Members Present:


Members Absent:

Robin Baker, Paul Butrymowicz, Jesse Dixon, Jeff Erger, Larry Honl, Barbara Lozar, Sean McAleer, Tariq Niezi, Scott Robertson, Lorraine Smith, Daniel Stevenson, Troy Terhark, Sharon Westphal, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Linda Carpenter, Margaret Cassidy, Donald Christian, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Carole Halberg, Dale Johnson, Jan Morse, Scott Oates, Andrew Phillips, Katherine Rhoades, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant, Elaine Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, March 8, 2005 in the Oneida/Menominee Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of February 22, 2005 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed
   • Please note: minutes (and Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook) do not reflect updated membership of Commission on Status of Women
   • Steps will be taken to correct handbook
   • Senate election results (also included in minutes of last meeting)
   • Jacqueline Bonneville elected academic staff senator at-large
   • Thomas Kemp elected to Faculty Personnel Committee

II. Interim Chancellor’s Remarks – Interim Chancellor Vicki Lord Larson
   • Delighted to be back – feel like returning home
   • Looking forward to participating in senate and Executive Committee meetings - hope to be fully involved
   • Familiar with faculty senate meetings as Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at Oshkosh
   • Been associated with University of Wisconsin for almost thirty years so have deep appreciation for shared governance
   • Collectively our voices and viewpoints take us further than if any one of us were making decisions; appreciate hearing various voices and viewpoints and collectively moving us forward
   • Like democracy, may slow us down sometimes, but when all said and done, still best form of government
   • Will be meeting with student leaders to get their viewpoint and understand their issues and concerns
• Spent 18 years at UW-Eau Claire prior to moving to UW-Oshkosh
  • Worked through ranks of tenure here, so understand tenure process
  • Also had opportunities in administration as department chair and assistant and associate dean of Graduate School and Research – worked closely and learned great deal from Provost Satz
  • Went to UW-Oshkosh as Dean of Graduate School and Research; then approached to serve as interim Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, which led to permanent position
  • When ready to retire, wanted to look around and see where I might spend my life – chose Eau Claire
    • My husband Jim lost battle with deadly form of cancer in January of 2004
    • Already working part-time for Eau Claire based publishing company, Thinking Publications
    • Asked by President Reilly about interim chancellorship at UW-Eau Claire; didn’t take long to accept
  • Delighted and honored to be back in Eau Claire in this position
    • Put retirement on hold; took leave of absence from Thinking Publications
    • Will be here as long as you need me so you have opportunity to search and screen for new chancellor
      • My entire motivation is to do what is best for this university
  • Won’t be difficult to find outstanding chancellor because of UW-Eau Claire’s excellent reputation, beautiful campus, fine administrative team, high quality faculty and academic staff, and high quality students
  • Hope to keep us focused on both quantitative and qualitative measures of our university, revise our strategic plan where appropriate, and keep momentum of exceptional capital campaign going
    • Will not go into detail on this my second day, but will share plans for this week and next
    • Will attend Board of Regents meeting this week and come back and brief you on what is going on, particularly as it relates to budget and academic affairs
    • Monday will testify at UW-Stout before Joint Finance Committee
      • Intent there is to talk about need for our students to have sufficient financial aid to attend our university as tuition climbs
      • By graduating students, investing in quality of life in state of Wisconsin and increasing tax base

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Nominating Committees looking for people to run as senators at-large
  • To find out when your senate terms end, check with Wanda
  • Remember to consider meeting times when nominating or scheduling for fall
• Joint Finance Committee to hold public hearings at UW-Stout on Monday from 3:00 to 8:00 p.m.
• Provosts and Chief Business Officers working on plans to meet required dollar savings in budget
• New Policy on gender identity and expression included in Chair’s Report
  • How to change language and processes on campuses to be more inclusive of those of different gender identities identified
• Next Board of Regents meeting March 10 and 11, 2005 in Madison

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
• Academic Staff Leadership Conference set for July 14-15, 2005 at UW-River Falls
  • Anyone interested in attending, contact Senator Wilcox
• Chart distributed on name tags includes information germane to past senate discussions
  • UW-Eau Claire has highest percentage in system of academic staff that are instructional (61%)
  • Also means lowest percentage of administrative and professional academic staff

V. Unfinished Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
B. Bylaws for Roll Call Vote Report – Vice Chair Gapko
  • Have been questions about roll call vote – generally when handbook silent, defer to Robert’s Rules of Order
  • Robert’s Rules superseded in this case by state statute indicating any member of a governmental body may require a vote be taken at any meeting in such manner that the vote of each member is ascertained and recorded
  • Can avoid confusion by stating that policy in handbook as bylaws
Motion 41-SE-09
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (11 for, 0 against) that new bylaws be inserted in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook for University Faculty, University Academic Staff and University Senate as follows:

Roll-Call Vote A roll-call vote may be ordered by any member of the body except for the election of officers. WI Statute 19.88(2)

Debate
- Vote for each bylaw to be by representative groups mentioned in motion
- Required by state statute, so do not have choice – this just eliminates search to find policy
Without objection, motion postponed for vote at next meeting.

B. First Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
Academic Staff Review of Performance Report – Senator Wilcox
- Found language needed updating
  - Realized different departments used different procedures; wanted to insert language referring to procedures as outlined in Department Evaluation Plans (DEP)
  - No differentiation in current language between Fixed Term – Renewable (FT-R) and Fixed Term – No Intent to Rehire (FT-NITR) academic staff; FT-NITR academic staff not even mentioned
  - Wanted to ensure Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) evaluated only on contractual responsibilities unless IAS requests additional contributions be included in evaluation
  - Proposal came to committee from both IAS and department chairs – some IAS very involved in professional development even though not part of contract
  - Wanted to be able to include those activities in personnel file
  - No opportunity for FT-NITR academic staff to have performance reviewed – wanted language that would allow that
  - Committee amazed and appalled at how many FT-NITR academic staff here for multiple years
  - Felt performance reviews would benefit academic staff members and also departments making hiring decisions
  - New language may make extra work for department chairs and Departmental Personnel Committees (DPC)
- Responses to questions for clarification
  - NITR can be for semester or year contracts
  - Motion would not preclude doing annual performance review of IAS members with multiple year contracts – says review need only be done during year reappointment to occur
  - Could not find in administrative code where annual evaluation required for IAS as required for administrative and professional academic staff (APAS)
  - Performance review different than salary review; language for both in handbook – this strictly performance review
  - Whether or not written request of IAS for inclusion of additional activities in performance review honored by department would depend upon what is in place in DEP
  - Committee did run language by Faculty Personnel Committee; although an academic staff personnel issue, certainly has implications for faculty
  - State personnel guidelines say if IAS here six years, multiple year contracts should be considered if budget allows, etc.
  - UW-Eau Claire language says you must work 50% or more for six consecutive years – has been problematic, trying to take word consecutive out as it does not appear in state guidelines

Motion 41-AS-02
Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (8 for, 0 against) that the following changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, UWEC 10.03(3) Review of Performance

1. Fixed Term—Instructional and/or Research Academic Staff (IAS)
a. Fixed Term - Renewable

1) Performance Review

The performance review of instructional and/or research academic staff for reappointment will follow procedures at the departmental level outlined in the departmental evaluation plan and similar to those employed for probationary faculty for peer review (UWEC 3.05) including the evaluation consideration of student ratings evaluations. The Departmental Personnel Committee will conduct a review of performance and forward a report to the Department Chair. The performance evaluation by the Department Chair, including the Departmental Personnel Committee’s report, will be given to the instructional and/or research academic staff member in writing at the same time the report is forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The instructional and/or research academic staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of receipt of the Department Chair’s departmental evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s personnel record, the Department Chair’s performance evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be filed in the instructional and/or research academic staff member’s personnel file.

The Department Chair’s performance evaluation is to be forwarded to the Dean prior to January 15 in the instructional and/or research academic staff member’s first two years of service; prior to October 15 of the third through sixth years of service; and prior to February 15 for appointment to the seventh and subsequent years of service. (US 5/97)

When an IAS member holds a multiple year contract and has been employed at the University for six or more continuous years, a performance review need only be done during the year in which reappointment is to occur.

b. 2) Areas of Evaluation

The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff shall be a comprehensive evaluation based on contractual responsibilities, and shall at the written request of the instructional academic staff, the evaluation may include those functions related to teaching as well as professional growth and appropriate contributions service to the department, the university, the profession, and the public community. An instructional and/or research academic staff member is to be evaluated only on his or her assigned responsibilities as specified in UWEC 10.03(1).

b. Fixed Term – No Intent to Rehire

1) Performance Review

For an instructional and/or research academic staff member whose contract indicates there is no intent to rehire, the department may conduct a more limited review as outlined in the departmental evaluation plan. The staff member will meet with the department chair at the beginning of the contract period to discuss evaluation criteria. At minimum, a written evaluation by the department chair or a member of the Department Personnel Committee shall be provided to the staff member following the review. The staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of receipt of the department chair’s evaluation. The written evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be placed in the staff member’s personnel file. This process shall conclude not later than 30 days prior to the end of the contractual period.

2) Areas of Evaluation

The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff whose contract indicates there is no intent to rehire shall be an evaluation based on contractual responsibilities. At the written request of the instructional academic staff, the evaluation may include professional growth and appropriate service to the department, the university, the profession, and the community.

Debate

- Part of Academic Staff Personnel Rules, so only academic staff senators to vote on motion
- Strongly favor motion
  - Sent to Faculty Personnel Committee to inform and also ask for advice regarding language
  - Tried to put as much authority and responsibility in hands of departments as possible
• Not attempt by academic staff to force any department to make special rules, just state in DEP how performance of IAS will be reviewed

Without objection, vote on motion postponed to next meeting.

C. First Reading – Motion from Academic Policies Committee

University General Education Committee Report – Senator Syverson

• Committee has right to make substitution since motion not yet introduced
• Motion brought forward from University General Education Committee (UGEC)
  • UGEC in operation more than two years – decided appropriate to clarify some committee responsibilities
• Motion would include provost or representative as ex officio, nonvoting member of committee
• Formalizes how committee has been operating since inception
• Since committee addressing curricular issues, APC also thought appropriate
• Motion proposes UGEC annually review catalogue copy pertaining to general education (GE) program
• Also proposes committee periodically evaluate GE program’s effectiveness against GE goals
  • Goals drafted by UGEC, would be approved by APC and Senate
  • If committee, using data from Assessment Committee, raises serious issues with GE program quality and effectiveness, steering committee would be appointed by provost as has been done in past to evaluate problem and bring forth recommendations to APC
• Since motion changes constitution, University Faculty will also need to approve
• Revised version takes care of concern on part of committee about collaboration with Assessment Committee
  • Language changed by APC after motion distributed at request of Scott Oates, chair of Assessment Committee
  • Thought more appropriate for UGEC to use information from Plan for Assessment of Student Academic Achievement to reduce role of Assessment Committee, which already has enough to do
• Response to questions for clarification
  • On revision, year changed to yearly as per original motion
  • Was committee discussion about relationship between reconstituted GE goals and baccalaureate goals
    • One of questions was whether appropriate to have separate goals for GE program because might be considerable overlap with those of baccalaureate degree
    • Seemed there would be some difference between goals of GE versus goals of degree itself
    • UGEC not starting from square one in developing GE goals – don’t think there will be wholesale revision of baccalaureate goals
      • Expecting significant overlap so Assessment Committee does not have two huge documents to coordinate

Motion 41-AP-03

Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (8 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the language of the Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff be approved:

6. University General Education Committee

a. Membership: The committee includes six faculty representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, two faculty representatives from the College of Business, two faculty representatives from the College of Education and Human Sciences, and one faculty representative from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. These representatives will be chosen by existing shared governance processes established through the bylaws of the respective schools or colleges. One student, with at least junior standing, will be appointed by the Student Senate President in accordance with customary procedures. Faculty serve staggered three-year terms with approximately one-third of the representatives from each College being elected each year. The Provost and Vice Chancellor or designated representative shall serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the committee.

b. Function: The University General Education committee is responsible for recommending criteria for General Education courses, and developing the purposes and intended learning outcomes for
general education. The criteria, purposes, and intended learning outcomes will be forwarded to the University Senate Academic Policies Committee and the University Senate for approval. The Committee is responsible for approving courses for inclusion in the General Education Program, periodically reviewing existing general education courses for reapproval, yearly review of UWEC catalog copy regarding General Education, and working with the office of Academic Affairs to annually evaluate the GE program’s course availability and, using information from the Plan for Assessment of Student Academic Achievement, periodically evaluate the GE program’s effectiveness against the General Education goals as passed by the University Senate.

Amendment 41-AP-03-a1
Moved by Senator Gallaher and seconded to strike with at least junior standing after student in membership paragraph.

Debate on Amendment
- After UGEC forwarded motion to APC, Student Senate passed resolution requesting student representative requirements be more open – having difficulty finding junior or senior students to join committee
- Student Senate resolution sets guidelines, such as having taken a 300-level GE course
  - UGEC felt it made sense to let students include membership criteria in their bylaws, rather than putting criteria in our constitution
- Would worry younger students wouldn’t have confidence stepping onto committee to speak up; older students more likely to have that confidence and experience

Vote on Amendment 41-AP-03-a1: Amendment PASSED by University Faculty Senators.

Continued Debate on Main Motion
- As member of UGEC, wondering how much assessment GE committee getting itself into – workload issue
  - Not sure committee can answer question of what it would do if data found deficient
- That was question Assessment Committee had all along: how much work this motion might create for that committee?
  - Thought better to stabilize language by grounding authority in Plan for Assessment of Student Academic Achievement, a document that now exists, rather than in two committees that could become too free-wheeling in setting goals for student learning
- Pretty clear as committee identifying goals for general education, working toward seeing program changed
  - Don’t mean this as criticism, more as wake-up call to make sure as we vote on this, we’re aware of what is happening
- Clearly a possible consequence of motion is that GE program might be changed
  - Then again, GE program might be changed if this language not in place
  - This just says UGEC has certain responsibilities; support that because no one else has these responsibilities at this point
  - Everything in this proposal now either already done by UGEC or nobody is charged with doing it
  - Proposal basically looks at GE in terms of goals and structure and brings it through faculty governance – provides a channel for change
Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

D. First Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee
- Each year Compensation Committee brings forward recommended policies for distribution of pay plan – this year similar to past plans with some significant changes
- Still uncertainty as to what system pay plan will look like so want flexibility built into plan
- Does not look like market shortfall funds requested by regents appearing – if necessary, can address those in separate document
- Given relatively low pay increases over last few years, new model, especially on faculty and IAS side, not fully tested, would like to see plan remain stable to determine implications
Plan suggests removing distinction between external and internal equity adjustments as no external equity requests funded over last two years.

Committee split on need for UW-Eau Claire salary minima and whether they should be raised.

Committee discussed promotion amounts and whether to raise based on formula used in past.

Recommend changing merit system for APAS so value of each merit award determined by number of recipients instead of fixed dollar merit amount limiting number of awards.

- Given prospects of small pay plan, concerned that wouldn’t be enough to go around.

Previously no mechanism for salary ratings of faculty and IAS by department chairs to be challenged by successive levels of administration.

- Checks and balances built into this plan so can look at evaluations for entire department.

Pros of proposed plan:
- Sufficient flexibility to handle pay plan percentages likely to receive.
- Maintains familiar faculty and IAS merit rating system.
- Establishes APAS merit system in which number of meritorious performers determines amount of award rather than award determining number of meritorious performers.
- Increases promotion amount following formulas used in past.
- Removes artificial distinction between internal and external equity; allows equity cases to be made on data most supportive of equity adjustment.
- Enables supervisors of person signing merit ratings to reject and/or ask for additional clarification as to how merit raises arrived at.

Cons of proposed plan:
- Increases promotion amounts, putting additional burden on already taxed base funds.
- Remains more complex than some would prefer.
- Adds another layer of administrative review by allowing supervisor to reject merit ratings.
- Does not address market shortfall of UW-Eau Claire salaries as compared to peer and national data.
- Does not address salary compression among faculty ranks.

Response to question for clarification:
- Promotion amounts increased $50 per rank.

Motion 41-CP-01
Moved and seconded by the Compensation Committee (5 for, 0 against) that the proposed 2005-2006 Comprehensive Salary Plan be approved.

Debate:
- All senators vote on motion.
- Speak for plan; are some areas worthy of discussion.
  - For salary minima to be useful, must raise year after year.
  - While doesn’t always give real salary benefit, seems logical to maintain.
- Same applies to promotion increases.
  - Last year senate passed hefty promotion increases that were not approved by the chancellor because he said it was not logical – nothing logical about $50 for every rank.
  - Not based on overall proportions, creates compression.
  - Don’t think we are maintaining salary structures; need to do more for ourselves in this pay plan than ask for what we think we are going to get.
- Speak for plan – particularly for added sentence for APAS merit awards.
  - Major complaint in past years was that people worthy of merit increases didn’t receive them because money ran out.
  - If every academic staff member received a merit recommendation, award would be $260; in past about one-half to two-thirds of faculty and academic staff recommended for merit.
  - Under this plan, those acknowledged as meritorious up line would get merit increase.
- Discussion of faculty salary minima began with proposal to remove them since UW-System salary minima in place.
  - Reasoning was not to force ourselves into corner unnecessarily during times of tight money.
Proposal not supported by full committee
For example, UW-Eau Claire minimum for Associate Lecturer is $30,750; UW-System minimum is $23,375
  - If took away that UW-Eau Claire minimum, would have effect of possibly lowering salaries for Associate Lecturers
  - Asked Administrative Officer Morse what she believed figures should be for academic staff
    - Based on those figures for various IAS ranks, and system formula of IAS minima being 75% of corresponding professor minima (Associate Lecturer minimum = 75% Assistant Professor minimum), mapped those back to faculty ranks
    - So all minima raised, although not equally
  - Sections on performance salary adjustments for APAS and for faculty not consistent with one another; not intended to be
    - Could use same argument as used for removing salary minima for promotion increments – system amounts for promotion about $750 to $1500, we are three to four times higher than those
    - Eau Claire has taken proactive approach consistently for number of years
    - Offering respectable salary to IAS important – support raising minima
  - Since governed by system policies, as increase in pay plan initially goes up from 2%, people with solid performance would fare worse
    - System policies dictate that at 2% or less, increases will be distributed to everyone; above 2%, the one-third, one-third, one-third rule kicks in
      - Requires one-third to be put into solid performance, one-third into merit-market, and one-third up to campus discretion, which traditionally Eau Claire has put in solid performance
      - Increase for solid performance thus equal at 2% and 3%, decreased between
    - In comparison to other universities, department chair’s stipend of $2000/year seems very low
    - Department chair stipend portion of pay plan describes current practice at this institution
      - $2000 stipend is not base adjustment; ends when chair leaves position
      - Paid from base dollars, not pay plan
      - Included in comprehensive salary plan because is part of salary distribution policies
      - Are appointments made in summer for chairs – not mentioned here as equivalent to overload appointments also not mentioned
    - Still say promotion amounts and minima inadequate
      - If not the case, why would statistics show how poorly paid we are, especially the longer you are here
      - Need to figure way to infuse base dollars into salary as it is only reasonable way to affect change
      - Madison has done it and infused money from foundation; LaCrosse has done it
      - Ought to ask for more – only vehicles in salary plan to do that are equity adjustments and promotion amounts – have lagged behind too long not to address this
    - In last two years, no equity adjustments because no money; have been equity adjustments in years past
    - External equity adjustments only in existence for two years; internal equity procedures funded by pay plan
      - In last two years, no equity adjustments because no money; have been equity adjustments in years past

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton that the rules be suspended to vote on this today seconded and DEFEATED by vote of 17 for, 36 against.

MOTION by Senator Wick that the vote to suspend be reconsidered seconded.
  - Vice Chancellor Soll before meeting indicated system looking for salary plans due March 1st; only five campuses have complied
  - Hate to see further postponement when there are not large changes to what already doing
  - Would ask senate to muster up confidence to let this go forward to allow us to comply with UW-System requests

POINT OF INFORMATION: Senator Wick voted against suspending the rules, which was the prevailing side.

Vote on Reconsideration of Suspending the Rules: Motion PASSES by vote of 28 for, 19 against.
POINT OF INFORMATION – Suspending rules not debatable.
Without objection, body will allow response to question of changes proposed salary plan makes to previous plan
- Plan allows for challenge of department chair evaluations by subsequent administrators
- Promotion amounts increased $50 per rank
- Removed distinction between internal and external equity
- Merit system for APAS will vary amount of award based on number of recipients
- Salary minima raised slightly

Vote on Suspension of the Rules: Motion DEFEATED by vote of 30 for, 18 against (requires a two-thirds vote).

Senator Wick requested opportunity to address senate to explain behavior
- Didn’t believe you had all information necessary to make informed decision, but motion to suspend rules is not debatable
- Only way to get information out was to vote against motion and then propose reconsideration
- Apologize that it seems underhanded, but felt it necessary to get you all pertinent information

Continued Debate on Main Motion
- Overall, favor pay plan; have one concern
  - Last year established merit pay system with each department getting its kitty to divide up how it saw fit
  - Idea was to prevent deans from favoring one department over another
  - Now, new pay plan gives deans and provost power to second guess what is established in departmental pay plans
  - To clarify – this salary plan not changing fact that distribute at department level 90% of funds generated by salaries in that department
  - Intent of change is to allow deans’ offices to go back to departments if salary recommendations do not seem to be based on performance review as required by UW-System
- Agree that not doing enough for ourselves in addressing salary compression
  - Last year proposal for post-tenure review with pay adjustments defeated by this body
  - One reason for compression is once you hit rank of professor, no more salary bumps
  - If we are serious about dealing with salary compression, need to revisit post-tenure review salary adjustments
- Compensation Committee looking at possibility of replacing current formula-based compression model with post-tenure review model with significant salary increases available to essentially full professors
  - Interested in hearing opinions from members of this body and faculty and academic staff at large on post-tenure review salary adjustments
  - In years with less than 2% pay increase, would be funded from base dollars, which would infuse additional base dollars into salary line
  - Believe defeated last year largely because would affect relatively few people each year – approximately 26 people would come up for consideration each year for those awards, with approximately 50% of those people receiving base salary adjustments between $1500 and $4500
    - Proposed half receive those adjustments based on fact that in past have awarded approximately half of people meritiorious increments; other half receive simply solid performance
    - Was supported by chancellor’s office
    - If no one interested in bringing post-tenure review salary adjustments back, would save lot of work
- Because it was part of a joint salary plan, post-tenure review salary adjustments proposal voted on by both faculty and academic staff
- As department chair, lateness of plan getting approved makes it very difficult to administer salary recommendations in departments
  - Hope in future salary plan can come before senate and get out to department chairs in time to make timely recommendation to faculty members regarding their performance for past year
- Compensation Committee has been waiting on system for guidelines and rules to follow for pay plan; committee not dragging its feet – no one giving it anything in timely manner
  - Would be nice to do something on biennial basis so every other year not waiting, then scrambling
Wondering on post-tenure review salary adjustment if there aren’t donors out there who would support funding for those adjustments on merit basis
- When discussed those dollars coming from outside pay plan, people wondering what areas would then be cut
- Know faculty are behind peers about 6%; APAS behind peers about 16-17%
- Interested in possible ways to include more dollars in pay line for all staff in general
- Discussion of allocation guidelines for 2005-2007 biennium on regents agenda this week – hoping to get more information on where unclassified pay plan heading
- Post-tenure salary adjustment voted on by entire senate, even though only faculty part of pay plan includes compression – was offered as alternative means of addressing compression for faculty
- Salary plan on agenda for February 22, 2005 senate meeting; did not get to it
- Should be pressuring governor to do his job before we do ours – even with approved pay plan, wouldn’t know dollar amounts for salary letters
  - Doesn’t make difference, process in place for evaluating faculty
  - More concerned that we take ample opportunity to make sure this is right
  - Think always wrong to defy own rules to rush things through without good reason
- For information, LaCrosse and UW-Colleges raised their salaries by cannibalizing positions
  - In case of LaCrosse, was whole department; over 20 positions lost in Colleges
- Part of beauty of rating system is you submit ratings, not salary recommendations
  - Once you know moving forward with same rating system, free to do performance reviews and get ratings to faculty
  - When committee received system policies and knew we would put forward rating system similar to what used in past, shared that with administration and recommended getting word out to department chairs to proceed as normal
  - Why built flexibility into plan
- Previously, Chancellor Mash indicated he had funds available to support post-tenure review salary adjustments without layoffs or using positions
  - Was willing to fund full amount in years with pay plan increases of less than 2%
  - Chancellor Mash did reject ad hoc approach to raising promotion increases
  - Argument was not we can’t afford it, but that we don’t conduct business this way

MOTION by Senator Gapko that the Compensation Committee consider language of post-tenure review salary adjustments to be brought back as an amendment to the current pay plan for next senate meeting seconded and PASSED. Amendment to be distributed as soon as it comes out of committee.

Without objection, next meeting to start with second readings from last meeting, then to salary plan, then continue down agenda.

X. Announcements
- Next meeting March 29, 2005 in Tamarack Room

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate