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Guests:

Bernard Duyfhuizen, Gene Hood, Dale Johnson, Jan Morse, Karen O’Day, Eric Ristau, Eva Santos-Phillips, Andrew Soll, Steven Tallant, Kathy Tank

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, April 13, 2004 in the Council Fire Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of March 30, 2004 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

- Lot of activity in Chippewa Valley as result of companies announcing layoffs and closing operations
  - Meetings in Madison and locally to bring everyone together to talk about what to do; university at table
  - Last time this happened, UW-Eau Claire Career Services part of plan to provide counseling for those looking for other work or starting new careers
  - This time will do what we can as regional public university, but can’t do much because diminished financial capacity decreases flexibility, margin and ability to respond
  - Was opportunity to talk about current circumstances and get message heard by legislators and others
- Wisconsin competing to attract business and personnel to state (brain gain); brain drain not main problem because 80% of UW-System graduates stay in state
  - Wisconsin at bottom of list for import of college graduates
  - In one breath state leaders talk about a constitutional amendment to clarify stance against gay marriage in Wisconsin (reportedly approved by two-thirds of state residents) and in next breath talk about competitive Wisconsin attracting people
  - Conflict in those positions
  - Close vote also almost made it possible to carry concealed weapons in Wisconsin
  - Literature on human capital and attracting creative class does not match profile state leaders creating in Wisconsin
- University trying to attract faculty and professional staff in national marketplace – climate toward folks trying to attract becomes an issue
Regional legislative session coming up next week at River Falls
To talk about challenges as begin to think about 2005-2007 budget requests
City Council to decide at meeting tonight whether to approve parking ban on couple blocks in Third Ward neighborhood
University has been in communication with neighborhood association and city about issue
Have added 1200 parking spaces on campus since enrollment peaked in mid-1980s
In 1997, because students willing to be part of solution, city able to launch bus system providing 280,000 rides to and from campus annually
Don’t favor banning parking in streets – don’t see as solution
Favor tougher enforcement; willing to assist
If passed, bans would complicate business we do here, but preparing just in case
University not ignoring its community; will continue to take high road
Response to questions and comments from floor
Parking proposal to develop small property adjacent to Hibbard Lot rejected by previous chancellor; no current plans for increasing parking because spaces in Water Street lots not filled
Seven minute walk not unreasonable on college campus
Students need to be responsible about parking and also not sit in traffic lane waiting for spots
Not in battle with eyes closed to legitimate concerns of neighborhood folks

III. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
Welcome Earl Shoemaker, new senator from Educational Support Services within Student Development and Diversity area
Three items of note in written Chair’s Report
Wording of Board of Regents resolution concerning TABOR constitutional amendment
Details of parity pay plan request as passed by board
On back, explanation of process used to rule on amendment under discussion at end of last meeting
Will resume at point of debate on amendment; vote ruled invalid because of clear lack of quorum
May appeal ruling to full body if desire
Next meeting of faculty reps is teleconference on April 30, 2004
Next Board of Regents meeting on May 6 and 7, 2004 in Madison

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
Next academic staff reps meeting April 15, 2004 in Madison
Academic Staff Leadership Conference scheduled for July 29 and 30, 2004 at Stout
In past, provost sent six academic staff; may be able to send more because no lodging expenses
Call for Proposals available to anyone interested in presenting, usually deals with communication and leadership issues

V. Unfinished Business

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Second Reading
Election of Academic Staff Representative
Continued Debate on Amendment 40-AS-03-a1 deleting words and chairs from main motion – vote at last meeting ruled invalid due to clear lack of quorum
Made amendment to increase options
ELECTING FROM SENATE WITHOUT OTHER REQUIREMENTS MAY INCREASE LIKELIHOOD OF MORE THAN ONE CANDIDATE
Also don’t think senate should set precedent of giving release time to chairs of committees
Direction of senate discussion in October seemed to favor keeping options as open as possible
Current amendment does not prohibit anyone from serving in as many roles as desired
Against amendment – main points from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
Need to be upfront and honest about expectations for academic staff rep
Language in handbook should reflect what really happening – for at least last decade, academic staff rep has invariably been chair of Academic Staff Personnel Committee
• More effective rep/chair if experienced in both areas
• Committee voted unanimously for motion
• Options good, but apparently no one interested in that option for last 15 or so years
• Chair of Academic Staff Personnel Committee not getting release time, academic staff rep is
• Favor amendment – although combined for years, adding to handbook makes harder to change
• Chair serves as unbiased leader of committee; academic staff rep advocacy role increasing
  • May, at times, be good to separate
• Want knowledgeable advocate – chair often best person because knowledgeable on personnel issues

Vote on Amendment 40-AS-03-a1: Amendment PASSED by vote of 13 for, 9 against by academic staff senators.

Vote on Motion 40-AS-03: Motion PASSED by vote of academic staff senators without dissention.

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED
Faculty and Academic Staff Organization Chapter 3 Page 24

Academic Staff
Representative to UW System

19. The Academic Staff Representative to the University of Wisconsin System shall be elected by and from the Academic Staff Personnel Committee academic staff members of the University Senate in December at the first fall-semester meeting of the University Senate of even numbered years. The term of office shall be for two years beginning the next July 1. An individual may serve as Academic Staff Representative for no more than two terms.

The Academic Staff Representative serves as an ex officio (and voting) member of the University Senate and the University Senate Executive Committee, and serves on the Academic Staff Personnel Committee. If his/her term on the Academic Staff Personnel Committee expires, the he/she becomes an ex officio (and voting) member of the Academic Staff Personnel Committee for the remainder of his/her term of office as Academic Staff Representative. Immediately upon election, the Academic Staff Representative-Elect shall be an ex-officio (and voting) member of the Academic Staff Personnel Committee.

The Academic Staff Representative shall represent the academic staff at UW System meetings of the Academic Staff Representatives and at other appropriate meetings where concerns of the academic staff are discussed; and shall be responsible for reporting actions and information relevant to academic staff, to the University Senate and to the Academic Staff Personnel Committee, and to the academic staff at large; shall communicate with UW-Eau Claire and UW-System administration on academic staff issues; shall represent UW-Eau Claire academic staff at official functions of UW-Eau Claire or UW-System; may serve on task forces/committees of the UW-System; shall assist the Chancellor in setting the agenda for the spring all-academic staff meeting; and shall generally advocate for academic staff.

[The academic staff may, either directly or by action of the academic staff of the University Senate, alter this bylaw.]

VI. Reports of Committees
◆ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • Next meeting of committee on April 20, 2004 to review term lengths of nominating committee members, upcoming senate survey, and agenda for April 27, 2004 meeting of University Senate
◆ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  • Next meeting April 20, 2004 with agenda items
    • Distribution of DPC minutes
    • Selection of search and screen committees for department chairs
    • Possible language changes on who has authority to revise handbook sections
◆ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  • Next meeting April 15, 2004 to complete work on handbook language changes
- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
  - Today worked on recommendations for program reviews for next year
  - Next two meetings (April 20th and 27th) devoted to program reviews of Departments of Communication and Journalism, Communication Disorders, and English
  - Also working through system is proposal to eliminate Music Therapy program – discussion tentatively slated for May 4, 2004

- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
  - At last meeting, had presentation from Facilities Planning and Management on
    - Ongoing campus air quality issues and attempts at addressing
    - Report on major plant projects for future, including riverbank project that will go to next stage

- Budget Committee – Senator Zantow
  - Meeting scheduled for April 19, 2004 to begin second phase of budget planning

- Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
  - Do not anticipate meeting again this semester

- Nominating Committee – Senator Pederson
  - Two nominees for senate chair
    - Mitchell Freymiller
    - Susan Harrison
  - No additional nominations from floor
  - Election to be held at next meeting of University Senate

- Technology Committee – Senator Goulet
  - Meeting April 22, 2004 for purpose of gathering information from CIO Lowe in preparation for changes to administrative computing system

Chair Harrison announced that in order to provide for two readings, motions to be considered this session need to arrive in Senate Office by April 20, 2004.

VII. Special Reports – None

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

A. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on LAS Prefix – Senator Syverson
- Latin American Studies Program reviewed by APC last year
  - Based on comments of internal review committee, external reviewer, and self-study, APC made six recommendations about program
  - One recommendation suggested creation of Latin American Studies prefix, which could be used to offer an introductory course, a capstone experience, and directed and independent studies courses
  - Motion now coming forward
  - Academic Policies Committee thought would be beneficial for Latin American Studies Program
- Response to questions on content of report
  - Will still be courses under INTS prefix – most of them introduce students to culture of host country for study abroad programs
  - LAS prefix will be more visible outside INTS

Motion 40-AP-14
  Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that the University Senate approve a new prefix for Latin American Studies (LAS)

Debate
- Will probably not continue to add prefixes for courses left in INTS prefix; Latin American Studies is major/minor program and would not impact other courses under INTS prefix
- Becomes place for courses that do not fit anywhere else to find home
- Just submitted courses to Curriculum Committee of Arts and Sciences
Different than previously debated CE prefix because major and minor associated with LAS prefix; allows for introductory, capstone, directed and independent study courses under their administration
- More comparable to Criminal Justice prefix passed last year, or American Indian Studies or Women’s Studies prefixes
- To remain housed in foreign languages, but are separate program reviewed separately
- Is interdisciplinary so have courses under other departments

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

B. Academic Policies Committee - First Reading
Report on LAS GE Categories – Senator Syverson
- Motion only germane if LAS prefix approved
  - Courses in LAS prefix that meet requirements for general education would need GE home
  - Latin American Studies Program Committee proposed listing under GE category III-G (interdisciplinary studies – social sciences) and GE category IV-E (interdisciplinary studies – humanities)
  - APC thought those appropriate places; also debated in committee about including GE category V
    - Decided if GE committee were to look at an LAS course they thought crossed GE categories, they would put that course in GE V – no need to add to motion
- Questions for clarification
  - Don’t understand need for GE category language – why predetermine when have committee to make those decisions
  - Categories are driven by disciplines; in programs that are interdisciplinary, it benefits GE committee to know senate intention
  - Not all courses automatically fall into specific GE category by discipline
    - Responsibility of group putting course forward to decide where it fits and submit to GE committee, which can agree or disagree
    - Are number of courses on campus that cross disciplines and GE categories

Motion 40-AP-15
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that any course with the LAS prefix that meets General Education criteria be included in either General Education Category III-G (Interdisciplinary Studies – Social Sciences) or General Education Category IV-E (Interdisciplinary Studies – Humanities).

Debate
- Could grant authority to GE committee to make decisions on where prefix (not course) goes
  - APC thought appropriate to go forward to senate because GE committee not currently granted that authority
  - Did think appropriate for GE committee to look at individual courses and decide if, because of overlap of categories, a course might belong in GE V
- School or college APCs decide where think course goes and GE committee votes up or down
  - Not always clear, so senate providing guidance on prefixes that are interdisciplinary appropriate
- Each GE category defined
  - In this case policy would put LAS courses in GE III or GE IV
  - Place of GE committee to decide in which one
- If decide now that only two places for interdisciplinary prefix to go, what happens when something else comes up that would fit somewhere else?
- All current LAS courses would fit in III and IV; if course came up that fit in another category, up to senate to decide where
- Against motion – see as unnecessary step reminiscent of notion that only people in College of Arts and Sciences can decide what category to place courses
  - Don’t like whole community pre-deciding about my courses
Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

C. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on Medical Excuses Guidelines – Senator Syverson

- Motion brought forward from Health Services
  - Excuses being supplied not sort of information faculty need for excused absences
  - Problem when student comes to health services when no longer sick
  - Not really giving medical excuses, just stating student visited Student Health Services on certain date
  - Takes up time of Student Health Service personnel
  - Motion clarifies that SHS will not issue medical excuses and puts guidelines in handbook
  - Committee also considered that not all illnesses require medical attention; still might not want that student in your class
  - Would reduce demands on scarce health care resources for activity not supplying type of information faculty member looking for
  - Issue has to be worked out between student and faculty member on individual basis anyway
  - Response to questions on clarification of report
    - Implementation would be next edition of handbook
    - Still providing for verifications as necessary
    - Student Health Services still student advocate in cases of serious illness
    - Paragraphs not in bold already in handbook under authorized absences
      - This motion does not change them
      - Included here to see context
    - Will find appropriate title for Dean of Students Office language
    - As in the past at beginning of fourth paragraph actually deleted by APC; should not be there

**Motion 40-AP-16**

Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that the following guidelines for issuing medical excuses be approved.

Language to be added to the Authorized Absences section of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook (Chapter 7, page 8, Sept. 2002 edition) is in boldface

**Authorized Absences**

A student's absence from class is authorized by the Dean of the College for (1) participation in an approved field trip listed in the catalogue as a requirement for a course in which the student is enrolled; or (2) participation in an authorized extra-curricular activity on the regularly approved calendar of university events [such absences are reported by the Dean to each instructor at least 48 hours in advance of the trip or event]; or (3) illness, injury, or emergency of such severity as to prevent the student from being able to attend class. The **Dean of Students Office of Student Development and Diversity** will assist the student in providing any needed documentation. Instructors are obligated to furnish students with an opportunity to make up any course work missed during authorized absences.

Excuses will not be issued by Student Health Services for course related activities. Specifically, the SHS will not provide “medical excuses” for missed classes, missed examinations, or the late completion of assignments. Faculty and students should together resolve the dilemmas resulting from an illness or injury based on the student’s own explanation of the problem.

In some situations, clinicians at the SHS will give students specific advice impacting their ability to attend class or complete assignments. At the clinician’s discretion, written advice may be given. Students may wish to share this advice with instructors, but they are not required to do so.

SHS personnel will routinely call the Office of Student Development and Diversity on the student’s behalf if an absence is expected to be longer than two days. That office will then inform the student’s instructors.
Requests for illness verification may arise in certain specific situations. These requests will likely be granted if deemed to be in the student’s best interest. There are some situations in which verification from the office of Student Health Services will be provided, they are listed below.

**Situations where verification is appropriate:**

1. Health reason for termination of a housing contract.
2. Disability requiring handicap parking permit.
3. Health problem resulting in cancellation of an airline reservation or other reservation when required to obtain a refund.
4. Health problem causing withdrawal from the university after usual deadlines.
5. Required clearance for return to work.
6. Health problem leading to a student requesting an “incomplete” in a course.

Students who are unable to attend fall classes until after the Labor Day holiday due to continued summer employment should contact the **Dean of Students Office** of **Student Development and Diversity** before the start of the semester. Students should inform the Dean of Students Office of other commitments in addition to classes, such as residence hall leases, etc., which may be affected by the delayed attendance. A letter from the employer indicating that the student is employed through the holiday weekend may be requested. The **Dean of Students Office** of **Student Development and Diversity** will notify instructors whose classes are affected by the absence. Instructors should consider these to be excused absences and should not report them to the Registrar's Office. It is the student's responsibility to contact faculty to acquire information and assignments given during the absence.

Debate – None

MOTION by Senator Mac Briar that the rules be suspended to allow a vote on this motion today seconded and DEFEATED by vote of 20 for, 17 against (two-thirds majority required).

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

D. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
**Report on Wellness Requirement Exemption for Military Service** – Senator Syverson
- Brought forward from Student Senate; issue surfaced after National Guard member inquired why National Guard personnel unable to get same exemption as other military personnel
  - Especially when consider expanded role
  - Resolution passed Student Senate unanimously on November 10, 2003
- Proposes that military personnel, whether they have been discharged or currently part of National Guard or other military branch, who have completed boot camp-type experience would gain an exemption from one-credit physical activity portion of wellness requirement
  - Chair of Department of Kinesiology and Athletics willing to support change
  - Broadens exemption currently on books
- Seemed fair that exemption be available to all military personnel, not just those discharged

**Motion 40-AP-17**
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (8-0) that the following changes to the physical activity requirement of the Wellness Requirement be approved.

**WELLNESS REQUIREMENT** (2003-2004 Catalog Copy with changes)

All candidates for the baccalaureate degree must satisfactorily complete one semester credit in wellness theory courses and one semester credit in physical activity courses. The requirement is designed to provide students with a comprehensive exposure to wellness. Courses numbered Kins 100-189 may be used to satisfy the physical activity requirement. The courses which satisfy the wellness theory requirement are listed below. Kins 186 satisfies both the physical activity and wellness theory requirement.

The one required credit in physical activity courses is counted in the minimum total of 120 credits for graduation. Additional credits may be earned in physical activity courses but may not be counted toward the minimum total of 120 credits for graduation (See Kinesiology and Athletics for exceptions).
The Department of Kinesiology and Athletics provides adaptations in physical activity courses for students who have a medical excuse from a physician and approval of the Student Health Service. Students who have served at least one year of active duty in completed basic training/boot camp for the military may are to be exempt from the one credit in physical activity (only) requirement upon presentation of either current military identification or discharge papers (D. D. 214) to the Registrar’s office.

Debate
- Committee did not discuss whether law enforcement or fire department personnel that must meet some sort of physical training requirement should also receive exemption
- Registrar’s Office would not know what to ask for relative to those professions

Amendment 40-AP-17-a1
Moved by Senator Russell and seconded to add additional form to be accepted by Registrar’s Office – add or a transcript from the American Council on Education (ACE) Registry showing completion of the Basic Combat Training Course

Vote on Amendment 40-AP-17-a1: Amendment PASSED without dissention.

Continued Debate
- No blanket exemption for age, but do waive requirement for many students over 25
- May be against depending on original purpose of physical activity segment of requirement
  - Whether to quickly whip into shape or teach physical activity to get in exercise habit for life
- Purpose of proposal is to expand groups allowed exemption
  - National Guard personnel required to maintain standard of health to remain in guard
  - Six week intensive program does teach lifelong skills for staying in shape
- As physical conditioning specialist in Air Force can tell you there was educational component
- Don’t like that anybody who has ever been in military would be exempt
  - Would assume have physical activity requirement because want student active right now
  - Seems current piece important part
- Catalogue states requirement is designed to provide students with comprehensive exposure to wellness
- Think argument hinges on desire to have them take it here – could say same for any other transfer course
- Seems very appropriate because just physical activity segment, still have to take wellness theory part
  - Willing to give them credit for past because appreciate what they have done
- Can do good thing for lot of people; set precedent to signal anyone to make similar proposal for other equally deserving groups
- Will look in archives to find original reasons requirement put in place

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

E. Compensation Committee – First Reading
Report on Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment – Senator Gapko
- Purpose of motion is to address salary compression among faculty ranks at this university
  - Follows post-tenure review for persons requesting consideration for salary adjustment
  - Committee also desired to recognize services
- Tenured faculty employed here for at least five continuous years eligible once every five years
- Funded primarily from chancellor’s 10% discretionary portion of faculty comprehensive salary plan
- Pros and cons listed on report form
- Response to questions on content of report
  - Since using faculty portion of comprehensive salary plan, instructional academic staff contributing in some sense to pool of resources from which ineligible to draw
    - Way it works right now for compression
    - Would be same for assistant and associate professors, although upon promotion they would be eligible
So long-term instructional academic staff contributing to rewarding full professors, but have no chance under this proposal of ever being rewarded for good teaching, good service, or longevity

When we as institution get pay raise, given to us with policies on how it can be distributed
  - Ten percent of money can be used to reward things like compression in faculty ranks
  - Not money that is in anyone’s pocket, so no one actually contributing from their salary to this
  - To categorize as tax situation, where contributing to someone else, inaccurate

If want to be rewarded, have to attain job, go through review process to professor level of achievement

Distinction between Tiers IV and III in difference between meanings of exemplary and extra meritorious

Think there should be additional statement that distinguishes exemplary from extra meritorious

Hard to come up with language that applies across all disciplines and activities – rest of document does talk about top 10% versus next 15%

Committee also looked at word distinguished, but if look up exemplary will find it goes beyond extra meritorious

Another option considered, but decided against, would be to require exemplary performance in all four areas of services

Open to suggestions

Concerned about whether checks and balances in proposal

Compensation Committee needs detailed report as to where money goes in order to make value judgment about effectiveness

Committee will analyze to best of ability few years down road to see if working

Problem for me is when post-tenure review process changed from summative to formative, doubled work for everybody, yet only full professors can benefit
  - Only get one chance every five years
  - Fifty percent of faculty to receive nothing

**Motion 40-CP-02**
Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6-0) that the following policies be included in the faculty portion of the 2005-2006 Comprehensive Salary Plan in place of the previously implemented compression adjustments.

**Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment Policies**

The intent of the Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment is to help address compression/inversion among senior faculty and to recognize a pattern of effective performance across multiple years of service when all applicable promotion awards have been obtained.

Tenured faculty are eligible for a post-tenure review salary adjustment at the completion of each post-tenure review when they have been employed at UW-Eau Claire in a 50% or more appointment for at least 5 continuous years (as defined in UWEC 3.04 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook), have not received a salary adjustment for change of position or rank in the last five years, and would not normally be eligible for promotion. The phrase “not normally eligible for promotion” is used to ensure that employees in special circumstances may be evaluated for participation in the post-tenure review salary adjustment process. An employee who receives a post-tenure review salary award is ineligible for a promotion salary adjustment for the next five years.

Post-tenure review salary adjustments shall be provided from a combination of base budget and UWS Pay Plan increase funds. A maximum of 8% of the faculty portion of the Comprehensive Salary Plan can be used to fund the cost of the post-tenure review salary adjustments with the remaining necessary funds coming from the base budget above the deans’ level. Any unused funds from the 8% of the faculty portion of the Comprehensive Salary Plan shall be available for internal equity adjustments and shall follow the policies and procedures thereof. The post-tenure review salary adjustments shall result in an increase in the faculty member’s base salary rate according to the table shown below.
A faculty member in this tier has demonstrated a pattern of
exemplary performance and professional growth in at least
three of the primary areas of evaluation (i.e., teaching,
scholarship, service, and advising).

Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Exemplary performance and professional growth in at least three areas of evaluation.</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Extra meritorious performance and professional growth in at least three areas of evaluation.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Meritorious performance and professional growth in at least two areas of evaluation.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Solid performance in teaching, scholarship, service, and advising but exhibits a lower overall performance and level of professional growth than deemed necessary for a Tier II award.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department Evaluation Plan of the faculty member’s department shall determine the relative weight of each area of primary evaluation. In addition to the criteria outlined above, to be considered for a Tier IV, III, or II salary adjustment, a faculty member must have had at least satisfactory performance in all primary areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service, and advising).

While it is anticipated that there will be fluctuations in the number awards granted each year, it is expected that over time approximately 10% of those eligible each year should receive a Tier IV award, 15% of those eligible each year should receive a Tier III award, and 25% of those eligible each year should receive a Tier II award. The exact number of awards in each tier should be determined by the performance of the individuals under consideration and should not be influenced by the required source of funding (Pay Plan increase versus base funds).

Faculty may be recommended for a post-tenure review salary adjustment based on the outcome of each post-tenure review. Following the post-tenure review, and at the request of the faculty member, the Department Chair shall recommend a specific Tier salary adjustment from the above table. This recommendation, along with documentation supporting it, shall be shared with the faculty member at least five days prior to submission to the Dean’s Office. During that time, the faculty member may request a meeting with the Department Chair to appeal his/her recommendation. In the event that the Department Chair and the faculty member cannot reach an agreement on an appropriate recommendation, the Dean shall meet with both the Department Chair and the employee to mediate the disagreement. The decision of the Dean is final.

Each subsequent administrator is responsible for reviewing all recommendations received and forwarding those recommendations (including any supporting materials) to the next level of administration. Each administrator may raise or lower the recommendation based on a comparative analysis of all submitted recommendations. Each administrator may attach additional information to the received recommendations, as necessary, to support his/her recommendations.

At the same time as the recommendation is forwarded to the next level of administration, all lower levels (including the faculty member) shall be informed in writing as to the recommendation forwarded on the faculty member’s behalf. The employee shall have fourteen days during which to request a meeting with the administrator receiving the recommendation to discuss any concerns over the forwarded recommendation.

Based on a comparative analysis of all submitted recommendations, the availability of funds, and the expected distribution of adjustments across the Tiers (i.e., 10% in Tier IV, 15% in Tier III, 25% in Tier II, and 50% in...
Tier I), the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall make recommendations for final Tier salary adjustments and forward them to the Chancellor for approval. While the availability of funds is a necessary constraint, it is the intention of these policies that the final Tier salary adjustment for each faculty member be based on merit and the expected distribution of adjustments across Tiers. Only for the most compelling reasons should the availability of funds be used as a justification for reducing the number of faculty receiving each salary adjustment. The Chancellor shall notify each faculty member of the Post-Tenure Salary Adjustment.

1 The procedures for recommending a Department Chair for a post-tenure salary adjustment are the same as that for regular faculty except that the Dean holds the responsibilities described for the Department Chair and the Provost and Vice Chancellor holds the responsibilities described for the Dean.

Amendment 40-CP-04-a1

Moved by Senator Whitfield and seconded that in Tier IV, which goes above and beyond that expected for extra meritorious performance, be added between growth and in

Debate

- When definition for first thing on list cites second thing on list, don’t think that is clarification – just have to get used to exemplary

POINT OF ORDER: Will be no vote on amendment today as have lost quorum.

Continued Debate

- Decision of whether performance is exemplary or extra meritorious starts with colleagues in department
  - They do post-tenure review evaluation
  - At discretion of faculty member, evaluation given to department chair who will make recommendation as to which category applies
  - Recommendation goes up administrative channel and can be altered at each level based on documented argument
  - In end, decision is chancellors upon advice of provost and vice chancellor
- This salary adjustment based on post-tenure review; only those undergoing that review eligible
  - Includes department chairs; does not include other full-time administrators
  - Also includes faculty serving other roles not typically viewed as academic positions
- Sentence on lines 95 and 96 stating the decision of the Dean is final occurs at end of paragraph discussing what happens when faculty member and department chair disagree
  - Immediate supervisor then makes final decision based on arguments heard from both; it is final decision as to what recommendation will be forwarded to dean’s office
  - Process does not stop there – are additional paragraphs
- Strongly favor motion
- Plan funded from combination of base dollars and pay plan dollars, so even if come up for post-tenure review during year of zero percent pay plan, should not sway numbers as to how many people receive these awards
  - Would place larger burden on base salary funds that year
  - Same thing happens now with promotions under zero percent pay plan
  - Chancellor has begun talks with Foundation to begin to build pot from private sources to help offset pressure on base budget, particularly when presented with zero percent pay plan
- Have policies that prevent some comparisons of salary actions based upon merit and other decisions
  - Will be ways to evaluate even if use numbers instead of names; not as though will not be accountability
- Having served on this committee, find we almost always lack effective documentation; trying to make decisions without good information
  - Seems now would be time to adjust this motion so there is feedback
  - For example, if committee found all awards went to College of Business in one year, members might think differently about funding that program
- Believe that sort of information available
Prevented from releasing names in way that indicates this person meritorious, and this person less so
Committee can also go into closed session
Don’t have institutional policies that go beyond system policies
Chancellor willing to releasing anything appropriate after clarification from system
Kind of report now received from administration would indicate how many awards were given in College of Business, College of Arts and Sciences, and how many in other cases, for example to limited appointments and instructional academic staff
That is starting point of what committee needs
Would be nice to have additional data, but don’t want this motion to hinge on larger argument of how to get additional data to committee
Valid discussion to have in future, not during this motion

POINT OF ORDER: Discussion is not to point of amendment on floor.
Chair allowing because amendment cannot be voted on and this is last discussion before next meeting

Continued Debate
Overwhelmingly support – issue of compression has to be addressed
Request Compensation Committee also look at long-term instructional academic staff no longer eligible for promotion to see if there is way for them to be rewarded for years of service to university

IX. Announcements – Next meeting on April 27, 2004 in Tamarack Room.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate