The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, March 29, 2005 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of March 8, 2005 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Interim Chancellor Vicki Lord Larson
   • Announcements
     • 2005 Regent’s Academic Staff Award of Excellence going to Carole Halberg, President of Foundation and assistant to chancellor
       • Previous recipients from UW-Eau Claire were Jim Vance and Kathie Schneider
     • Governor was on campus as part of Wisconsin Discovery Institute
       • Thanks to everyone who participated
       • Hear everything went extraordinarily well and governor was pleased
     • Senator Herb Kohl here for Senior American Day; very enjoyable day
     • Representative Ron Kind to be on campus tomorrow morning to discuss Higher Education Reauthorization Act
       • Recommend attendance if possible; will have direct ramifications, particularly for state of Wisconsin
     • Budget forums and meetings announced in University Bulletin
       • Will be inclusive process; hope you all will participate
       • Certainly not easy with budget cuts coming back to back
   • Joint Finance Committee public hearings
     • Reports given by three chancellors (from Stout, River Falls, and Eau Claire) with following themes
       • Investment in higher education is investment in quality of life and tax base of state of Wisconsin
More individuals with baccalaureate degrees means higher salaries and contributions to tax base
- Pay plan critical to recruitment and retention of faculty and staff
- Accessibility of higher education to Wisconsin students, especially those from families in two lowest economic quintiles
- Worried that over time, without dollar for dollar match between tuition increases and financial aid, individuals from lower income homes will not have opportunity to pursue higher education
- Perception that college not attainable may take root as young as sixth grade, even among motivated and intellectually capable students
- Board of Regents meeting
  - Reviewed policy on tuition and financial aid; theme was to keep tuition reasonable to provide access
  - Strong feeling tuition may have to go up five to seven percent because fewer GPR dollars from state
  - In twelfth year; first in nation to adopt system-wide accountability report
  - Four measures all campuses respond to are: enrollment, retention and graduation, student involvement, and credits to degree
  - Each institution has autonomy to put forth other measures
  - Board of Regents recommended using copy of this report with legislators and taxpayers to show achievements of system
  - Twelve out of twenty indicators successful; many of eight challenges clearly due to loss of state investment in higher education
- General feeling that capital budget recommendations in governor’s budget better than last several biennia
  - Promising for various building plans on campuses throughout system
- Representative David Ward, co-chair of Joint Finance Committee, said education (focusing mainly on K-12), shared revenue, and medical assistance would be three areas stressed in budget
- Wonderful resolution honoring Chancellor Mash
- President Reilly’s report highlighted
  - Students going to Washington DC during spring break to lobby for additional financial aid
  - Student representatives from all UW campuses showcasing undergraduate research in capitol rotunda on April 7, 2005
- Business and Finance Committee – budget decision rules for 2005-2006 passed
  - Chief business officers and provosts working on rules for second year of biennium
  - Number of resolutions passed – one concerning social responsibility of some investments
- Education Committee enlightening – discussed
  - Possibility (now on hold) of system-wide climate survey report card
  - Score card on how to improve student achievement
  - Whether credential degree creep (adding credits) really making better professionals in allied health area
  - Passed two resolutions
    - Master’s degree in Women’s Studies and Gender Studies at UW-Madison
    - Collaborative doctorate degree in audiology at UW-Madison and UW-Stevens Point
- Chancellor Search and Screen Committee selection process underway
- Response to question from floor
  - Better budget in terms of capital building expenditure – don’t know about salary dollars
  - Decision rules provide general guideline for distribution of pay plan – if pay plan 2% or higher different guidelines apply
  - At this point, no recommendation from Department of Administration

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- URL on Chair’s Report to access full summaries of both days of regents meetings
- On behalf of Judicial Issues Committee, invite campus to What Do We Do about Cheating? – nuts and bolts presentation about how we respond to academic dishonesty
- Flyer distributed includes URL of new academic misconduct website sponsored by Office of Student Development and Diversity
- Chair’s Report provides brief overview of timeline for Chancellor Search and Screen process
IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox

- Great that in eight years Regent’s Academic Staff Award has been around, this is third time someone from UW-Eau Claire has won
- Report attached to name tags
  - Be aware when system talking about millions of dollars in administrative efficiencies, using term administrator loosely – basically talking about administrative and professional academic staff positions
  - Encourage all academic staff to go to open forums; dates in University Bulletin
  - Have found Interim Chancellor Larson and Provost Satz very open to suggestions
- Received letter from President Reilly about Chancellor Search and Screen Committee – to include two academic staff members
  - Campus will elect four academic staff by May 1, 2005 – system to choose two
  - If interested, contact Connie Russell, chair of University Academic Staff Nominating Committee
  - Provide short bio and reason for wanting to serve on committee; will send those on to system
  - Copies of responsibilities and procedures for search available
  - Is real responsibility and commitment – tremendous opportunity, but very time consuming
- Academic Staff Leadership Conference in July
  - Seeking proposals
  - Will be getting information out to all academic staff

V. Unfinished Business
A. Second Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee

2005-2006 Comprehensive Salary Plan

Amendment 41-CP-01-a1

Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee that the following section be added to the end of the proposed Comprehensive Salary Plan for 2005-2006.

8. Market Shortfall Adjustment Distribution
If the biennial budget process provides funding to address market shortfalls, the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire will establish a model to distribute such funds to correct market needs and salary needs with due regard to establishing average salaries at peer group medians. The University Senate, based on recommended policies developed by the University Senate Compensation Committee, will approve and forward to the Chancellor a set of policies for distributing any available market shortfall funds. These policies will be consistent with any and all UW – System policies governing the distribution of such funds.

Debate
- Heard from other institutions that system wants statement about possibility of market shortfall funds being available and that these funds would be distributed according to some policy
  - Added generic paragraph close to some that have been accepted by system
  - Indicates market shortfall funds different than pay plan dollars and policies will be developed to distribute them if necessary
  - Pay plans have been rejected by system if such a statement not included

Vote on Amendment 41-CP-01-a1: Amendment PASSED without dissention.

Continued Discussion of Salary Plan as Amended

- Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment Motion distributed via email and on name tags is not an amendment to current salary plan; will be brought up under miscellaneous business
  - Distributed at this time, by senate request, so available prior to vote on salary plan

Vote on Motion 41-CP-01: Motion PASSED without dissention.
B. Second Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
Senate Membership

Continued Debate on Motion as Amended - None

Vote on Motion 41-SE-07: Motion PASSED without dissention

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED

*Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 21st Edition, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section B Membership, page 11* be changed as shown:

4. Senator Balance

Each year the Senate Executive Committee will review the size of the University Senate and distribution of senators, as described in the Bylaws of the University Senate. The percentage of University Faculty senators and the percentage of University Academic Staff senators within the University Senate shall reflect, as closely as possible, the percentage of University Faculty and the percentage of University Academic Staff, respectively, within the total number of University Faculty and University Academic Staff eligible to vote. To monitor these percentages, the following steps shall be followed:

a. Each spring the Senate Executive Committee or authorized representatives will work with the appropriate administrators to determine the numbers of University Faculty and University Academic Staff eligible to vote using the *Official Frozen File* created the previous fall for that academic year. (Eligibility to vote is defined in Article One: Section D and Article Two: Section D of this constitution.) Based on this information, recommendations pertaining to the number and distribution of senators may be made.

b. The Senate percentages will be compared to the eligible to vote percentages.

c. If the Senate percentages differ by more than five percent from the eligible to vote percentages, the Senate Executive Committee shall recommend to the University Senate the necessary minor adjustments to the number of University Faculty and University Academic Staff senators at large to maintain the proper percentages.

All recommendations for changes in the number and distribution of senators at large and procedures for implementing the changes must be approved by the University Senate. Upon approval, such changes shall be reflected in the spring elections of senators at large.

And that the language in the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Bylaws of the University Senate, Membership of University Senate, Page 22 be changed as shown:

1. The University Senate shall consist of University Faculty and University Academic Staff senators and will reflect the appropriate percentages of University Faculty senators and University Academic Staff senators as described in Article Three, Section B, 4 of the Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff.

The voting members of the University Senate include:

44 University Faculty (defined in Article One, Section C)

32 1 University Faculty members from each academic department or equivalent with 4 or more members

1 University Faculty member from Library Services

1 University Faculty member from Chapter 37 faculty (Article One, Section C, definition 3)

1 Provost and Vice Chancellor

45 University Faculty at large:

3 University Faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences

1 University Faculty from the College of Business

1 University Faculty from the College of Professional Studies

1 University Faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences

5 Additional University Faculty from any area as needed to total 44
23 University Academic Staff (defined in Article Two, Section C)

- 2 University Academic Staff members: 2 from each Unit with 20 or more members
- 9 University Academic Staff members:
  - 1 University Academic Staff from each Unit with 4 to 19 or more members
- 42 University Academic Staff senators at large:
  - 4 University Academic Staff from Units with less than 4 members
  - 2 University Academic Staff from the instructional academic staff without faculty statues
- 6 Additional University Academic Staff from any area as needed to total 23

The Chancellor shall be a non-voting member of the University Senate.

C. Second Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
   University and University Senate Committee Membership

Continued Debate – None

Vote on Motion 41-SE-08 Executive Committee: PASSED without dissention
Vote on Motion 41-SE-08 Faculty Personnel Committee: PASSED without dissention
Vote on Motion 41-SE-08 Academic Policies Committee: PASSED without dissention
Vote on Motion 41-SE-08 College Faculties: PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators
Vote on Motion 41-SE-08 Selection and Evaluation of Administrators: PASSED without dissention

D. Second Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
   Roll Call Vote Bylaws

Continued Debate – None

Vote on Motion 41-SE-09 University Faculty Bylaw: PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators
Vote on Motion 41-SE-09 University Academic Staff Bylaw: PASSED without dissention by University Academic Staff Senators
Vote on Motion 41-SE-09 University Senate Bylaw: PASSED without dissention

E. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Academic Staff Review of Performance

Continued Debate
- Concerned that people on multiple-year contracts need not be evaluated every year when reviews on yearly basis give data to use for promotion – would be to academic staff’s advantage to have yearly feedback for portfolio
- Motion says for members holding multiple-year contracts that have been employed for six or more years, performance reviews need only be done during years in which reappointment is to occur
  - Would guess if academic staff requested review yearly, it would be done
- Requirement for annual review only applies to indefinite administrative and professional academic staff
- Agree for most academic staff, it would be to their advantage to be reviewed annually
- Timing of feedback to staff person doesn’t seem clear – chair gives to staff member being evaluated at same time report forwarded to dean
  - Seemed to my department that there should be chance to comment prior to forwarding to dean
- That part is current policy – nothing changed in terms of timeline
- Dates seem to work best from what we know from Academic Affairs Administrative Officer
- Timing complicated because dependent on how long instructional academic staff in position
- Does not preclude Department Personnel Committees from distributing a copy to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) members at point sent forward to chair – might be part of Department Evaluation Plan (DEP)
- Main thrust of motion is that procedures in DEP be followed
  - Intent was to let departments decide how to go through process, document it, and inform IAS in department of procedures
Was no attempt to tell department what procedures have to be

**Vote on Motion 41-AS-02:** Motion PASSED without dissention by academic staff senators

F. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Policies Committee
   University General Education Committee

Continued Debate – None

**Vote on Motion 41-AP-03:** Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators

**TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED**

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.

VI. Reports of Committees

* Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  * Next meeting April 5, 2005

* Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  * No report

* Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  * Next meeting March 31, 2005

* Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson

FOR THE RECORD

Approved two items forwarded from Center for International Education

* New Study Abroad Program – Costa Rica/Nicaragua

* New Study Abroad Program – International Student Exchange Program Direct Affiliation
  * Students now eligible for sites where we do not have programs; for nominal fee, able to go to sites without required one-for-one exchange of students

Without objection, entered into record

* APC passed recommendation for new Women’s Studies Major – coming forward in two weeks

* Have materials for program reviews from department internal review committees – reviews to begin in APC on April 12, 2005
Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
- No report

Budget Committee – Senator Alex Smith
- Next meeting April 4, 2005
- Vice Chancellor Soll to brief committee on proposed state budget for 2005-2007 biennium and provide allocation guidelines recently approved by regents
- Will also provide UW-Eau Claire specific information about required budget reductions and efforts underway to deal with them

Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
- No report

Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield
- No report
- Let any member of Nominating Committee know if interested in running for senate vice chair
  - Must be University Academic Staff
- Response to question
  - Results of associate dean search may change status of senate chair; should be known prior to election

Technology Committee
- No Report

VII. Special Reports - None

VIII. Miscellaneous Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee

University Senate Budget and Technology Committee Membership Report – Vice Chair Gapko
- Membership of Budget and Technology Committees being considered primarily due to organizational changes resulting in new colleges
- Executive Committee formed small ad hoc committee to look at membership of Budget Committee
  - Ad hoc committee recommended reducing size while maintaining representation from various constituencies

Motion 41-SE-10
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 21st Edition, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section F Committees, page 16, be changed as shown:

9. The University Senate Technology Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes five University Faculty and two University Academic Staff senators elected by the University Senate for three-year terms. The Chief Information Officer shall be a non-voting member of the Technology Committee.

Motion 41-SE-11
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (11 for, 1 against) that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 21st Edition, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section F Committees, page 15, be changed as shown:

6. The Budget Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes three members of the Administrative Staff selected by the Chancellor, an academic dean elected by the colleges’ deans, the University Senate Chair, and seven senators elected by the University Senate for three year terms. Of the seven senators elected by the Senate, two must be selected from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the College of Business, one from each of the Schools in the College of Professional Studies, each College, one from the Library, two from the University Academic Staff, and one from any area. The committee also includes three ex-officio, non-voting members from the Administrative Staff selected by the Chancellor.
Debate on Motions
- James Lowe is Chief Information Officer
- All members of each committee contacted as well as current CIO
- Favor Budget Committee revisions – strongly favor reducing size of committees whenever possible
  - Considering workload issues, if committee can function in effective way, better off having smaller committee

MOTION by Senator Gallaher to suspend the rules to allow a vote on motions today seconded and PASSED without dissention.

Further Debate
- Technology Committee size not being made smaller – CIO just recognized as nonvoting member

Vote on Motion 41-SE-10: Motion PASSED without dissention
Vote on Motion 41-SE-11: Motion PASSED without dissention

B. First Reading – Motion from Academic Policies Committee

Dual Degree – Geological Engineering Emphasis Report – Senator Syverson
- Motion brought forward from Department of Geology to add additional emphasis to geology degree
  - Modeled after successful program in Department of Physics and Astronomy
  - Department approached by University of Minnesota Institute of Technology (UMIT) suggesting possibility
- Students would take approximately six semesters in geology, math, and physics at UW-Eau Claire
  - Then transfer to UMIT to complete coursework in engineering
  - Would then graduate with degree in engineering from UMIT as well as geology degree from UWEC
- New emphasis would not require new coursework in Department of Geology or elsewhere
- Unclear how many students might be interested – may be five or six students per year
- Hope program brings in highly quantitative students who normally would not attend this school
  - Then some of their quantitative skills might rub off on other students here
- Nice fit for new faculty member in Department of Geology with geological engineering background
- Response to questions for clarification
  - During three years at Eau Claire, students will fulfill all graduation requirements of UW-Eau Claire
    (GE, upper-division GE, service-learning, etc.) – only thing requiring waiver would be senior residency requirement
  - Depending on load, would take probably two to two and one-half years

Motion 41-AP-04
- Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10 for, 0 against) that addition of a Dual Degree – Geological Engineering Emphasis to the existing geology major be approved as supplied in packet

Debate
- Implementation date is 2006-2007, no advantage to passing today
- Students would earn 96 credits from Eau Claire; remaining credits would transfer from UMIT to complete 120 credits to degree

MOTION by Senator Lozar to suspend the rules to allow a vote on motion today seconded and PASSED without dissention.

Further Discussion
- Students need 35 engineering credits from UMIT – if take only required classes, could probably do that in two semesters and one summer
  - Would probably be closer to two years by the time things get sequenced
Vote on Motion 41-AP-04: Motion PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators.

C. First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
   Chair Administrative Review Report – Senator Wick
   ● Worked with Jan Morse on modification of language for administrative review of chairs to update handbook to be consistent with approved post-tenure review (P-TR) process
   ● When brought forward to senate, was objection to part of unchanged original language
     ● New motion takes objection under advisement and strikes language concerning distribution of draft and report to chair and faculty and academic staff members of departments

Motion 41-FP-06
   Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (6 for, 0 against) that the following changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 83:

   **Procedure for Reviewing Department Chairs and Director of Libraries**

   Department Chairs\(^1\) are to be reviewed by the Dean within three years of the initial appointment and every five years concurrently with their normally scheduled faculty post-tenure review thereafter.

   The review of administrator performance is to be initiated by the Dean who will receive a written statement from the Chair which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The Dean will survey all faculty and academic staff in the department and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with the faculty and academic staff. Any such survey will include a summary evaluative question granting faculty and academic staff an opportunity to express their confidence in the Chair’s performance as an administrator. The Dean will write a draft report which will include the results of a summary evaluative question and will distribute it to the Chair and the faculty and academic staff members of the department along with an invitation to submit responses or reactions to the draft report. Any faculty or academic staff member of the department may request and shall be granted a meeting with the Dean to discuss the draft report and its implications. The Dean shall write an evaluation which will include the results of a summary evaluative question. Following receipt of the written and face-to-face responses, the draft report will be revised as appropriate. Summary data from the survey will be available to the Chair. Raw data and verbatim comments shall not be distributed, nor included in any report. Immediately after the final report evaluation is written, the surveys and other information gathered during the review will be destroyed, except for numerical results incorporated directly into the final report. Throughout the review process, including the draft and final reports, the Dean will make every reasonable attempt to protect the confidentiality of the reviewers, faculty and academic staff who participated in the review. Copies of the final review report written evaluation will be given to the Chair, the faculty and academic staff members of the department, and filed in the Dean’s office and in the personnel file of the Chair.

   The written evaluation will be part of the information used by the Dean in making personnel recommendations concerning the Chair, and in improving the administration of the College or School Division.

   \(^1\) The procedures for reviewing the Director of Libraries are the same as those for review of a Department Chair except that the Library serves as the department, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to whom the director reports, holds the responsibilities described for the Dean.

Debate
   ● Information from deans summary review would no longer be transmitted back to faculty
   ● Under current handbook, only chairs and director of library have personnel information distributed to whole department
     ● Is opportunity for input, but final report for other administrators goes only into personnel file and to next level of supervisors
• When review of chairs’ administrative performance not shared, faculty don’t have information about how review carried out, nor data to understand how chair works with dean
• As member of a department, would like to know more about process and what dean thinks about chair’s performance
  • Perhaps on low rung of administrative ladder, information could be broadcast more widely
• According to Administrative Officer Morse, impetus for change came from system legal; opinion was that it is not legal for reports that are part of performance review, and thus part of personnel files, to be distributed
  • Would assume allowable for chairs to choose to share information
  • Not specifically asked, but would expect draft report still part of performance review
• Have all these methods and means for student assessment, and try to evaluate what we do; but leave gaps
  • Fail to acknowledge outstanding performers in faculty – cloaked behind guise of private information
  • Inconsistent and makes no sense

Without objection, vote on this motion postponed to next meeting.

D. First Reading – Motion from Senator Wick
  Clarification on Voting in Personnel Actions Report – Senator Wick
  • Senate approved language sent forward from Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) regarding voting procedures on personnel actions
  • Since that approval, committee received questions as to whether tie votes do or do not support a recommendation
    • Asked system legal; advice was a positive recommendation must receive a majority of votes
  • Because item not published on agenda for FPC, bringing forward as individual senator; FPC endorsed this motion

**Motion 41-US-02**

Moved by Senator Wick and seconded that the following changes be made to the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook* on page 5.10 immediately following new section titled Voting:

To be considered a positive recommendation (e.g., supportive of reappointment, tenure, or promotion), a simple majority of the voting members must vote for the action (more votes “for” than votes “against”). Any personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the voting members voting for the action (either a tie or more votes “against” than votes “for”) is considered a negative recommendation (e.g., against reappointment, tenure, or promotion).

Debate

• Was system legal advice, unable to find anywhere in state statute; probably could write in that tie would be positive vote
• Intent was for simple majority of voting members, abstentions not considered votes; may not be explicit enough
• Would like to see modification clearly stating abstentions not part of count
• Not clear whether talking about those eligible to vote, or actually voting, or where abstentions fit in
• Could say “a simple majority of those voting either for or against the action”
• People abstaining do not have to give reasons for their abstentions
• Yellow sheet for reappointment has three slots – votes for, votes against, and votes abstaining
  • So does that make abstaining an active vote, or is it simply counting up rest of members present
• Which way you choose to do it not specified
• Parenthetical statement about more votes for than votes against intended to ignore abstentions; does not answer question of how to “count” them
• If there are ten people present, four vote in favor, three vote against, and three abstain, then motion carries
• You don’t vote to abstain, you just don’t vote; that is abstention
• Some departments do call for abstentions in personnel actions
• In cases of conflict of interest, someone may want to go on record as abstaining
• In roll call votes, would you have to say abstain, or simply not answer?
DEP may have more specific language about how to count abstentions – seem to remember different applications of abstentions for tenure vs. reappointment
- May be that Robert’s Rules of Order not designed to handle our yellow and pink forms
- Might be appropriate to insert language that is more clear
- May suggest language; or may want to change form to ask how many members present, votes for, votes against and just leave it

Without objection, vote on this motion postponed until next meeting.

E. First Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee

Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustments Report – Senator Wick
- At last senate meeting, Compensation Committee asked to consider what P-TR salary adjustment policy language might look like
  - Some wanted to see such language before action on 2005-2006 Salary Plan
- Committee decided not appropriate to include in 2005-2006 Salary Plan when performance reviews and process already taking place
  - In addition, would be administrative work involved to even out loads of when faculty come up for review and get base dollars allocated as necessary
- Motion seeks to establish in 2006-2007 comprehensive salary plan a set of policies for distribution of P-TR salary adjustments to replace current formula-based compression adjustments
- Three typos in motion as it went out
  - Line 76, add have – (2) they have undergone
  - Line 80 – maybe should be may be
  - Line 120, add of – number of awards
- Most compressed faculty rank on campus is full professor; attempting to come up with way of giving full professors opportunity for significant salary increment after through all attainable promotions
  - Number of people have been on campus long enough to have gone through ranks when promotion increments not as substantial
  - Results in loyalty tax – more compressed the longer you stay compared to market-adjusted salaries of incoming faculty
  - Identifying policies to put financial reward behind outcome of P-TR – essentially after P-TR completed, faculty member can request review be shared with chair and subsequent administrators in competition for P-TR salary adjustments
  - Sent forward with recommendations of chair on tier-based system
    - Each subsequent administrative level reviews recommendations and forwards
    - Provost’s Office, based on cumulative experience built up over time, will make final determinations on tiers 0 through 4
  - Anticipated over time that about 10% of those eligible will receive a Tier 4 recommendation, about 15% will receive Tier 3, about 25% Tier 2, and remaining 50% either Tier 1 or Tier 0, whatever is deemed appropriate
    - Approximate ranges – nothing set in stone
  - Adjustments self-funded out of pay plan in years with increase of about 2.5% or more
    - In years pay plan under a 2.5% increase, funds as needed infused from base dollars
    - Even at 0.5% increase, pay plan would contribute towards program unless not allowed by system policies; for instance, if guidelines indicated the increase must be across-the-board
  - Primarily dedicated to full professors; however, is way for someone, not a full professor, who department wishes to have considered for this as valued and contributing member of institution, to be considered
    - May or may not be honored as moves up administrative channels
  - Assistant professors and associate professors have opportunity to move through promotion increments, which are quite substantial; will get opportunity to participate in P-TR salary adjustments once they reach full professor level
Response to questions for clarification

- Pay plan money for these adjustments comes from faculty portion of pay plan distribution funds; particularly from discretionary 10% chancellor given by UW-System
- Discretionary funds now used for equity and formula-based compression adjustments
- Previous proposal for P-TR salary adjustments had no Tier 0; Tier 1 faculty received no salary increment
- Committee felt important that there not be a mandatory amount given to everyone; may be very good reason for someone not to receive salary increment
- Did not want to force anyone’s hand
- Do not know what process will be for adjustment of P-TR calendars, but there is justification
  - With base dollar implication, don’t want 30 people considered in one year and two the next because of difficulty of funding in years with more reviews taking place
  - Idea is to allow some reshuffling of calendars to even out number of faculty coming up each year
  - How it will be done unspecified, details to be worked out; believe it will be open process with deliberation and faculty input
    - One possibility might be for people who have been here longest to come up first

Major changes between this motion and previous proposal

- Main complaint heard was that satisfactory performance not rewarded in old plan – so now Tier 1 given $500 with other tiers reduced to work out to same overall cost
- Current motion says cumulative comparative analysis instead of comparative analysis
  - Intent is as gain experience, will get feel for what Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and Tier 4 performances look like
  - So faculty being reviewed in years when bunch of ‘stellar performers’ come up not penalized
  - Can then take historical perspective and say this year we happen to have more than 10% in Tier 4, let’s reward them all
- Language added to make explicit, what was only on report of previous version, that there will need to be administrative reorganization of calendars to even things out

Motion 41-CP-02

Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6 for, 0 against) that the 2006-2007 Comprehensive Salary Plan include policies for distributing compression salary adjustments as per attached.

Amendment 41-CP-02-a1

Moved by Senator Majstorovic and seconded that two of the areas of excellence for the top two tiers must be teaching and scholarship.

Debate

- Seems to me for top two tiers, two areas of high levels of performance must be teaching and scholarship for these kinds of awards for senior scholars
- Against amendment – sets double standard
  - Different than what departments specified
  - This is very good plan – gets foot in door of base money and allows for everyone who is solid performer to get some money
- Setting high standard
- Against amendment, although understand senator’s reason for putting forward
  - Might be somebody who never will be promoted to full professor, but contributes in other ways at higher level; department ought to be able to reward that person
- Against amendment, not because philosophically disagree, but committee worked hard on motion to make sure not to interfere with value systems of departments
  - Don’t want P-TR salary adjustments to be used to allow people to avoid working toward promotion – why limited some of top ranks
- Nowhere in handbook does it say teaching and scholarship must be most important criteria – departments are free to weight those as they see fit
Motto is excellence; adding amendment would further ensure award would be distributed more equitably according to those really performing at high level

- Can see award being concentrated in certain departments or certain colleges; nothing to guarantee it won’t be good old boy network type of award
- With amendment even if you are a good old boy, you must perform; at least salary adjustment deserved
- What amendment suggesting would make us change handbook and everything else
- Speak against amendment, autonomy to make that decision should remain in departments
- Amendment probably not necessary because will become overall decision by university based on historical perspective looking at merits of that sort of ranking; will probably include some of what amendment saying
- For amendment; although service in theory should not include administration, it is very obvious to all of us that many full professors will be department chairs and will be valued in that role by people above them
  - To get to highest levels of reward, saying service important, but teaching and scholarship is needed seems most appropriate

Vote on Amendment 41-CP-02-a1: Amendment DEFEATED

Without objection, vote on main motion postponed until next meeting

X. Announcements

- Next meeting April 12, 2005 in the Council Fire Room of Davies Center

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate