security, salary, and opportunities for advancement.
- *Salaries and opportunities for sabbaticals* were the least satisfying aspects of faculty jobs.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS
ABOUT POSSIBLE ISSUES
IN THE SYSTEM AND ON CAMPUSES**

- Faculty tend to be satisfied with *office space, computing resources and secretarial support.*
- Faculty are somewhat satisfied with most *resources for teaching.*
- U. T. System faculty are somewhat to moderately satisfied with *policies and practices for annual and periodic job performance reviews and for promotion and tenure decisions.* But faculty do not believe performance reviews have enhanced teaching quality or faculty productivity.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS
ABOUT POSSIBLE ISSUES
IN THE SYSTEM AND ON CAMPUSES**

- Faculty do not hold strong opinions regarding the assertion that "too many full-time faculty have been replaced by part-time faculty."
- Salary compression is viewed as a problem by faculty from all but the Health Institutions.
- Faculty tend to be less satisfied with the process used to determine merit increases and salary adjustments.
- Faculty tend to be less satisfied with institutional funding for research projects, external speakers and travel to research/professional meetings.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS
ABOUT POSSIBLE ISSUES
IN THE SYSTEM AND ON CAMPUSES**

- Faculty are concerned about the staff available to assist with the preparation of proposals and with the management of funded projects.
- Faculty disagree with the assertion that TeleCampus services are worth the cost.
- Faculty are less satisfied with graduate student support available to assist them with their teaching and research.
- Faculty at all Academic Institutions except U. T. Austin are concerned about print library materials.

DIVERSITY ISSUES ON CAMPUSES

- Across comparison groups, faculty believe that the diversity of the students is important to the educational process.
- Faculty in the different institutional, tenure, seniority, and disciplinary comparison groups tend to disagree with statements suggesting women and minorities are discriminated against or disadvantaged in recruitment and promotion.
- Faculty believe women and minorities are underrepresented in senior faculty and administrative positions.

DIVERSITY ISSUES ON CAMPUSES

- Women and racial/ethnic minority groups believe that European-Americans received more helpful career advice.
- Both members of ethnic/racial minority groups and women think they have to work harder than their European-American and male counterparts to achieve legitimacy as scholars.
- Women are noticeably less satisfied than men with promotion/tenure review and merit/salary adjustment processes.

**COMPARISON OF 1993 AND 2003
FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEYS**

The survey found little to no difference between times of data gathering for satisfaction with:

- Job security
- Retirement benefits
- Autonomy in teaching
- Collegial relations among faculty
- Responsiveness of department chairs to faculty.

**COMPARISON OF 1993 AND 2003
FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEYS**

The data suggest slightly higher satisfaction in 2003 for:

- Health benefits
- Perceived value campuses give to research in Academic Institutions (Health Institutions remained about the same)
- Processes used in annual reviews of job performance.

COMPARISON OF 1993 AND 2003 FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEYS

For the remaining items, *satisfaction is slightly lower in 2003 than it was in 1993:*

- Salary
- Perceived value campuses give to teaching
- Institutional level administrators responsiveness to faculty
- Effectiveness of faculty governance
- Institutional resources for research
- Staff support for courses
- Library resources (Academic Institutions)
- Support given to new faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the 2003 Faculty Satisfaction Survey, Digital Research, Inc. indicated that the following areas of concern should be addressed and given highest priority (in descending order of importance in each category):

- (1) *All Universities* should identify and address specific concerns
- (2) *All Academic Institutions* should identify and address specific concerns
- (3) Faculty and administrators in all *Academic Institutions (other than the U. T. Austin)* should take action regarding specific concerns
- (4) Faculty at *UTA, UTD, UTEP, UTSA* should pursue specific concerns
- (5) Faculty and administrators in all *Health Institutions* should examine and refine specific policies and practices

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) *All Universities* should identify and address specific concerns with respect to:

- Opportunities available for *faculty development leaves, sabbaticals.*
- Policies and practices used to determine *merit increases and salary adjustments.*
- The effectiveness of *faculty governance* in dealing with upper administration.
- *Salary compression.*
- The visibility and effectiveness of *Committee on the Status of Women and Minorities* and its impact on the work lives of individuals within these groups.
- *Support given to new faculty.*

RECOMMENDATIONS

(2) *All Academic Institutions* should identify and address specific concerns regarding:

- Health and retirement *benefits.*
- Staff support for *course-related activities.*
- Staff support for the *preparation of proposals* to external funding agencies.
- Staff to assist with the *management of funded projects* (e.g., bookkeeping, accounting, correspondence).
- Policies and practices regarding *release time from teaching responsibilities* to work on projects funded by external sources and the *assignment of graduate research assistants* to work with faculty on their research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(3) Faculty and administrators in all *Academic Institutions (other than the U. T. Austin)* should take action with regard to the following concerns:

- Quality of *library print materials.*
- Responsiveness of institutional *administrators* to faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(4) Faculty at *UTA, UTD, UTEP, UTSA* should pursue faculty concerns about:

- Quality of *undergraduate students*, including community college transfer students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(5) Faculty and administrators in all Health Institutions should examine and refine policies and practices regarding:

- Patient *billing*.
- Securing *payment of bills by patients*.
- *Salary incentives*.

APPENDIX

Table A. Institutional Climate Index Scores for Institutional Types*

	UT System		Institution Category		
	Total	UT Group 1	UT Group 2	UT Group 3	Health
Satisfaction with Job (10)	4.54	4.43	4.28	4.21	4.74
Satisfaction with Institutional Teaching Climate (7)	4.96	4.86	4.77	4.81	5.20
Satisfaction with Institutional Research Climate (7)	4.82	4.87	4.82	4.51	5.00
Satisfaction with Institutional Governance and Leadership (3)	4.00	4.07	3.88	3.44	4.17
Satisfaction with Institutional Policies/Patient Billing and Incentive Schemes (4)	3.56		3.31	2.78	3.58

*Indicates represent overall scores for items in each category. Respondents who did not complete at least 20 of the items in an index were treated as missing data. Parentheses indicate number of items in each of the indices.

UT-Group 1 = UT-Austin
 UT-Group 2 = UT-Arlington, UT-Dallas, UT-El Paso, UT-San Antonio
 UT-Group 3 = UT-Brownsville, UT-Pan American, UT-Permian Basin, UT-Tyler
 Health = UTHC-Tyler, UTHSC-Houston, UTHSC-San Antonio, UTMD Anderson, UTMB-Galveston, UT-Southwestern

Note: Unless otherwise specified, the scale is 1=Not at all Satisfied to 7=Extremely satisfied

APPENDIX

Table B. Satisfaction with Resources Index Scores for Institutional Types

	UT System		Institution Category		
	Total	UT Group 1	UT Group 2	UT Group 3	Health
Satisfaction with Institutional Resources-General (7)	4.26	4.23	4.04	3.88	4.48
Satisfaction with Institutional Resources-Teaching (11)	4.46	4.50	4.24	4.10	4.82
Satisfaction with Institutional Resources-Research (8)	3.99	4.10	3.63	2.96	4.35
Satisfaction with Institutional Resources-Library (3)	5.38	5.46	4.90	4.70	5.78

UT-Group 1 = UT-Austin
 UT-Group 2 = UT-Arlington, UT-Dallas, UT-El Paso, UT-San Antonio
 UT-Group 3 = UT-Brownsville, UT-Pan American, UT-Permian Basin, UT-Tyler
 Health = UTHC-Tyler, UTHSC-Houston, UTHSC-San Antonio, UTMD Anderson, UTMB-Galveston, UT-Southwestern

Note: Unless otherwise specified, the scale is 1=Not at all Satisfied to 7=Extremely satisfied

APPENDIX

Table C. Gender/Ethnic/Racial Index Scores for Institutional Types

	UT System		Institution Category		
	Total	UT Group 1	UT Group 2	UT Group 3	Health
Satisfaction with Institutional Climate-Race and Gender (3)	4.92	4.47	4.97	4.95	5.08
Satisfaction with Institutional Treatment of Women (9)	3.03	3.35	2.92	2.90	2.90
Satisfaction with Institutional Treatment of Underrepresented Ethnic/Racial Groups (7) *	3.09	3.03	3.11	3.20	3.09

*Two of the original items in this scale were reverse coded to maintain index integrity.

UT-Group 1 = UT-Austin
 UT-Group 2 = UT-Arlington, UT-Dallas, UT-El Paso, UT-San Antonio
 UT-Group 3 = UT-Brownsville, UT-Pan American, UT-Permian Basin, UT-Tyler
 Health = UTHC-Tyler, UTHSC-Houston, UTHSC-San Antonio, UTMD Anderson, UTMB-Galveston, UT-Southwestern

Note: Unless otherwise specified, the scale is 1=Not at all Satisfied to 7=Extremely satisfied

APPENDIX

Table D. Departmental Climate Index Scores for Institutional Types

	UT System		Institution Category		
	Total	UT Group 1	UT Group 2	UT Group 3	Health
Satisfaction with Departmental Teaching Climate (8)	4.73	4.72	4.65	4.54	4.80
Satisfaction with Departmental Research Climate (3)	4.29	4.32	4.14	3.55	4.55
Satisfaction with Departmental Collegiality and Leadership (4)	4.79	4.82	4.78	4.57	4.84
Satisfaction with Departmental Policies and Practices (4)	4.24	4.17	4.24	4.29	4.49

UT-Group 1 = UT-Austin
 UT-Group 2 = UT-Arlington, UT-Dallas, UT-El Paso, UT-San Antonio
 UT-Group 3 = UT-Brownsville, UT-Pan American, UT-Permian Basin, UT-Tyler
 Health = UTHC-Tyler, UTHSC-Houston, UTHSC-San Antonio, UTMD Anderson, UTMB-Galveston, UT-Southwestern

Note: Unless otherwise specified, the scale is 1=Not at all Satisfied to 7=Extremely satisfied

2. **U. T. System: Social Security Number Task Force Initiative Update**

REPORT

Florence Mayne, Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs and System Administration Compliance Officer, will provide an update on the work of the U. T. System-wide Social Security Number Task Force. The work of the task force is proceeding in accordance with the timeline attached on Page 318.

A presentation of the use of Social Security Numbers to the Student, Faculty, and Staff Campus Life Committee on January 6, 2003, resulted in the proposed establishment of a System-wide task force to study and recommend a strategy with respect to a coordinated approach throughout the U. T. System for the collection, maintenance and dissemination of Social Security Numbers. The task force was established and is actively working to meet its charge.

SYSTEM-WIDE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER TASK FORCE TIMELINE

Revised July 2, 2003

Due Date	Action	Comments
February 26	Task force nominations due to Chancellor Yudof	Completed
March 7	Task force members announced; initial meeting agenda distributed	Completed
March 19	Initial meeting in Austin	Completed
March 21	Self-nominations for working groups and group leaders due to task force chair	Completed
March 25	Chair will establish working groups	Completed
April 1	Each institution's representative to deliver to task force chair a report compiling institution's proposed or current SSN policies	Completed
April 7	Working groups to begin discussions by this date	Completed
April 21	Office of General Counsel (OGC) to deliver report to task force chair identifying the legal requirements governing the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of Social Security numbers	Completed
April 21	Each institution's representative to deliver inventory of processes to task force chair	Completed
May 1	Each working group to submit to task force chair a report cataloging issues and concerns	Completed
May 12	OGC to deliver to task force chair a report determining the legal authorization for the processes identified in each institution's inventory	Cancelled; results of inventories revealed that such a process would be cumbersome; instead, each institution is to take OGC's report, apply it to inventory and consult with OGC as appropriate
May 21	Full meeting of task force in Austin to discuss a strategy for a System-wide approach	Completed
June	Drafting of preliminary strategy and recommendations	Completed
July	Review of preliminary draft at each institution	Sent to presidents of institutions on July 1, 2003; responses requested by July 29, 2003
August	Review of revised draft with Chancellor Yudof	
August	Status report to the Campus Life Committee of the Board of Regents	
September	Final drafting of strategy and recommendations	
November	Presentation of final report and recommendations to the Campus Life Committee of the Board of Regents	Originally scheduled for October; Board committee meetings, however, have been rescheduled for the same month as the full Board meets