

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Notes**  
**February 8, 2021, 2:00 p.m. CT, via Zoom**

**Attending:**

Randy Clark, Kay Daigle, Kate Shannon, Rolando Diaz, William Fridley

**Not Attending:**

Dan Althoff, Stan Alluisi

Chair Clark called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

**No Old Business**

**New Business**

1. The Administrative Council met on February 1. Senator Fridley pointed out that the [Meeting Notes](#) are posted on the Faculty Senate (FS) website. It is noted that this is not a FS Document, and that we thank the Office of the President for making the notes available.
2. The first Shared Governance Forum of the semester is scheduled for Tuesday, February 6 at 2:00 p.m. CT, via Zoom. The administration's choice for the topic is the Anthology (formerly Campus Labs) end-of-course evaluations that were implemented campus-wide in the fall. Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) Teresa Golden has asked that questions on the topic from faculty be emailed to Bryanna Allsbury (Administrative Associate/Assessment Coordinator). Discussion began with recalling some history. The EC was first informed about the IDEA (called at the time) surveys at a [meeting on November 5, 2019](#) with then Interim-President Bryon Clark and VPAA Golden. The EC was told that the surveys would be implemented on a limited, selective, and experimental fashion, with the likely first-users being those academic departments undergoing program review. Senators raised several questions and concerns including the reliance on third-party vendors, the notorious misuses of such surveys in faculty evaluations (promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review), questions of who has access to the data, conflicts with current departmental surveys of instruction, and cases of bias that have been known to taint the use of surveys. Nonetheless, the committee was prepared to observe the selective experimental implementation of the Survey and assess its effectiveness and propriety.

In the fall of 2020, it was announced that the Survey would be used by all faculty for every course. This departure from what senators were told had some unfortunate results. Without the promised selective, experimental implementation, faculty had no experience with the Survey on which to assess its value and to direct its future use. The sudden campus-wide implementation left little time for faculty training and preparation, for departmental coordination, or to achieve any degree of faculty buy-in to the process. Faculty input was not solicited. In short, the sudden, un-reviewed and unexplained implementation exacerbated a perception from faculty that the process lacked credibility.

The EC agreed to start a list of questions and concerns. Chair Clark agreed to solicit further input from senators at the 2-10-2021 meeting, to compile a list, and to forward the list to

Bryanna Allsbury for the administration's SGF preparation. Initial questions and concerns included:

- Cases at the departmental level of redundancy (and in some cases incompatibility) with current practices.
- What are the processes for departments that wish to standardize their objectives on the survey?
- It was noted that the Survey utilizes national comparisons. How should this be viewed and assessed? Would it be possible or preferable to use interdepartmental or inter-school comparisons?
- Who has access to this data and how is it used by outside parties?
- How will the Survey results be used in annual evaluations of faculty, and in promotion & tenure, and post-tenure review?
- It was noted that a likely reason for the sudden implementation might be to provide information for the [Higher Learning Commission \(HLC\)](#), for example CRITERION 3. TEACHING AND LEARNING: QUALITY, RESOURCES, AND SUPPORT, point 4 "Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures." Given that some departments have not practiced systematic evaluation of instruction for years, will the sudden Survey implementation (without faculty input or review) be used in a way that gives a more robust portrayal of *evaluation of instruction* than is warranted from our experience?
- Can we arrange for more direct access to the Survey information on the SE website?

Senator Daigle noted that department chairs had been asked to gather input from their departmental faculty as well. There appear to be inconsistencies among department chairs in the degree to which departmental faculty have been informed.

3. The [Faculty Salary & Compensation proposal](#), conversations between the [EC, President Newsom, and VPAA Golden](#), and [President Newsom's written assurance](#) of prioritizing the issue of faculty salary were discussed.

There was agreement that the process and fate of the proposal are in the administration's court. Given that, what degree and form of follow up and insistence should the FS take? It is recognized that this is President Newsom's first time working through our university's budget, and that navigating the process will involve twists, turns, unanticipated obstacles, and perhaps pleasant surprises.

It was agreed that suggestions and recommendations to the administration on *how to approach the budget process* are in order. One idea that has gained agreement among senators is a "pay yourself first" approach (introduced at a meeting by Senator Laura Atchley) in which a specific dollar amount for faculty pay raises (e.g., \$2,021 added to the base salary of all full-time faculty) is a working assumption, and then the rest of the budget process is handled in a way that preserves and ensures the targeted pay raise. This is a simple procedural technique that can inform direct action that gives life to the rhetoric of prioritizing faculty salary.

The FS will be asked to consider forwarding a recommendation on this, perhaps delegating follow up to the [Budget Committee as they work to build on their initial correspondence with administration on the budget.](#)

Chair Clark noted that the proposal only represents an initial step in addressing long term issues related to the salary card, annual salary increases, and a plan for adjusting faculty salaries in the future. He encourages the FS and Budget Committee to continue their work on this issue by gathering information, framing strategies, and reiterating FS requests for faculty to have formal participation in the budget decisions.

The allocation of CARES Act funds was discussed. Department chairs have been asked to solicit input from their faculty on this issue. Again, there has been inconsistency in the flow of information in different departments. It was suggested that the FS request formal faculty involvement in these decisions with, perhaps, the Budget Committee taking a leading role.

Chair Clark recalled a conversation about using CUPA data to set a target for faculty salaries commensurate with similar institutions. Senator Fridley noted that for years (circa 1999 to 2010) the Budget Committee's primary task was to do salary comparisons with our sister regional institutions. Nothing much ever came of the comparative studies.

4. The delayed survey of the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process and results was discussed. It was noted that the annual PTR process concludes on March 1. It was agreed that the request for review of PTR would be forwarded to the administration after March 1, to allow them time to collect and process the data, and to report on the findings in the fall of 2021. The survey instrument exists and will need to be updated.
5. Chair Clark received a request from Christala Smith (Director, CIDT) for the Executive Summary of the COVID Survey conducted by the University Affairs Committee. Interest in the survey results has also been expressed by President Newsom. The Survey results are posted on the FS website.
  - [Executive Report on the Covid-19 survey conducted by the University Affairs Committee.](#) A revised version with additional data is expected by the end of the year. (Fall 2020 Documents)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Notes by William Fridley, filling in for the FS Recorder.