



- c. Second – Senator Gantt
- d. Discussion – none
- e. Vote to approve: Yes – 17; No – 0; Abstaining 0.
- f. There will be a minimum of one committee member from each of the ~~six~~**seven** groups (Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Applied Sciences, Behavioral Sciences ~~and~~ Applied Behavioral Sciences, **and Tribal Organizational Leadership**). An additional member from the department of English, Humanities and Languages will also be a member. The **Executive** Director—**Center for Student Success** or designee of the Academic Advising and Outreach Center (AAOC), and the Coordinator of the BSLAS will serve as ex-officio, non-voting members (APPM 3.5).

Changes are crossed out and in bold.

The committee also recommends Amy Gantt to represent the Tribal Organizational Leadership.

- C. Executive Committee (EC) – ([Meeting Notes](#) submitted)  
The EC met on 2-8-2021.

- a. It was announced that the semester’s first Shared Governance Forum will be held on Tuesday, February 6, at 2:00 p.m. CST, via Zoom. *The Anthology (Campus Labs) Course Review System: Q & A and Discussion about Best Practices Going Forward* (topic chosen by the administration). The EC began a list of questions and comments on the SGF topic (see Meeting Notes). Questions and comments will be forwarded to Bryanna Allsbury (Administrative Assistant/Assessment Coordinator).

Chair Clark opened the floor for discussion. Comments and questions included:

- What is the philosophy and function of the survey? What is its significance for our pedagogy, and how is it used to improve our teaching? How are the “findings” found and interpreted?
- In some cases, objectives that were chosen by faculty were not accurately included in the published survey.
- If the survey can be updated, will academic departments have access to perform the changes or will they have to go through an intermediary?
- It was noted that the survey did include prompts for qualitative comments.

Chair Clark invited senators to email any questions or comments to add to the list.

- b. Chair Clark opened the floor to discussion of the [Faculty Salary & Compensation proposal](#), conversations at the 1-25-2021 meeting with the [EC, President Newsom, and VPAA Golden](#), and [President Newsom’s written assurance](#) of prioritizing the issue of faculty salary.

Several comments addressed the tension between the temporal relation of our salary proposal to the current budget process, and the long-term goals of a codified annual salary increase, codifying an increase in base pay for all full-time faculty, and establishing a long-term plan for addressing faculty salary and compensation.

Senator Cotter-Lynch recommended an approach in which our requests and recommendations are pegged to the budget timeline and the corresponding release of relevant information (e.g., from the state). Perhaps we can address the issue on a monthly basis beginning in March. Various units are being asked to give budget priorities to the President and VPBA Westman in late February and early March. The actual budgets will be drafted in May. The perennial problems created by the state's budgetary timeline were also noted.

Chair Clark noted that the next EC meeting with the President and VPAA is scheduled for February 22. How do we continue with an insistent focus on faculty salary without "beating a dead horse"?

Senator W. Fridley proposed that we suggest approaching the budget with a "pay yourself first" framing in which a dedicated dollar amount for faculty salary increases is established up front (e.g., \$1,638 or \$2,021), and the budget is then drafted in a way that prioritizes maintaining the dedicated funds. This idea was discussed and supported at the February 8 EC meeting. The idea was initially proposed by Senators Atchley and Alluisi in FS discussions. Fridley added that this framing would provide a reasonable method to give life to the administration's rhetoric on prioritizing faculty salary.

Senator Alluisi noted that this method also functions to flip the pattern of only raising faculty salary if money is left, after the budgeting process.

W. Fridley suggested that the Budget Committee would be the ideal group to draft a brief suggestion for the EC to present at the February 22 meeting.

Cotter-Lynch recalled that the FS Proposal had two parts, one immediate and the other long-term. She also re-iterated the importance of preparing our positions for the long-term salary issues. Chair Clark agreed, and encouraged us to work on developing our position lest someone else do it for us.

Senator C. Fridley stated that this is a both/and issue. She expressed a bit of bafflement at the administration's characterization of the mystery surrounding a difficult, but in many ways a familiar and necessary task for a university's

administration. What is not unknown is that we have had four consecutive semesters of record enrollment. The time is right for the FS to “ask up front.”

Cotter-Lynch recognizes the constraints on administration formally committing to dollar amounts and countered that they are able to commit to a plan and process for addressing faculty salary in the future. What kind of process do we want in place?

Alluisi likened the “pay yourself first” approach to an experimental learning experience that necessitates explanation rather than waiting until the process is completed to be told we do not get a raise.

Senator Gaffney explained that many organizations use an established formula for annual raises and cost of living salary adjustments, and that he favors the dual approach to address both the immediate and long-term issues.

Senator Sparacio asked if the annual step-increases are in writing? Yes. They are in the Salary Card in an Appendix to the APPM, but we are not receiving them. It is a bit frustrating that actually practicing the university policy is a matter of contention.

Chair Clark noted that the next FS meeting is February 24, so the full senate would have difficulty weighing in to bring a discussion point to the EC meeting with the President (2-22). W. Fridley asked if it would be procedurally appropriate or practical to ask the Budget Committee to draft something for the EC meeting?

Cotter-Lynch asked for some clarification of what the Budget Committee is being asked to do. If it is to propose a long-term plan for annual raises, that would be too much to complete in the tight timeframe. W. Fridley explained that this would be a proposal for a way to approach the requested pay raise for Fall 2021. Cotter-Lynch recommended that we ask how current mandatory annual adjustments (e.g., personnel and insurance costs) are handled and what the rules are.

It was agreed the Budget Committee would work on preparing something for the EC meeting.

- c. Chair Clark explained that the delayed review of the post-tenure review process would commence in March with a target completion by Fall 2021. We will need to update the survey instrument.

#### D. Personnel Policies

- a. Did not meet, nothing new to report

- E. Planning Committee
  - a. Did not meet. Senator Boothe reported that the review of award nominations is moving along. Approximately 380 nominations have been received; many nominations for *teaching* and not many for *scholarship or service*.
  
- F. University Affairs Committee
  - a. Did not meet. Senator Diaz was asked how the two Presidential ad hoc committees on *diversity* are going? Diaz noted that the Diversity Student Recruitment and Retention Task Force has a report due on March 8.
  
- V. Old Business – None
  
- VI. New Business - None
  
- VII. Announcements – Chair Clark announced the [FS subcommittee](#) appointments for new senators Matt Sparacio (Personnel Policies, University Affairs) and Andy Kramer (Planning, University Affairs).
  
- VIII. Adjournment
  - A. Adjourned at 3:58 p.m.
    - 1. Motion Senator Daigle
    - 2. Second – Senator Alluisi
    - 3. Motion passes by acclamation

Minutes submitted by Archivist William Fridley, filling in for Recorder Kate Shannon