

Thursday, April 7, 2022  
2 pm, MA 319 & Zoom

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA SETTING MIEEING**

\_\_\_\_\_ meeting minutes as circulated.

2. Curriculum -John Cavitt (see bottom of page)  
Curriculog [Justifications for Curriculum](#) or Curriculog [Agenda EC April 7, 2022](#)  
MOTION: to move curriculum proposals forward to Senate by Amy Buckway  
SECOND: Eric Gibbons  
OUTCOME: Unanimous approval

The intense January workload makes it a struggle for UCC members to adequately review all proposals. It would be good to look at options for how this workload could be spread out.

3. Faculty Board of Review Report - Becky Jo Gesteland, Chair  
In 2020-21 there were no complaints filed. In 2021-22 a formal complaint was filed. The case is on-going and FBR recommended an outside investigator come to do an investigation.
4. SBBFP [Faculty Salary Survey](#) – Doris Geide-Stevenson  
The Faculty Salary Survey was reviewed. The results indicate that 70% of faculty prefer that salary increases include an option that has some portion based on merit. It was also important that the issue of equity be prioritized. As a result of this survey SBBFP has recommended that of the 5.75% salary increase that the legislature approved a cost-of-living adjustment of 3.75%, merit of 1%, and equity of 1% be given. The final negotiations with the president's office resulted in a \$1000 base increase for a regular employees working full-time (funding for this purpose is equivalent to a 1.25% increase for all regular employees.), a 2.5% general salary increase for all regular employees performing at a satisfactory level, and distribution of an amount equivalent to 1.5% to employees based on merit. An amount equivalent to 0.5% will be targeted to help the university address its most urgent salary equity issues. The negotiating team felt that this aligned very well with their recommendation. Other SBBFP recommendations include 1) Increase Adjunct/Overload pay – what is commonly referred to as the CE rate of \$970 per credit hour. 2) Gradual phasing out of the online pay of \$35/SCH. 3) Address equity issues among colleges. 4) Consider new sources of revenue, for example differential tuition for high-

MOTION: To send to Senate by Amy Buckway.

SECOND: Marjukka Ollilainen

OUTCOME: Unanimous approval

5. APAFT – Paul Crow

a. [PPM 8-7](#) Senior Instructor

This proposal would change PPM 8.7 (instead of PPM 8.6 as listed in the original charge) to create the position of senior instructor. The senior instructor position would be available to a faculty member only through promotion from instructor after employment at the instructor level for a minimum of six years. This mirrors tenure track appointments, as do the channels that are included. The proposal establishes criteria for promotion to senior instructor and makes clear that promotion to senior instructor does not come with tenure either immediately or in the future. The verbiage of ‘Senior Instructor’ was heavily discussed by the APAFT committee, and it was determined that these are the best words to convey the intent, and are commonly used at other institutions. No salary increase amount has been determined. There was discussion in EC about the requirement of ‘service’ and it was noted that each college will be free to define that word as fits their college, noting that in some colleges teaching can be swapped for service, or serving on boards in the community can be included as service.

MOTION: To move to Senate by Amy Buckway

SECOND: Marjukka Ollilainen

OUTCOME: Unanimous approval

b. [Dean’s Leadership and Management Evaluation](#)

The Deans’ Evaluation was edited for effectiveness, clarity, consistency of language and inclusiveness. The changes were mostly centered on using consistent language for Likert scale questions, and making sure that the question was clearly stated. Questions regarding development efforts, transparency in budget and policy matters and support for diversity were added to the survey

MOTION: To send to Senate by Eric Gibbons

SECOND: Amy Buckway

OUTCOME: Unanimous approval

7. ASSA - Charge 2 and - Michelle Paustenbaugh & Brady Brower

a. [Disability Accommodation Letters](#)

This document gives clear guidelines that outline what faculty is responsible for, (i.e., define “reasonable accommodations”), what resources are available and responsibilities of WSU Disability Services in regard to disability accommodations.

b. [Survey Interpretation](#)

This charge included working with WSU Disability Services and Legal Counsel to create a survey that was sent out to faculty to gauge their experience, knowledge, etc. with student accommodations. The survey

a. FGA Award