

## CMU Faculty Senate MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 4, 2025, 3:30 – 5:00pm

Venue: Chez Lena in Kayenta Hall (CMU Tech)

### Senators/Representatives present:

Karl Castleton, Kathy Diehl, Cassie Fenton, Ann Gillies, Eli Hall, Yen-Sheng Lee, Christopher McKim, Steve Merino, Josh Meuwly, James Perez, Jenny Radomski, Markus Reitenbach, Stacie Schreiner, Megan Sherbenou, Rachel Weinzimmer, Cher Hendricks

### Senators/Representatives Absent:

Christine Noel, Richard Scott, Leilani Domingo

### Guests:

David Weinberg, Jeremy Bergen, Chad Middleton

Renae Phillips- Recorder

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call by Sign-In
  - a. President Merino calls meeting to order at 3:30pm
  
- II. Committee Minutes and Reports to Approve
  - a. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 13, 2025  
**Motion: to approve Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting minutes from November 13, 2025 (Schreiner, Seconded Weinzimmer); Motion Carried**
    - i. Discussion: None
  
  - b. Faculty Salary and Benefits meeting minutes from November 11, 2025  
**Motion: to approve Faculty Salary and Benefits meeting minutes from November 11, 2025 (Weinzimmer, Seconded McKim); Motion Carried**
    - i. Discussion: None
  
- III. Approve Faculty Senate Minutes from November 20, 2025  
**Motion: to approve Faculty Senate Minutes from November 20, 2025 (Hall, Seconded Castleton); Motion Carried**
  - i. Discussion: None
  
- IV. Continuing Business
  - a. New Faculty Senate priorities and feedback from President Marshall
    - i. Discussion:
      1. Financial side:
        - a. #1 Take Home Pay and #4 Healthcare: these are big priorities for senior leadership/BOT, actively exploring

- other options on the healthcare side, including teaming up with other major local employers, creating a community program or consortium.
- b. #3 Promotion bumps and #7 Dependent Tuition Waiver: need to be priced out.
  - c. #6 Increase Investment in Professional Development: Marshall asked, what exactly do we want more investment in? More awards? More funding for individual awards? He suggested that Academic Affairs (i.e. Hendricks/Middleton) investigate it.
  - d. #9 Reduced Teaching Loads: encouraged Faculty Senate to think about the context of CMU's mission and values. Marshall is skeptical that a move would reflect those values. He wasn't entirely opposed to it but seemed skeptical.
  - e. #10 Short-term Housing for New Faculty: something is in the works, potentially. There is a 15–20-unit purchase in pipeline and may be a discussion.
2. Non-financial side:
- a. #1 Increasing Communication: Marshall acknowledged that it is useful criticism and asked whether there are specific themes or items that could be communicated better.
  - b. #2 Developing Evals that Rely on Student Evals - Holistic Evaluations: Marshall expressed that student course evals reflect our customers' experience and that consistently negative course evaluations need to be recognized and corrected.
  - c. #3 Strengthening Faculty Input: Marshall said that some of it is best handled at the department level and again asked whether there are specific things that we can work on. Marshall noted that Hendrick is the faculty voice on the leadership team in terms of faculty viewpoints.
  - d. #4 Clarity of Tenure and Promotion: Marshall acknowledged that we could continue to do better and that part of the issue is the perception that expectations vary widely by department.
  - e. #5 Clarity Around Budget Reporting and Decisions: Marshall asked where exactly the problem is, i.e. department, senior leadership, etc.
  - f. #6 Increase Fostering of Academic, Artistic, and Intellectual Life: Marshall asked what specifically we could do better but seemed open to it.
  - g. #7 Breaks & K-12 Schedule and #8 Transportation Safety: are currently being worked on.
3. David Weinberg reminded that there may be discrimination within the evaluation process along with the salary system/promotion is

associated with the use of them. Sherbenou reminded that the bottom priorities feel that way as the faculty felt they were less important.

b. Assessing and improving the Policy and Procedures Manual for Faculty Senate Standing Committees

- i. Discussion: Reminder that the liaison needs to connect with their assigned standing committee/chairs to get feedback on what's working, what's not, and what could be updated or improved. Please bring this information to February's Faculty Senate meeting for review and discussion.

c. Updating Faculty Senate's Constitution and Bylaws to reflect changes to PPEH/CHAPS and an opportunity for other changes and updates

- i. Discussion: Merlino has reviewed old bylaws along with the updates to CHAPS. Shared language that might need updated. 2/3 of Faculty Senate must approve amendments and 1/2 of full-time faculty must vote with a 51% approval to pass amendments. Schreiner stated that the Faculty Trustee is not even listed in the Bylaws as a member of the Executive Committee. Merino asked Faculty Senate to reach out to their department about having ranked, teaching faculty on the Faculty Senate and Standing Committees along with pros and cons (consequences such as not being protected by tenure, etc.).

d. Proposed academic dishonesty policies from Academic Policies Committee

- i. Discussion: Bergen looked at regional peers on what they do. There are similarities, but not completely the same across the board. The committee has not created a new policy but has made changes to current policy to incorporate the changes and updates that the committee recommends. Weinzimmer reminded us to update recent title changes, i.e. Provost. Sherbenou asked if it was going to be clear on the transcript notation, so it still shows up. There would be a notation, i.e. ZF, for any irrevocable grade.

**Motion: to approve Academic Policies Committee (APC) updates with the additional title change of Provost.**

**(Weinzimmer, Seconded Hall); Motion Carried**

V. New Business

a. Potential charge for APC regarding policy for graduate courses for both undergraduate and graduate degree credits

- i. Discussion: Allowing a student to take up to 6 total credit hours of graduate credit while completing their undergraduate credit requirements and applying those graduate credits to their undergraduate degree. Those same credits may subsequently be applied toward the completion of a CMU graduate degree. The policy does not apply to students in an accelerated (i.e. 3+2, 3+3, 4+1) graduate program as they may have

courses in their programs designated to fulfill undergraduate and graduate credits. In this situation, credit hours above 30 credit hours for a master's degree and 60 credit hours for an entry-level doctoral degree can count back toward the undergraduate degree, provided that the credit hours do not exceed 25% of the undergraduate degree, or 30 credits.

- ii. Weinzimmer noted that with the administrations list of professions that are not considered "professional", that there will now be a cap on loans at \$20500/per year for those graduate level programs. Allowing undergraduate students to utilize this policy may help them financially to complete their degree under these new guidelines.

**Motion: to charge the Academic Policies Committee (APC) to conduct a comprehensive review of the CMU's current policy for using graduate courses for undergraduate and graduate credit. This review should specifically review how peer institutions approach counting graduate courses for undergraduate and graduate degrees in an accelerated (i.e. 3+2, 3+3, 4+1) graduate program, something not currently defined at CMU. The APC should offer clear recommendations for revisions to the proposed policy to ensure that the policy upholds academic standards and institutional integrity.**

**(Sherbenou, Seconded Weinzimmer); Motion Carried**

b. Report from Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee

- i. Discussion: David Weinberg shared a handout on Issues with Market-Based Salaries on a 5-Year Review Cycle and a Possible Solution.
- ii. Monetary Issues:
  1. 5 Year frozen salary falls far behind inflation
  2. Starting salary is frozen for 5 years
  3. Promoted personnel must wait for the 5-year review to get a market-based pay increase; they only get ~\$3000 associated with promotion that has stayed the same for over a decade
  4. Unlikely to keep up with COLA
  5. Unpredictable increase in pay that depends on the market
- iii. Solution: [1% COLA (Normal or Flat Dollar Distribution)] + [% Increase Toward Market Levels with Rank/Year Increases Every Year and Review Every 5 Years]
  1. 5-year reviews involved a determination of what the market value is for every level.
  2. Yearly determination of salaries
    - a. Calculate the total cost of a 1% COLA across campus and distribute it in one of the following ways:
      - i. Flat Dollar Distribution: divide the total cost of the 1% COLA by the number of faculty members. Increase everyone's base salary by a flat dollar amount (e.g. each faculty member's base pay goes up by the same amount across campus). This slightly favors people with low salaries.

- ii. Normal Distribution: Give a 1% base pay increase to each faculty member. This slightly favors people with high salaries.
    - b. Determine the amount of money available for salaries
    - c. Subtract the cost of the 1% COLA
    - d. The difference would go toward moving everybody by the same percentage (determined yearly) toward their market value
      - i. Nobody's salary should decrease even if the market value went down because it would be bad for morale.
- iv. Benefits
  - 1. Everyone's salary would go up each year
  - 2. Promotions would generally lead to immediate increases in market values.
  - 3. They would keep the ~\$3000 pay increases for promotions, but these would also be coupled with a change in market value.
  - 4. Would allow increases in starting salaries to keep them competitive
  - 5. The regular increases in pay facilitate retirement planning
  - 6. The university can still adjust each year based on financial burdens by modulating the percent increase toward market values; it would just need to commit to the 1% COLA increase
  - 7. Market reviews for each program still just need to occur every 5 years. It may require a higher level of detail to determine the pay for each rank with any possible number of years' experience, but the determination of market values could be automated after inputting CUPA data
- v. Cher asked to share this information with Marshall

## VI. Reports

- a. Provost Report, Cher Hendricks
  - i. 19 responses to the handbook changes so far. There are too many suggestions on the recruiting and hiring section, that it is not ready to share with the BOT. Section I and Section II had really good feedback and integrated most of that feedback with a slight adjustment, which will be shared with the BOT. The BOT might be ready to vote on those sections at their next meeting, next week.
  - ii. Submitted a grant proposal (\$2.7 million over 4-years), for a Center for Civil Discourse. Expect to hear by January 1<sup>st</sup>. President Marshall is interested in this enough to submit budget request for the grant.
- b. Faculty Trustee Report, Stacie Schreiner
  - i. BOT meets next week.

- c. CFAC report, Christine Noel
  - i. No report
  
- d. VP report, Christopher McKim
  - i. No report
  
- e. Student Government Report, Leilani Domingo
  - i. Has expressed her intention to be present at the Faculty Senate meetings next semester. Merino will forward the ASG report that Leilani sent him, to the Faculty Senate for review.
  
- f. Executive Committee Report, Markus Reitenbach
  - i. No report
  
- g. President's Report, Stephen Merino
  - i. No report

VII. Adjourn

**Motion: to adjourn the meeting**

**(Weinzimmer, Seconded Fenton); Motion carried 4:58p**