

FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

March 21, 2024

4:00-5:30 PM

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, Amanda Roundy, Grant Shimer, Ryan Siemers, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

Not Attending:

Proxies: Matt McKenzie for John Lisonbee

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

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
 - a. Lynn White, WaFSEC Chair
 - b. John Lisonbee, Staff Association President
 - c. Alexis McIff, 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. Approval of Meeting Minutes:
 - a. **March 7, 2024 minutes**
Tabled for April 4th meeting.
4. Events and Announcements:
 - a. [Every Brilliant Thing](#) productions March 22 7:00pm and March 23 2:00pm (free!)
 - b. [QPR Training](#) March 27, Cedar Breaks Room, 11:00am-12:30pm
 - c. [COHS 5k Fun Run](#) Fundraiser April 20
5. Information Items: (4:05)
 - a. Faculty Survey Results

I have edited comments for anonymity. Will finish up and share with everyone and then at a future meeting we can discuss next year's focus items.

- b. [Task Force](#) for implementing requirements of legislation passed in 2024

Provost Anderson: There is a large spreadsheet that was created about all the legislation. There are three main bills that we are looking at per President Benson's request. We are looking to implement the spirit and the letter of the law. One of them has to do with all the DEI initiatives – intent is to make sure to serve all students. Another is the bathrooms and facilities to make sure we have the right signage, so Tiger Funk is on the committee to help with that. The other is post-tenure review. We've been looking at this closely. We will have to do this annually. We already have tools like the AIM and the FECs and the last update to 6.1. We will be working on all these over the summer and pull in a representative from Faculty Senate. That's the scope of the work of the committee and then updating the strategic plan to match those pieces.

That's the scope of the work of the committee.

6. Action Items: (4:10)

- a. Vote on [Policy #6.33 - Academic Misconduct](#)

Mike: We are just now getting feedback – wondering if we should wait and discuss things a little more. The process checklist has a link that is dead – I ultimately found it and it is based on the prior policy, in terms of who is copied on the initial letter and number of days that the faculty and student have to respond. Also, there is a written determination letter template that I couldn't find. I'm passionate about going through the process with students to record what is happening, esp. for repeat offenders.

Also, mentions a template/letter that I couldn't find. So we weren't able to evaluate those documents.

I feel passionate about doing the process with students and recording what's happening.

We've had experience in the past with dead links and I worry about starting out with this new policy this way.

5 days to respond is better than 10 days.

Abi: The forms are being worked on right now – because the policy hasn't been approved I have tabled these until it is approved and the Academic Integrity Specialist is in place. This will be addressed and there will be training for faculty on how to use the forms and on the process. Those templates/forms don't have

to be used as long as faculty include the items in the policy that are outlined are included in that initial notification and the things that are discussed in the initial meeting are checked off. The forms are just for initial guidance.

Mike: I really appreciated those forms, because when you read through everything that's supposed to be in a letter it can be pretty daunting, but those forms make it really easy to just plug in the information that was there. I understand that you don't have to use those forms, but I think especially for faculty who are already a little hesitant to do this.

Abi: They will absolutely be made available before the policy goes live. The policy as it stands now has been approved by the Dean's Council. If we don't approve it today, that's fine, but then we won't be able to return to it possibly until next fall, because Cabinet meets on Monday, and then it needs to go out for a 21-day review, which is another opportunity for people to give feedback on it. Then it has to go to a vote in the President's Leadership Council, and then it goes to the Board of Trustees. It's okay if we don't vote on it but keep in mind that the policy that we currently have in place hasn't been updated since 2004. The Academic Integrity Specialist probably would not be able to be put in place until the following semester, so possibly spring 25.

I feel like I've been working on this policy since September and was actually approved 2 years ago by Faculty Senate, and then it sat dead for 2 years, because Legal had some feedback and the committee that originally started working on revising this policy said they didn't want to work on it anymore and dissolved itself. I picked it up this fall as chair of Academic Affairs, and I've been working on it with Jake Johnson, as well as legal counsel and the Academic Affairs Committee.

Kelly: I would recommend that unless folks have serious reservations about key points, just remember that certain things can be raised/refined during the 21-day campus review.

Josh: How does this policy handle repeat offenders?

Abi: When the AIS receives the case of misconduct they will be able to go through the database to check previous cases of misconduct. At that time, they can impose a more robust sanction if there are repeat offenses.

But the faculty member should not have that information. If the student has engaged in academic misconduct in another class with another faculty member.

JOSH: Where is that stated in the policy?

Mike: It's in 4.4.C.5

Is there a motion to vote to approve policy 6.3.3 as revised? Elise Leahy made a motion. Kyle Thompson seconded the motion.

Approve: 25

Abstain: 2

Not approve: 1

- b. [Resolution Requesting Increase in Adjunct/Overload Compensation](#)
 - i. [Rationale](#)

I asked to only make a request for an adjunct rate – there was feedback that it should be combined with overload compensation. USHE institutions do have them combined so we have decided to do the same. The Executive Committee has recommended \$1050 per credit.

There is more rationale in the link about these particulars.

Rachel: Clarification – is there no longer a difference between undergraduate and graduate compensation.

Kelly: Right this is the rate regardless of the course level. The rationale is that undergraduate courses tend to be large and need more attention and feedback whereas grad students may not likely need as much guidance.

Rachel: I do have concerns about the compensation being the same for undergrad/grad.

Donna: Well, it has not been discussed in the years since you've been on board, Rachel. Would it be appropriate to share the resolution and the rationale with the Graduate Council? I'm not sure what's the most productive thing to do here. So I welcome recommendations.

Kelly: Please share with the Graduate Council and faculty. The Cabinet is meeting on Tuesday to discuss budget requests – so the goal is if we're asking for an increase to get this in front of the Cabinet while they're having these discussions.

Kyle: After talking with my department, there is overwhelming support for increasing adjunct compensation; we are in favor of this senate resolution wholeheartedly.

Josh: Do we know how much this will cost the university? How many overload/adjunct courses are being taught each academic year?

Cody: Do we have a recommendation of where this money is coming from?

Kelly: My understanding is this would come from the SUU pool of funds that is generated through tuition and fees. The budget office has done an analysis to see how much it will cost the university.

Jon: Including benefits would cost around 500k in ongoing funds. We have to pay 14.5% benefits to adjunct faculty and cover FICA. We pay about 22% benefits to full-time faculty because they get the FICA portion we have to cover and an additional portion to the retirement account. That would be the total amount across all full-time faculty, staff, and adjuncts who teach to move everything to about \$1,050. It's about half a million a year.

Kelly: Cody to your point about, why are we asking for this? It has come up in Senate discussions over the last several years. I don't know that anybody actually ever asked, how do we do that because it's an amount that the university sets. There's no salary model for adjunct/overload pay. The last time there was an adjustment to the adjunct and overload compensation rate for the increase from \$800 to \$900 per credit at the undergraduate level in summer of 2021, and graduate level compensation was not changed. Even if we keep graduate and undergraduate compensation the same, this would be an increase for graduate level courses. Prior to that I do not know when or if compensation was ever added other than I can tell you that when I mentioned this at the Board of Trustees meeting last Friday morning that our VP of Finance, Dr. Mary Pearson, said that when she started teaching at SUU as an adjunct 27 years ago, she got paid \$2,400 to teach a three-credit class and now that compensation would be \$2,700 to teach a three-credit class. So, if we want to backtrack 27 years, that rate has probably not increased significantly for quite a long time.

This is a recommendation not a guarantee that it will change at all or to the level we recommend.

Bryan: When I teach a grad class I get the same ICH as undergrad so I'm ok with this. Why is it not more – teaching five classes that's a full-time instructor and it doesn't seem like a ton of money.

Jon: I agree - the challenge we have being in Cedar City is we don't have a lot of options to pull into face to face classrooms.

Maren: \$2700 is what I got paid to teach as an adjunct 13 years ago.

Kelly: Bryan your question addresses the larger issue of adjunct instructors and higher ed more broadly. If you have somebody teaching a full course load and they're not a full-time faculty. This is an important but separate question.

Donna: In the spirit of having this move forward so the Cabinet has something to consider – I would be comfortable supporting this and look at it later.

John Meisner: Is there potential that if we approve it now will we be able to re-address this later?

Kelly: The initial number proposed was \$1200.00. We ultimately felt that it was important where there was support that we shoot for something that is reasonable and possible. I don't think this would preclude another negotiation.

Ryan: We're requesting that it periodically be reviewed and adjusted. So, part of the resolution is requesting that it not stagnate forever.

Chris: Why a resolution and why not some other vehicle?

Kelly: This is how I was advised to send a request directly to the President. We pass policies; this is not a policy. We don't do resolutions very often. We looked to SUUSA for examples.

Is there a motion to vote on the resolution?

Mitch Greer motioned and John Benedict seconded the motion.

Approved 28/28

This will be delivered to President Benson tomorrow.

7. Discussion Items: (4:44)

- a. Proposed [Faculty Compensation Procedures](#) (Lynn White)
 - i. [Rationale](#)

8.5.2

Lynn: An overview was provided about the work of this committee.

Some have a perception that faculty pay is inequitable. We have worked to try and bring a compromise to compensation.

Some have no idea how faculty compensation is determined or how increases happen. We have proposed a unique model.

Base salary + FEC report-dependent increase + COLA

Establish a 100% CUPA median for CIP and rank (determined annually) + determined by the number of successful FECRs independent of rank, department, CIP + adjusted up for faculty who fall below the median COLA increase that year.

These are some of the strong points: equal raises for equal work, addresses compression, helps recruit quality faculty, retains quality faculty, simple and transparent.

Some challenges: (1) Inflation rate (2.4%) Not sure if we should have higher services tables early on or later to reward loyalty. These are things we still need to address. (2) Buy in from the Deans: signing bonuses, relocation, merit not added to base. (3) Buy in from faculty – those currently making less will like this but those making more may not want to give up their percentage increases. (4) Where will they get the funds – we would like to work toward this. The cost saving on giving more to those who have worked here the longest will be spread out to benefit more faculty.

Andrew: Would there still be a significant pay raise with rank advancement then?

Abi: My understanding was that moving from associate to "full" would increase your CUPA median so compensation would happen that way. If we could have some kind of bump or reward for making rank advancement or tenure. Potentially it could be a change in the CUPA median.

John: Thanks to the committee. Would our individual DEC need to be changed? Are we coming up with our own metrics and scales or would that be the university's role?

Lynn: We haven't addressed that. But we feel there needs to be an independent review committee for these situations.

John: This could be a real concern as there isn't a lot of person-power to support committees. Whenever these merit-based incentives are introduced it becomes a political nightmare to get inflated reviews so they get the money. Other times a review was arbitrarily reduced for external reasons which led to a reduction. We are all still people and I'm concerned about potential problems.

Lynn: We hope a very objective, well-defined DEC will minimize these possibilities.

Grant: How much money are we talking about for these advances? Is COLA currently a percentage of our salaries? If it's a flat rate then it could solve some of these problems.

Kelly: COLA is authorized by the legislature and they set the number from what the state approved and then they prescribe how that raise is allocated.

Grant: So, this is to make up for the COLA unfairness which exasperates the issue.

Lynn: It would cost \$116,600.00 to bring people up to the CUPA median. But what it would cost to use the service tables and add based on the FEC reports is \$500,000+. If we use the service table it takes away perceptions of favoritism because it's based on the number of FEC reports. There is a lot of flexibility built into this table to make sure it's perceived favorably by the majority of the faculty.

Chris: If this goes into effect will there be any consideration of those who have been here longer and bring them to where they would have been? It seems this will be applied retroactively. After a certain point, your increases will have to flatten out and get the same amount every year.

Lynn: Right, if you've been here 27 years we're going to assume you've had that many successful FEC reports. After a certain amount of successful FEC reports it will level out.

Kelly:

We are being asked to recommend this procedure to guide faculty compensation.

Amanda: So in the short term, just curious, if you are below the median and you know new hires in your dept are getting hired at significantly higher rates and getting more overload within your dept is there anything that can be done?

Kelly: Hopefully departments are putting into place clear guidelines for equitably assigning overload.

Chris: If someone is above CUPA median, the average could catch up with them, assuming there's no increase unless they are below median.

Mike: If we're trying to hire a faculty member – we are competing with other business schools of similar size. If I'm in an area that is making more than other departments, this will keep you up with the competition. It seems this proposal pushes you to the average and would not be the equivalent to raises that other schools are giving.

Lynn: This is one of the biggest challenges. They will be coming in at the CUPA median and it is based on all institutions in the United States. A signing bonus could be offered (but not added to their base). We would like numbers added to

the service table that will keep them interested. Increases based on FEC reports but keeping up with nationwide CUPA median. This computation is done annually for each faculty member. To throw a number out there, if you are at \$80,000 and with a successful FEC report you will receive money from that and any CUPA money. This will guarantee that everyone is at the CUPA median or above and getting increases from FEC reports. What could someone in Accounting expect? If they have the potential to make more based on the percentage of base then that goes back to the concern of inequity. No one will fall below the median in this model and we will be competitive.

Mike: If you're getting above the CUPA median, you're not reducing the salary but it would not be increasing at the rate it would increase if it was based on just a percentage raise, which is what most schools do. I don't know if people in every department are always kept at their CUPA median, and although I do know that there are faculty right here at SUU right now who are below the CUPA median, so that it has to be the case that we're not all there.

Ryan: As a member of this committee I want to thank Lynn. A flat COLA might fix this but right now we get a boost at tenure and at promotion, and then we get an additional COLA, if the legislature decides to give us one. What this is proposing to do is to add an additional amount that we can depend on every year, a raise based on the number of successful FEC reports. It would mean that the university would then have to actually go to the legislature and request money ahead of time and on a regular basis to fund this. It's a more active position instead of wondering whether we'll get money every year. The guidelines, as Lynn pointed out, mandate that the legislature gives us the freedom to control how that COLA is distributed. We prefer a flat amount, but that's up to the legislature this year, for example, they're not allowing us to do that at all. We're balancing a lot of different priorities. I also appreciated Kelly's point at our last WAFSEC meeting that we're trying to eat this elephant one bite at a time. So, Grant's question about the magnitude of the differences of the numbers on the table is a very important question and the committee wasn't able to come to a consensus on the specific model in that table and that's something I'm pretty confident we'll be able to work on next year. That's our priority for next year. But, I appreciate everybody's work trying to just put the model forward.

Josh: If we're basing everything off the FEC report it establishes the department minimum. When I first got here, if a faculty member, whether independent of their department, excels and exceeds those expectations they're given the same pay raises as those that just meet the minimum standard. To me, that's one of the challenges we should think about. This system does focus on equity, but it also does equity among those that just meet the standard, and I don't know if that's what we want to be able to do. We want to reward those that contribute to the mission and vision of the university, those that go above and beyond. This

system does not allow that to happen in terms of the base pay, it could happen with bonuses. But that's where I think the previous comment of it's going to be a political nightmare to give bonuses here and there. But I really think that we turn to the DECs to establish those who exceed expectations and standards. And then we set an X and a Y based on that, so that those who exceed expectations might get equal pay for their equal work that they're doing.

Lynn: We did talk about merit-based bonuses that the Deans could award that would not be added to base. But here's the thing in our proposal, we also asked that the Deans come up with a set of procedures for determining any kind of merit-based bonuses, and that those procedures be clear and defensible and posted on their website. So that way, faculty know what the rules are, because I don't think they know what the rules are if there is any merit-based money available, I think very few of us do know. If the Deans were to come up with something that was vetted and defined as acceptable to faculty and administrators and posted, then that can alleviate some of the concerns that I'm hearing.

Kelly: Please take this back to your departments. Lynn has agreed to field any questions. I'll set up a Google doc to record feedback.

b. [Graduating with Latin Honors](#)

This came up at the Dean's Council meeting – the Registrar brought the Provost Office's attention 45% of our 2024 class is graduating Summa Cum Laude or Magna Cum Laude – what does that mean? This table shows how SUU compares to our peer institution inside and outside the state. Our GPA averages are low in comparison. It would necessitate an update to policy 6.49 and if the Faculty Senate would be willing to work on a proposal to get through before we end this school year. Any interest in leading this committee to look at what graduating with honors means.

Maren: What's the rush?

Jon: No rush – but we want the students to know as soon as possible this would take effect this spring or next.

Chris: If there's no standard across the board for what this means, then what's the problem? Are there perceptions that we're inflating the honor? Is this really a big deal?

Kelly: What do honors mean if 45% graduate with honors? Maybe it's not GPA changes but the top percent. What makes some exceptional and what does it mean and what does it carry? It looks like we will tackle this at a later date.

Chris: Can we ask people who are interested in this?

c. [Student Course Feedback Surveys](#)

There does seem to be a desire among departments to look at these questions so we may be asking for a group to address this in the fall and perhaps pilot something in the fall.

Kelly: I will ask Camille about something she could take on and we provide some Senate representation. Most of the feedback I received are the questions and response rate in their current form there is no actionable feedback for faculty. They would like direction on what to change, continue, or add, etc.

8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:48)

a. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)

b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)

c. Staff Association (John Lisonbee)

We will be doing Finish Strong stations the last week of classes to grab a bite and encourage them. Faculty are more than welcome to participate. We'll be providing information soon.

d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

- i. We've discussed which courses will be in GE. We've discussed moving Info 1010 to a university required course. Three credits made available will be a personal and social responsibility course from what is already offered. Our students need experience with life skills. We would not have to develop new courses.

e. Graduate Council (Donna Handley)

Two policies 6.60 and 6.6.2 that were approved by the Grad Council and Jake Johnson. We are forwarding this to the Senate and Dean's Council.

University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)

f. Student Association (Alexis Mccliff)

College weeks are ongoing – and there are great turnouts. Students would love for faculty to attend events. Tomorrow there will be baby lambs on the library quad for a pick me up. Primaries are this week. They have several candidates. Many of the positions are not uncontested this year. The general elections are next week. Candidates are handing out promotional materials this weekend next week. They may also ask to visit classes. There is a debate next Wednesday at 10:30. Please encourage your students to vote.

g. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)

Met today to discuss preparations for the health benefits analysis. We're working with consultants to develop a survey to find out what their priorities are.

- h. 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)

There was no support for the distinguished educator awards to be assigned to adjunct, Gen. Ed., and graduate course instructors, but there was more support for the idea of just adding those separately and not taking the ones we already have in place.
 - iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
 - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Andrew Misseldine)
- i. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)
- j. Past President's Report (Abigail Larson) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee working on 6.1 and getting ready to share as an information item next meeting.
- k. President Elect's Report (Scott Knowles) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)
- l. President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

Be on the lookout for a campus safety campaign walking and driving.

 - i. Policy #6.3 - Internships to go to Policy Arbitration Committee to clarify some language
 - ii. [SUU Campus Master Plan](#)
 - iii. Compensation: 3% COLA, to be distributed as across the board % increase
 - iv. Tuition increase requested (2.85%)
 - v. Dean searches for CPVA and School of Business
 - vi. Budget process review will begin Tuesday March 26
 - vii. Elections for Faculty Senate President Elect next week.

9. Call for Executive Session

10. Adjourn (5:58)