The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9, 2003 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of November 25, 2003 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   • Prior senate meeting included great examples of things we are doing to help ourselves
     1) Approval of couple of new emphases – German Business/Professions and Public History
        ● Likelihood of getting new major approved these days not good
        ● Could throw up hands and say not a lot we can do given financial restraints
        ● But emphases and minors are items we control locally
        ● If can package existing courses to create emphases that make sense, should do that as way of creating movement and refreshing curriculum
     2) Clarifying search process to provide flexibility
        ● Have procedures and policies on books that were appropriate at one time, but do not serve us well today
        ● Need to continue to do things to create flexibility and environment that work today even if look different than ten years ago
   • Nothing has changed with regard to way we handle promotions; promotion reviews continuing on schedule
   • Has been some question since last senate meeting when mentioned Compensation Committee working toward pay plan
   • Pay plan does specify salary increment that comes with successful promotion in rank
        ● But promotion increases not part of pay plan dollars that come from state; funded from our base budget
        ● Even though times are tight, think important to keep salaries competitive
   • With regard to Provost Satz’ absence
        ● In process of working collectively to fill vacuum
• Expect to continue to fine tune process
• Let us know if anything not getting attention it should; we will work on it
• Provost will provide more information on his situation when he is ready – he is controlling that part of message
• He is appreciative of fact people care and knows we are thinking and praying for him
• Largest private gift ever to come to UW-Eau Claire announced this morning
  • From estate of descendant of former geography professor and coach, Colonel Simpson
  • Held joint press conference with YMCA because they also received their largest gift ever
  • Six million dollars plus will come to UW-Eau Claire and another $4 million plus to YMCA
  • Good news as need to reinforce that moving forward in spite of temporary lull in way state funds public higher education
• Sometime this month, UW-Eau Claire to receive check for $2 million
  • Because this money unrestricted, it becomes part of Excellence Fund, which supports professional development activities, our students, and other things that are important to us
• Additional $4 million to come at some point to be directed to department of geography and anthropology and to intercollegiate athletics
  • That size gift to a department/unit (roughly $80,000 to $100,000 annually for each) has ability to transform area – allows elevation of level of excellence over time
  • Similar to effect Karlgaard gift had on computer science department
• Believe there will be more such gifts that were not even on our radar screen a few years ago
• Don’t underestimate real possibility that newsletters all departments sending to graduates are touching people who are making arrangements to do something significant
• You contribute to success of campaign by continuing to do what you are doing every day – a great job with our students and connecting well with graduates
• Private dollars becoming bigger part of higher education; we are right on track
• Annual Holiday Reception tomorrow
• Response to questions from floor
• Implications for raising promotion increases in pay plan this year very significant; need to think hard about where to invest base budget funds
  • Condition of base budget part of what Compensation Committee considered when decided not to elevate promotion increases this year
  • Fund these ourselves; the more dollars put into personnel pot, where now have 85% of operating budget dollars, the shorter we come up on side of everything else we must do with budget
  • Have been raising these salary actions over years so on very top of comprehensives in system; intend to stay there
• Compensation Committee over last several years based promotion amounts on formula using median salary for each rank
  • Medians this year, because of retirements, would result in slight decrease in promotion stipends; so left them where they were

III. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Next Board of Regents meeting on February 5 and 6, 2004 in Madison
• Next faculty reps meeting on January 30, 2004

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
• Next academic staff reps meeting is teleconference on December 18, 2003

V. Unfinished Business

A. Faculty Personnel Committee – Second Reading
  Recruitment Procedures

Continued Debate on Motion 40-FP-02 that changes be made in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 11, 4th paragraph under UWEC 3.02 Recruiting:
Believe half sheet distributed responds to concern raised at last meeting
Actually half sheet from Affirmative Action Director Stevens supports language of original motion
- First three paragraphs explain why search is closed crossed out and replaced by review of applications
- Last paragraph only indicates what need at very least if senate chooses not to pass proposed language
  - Even that adds unnecessary restriction to process

**Amendment 40-FP-02-a1**
Moved by Senator Smiar and seconded that the first line of the motion be amended to read: *After the application deadline has passed,* …

**Debate**
- Against amendment – Director Stevens recommending original motion language because avoids need to put deadline in advertisements
  - Not required to do so by law, so no need to force that requirement on ourselves
  - Original motion allows more flexibility in process
- For amendment – removes ambiguity in motion language
  - Don’t know what review of applications means, where it ends or what point it refers to
  - Amendment less ambiguous
- Speak for amendment; otherwise you can select best qualified candidate before deadline for applications
  - More sensible to speak about a date

**Vote on Amendment 40-FP-02-a1**: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 10 for, 15 against by faculty senators.

**Continued Debate**
- Was some discussion last time about adding words to effect of after review of applications consistent with published date
- Was just suggestion, no amendment proposed

**Vote on Motion 40-FP-02**: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of faculty senators

**TEXT OF MOTION**
After the search is closed review of applications, the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty of the department shall select the best qualified candidate(s) or candidates; and after review by the Affirmative Action Officer and approval of the Dean of the College and the Provost and Vice Chancellor, the Dean shall invite the candidate(s) or candidates to the campus for interviews. If none of the candidates is acceptable, the position shall be advertised the Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty of the department, shall (1) revisit the pool for additional candidates, (2) readvertise in the same and/or different locations using exactly the same position description and requirements, or (3) close the search, and, if appropriate, determine what changes need to be made to either the position or the wording of the advertisement and request permission to begin a new search incorporating the changes.

B. Faculty Personnel Committee – Second Reading

Periodic Review

Continued Debate on Motion 40-FP-03 that the proposed changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5 – None

**Vote on Motion 40-FP-03**: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of faculty senators

**TEXT OF MOTION**

---

**Faculty Personnel Rules**

UWS 3.05 PERIODIC REVIEW
**UWEC 3.05 Purpose**

The University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire is committed to a continuous self-evaluation as one means of ensuring the quality of the education it offers students. The periodic review of faculty performance is an integral part of this process. As such, it has as its primary purpose the maintenance and improvement of the quality of instruction provided by the individual faculty member and the quality of programs offered at the departmental or College levels. Recognizing that teaching, research, professional development, service to the public, the profession, and the University, as well as all other types of scholarly activity, contribute to the quality of educational opportunity available at the University, all faculty shall be evaluated in all aspects of the fulfillment of their professional commitment to the institution.

The Department Chair, the Department Personnel Committee, the promotion subcommittees, and designated academic administrators participate in one or more of the several phases of the performance periodic review of each faculty member listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Initiated By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Review</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment Review</td>
<td>Annually through the fifth probationary year</td>
<td>Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Review</td>
<td>Prior to the seventh probationary year</td>
<td>Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Review</td>
<td>After satisfaction of applicable criteria</td>
<td>Department Personnel Committee (Appropriate Promotion Subcommittee) and Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td>At least every five years following tenure and/or promotion.</td>
<td>Department Personnel Committee (Appropriate Promotion Subcommittee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance periodic review of probationary faculty and of tenured faculty shall follow the same procedures as described below. The reviews may be incorporated into other departmental procedures for salary and other performance reviews at the department level. (US 4/97)

**PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

The information gathered through the various phases of periodic review of probationary faculty is used in making personnel decisions as well as in the formulation of plans for the professional development of the faculty member involved. To promote the retention of qualified probationary faculty, the institution encourages departments to assign mentoring teams to the new faculty, to monitor retention goals, and, in conjunction with the administration, work to enhance the intercultural climate. The evaluation policies and procedures shall respect the dignity and the academic freedom of the individual and shall recognize the importance of good staff morale to the achievement of academic excellence.

**TENURED FACULTY**

The information gathered through the various phases of periodic review of tenured faculty is used to ensure continuing growth and development in professional skills; to encourage faculty to explore new ways to promote academic excellence; and to identify areas for improvement and provide solutions for problem areas. (US 4/97)

**CRITERIA FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

1. General Criteria
The **Each periodic** review of faculty performance for purposes of reappointment, granting tenure, promotion in rank, and salary recommendations must include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession, and the public. These criteria are defined as follows:

a. **Teaching Effectiveness** means the success of the instructor in securing interest, effort, and progress on the part of students. The primary consideration is that students are stimulated to better standards of scholarship, to keener interest in learning, to greater professional understanding, and to more effective effort toward self-improvement.

b. **Academic Advising Ability** means the effectiveness of the instructor in providing ongoing consultation for the student; in referring students to appropriate sources of assistance when necessary; in assisting the student in the development of a comprehensive, long-range academic and career plan and the selection of each semester's courses; and in monitoring the student's progress towards the fulfillment of all applicable degree requirements.

c. **Scholarly Activity** means scholarship of a live and progressive character, manifested by continued study, scholarly interests, research, productive and creative work, and professional participation and performance. The essential test of such growth is the teacher's success in holding the respect and esteem of students and colleagues within his or her special field of study and in maintaining professional standards in keeping with those generally approved by the teaching profession.

d. **Service to the University, the Profession, and the Public** means the acceptance and fulfillment of the responsibility to serve the University, the professions, and the public through various activities which take place outside the classroom.

1) Service to the University refers to service on various committees, advisory boards, etc., at either the department, school, college, university or system level.

2) Service to one's profession refers to active participation in professional organizations at the local, state, national, or international level.

3) Service to the public refers to participation in community movements of an educational nature, or in Continuing Education activities, or to using one's professional expertise in a consulting or advisory capacity to agencies, business, or individuals, or to similar types of activities through which the university achieves greater recognition and prestige in the community, state, and nation.

2. **Department Criteria**

Each phase of periodic review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the public. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of each department or functional equivalent with input from the Department Chair shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan that defines each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member's career. Upon approval by the DPC, the plan shall be submitted to the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor who shall review the plan and, if it is determined to be acceptable, approve it in writing. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria. The Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall use the agreed upon criteria in considering performance reviews.

The Department Personnel Committee shall annually review the Department Evaluation Plan and revise the plan as deemed appropriate. Revisions shall be approved in the same manner as the original plan. The Department Chair shall inform the department in writing of any agreed upon revisions in the plan.

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan agreement cannot be reached over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences and to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the
Provost and Vice Chancellor’s effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning that portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by three-fourths of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons. (US 12/023)

PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

1. Procedures for Periodic Review by Department Personnel Committee

   The committee or one of its subcommittees shall meet annually with all instructional staff of the department for the purpose of discussing the Department Criteria, the relative emphasis given to each of the criteria in the review of the individual faculty member’s performance, and the procedures of the evaluation plan.

   In addition to student evaluations, the each phase of periodic review shall provide for peer judgments of performance and may be conducted by means of classroom evaluations, information presented by the faculty member, and information gathered by the DPC or its subcommittees. For nonteaching faculty, the plan shall follow the principles reflected in these guidelines with appropriate modifications based on the responsibilities and duties of the individual.

   The departmental faculty evaluation plan shall include procedures which:

   a. Conform to the Wisconsin open meetings and records laws, the UW System rules and policies, and UW-Eau Claire policies, all of which shall take precedence.

   b. Provide forms and procedures for administering and analyzing student evaluations and promote the anonymity and integrity of those evaluations.

   c. Provide that the faculty member shall be given copies of all periodic reviews of faculty performance at the same time as such reports are submitted to the Department Chair or other administrators by the Department Personnel Committee or its subcommittees.

      1) Provide that the performance each phase of periodic reviews of probationary faculty be forwarded through administrative channels to the Department Chair, Dean, Provost/Vice Chancellor, and Chancellor in the course of the reappointment process. (US 4/97)

      2) Provide that the performance each phase of periodic reviews of tenured faculty be forwarded to the Department Chair. After review the Department Chair will return the review to the faculty member and acknowledge completion of the process to the Dean. Performance Periodic reviews of tenured faculty for purposes of preparing promotion recommendations will take the place of the post-tenure review and will be forwarded through administrative channels according to the procedures for promotion. (US 4/97)

   d. Provide that the faculty member be given an opportunity to examine his or her student evaluations.

   e. Provide that the faculty member be given an opportunity to respond in writing to the student evaluations and the evaluation reports prepared by the Department Personnel Committee and that such responses be attached to the original documents before the evaluation report is forwarded to the Dean.

   f. Afford the faculty member opportunities to submit to the Department Personnel Committee or its subcommittees any documents or information relevant to the evaluation of his or her performance, and/or request a meeting with the Committee.

   g. Recognize that the Department Chair has the responsibility for maintaining the departmental personnel file for each staff member, including a record of the periodic evaluations, personnel decisions, and the information on which they are based.

   h. Afford the faculty member an opportunity to review and respond to the information in his or her departmental personnel file.
2. Procedures for Periodic Review by Department Chair
   In addition to student evaluations, the each phase of periodic review by the Department Chair may be conducted by means of classroom observations, information presented by the faculty member, and information gathered by the Department Personnel Committee or its subcommittees. Following the completion of the performance each phase of periodic review, the Department Chair shall provide the faculty member with a written report on his or her performance. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond to this report in writing. This report, the information on which it is based, and the response, shall become a part of the departmental personnel file of the faculty member. (US 12/01)

   The Department Chair, in consultation with the Department Personnel Committee, will prepare a schedule for the regular (at least every five years) post-tenure review of the tenured faculty. An annual report to the Provost/Vice Chancellor identifying those tenured faculty reviewed during the year will be filed before the end of each academic year. (US 4/97 12/03)
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Charge to the Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee shall:

1. Establish criteria and procedures for periodic review of faculty performance as prescribed by University and UW System policies.
2. Establish criteria and procedures for evaluating performance and making recommendations concerning the reappointment of probationary faculty, the rehiring of instructional and/or research academic staff, and granting tenure of faculty*.
3. Establish criteria and procedures within the limits granted to the department for making salary recommendations.
4. Assist the Department Chair in developing and approving the department long-range plan.
5. Assist the Department Chair in the recruitment of faculty and instructional and/or research academic staff.
6. Make recommendations to the Department Chair concerning appointment and reappointment of faculty, hiring and rehiring of instructional and/or research academic staff, granting tenure to faculty, and the granting of faculty status to instructional and/or research academic staff, including a specific statement whether the recommendation is for or against these actions. (US 11/89)
7. Implement personnel policies and procedures either delegated to or permitted at the department level.
8. Provide to faculty and instructional and/or research academic staff a copy of the current criteria and procedures used by the Department Personnel Committee, the promotion subcommittees, and any other subcommittees.
9. Annually provide an opportunity for faculty and academic staff to discuss the criteria and procedures used by the Department Personnel Committee and its subcommittees. (US 12/01)

Unless otherwise provided, the procedures of the Department Personnel Committee shall be governed by Robert’s Rules of order. (US 11/89 12/03)

*Note that this evaluation and recommendation must be distinct from the periodic review of faculty performance.
C. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading

German Business/Professions Emphasis

Continued Debate on Motion 40-AP-05 that the proposed Major: German, Liberal Arts – Business/Professions Emphasis (Code 208-203) be approved; also that the Major: German, Liberal Arts be renamed as Major: German, Liberal Arts Emphasis (280-201) – None

Vote on Motion 40-AP-05: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators.

D. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading

Public History Emphasis

Continued Debate on Motion 40-AP-06 that the proposed Major: History, Liberal Arts, Public History Emphasis (Code 380-205) be approved – None

Vote on Motion 40-AP-06: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators.

VI. Reports of Committees

♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • At last meeting
    ♦ Consulted with Associate Dean of Students Shaw about changing language to add academic staff to hearing committee for student misconduct in nonacademic settings
    ♦ Then went into closed session to recommend people to be included in pool for hearing committee
  • Next meeting February 3, 2004

♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  • Continuing to work in small groups on issues raised by Handbook Review Committee
  • At last meeting, discussed possible changes to complaint and grievance procedures in faculty handbook
  • Will be continuing that discussion at next meeting in spring semester

♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  • Next meeting December 11, 2003
  • To draft motion regarding election of academic staff rep and also looking at handbook changes suggested by Handbook Review Committee

♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
  • Committee passed motions today recommending creation of new computer science emphasis in computer engineering and establishment of corresponding new prefix CE
  • Other motions coming forward at today’s meeting
  • No meeting date scheduled for second semester – will be taking up assessment issues

♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee
  • At last meeting, discussed revisiting and evaluating policies and procedures related to smoking outside entrances to both academic and student buildings – will do so next semester
  • Future agendas to include
    ♦ City traffic engineers discussion of traffic patterns around Hibbard lot/State Street interface and entrance to Putnam Park
    ♦ Reports from Facilities Management regarding indoor air quality surveys of various academic buildings
  • Next meeting spring semester

♦ Budget Committee – No report

♦ Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
  • Will meet again in February
  • Motion on 2004-2005 pay plan coming forward today
    ♦ Would appreciate vote today, if possible, in order for department chairs and directors to have plan before salary recommendations due

♦ Nominating Committee – No Report
VII. Special Reports - None

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

A. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on Entitlement to Plan Women’s Studies Major – Senator Syverson

- Motion to start process of putting new major on books; very difficult process
  - If approved here, must ask system for permission to explore new major
  - If that approved after distribution for comments to all campuses, then can examine potential for offering
    Women’s Studies major, including study of student need, impact, reinforcement of mission, etc.
  - Then put together actual proposal that would need to go through whole process again – through curriculum
    committees, Academic Policies Committee, senate, and then to system and regents
- No women’s studies majors offered in this part of state
- Was some concern expressed in Academic Policies Committee about offering new major in current fiscal
  environment
  - However, won’t know all issues until study is complete; have chance to look at again at that point

**Motion 40-AP-07**

Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9 for, 0 against) that the request for entitlement to
plan a major in Women’s Studies be approved.

Debate - None

MOTION by Senator Lozar that the rules be suspended to allow vote on this today seconded and PASSED
by two-thirds vote.

Debate
- No major programs in western Wisconsin – majors only at Whitewater, Madison, and Milwaukee
- Is long process – work on our part can be done in about one year
  - Final approval can take considerably longer; is case for performing arts major previously approved, but
    being held by regents
- Proposal indicates two FTE sufficient assuming current integration into various departments
  - Budget and other issues would have to be looked at in self-study and specified in very involved
    proposal document
- Favor motion – much needed major
  - Even though fiscal climate not good right now, hope it will improve
  - If going to remain excellent university, need to keep moving forward

**Vote on Motion 40-AP-07:** Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators.

B. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on Kinesiology Emphases Changes – Senator Syverson

- Proposal brought forward from department of kinesiology and athletics to eliminate two emphases within
  current major and reshape into single new emphasis to be called Human Performance Emphasis
  - Would allow department to seek accreditation for single program
- Emphases on books now not designed to handle number of students presently enrolled; combining would enable
  better utilization of staff to serve more students effectively
- Would probably be fewer student served if change in force; based on data provided, these students would be
  better served
- Also proposed changing name of another emphasis from Movement Science emphasis to Movement Studies
  emphasis
- Response to questions for clarification of content
Will end up with just one new emphasis to replace two eliminated
Have more emphases on books, these are only ones impacted by changes

**Motion 40-AP-08**
Moved and seconded by the Academic Policies Committee (9 for, 0 against) that the proposed changes in the Kinesiology program be approved as follows:
1) Deletion of Kinesiology emphases Exercise Management and Exercise Science
2) Addition of a new Human Performance emphasis
3) Renaming of existing Movement Science emphasis to the Movement Studies emphasis

Debate – None

MOTION by Senator Smiar that the rules be suspended to allow voting on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Debate
- Favor motion, department repackaged curriculum; course revisions approved by curriculum committees
- Predicated on these curricular changes
- If passed today, would be time for inclusion in 2004-2005 University Catalogue so would match up with new course descriptions
- Excited about accreditation
  - Will help students graduate and find jobs and recognition they deserve
  - Keeping students on right track to keep pace with what is needed upon graduation
- This is new accreditation process American College of Sports Medicine implementing
- Changes would allow seeking accreditation for just one program instead of two
- Rolls accreditation issues into coursework instead of adding as afterthought

**Vote on Motion 40-AP-08**: Motion PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators.

C. Compensation Committee – First Reading
**Report on 2004-2005 Salary Plan** – Vice Chair Gapko
- Responsibility of Compensation Committee each year to prepare recommendation for comprehensive salary plan for faculty and academic staff to consider
- Guidelines this year no longer require 1/3-1/3-1/3 rule because only 1% increase available; to be distributed on basis of solid performance without different levels used in past
- One percent is not sufficient, but is all we have

**Motion 40-CP-01**
Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6 for, 1 against) that the proposed Comprehensive Salary Plan for 2004-2005 be approved.

Debate
- Voted against in Compensation Committee because no promotion or chair stipend increases, both of which come out of base budget
- We have authority to recommend those items; seems when given opportunity to give small adjustment, we make a mistake by not increasing them
  - Especially considering only two promotions over course of career
- No logic, but better than applying standards already used that would have made them do down
- To increase on regular basis with every salary package makes sense so don’t lag behind
- Can’t have much impact on base budget because not that many people eligible

**Amendment 40-CP-01-a1**
Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded that the amounts for promotion to full, associate, and assistant professor be increased to $5,500, $3,600, and $2,250 respectively.
Debate
- Against motion, although conceptually agree
  - Snowball effect on base budget of making these changes would be significant
  - Not a one-time deal, are committing dollars forever
  - This would not affect 1% increases coming out of pay plan; base budget is separate funding mechanism, however, pay plan does dictate actual amount of adjustments
  - Plan for years in advance for buildings, seems we should be able to do same for salaries; have a chance to do something for ourselves here

Vote on Amendment 40-CP-01-a1: Amendment PASSED.

Amendment 40-CP-01-a2
Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded to raise the chair’s stipend to $2,400 annually.

Debate
- Currently working group developing plan to overhaul distribution of chair’s stipends
  - Rather than making arbitrary increase, committee decided to wait for report from subgroup
  - Stipend does not continue after person ceases being chair
  - New language that comes before this body will supercede what is in place; let’s just supercede larger number
  - Would like to know if we spend base budget dollars this way, what do we not get
  - One reason committee did not adjust amounts for promotion and chair stipends is those come from base funds
  - Plans are in works for alternative mechanisms to INFUSE some base funds into salaries
  - More base funds chewed up by this means less available for post-tenure review salary adjustments; currently drafting policy on that
  - Have heard about post-tenure review thing for long time, yet never see anything coming from it
    - Now hiring people at just about same salary as senior associate professors
    - Increasing bump at promotion exacerbates compression because people promoted to full professor long ago see nothing, hence their salaries lag
  - Think dangerous to take committee report and just modify numbers
  - Over past few years, job of department chair significantly tougher; increase would send positive signal that university recognizes their efforts
  - Support this as think chair’s job has really increased
  - Chair stipend has been $2,000 for about four years

Vote on Amendment 40-CP-01-a2: Amendment PASSED

Amendment 40-CP-01-a3
Moved by Senator Wilcox and seconded that the salary adjustment for promotion for academic staff be raised from 7.5% of the incumbent salary to 8%.

Debate
- Not sure believe in raiding base for all this, but should be same for academic staff; have done calculations and 8% would be about same increase faculty receiving as result of previous amendments
- Committee tries not to make percentages arbitrary; have developed rationale over years
  - Have two different models because according to surveys in past, academic staff favor promotion increases as percentage of salary and faculty favor flat, fixed dollar amount
  - Percentages used in faculty ranks are 5% of median salary when promoted to assistant professor, 7.5% when promoted to associate professor, and 10% when promoted to full professor
    - Award more to higher ranks in attempt to fight compression
  - Academic staff ranks have only one salary increase amount – at 7.5% to be in middle of ones used for faculty because no documented compression among academic staff
  - Would hesitate for this body to make arbitrary changes because will be hard to use as policy guiding decision in future pay plans
Favor motion – at moment do not have instructors so first promotion level is moot and most academic staff have only one chance for promotion from no prefix to senior title
- Eight percent more appropriate given increase in faculty amounts
- Important to understand this money is not sitting around somewhere to tap, deans of various colleges have to go find it
- Can be done, but will have to be taken from somewhere else
- At present are no people being promoted from instructor to assistant professor so faculty promotions are only at $3,600 and $5,500 levels; academic staff would be around $2,400
- Still possibility that someone could be hired at instructor rank, so to be complete included that level in pay plan
- Favor amendment – are many pertinent points here, but this sends message that putting our people first
- Important to say that faculty and academic staff are priority issue when it comes to budget
- Imagine message sending to academic staff if more than willing to arbitrarily raise promotion dollars for faculty and chairs, but not for academic staff who play integral role on campus

Vote on Amendment 40-CP-01-a3: Amendment PASSED.

Continued Debate on Main Motion – None

MOTION by Senator Pitts that the rules be suspended to allow vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate
- Seems if anything should not be voted on today, this is it – especially after changes made
- Will not change anything that chairs have to do anyway, don’t see reason to rush
- Timing is of concern because normally complete this process in time to build budget
  - Adjustments won’t have impact on salaries paid next year, but would like to keep process going
  - Do not ask chairs, directors, and deans to go through merit recommendations if not required by pay plan
- While faculty side is same process as normally go through and can continue, on academic staff side, process is different in this pay plan than used to in past
  - Need to know what to send forward for recommendations in that case – this year will only be recommendation of merit for solid performance
- After hearing that, favor acting today

Vote on Motion 40-CP-01: Motion PASSED

IX. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m. without objection.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate