

scheduled and Chair Clark will continue to share information from these meetings with the Faculty Senate.

On Monday (11.30.2020) [VPAA Golden provided a written response to four motions](#) put forward by the Faculty Senate. A summary of the response is included in the [Executive Committee report](#).

Chair Clark summarized VPAA Golden's response by motion:

Motion 1 (Annual Appointment letter) – Salary summaries are currently available via Colleague, but it is administration's intent to make a letter available soon. The hold-up has been due to the need to develop code within the Colleague software to make this possible.

Motions 2, 3, & 4 – In essence, what we have recommended as a Faculty Senate the administration has taken very seriously. In some cases it is necessary to clarify wording in the APPM in terms of policy. For instance, with regard to Motion 3, in some cases there will be a need for a different way to record graduate hours. In order to highlight that need, clarification was needed in the APPM. Some of the articles of note from the APPM have been added as notes to support clarification points. Chair Clark feels that in general we were able to achieve objectives. Chair Clark, opened the floor for discussion and/or questions.

Discussion

Senator Gaffney made the point that the purpose of the Faculty Senate is to represent faculty in communication and policy matters with administration to address faculty needs. The work being done by the Faculty Senate is aligned with its mission, namely by asking administration to respond to the items that are not followed from APPM the Faculty Senate is promoting an ongoing process of reviewing policy and associate practice to bring them into line.

Senator Cotter-Lynch shared that she is surprised by the cap on overloads and asked if this puts into writing what has happened in the past (Full-time faculty can teach an overload equivalent to 2.0 FTE or 24 hours per semester; Instructors could potentially teach 30 hours per semester before permission is required for an overload limit above 2.0 FTE).

Senator Alluisi shared that in a conversation with VPAA Golden he asked under what conditions this might happen. She made clear that this is setting limits as a safety valve, it is not expected that faculty will meet or approach these limits.

Senator Daigle reiterated that this is not an expectation, it is to make sure that we are staying well below this overload cap. VPAA Golden was clear that her intention is not to see these caps met with regularity.

Senator Cotter-Lynch asked about the “arranged classes” guidance in the clarification document provided by VPAA Golden. The document states “these will not contribute to semester load unless adequate enrollment is obtained to be counted as a regular class (normally, 15 for undergraduate, 12 for graduate).” Senator Daigle shared that this is considered on a case-by-case basis. Some programs must run classes with smaller enrollments to provide required coursework for students in particular programs.

Senator Alluisi pointed out that some faculty might teach 11 hours in the fall and 13 hours in the spring, does the average across the two semesters satisfy full-time teaching requirement?

Senator Shannon pointed out that the RUSO policy states that full-time faculty teach 24-27 hours per year, this might inform the 11 hours one semester and 13 hours the following semester (fall/spring).

Chair Clark conveyed his appreciate for the progress of the Faculty Senate’s work in concert with administration to standardize practices, increase transparency with regard to operating procedures, and ensure that policy is followed. The policy goes into effect January 1, 2021.

Senator Alluisi asked if faculty could receive a retroactive adjustment (such as fall overload pay) based on the policy changes.

Senator Wood asked if the clarifications/terms are being added to the APPM? Chair Clark responded, yes. Senator W. Fridley agreed. Chair Clark followed up stating, the Faculty Senate offers suggestions for the VPAA, but the VPAA has the power to add any content to the APPM.

Senator Shannon inquired about the use of the references to an “employment contract” as a determinant for course load. Do contracts include this verbiage? Does everyone have an up-to-date employment contract?

Chair Clark pointed out that Instructor teaching load could be set at 15 hours per semester. If the Instructor course load is set at 12 hours, he/she must have additional responsibilities as a faculty member such as committee work, advising, scholarship, etc.

Senator C. Fridley returned to the use of contract terminology and offered that her rank is Instructor. She has been hired twice and there has been no discussion of a contract associated with rehiring. The word contract was not mentioned in rehiring process. It was stated (unidentified comment) that some people do get contracts.

Senator W. Fridley inquired, “are there contracts? If so, what are the terms of the contract? What does the contract for a 15-hour course load Instructor look like?”

Chair Clark offered that individual faculty members will need to reach out to their chairs to rework some things (this is in the response from VPAA Golden). Clarification may necessitate some changes. These clarifications make clear that we are not all the same. Differences may also be departmental. These differences at the department level will need to be worked through under a set of parameters and expectations that we have clarification on now with VPAA Golden’s response. You might need to advocate for changes that have not been in practice, like getting a 1.333 load for graduate courses hours, or teaching overloads. Based on this new information you will need to have a conversation with department chair.

Senator Daigle offered that Faculty Development Plans will be an important document to advocate for appropriate pay. If you are expected to engage in scholarship and/or service and teach 15 hours you should be paid an overload.

Senator Cotter-Lynch offered a perspective stating that most instructors should be at 12 hours and doing work that helps the department (advising, committee work, reports, etc.). Does a 15-hour load potentially disenfranchise faculty and limit their opportunity to participate in shared governance, scholarship, other service, advisement?

Senator Dixon pointed out that if an Instructor would like to engage in service and scholarship that could be negotiated with their department chair.

Chair Clark asked if the Senators wanted to go back to the drawing board and advocate that Instructors only teach 12 hours, and stated that this distinction seems different from the original motions put forward.

Senator Cotter-Lynch pointed out that full time is considered 12 hours, but sometimes someone might not engage in service & scholarship and would be paid 15 hours. The clarification document makes things more concrete and could help faculty advocate for themselves and negotiate regarding their role. This could help protect the faculty member.

Senator C. Fridley suggested that negotiating the load and expectations is about consent and agreement between the faculty member and their chair. We want faculty to have a choice and a voice in the role they play within the department and university.

Chair Clark asked about the strength of verbal agreements versus written ones.

Senator Alluisi posed an associated question/scenario: Many people may not have any paperwork that indicate what their role and responsibilities are. Most of the work they do has been agreed upon verbally. Anyone in a non-standard, non-card position should probably get it in writing.

Mike Davis provided information regarding the nature of contracts and assured Senators that the policy documents (APPM) is contractual and that verbal contracts are still contracts. Both state and federal courts would say the APPM accounts for the salary expectations. If changes occur that harm a faculty member it would be considered a breach of contract. However, if the changes do not result in harm faculty have no rights to a remedy. The APPM is a contractual document – employment is referred to as a contract throughout the document.

a. Chair Clark made the following motion

MOTION: The Executive Committee moves to recommend that a formal agreement of intent to “faculty compensation” be provided by the current administration before the end of the 2020-2021 academic year. This agreement, in principle, is an agreement to develop a systematic approach to base salary adjustments beginning August 1, 2021. Faculty Senate believes, as a first step, it is reasonable to **roll** the last three year’s (2019, 2020 and 2021) current salary card step increases into the base salary of all eligible faculty.

- b. Motion was seconded by Senator Daigle.
- c. Discussion – Chair Clark asked for assistance with wording and provided the following rationale: The intention of the motion is to bring step increases up to date and make adjustments to the salary card.
- d. Senator Cotter-Lynch offered a friendly amendment (role is changed to roll) this change appears in red in the motion above.
- e. Senator W. Fridley approves of the succinctness of the motion and commented that this provides a means for President Newsom to make his intentions known on the issue of faculty compensation. He also offered that a rationale should include discussion of the need for an annual adjustment and to raise the base levels on the salary card as faculty are being paid less and asked to work more. Faculty have been successful, but we are strained. Addressing compensation issues would boost morale and support recruitment and retention of faculty.
- f. Senator Daigle suggested that Senator W. Fridley’s comments be included in a section outlining the rationale for the motion.
- g. Senator W. Fridley also stated that we could add that the Faculty Senate would also support raises for other university employees (staff, adjunct faculty, etc.).
- h. Senator Cotter-Lynch offered appreciation for the phrasing of the motion, as it asks for an intention to develop a system without identifying a specific

system to follow. We want a commitment that we will have a system by the end of the year.

- i. Phrasing changes for the motion were considered at length. Senator Daigle suggested moving the last sentence up to the second sentence. Terminology regarding base salary increases on an ongoing basis (with inflation) was discussed but no significant changes were agreed upon.
- j. Chair Clark suggested a timeline for putting the motion before administration by the end of December and suggested that there would need to be consensus on wording. Or, would the Faculty Senate like to defeat the motion? And approach again at the beginning of the spring semester? It seems we are on board with the sentiment of the motion and need to haggle over wording a bit longer. Maybe we cannot solve this right now.
- k. Senator Alluisi expressed a concern saying if we wait, then it may be too late to affect budget adjustments for FY2021.
- l. Senator Shannon inquired about budget timelines – when are instructional salaries budgeted? If they come into play in January, we don't want to wait too long and be kicked out of the FY2021 budget cycle.
- m. Chair stated that he would like to continue to work on the composition of the motion. He asked for Senators to provide feedback via email and assist him in fine-tuning the motion.
- n. Senator Dixon offered another option, rescinding the motion
- o. Chair Clark agrees and makes the motion to rescind the motion. Senator Daigle approves.
- p. Chair Clark asked that Senators share their thoughts in constructing a rationale and wording for the motion. By the beginning of next week (12/7), he will send out something that can be voted on. [See the **Addendum**]

D. Personnel Policies

- a. Did not meet, nothing new to report
- b. Senator Fridley asked Senator Cotter-Lynch about progress on the request for information about faculty who are on the salary card, compared with faculty off the salary card. Senator Cotter-Lynch shared that she had heard from Marjorie Robertson and she is still working on the request. Noting the request requires looking at faculty members individually.

E. Planning Committee

- a. Did not meet, announcement for nominations went out on November 18th and closes on February 1st. There have been at least 93 nominations so far.

F. University Affairs Committee

- a. Did not meet, but the committee has survey results to share. Senator Diaz turned over the presentation of [results from the survey](#) to Senator Gaffney. The executive summary as provided via chat to Senators. Senator Gaffney shared his screen. The survey was composed of 10 likert scale questions and several open-ended, follow-up questions. 48% response rate. Respondents were diverse and represented a broad spectrum of faculty rank.

48.6% were tenured. Senator Gaffney reviewed responses and shared some of the comments provided.

- b. A question is missing from the report, Senator Gaffney will revise the report and send back out.
- c. Questions
 - i. Senator Wood thanked Senator Gaffney for the summary and suggested that the committee can come up with a list of recommendations over the next two weeks.
 - ii. Chair Clark would like to see the recommendations that are produced and suggested that the committee present results and recommendations to VPSA Liz McCraw and VPAA Golden.
 - iii. Senator Diaz asked about the process for getting the report out.
 - iv. Chair Clark suggested sending the Executive Summary with recommendations and providing contact information for follow up.
 - v. Chair Clark suggested contextualizing comments through a recommendations section. He also commended the committee for the work they have done.
 - vi. Senator Diaz shared that he would prefer for Chair Clark to present the Executive Summary. Chair Clark agreed.
 - vii. Senator Gaffney shared that his next step would be to pull out the additional question on growth (missing from the summary) and then create a recommendation section at the end. He will return the report to University Affairs committee for their comments and then send it on to the Faculty Senate for review.
 - viii. Chair Clark stated that he would like this information to go out VPAA Golden and VPSA Liz McCraw before the end of December.
 - ix. Senator Gaffney added that he would like to know what the students' responses might be. Maybe VPSA McCraw would be interested in sending it out to students.
 - x. Senator Cotter-Lynch shared that she had clicked on the link provided in the PDF document but could not see all of the comments from the link. Senator Gaffney stated he will correct it.

V. Old Business – None

VI. New Business - None

VII. Announcements – Chair Clark thanked Senator Cotter-Lynch and Chris Moretti for their work on the faculty compensation motions and supporting documentation and presentation at the Shared Governance Forum in November.

VIII. Adjournment

A. Adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

1. Motion Senator Daigle

2. Second – Senator Alluisi
3. Motion passes by acclamation

Minutes submitted by Senator Kate Shannon, Recorder

Addendum on Faculty Compensation Proposal (January 5, 2021)

[Faculty Compensation Proposal \(with history and rationale\)](#): at the December 2 meeting the FS recommended that the Executive Committee draft a faculty salary compensation proposal. The draft proposal was emailed to senators for comment on December 8. The proposal was put to an email vote on December 14, and it was announced on December 17 that the Proposal passed by a 15 to 0 vote.

The Executive Committee moves that:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the last three years' (2019, 2020, and 2021) current [Salary Card](#) annual step increases (\$546) be added to the base salary of all eligible faculty, beginning in Fall, 2021. The Faculty Senate asks that this recommendation be received and agreed to as an initial step in a sincere and intentional collaborative effort with the administration to:

- *Establish an annual cost of living adjustment for faculty, codified in an updated Salary Card.*
- *Increase the base pay for faculty at all ranks in an updated Salary Card.*
- *Develop and codify a reasonable and intentional process to systematically adjust faculty salaries in the future.*

Results of the vote:

The motion carries (15-0-0).