

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

April 4, 2024

4:00-5:30pm

Approved

Attending: Kelly Goonan, Abigail Larson, Scott Knowles, Daniel Eves, Gary Wallace, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Cody Bremner, Chris Graves, Scott Hansen, David Hatch, Steven Hawkins, Maren Hirschi, Jon Karpel, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Andrew Misseldine, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Grant Shimer, Ryan Siemers, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending:

Proxies: Shane Yardley for Amanda Roundy, Michiko Kobayashi for John Meisner

Guests: Jon Anderson, James Sage, Jake Johnson, Camille Thomas, Katya Konkle, Matt McKenzie, Alexis Mccliff, Katya Konkle, Donna Handley, Lynn White

1. Call to order (4:03)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:03)
 - a. Dr. Lynn White, WaFSEC Chair
 - b. John Lisonbee, Staff Association President
 - c. Alexis Mccliff, SUUSA VP of Academics
 - d. Camille Thomas, Asst. Provost of Faculty Engagement
 - e. Jake Johnson, Asst. Provost of Leadership Development and Compliance
 - f. James Sage, Associate Provost
 - g. Jon Anderson, Provost
 - h. Mindy Benson, President
 - i. Donna Handley, Graduate Council
3. Proxy Representation: (4:04)
 - a. Michiko Kobayashi (TED)
 - b. Shane Yardley (Nursing)
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:05)
 - a. [March 7, 2024 minutes](#) Approved.
 - b. [March 21, 2024 minutes](#) Approved.
5. Events and Announcements: (4:07)
 - a. [Senior Benefits Services Meeting](#) April 8, 12:00-1:30pm, Cedar Breaks Room (Medicare and Social Security)
 - b. [Benefits Upcoming Events and Changes](#) (TIAA Webinars, Retirement Planning, Open Enrollment Meetings)

- c. AAUP/AFT Organizing Training April 12, 3:00-5:00pm ED 111. AAUP Organizing Trainer, David Kociemba will be here to provide more direction on organizing for this campus. Virtual attendance option available (meet.google.com/yqf-hnaa-jkg)
 - d. Finish Strong Stations April 17 and 18 – signups coming soon!
 - e. [COHS 5k Fun Run](#) Fundraiser April 20
 - f. President’s Employee Appreciation Lunch April 23
 - g. [Special Rates for UT Locals](#) at Stein Ericson properties in Park City (thank you to Dr. AJ Templeton in HRHM for sharing!)
6. Information Items: (4:08)
- a. [Affordable Learning Materials Usage Survey report](#) (Chris Younkin)
Showed the results from the Usage Survey. Over 95% used affordable learning materials. With 269 courses listed where students used materials provided by the library.
 - b. Faculty Senate President Elect Results
Thank you for participating. Next president-elect will be Chris Monson.
7. Action Items: (4:17)
- a. Vote to recommend Faculty Compensation Procedures
 - i. [Rationale](#) for proposed procedures
 - ii. [Draft Proposed procedures 3.19.2024](#)
 - iii. [Revised Draft proposed procedures 3.27.2024](#)
 - iv. [Feedback from departments](#)

The feedback document had many comments about items we haven’t addressed. This is not a policy, only a set of procedures that are easy to modify and require far less approval. So I think that’s important to understand. The other thing was the service tables. There were people that were pretty adamant that they wanted to see service table increases dependent on successful FEC reports, and then there were people against it. This shouldn’t hold us up because what we are trying to do is create a set of procedures and get a basic idea of what people favor. Right now we have taken out the requirement to have successful FEC reports and table it for further discussion down the road. The service tables were never meant to be merit pay increases. They were meant to attract faculty to our campus and to retain faculty by rewarding them with increased dollar amounts the longer they stay at SUU. We can work out the numbers later. I know some of you want to know the numbers now, we did play with some numbers and decided that we weren’t at a spot to start filling numbers in on the table.

We are working in steps. We are currently at step one which is do you support regular reliable increases in pay because we don’t have anything like this. Do you support pay increases via a flat dollar amount that does not depend on which department you're from? Do you support the idea that Deans, for example, will

be responsible for establishing procedures for merit pay, and those procedures will be made publicly available so everybody knows, and merit pay increases will just be a bonus for that year and not added to the base to prevent compression. We don't know if administration will support this – we hope they will. But we are at the first step with so many opportunities for input and feedback.

Mike: Is the merit pay different from the service part – merit would be bonus and the service added to salary?

Lynn: We would look at your CUPA median and make sure you're getting that base amount and make sure you are at median and then we take that amount and add wherever you are on the service table. COLA will also be added and that becomes your new base.

Merit is something separate and we feel there isn't a transparent policy so that is what we're asking for. That would be a one time bonus for the year.

Mike: Where is the money coming from for the three different areas – COLA adjustment – making sure faculty is at CUPA median. Regardless of where the money is coming from, bringing faculty up to the median will be addressed before the other two?

Lynn: We haven't established what comes first with the finite pot of money. But I would say that CUPA is first and most important. We did ask Meagan Beasley from HR to run a cost analysis on what it would cost, for example, for this. We looked at everybody individually, and if they were below CUPA we brought them up, or we could give them the table increase, whichever was greater. I don't know what percentage of faculty would have benefited more from the table or the CUPA, but the strategy we would use is whichever benefits you most as an individual. So if bringing you up to the CUPA median benefits more than the service table increase, that's what we would do.

Mike: Would the COLA adjustment always be used for this?

Lynn: Where is all this money coming from – we are working on the idea first. Then we'll start to discuss sources yet, because we have to get the the idea approved first. Then we'll be meeting with the entities on campus to discuss budgeting and everything and see how feasible all this is. What kinds of numbers might we be able to plug into the table? That's step two, step one is the basic idea of having regular salary increases rather than just a bump every once in a while. Also for the amount to be the same regardless of your department or college. It's just based on year service. The basic idea needs to be approved by faculty and administration. And then we're gonna work on the numbers and say, Okay, how can we make it work.

Steven: Confused about the whole process. The proposal wasn't mentioned until last senate meeting and then a few departments gave feedback and the proposal changed. Some would argue that the changes are significant. I'm in the significant camp. And now we have a feedback document that I just opened and there is a lot of other feedback that hasn't been addressed or discussed. There are a lot of questions that haven't been answered. I'm confused as to why we're trying to push a vote on something that we don't know about.

Lynn: I think people see this as voting and no going back. This is not a policy – it's a proposal. We want to know if we are moving in the right direction and then we will work on the details for you to review and support. This is a series of baby steps – could this be something people could support and then present to administration and then we'll get to work on the details.

Steven: It's still unclear what this is – the target, the procedure... if we're voting on, do we want to keep working on this. That's very different than are we voting on that document that was emailed out a few days after the last Faculty Senate meeting.

Lynn: Help me understand. The numbers can't be defined until we see where the finances would come from and what it can support. But if we look at first of all, how salaries would be defined they would be a hundred percent of CUPA median plus an amount, we don't know the exact amount, plus an amount for service plus COLA. And the big change here is that the service table is not CIP dependent, not based on your CIP code. We want to know if faculty supports this. If so, we'll pursue it. Or is it something that people just don't want. In which case, we need to think of something else because if faculty are going to be supportive of using a service table and being at a hundred percent of CUPA and COLA, if it exists, then I guess we think of something else to propose.

Steve: It feels premature to me to vote – as we've hardly had time to review the feedback, etc. It seems like the document has a lot more than just 3 steps of an idea which is kind of what you're describing here.

Lynn: I understand your concern. I guess the only way to assuage that is again, just to say it's procedural, and it's not policy.

Chris: In this document I'm trying to figure out that if we vote to approve it would go to the president –what process would that trigger? Let's say we do approve it. What do you anticipate the process being from that point on?

Lynn: We would be meeting with a lot of different people on campus to discuss the feasibility and budget for something like this. We would like to review the work that WAFSEC has done.

Kelly: There is not a set timeline as it's a procedure. If the senate does vote to recommend these procedures it would go to the president and then other groups to vet the procedures. Any implementation would take time. Likely a phased approach due to the duration of service for some people.

Mindy: We take to the rest of campus processes for shared governance. This is the beginning point to move it forward.

Kelly: The most immediate effect would simply be making sure that new faculty are hired at the CUPA median and that anybody who is currently here is making at least a hundred percent of the CUPA median. That's my sense of what the most immediate effect would be. In terms of timeline, as Lynn has mentioned, there are several steps involved in this process. Even if the Senate does vote to recommend these procedures, they're not going to go into effect July 1st, 2024 they may not even go into effect. July 1st, 2025. Depending on how long it takes us to work through those additional steps.

Mindy: Sure, and then I'll kick it to Jon. If it passes today, then that merely starts the process. We then take it through the rest of campus processes and procedures with shared governance. So this is the beginning point. If it passes here today.

Jon: I understand WAFSEC is a subcommittee of the senate. So this is a committee recommending something to the Senate. The senate now needs to take a chance to vet the idea, as Lynn is suggesting. Once the senate has a recommendation on the procedure, we do need to do a thorough financial analysis on the numbers. This is a significant shift in our processes. Right now, people get bumps when they become an assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, tenure track or non tenure track, whichever those ranks are that costs the institution about \$130,000-\$150,000 a year in ongoing funds. Those funds come from new tuition dollars mostly. Occasionally, we get some state funding for performance or growth, we can use some of that. If we went to a flat amount instead of this process and the flat amount was \$1,500. I just took a rough number from something I'd seen earlier that \$130,000-\$150,000 becomes \$732,000. To fund that we would have to fund it internally. If there was a year where we didn't get money from the state or no new tuition revenue came in, which means we'd lose 8 to 10 faculty lines or 10 to 12 staff lines or \$732,000 operating funds every year to make sure that that was funded. And so there are a lot of things to work through. Regarding the process, once the Senate is done vetting all of it and everybody's happy with it, then it goes to the President's Cabinet, Budget will look at it, all those things and feedback would come back if changes need to be made.

Qian: Colleagues feel there hasn't been enough time to review these issues – the vote feels rushed.

David: I had one minor correction. We keep talking about merit pay but we're turning it into a merit bonus system. The deeper question is pay incentivizes people and what's wrong with the system we have? Where is it misdirecting our resources? And how is this going to direct our resources better? I think that's just an open question. I want everybody to think about.

Lynn: Right now people are incentivized to get things but there are a lot of people who can't progress because they've reached the top. By giving people a dollar amount to count on every year they are incentivized to stay here and look forward to consecutive raises. I guess it would depend on just what those numbers are in the table. But right now there isn't anything for people unless they're going to transition either in rank or tenure.

Scott: Currently the way raises work in my department is no incentive for raises – we either get them or don't based on the Legislature's whim. That is difficult for recruiting. The current system is, there's no procedure across most of the university. It's just all legislative, COLA. And what this is trying to do is say there's going to be at least two ways that people get raises that are outside of the legislative session. And that is going to be hard to fund, I do not deny that. I honestly have no idea how that question gets answered. But I do think we have a lot of smart people at this institution that could potentially figure it out. So yeah, I'm in favor of it, because there's at least some incentive and regular pay raises, whereas in the old system it seemed completely at the caprice of legislative bodies that don't actually work with us on a day to day basis.

Gary: It's very depressing in my group because two people have declined coming here because of money. We're fighting industry and we're not competing very well at all.

Bryan Koenig: If we were to approve this and it goes on to get vetted by everyone, it seems like we would want this more fully formed. Another thing is we do already have this in place, it's just a more unpredictable system. The rank advancement bumps, COLA, CUPA median, random pay bumps and some people may get merit bumps. I don't know anybody who has. We have a lot of trouble hiring professors because they can make a lot more money elsewhere. One of the concerns I have is to make sure no one makes less money with the new system.

Mike: In thinking about this – the median problem is a problem everyone has. I think one thing that makes me and some of my department concerned is we are not sure this is solving the problem. If we're distributing the COLA evenly, are we

creating a problem? If we're trying to stay at the median but the only money we have is this flat COLA adjustment money, then over time, and we ran a few of these over a few years, what it does is if you're in the upper tier of salary if you compare the upper and the medium and the lower, then to keep the upper at the average you have to start taking that COLA money. If we don't have any money to get them back up to the average, then they can't compete. And so over time it trickles down to each level. I guess that's why it's really hard, not having some numbers. When you do start to plug in numbers, which we've done a little bit, you realize that it really does cause problems if we don't have money to fund all three of those areas, something has to give, and if it's the average that gives for the upper group and then the middle group. Well, now, we can't compete but if you have to take money from the flat CUPA or from the flat COLA well, now, that's taken away from what it was supposed to be. I just can't see how to explain this to somebody and make sense of it without seeing examples of how it works and especially not knowing where money comes from. Passing something like this doesn't mean that all of a sudden that money is there. I don't know if we're solving the median issue. We're all struggling because we're competing with other marketing departments as we're trying to get marketing faculty. So we're competing with what their salaries are and if our average is low, it's low, it doesn't matter where we are relative to any other departments in SUU. I'm not sure how this helps our situation.

Lynn: I do think in order for this proposal to work, we need to find where the money's going to come from and how much it's going to cost. It will also hinge on a couple of other variables – one is what numbers we plug into the table, but also the demographics and SUU. How many faculty have been here 15, 20, 30 years? And as they retire, how many new people are we bringing in? So the demographics are going to dictate how much money we need to fund the model. That would be our next step to look at this basic procedure now that people feel could work and let's see if we could make it work. We need to obviously meet with the powers that be on campus and discuss the changing demographics and what we can expect, what it is going to cost, and how we can fund this.

Mike: We can't do any of that unless we vote and that's where it gets sticky for me because I agree with some of this and some of this I don't. So perhaps we should explore this further, or consider that the way our current system is set up is good enough. But without seeing those numbers, I don't see how some of this can work. If the numbers go in and it doesn't work the way some of us hoped, are we now stuck because of the vote?

Lynn: I think that would be true if it was a policy. I'm not convinced that it's true in this case, with a set of procedures.

Mike: I still don't understand exactly what we mean because it still sounds like we're trying to create a way to increase pay which will become policy. I don't understand how the procedure is not going to make it not as important. I know you've put a ton of work into this. It seems like with some of the comments in the table, I just don't know what we're voting for, and I can't tell my department what it is I voted for.

Kelly: The question here is whether this is something that faculty would like us to pursue or is this totally the wrong direction to go in? Maybe we can hear from a few others on the committee. It would be interesting to see if this is your perception of what we're doing. Do you see this as a one way road and no turning back type of thing if we move forward? I think this is scaring people a little bit. So maybe we could hear from the other committee members.

Ryan: I want to underscore the feeling that our current system or lack of system seems random and undependable and doesn't keep up with inflation. It feels like loyalty is undervalued every year. What my colleagues like about this proposal is that it would give them something dependable. Something that's transparent, something that's clear, something that's easy to understand, something they can depend on. It would require additional funding – we don't just want to move money around. We understand our issues will require additional funding. It moves the machinery along with a message – we need to find more funding. Every college has a representative on WAFSEC so if you haven't heard from them reach out to them. Let them know that this is important, we want to hear from you on a regular basis, we want to give you feedback. If you're not hearing from them, I can see why it might feel like you're locked out of the process. But every college has a representative.

If there is a universe of steps or a service table, if there is some dollar amounts that you can envision that could possibly work, then I would say vote for this and WAFSEC will go and work on it. If there's not a universe where you see anything that would work in terms of the service table, then vote against it, and we'll try to come up with something else. But there is a cost to delay. I mean, the longer we try to get something through. The longer we're just sort of stuck with the current system, and the less and less money in terms of real dollars a lot of us are making every year.

Chris: I have a question about policy 8.5.2, the HR link, the faculty link, and the staff link. Are those resources that hadn't existed before? So they're being added as they're coming up? Or was there something before that was being replaced?

Jon: Sure. So we did not have an institutional compensation policy, and I believe that was the first time it was adopted. You can see at the bottom of the policy.

Kelly: Looks like it was adopted in 1990 and updated in 2005. So it had not been updated in almost 20 years.

Jon: Yes. And so June 9, 2023, I believe, is the first time that they asked for specific procedures for faculty and staff to be added. That's my understanding.

Kelly: SUU is growing and we have people in various places in HR and Legal who are taking a closer look at these policies, and we are following them. I think we're getting caught up on a little bit of those growing pains. And that's why we're seeing a lot of these kinds of policy updates coming through over the last several years because several of those policies have not been updated in a very long time. And frankly, it's just not working for the university that we've grown to be.

Qian: We appreciate the team working on this proposal. Regarding the cost of a delay, if we didn't approve it today and needed more time to go through the process it should look the same for all the departments. That's also a reason why we need to pay more attention and be a little more patient with this. As Mike mentions, we don't have numbers and we may not need numbers to approve this proposal today but we would like some simple numbers and some assumptions about what this would look like. Perhaps we could start with 3% every year, a really simple model with numbers to represent the median, the higher and the lower. If we just want that model based on the CUPA adjustments, we can find that actually, for year 3, the medium and the higher faculty, those salaries will just be average. So it means like this model might impact $\frac{2}{3}$ of faculty, not just the minority. Hoping we aren't fixing one problem and inadvertently bringing in another problem.

Kelly: We have two options – we can vote on the proposed procedures or we can table the vote to the April 18th meeting to give the WAFSEC committee time to go over feedback and propose another response.

Dave Tufte motioned to table the proposal.
Steven Hawkins seconded the motion.

Yes 17/24

No 5/24

Abstain 2/24

Lynn: I'm fine with that. The only thing is that I know two weeks might seem like ample time, but I know that, for example, I'm going to be gone for most of next week at a conference, so I will try to convene the committee to get some of these many things that you've been bringing up addressed and everything. But I just can't promise that we're going to be able to get that done with that timeline.

Kelly: No, I understand. What I would encourage the senators to do to help Lynn and her team is if you can poll your faculty again and ask them, specifically for things that they like about the proposal and things that they would like to see change, or that they don't like. I think that would really help the committee if we can give them some concrete feedback on what the proposal is, and if they have different recommendations for perhaps how that model could be implemented. For example, the original model was based on FEC Reports. Then it was changed to years of service. If somebody has a different suggestion, it is better to be able to work off of concrete suggestions. I'll set up a new document so that it's clean. That would really help the WAFSEC group move forward. I know that they have a lot of comments to sift through in that original document. I think they capture a lot of the discussion that we've had here today. I'll ask maybe for a deadline if we can try to get that feedback in by Tuesday. Lynn, thank you for spending your evening with us and fielding those questions. And thanks to the team, I think we got some good feedback today and look forward to seeing the proposals for 3.0.

8. Discussion Items:

- a. None

9. Standing Committee Updates: (5:22)

- a. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)
- b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)
- c. Staff Association (John Lisonbee)
Closed nominations for Staff Association elections. Before commencement we will have a campus beautification day – all are welcome to join.
- d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)
- e. Graduate Council (Donna Handley)
- f. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- g. Student Association (Alexis McIff)
I'm sad my term has ended and it has been a pleasure serving with you. Om Mehta will be the new rep. Updates: we gave a resolution to the Library to extend hours and they will be changing for the month of April. There are a lot of closing events in colleges and students would love you to visit. We gave funding to the College of Health Sciences for their 5K fundraiser. We're going to hand out finals wellness kits similar to what we did at midterms. Most Fun Friday. Passed a resolution to place a new vending machine in the Science Building.
- h. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
Continuing to work on a survey for medical benefits. Will hope for late summer early fall. Please provide feedback for a better understanding to inform the RFP process.

Maren: Fall might be a better time for this to come out so we can enjoy our non-contract time

- i. Faculty Awards Committees:
 - i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
 - ii. Employee Commitment for Access & Belonging Award Committee (Kelly Goonan)
 - iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)
 - iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
 - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Andrew Misseldine)
- j. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)
- k. Past President's Report (Abigail Larson) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee
- l. President Elect's Report (Scott Knowles) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)
Nothing to report. Shameless plug for TDAA's last two productions of the year: Roe and The Wolves.
- m. President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council
Nominations for new IRB chair – it comes with a 6 credit course release each semester and a graduate student assistant. Reach out to Jake Johnson if interested. A legislative task force has been formed to help guide SUU in implementing the directives from the recent legislative session. We met this week. We decided to set up a webpage to post regular updates. You'll be notified when it is live with updates. Reminder about the last minute invitation to meet with accreditation (4/5 10-10:50am in Charles Hunter Room) about shared governance. Senators and Staff Association are encouraged to attend. Policy 6.3 for internships is going to the Policy Arbitration Committee to clarify some language.

Mike: Will another Google doc be sent to record feedback on the compensation model?

Kelly: I'll set that up after this meeting and share.

10. Call for Executive Session

11. Adjourn (5:33)