

## REPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

**University Senate Committee:** Faculty Personnel Committee and Compensation & Budget Committee

### **Brief History of Issue - why the issue is being considered:**

Based on the feedback received from the campus, Faculty Personnel believes changing the PTR category system will address the concerns raised regarding the PTR category assignment process.

The Compensation & Budget Committee has revised the Comprehensive Salary Plan (aka "Pay Plan"), addressing two key areas: 1) Post-Tenure Salary Adjustment Policies; and 2) Distribution of the state-funded pay plan.

- 1) In response to the Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation about PTR categories, Compensation & Budget recommends revised Post-Tenure Salary Adjustment Policies for faculty (Pay Plan section 3). PTR salary adjustments come from base funds.
- 2) In anticipation of a possible state-funded Pay Plan, the committee recommends that 85% of a state-funded Pay Plan is distributed based on performance. The remaining 15% is allocated to the Chancellor's Discretionary Fund in order to address internal salary inequities (the maximum allowable under UPS operational policy: TC 4). Equity Adjustments Policies and Procedures (Pay Plan section 6.3) have been adjusted for transparency and efficiency. Where possible, the Plan has been edited for clarity.

Introducing the recommended Pay Plan at the same time as proposed PTR changes will allow Senators to consider the Pay Plan in the context of total compensation.

### **Points Discussed by the Committees:**

#### *Faculty Personnel Committee*

1. Are we certain we can move all of the PTR rewards structure into the Compensation Plan?
2. Will this address the morale problems created under the earlier system, or will it create new ones?

And

#### *Compensation & Budget Committee*

1. Faculty Personnel has voted to revise the PTR compensation categories, so the PTR compensation levels must be reexamined.
2. Post-tenure salary adjustments are primarily intended for the purpose of addressing systematic salary compression and inversion arising under a long period at the same rank.
3. The state-funded Pay Plan rewards merit and solid performance for all faculty and staff.
4. Committee deliberated on post-tenure salary adjustments for full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors.
5. Committee deliberated about allocating a portion of the state-funded Pay Plan to the Chancellor's Discretionary Fund.

### **Pros of Recommendation:**

PTR changes – Addresses many of the concerns raised regarding the current PTR category system.

#### Pay Plan changes

1. Recommended Pay Plan aligns with Faculty Personnel's recommendation about PTR categories.
2. Recommended changes to PTR compensation categories improve transparency for faculty subject to PTR.
3. Recommended plan allows the University to adjust salaries based on performance factors and on salary inequities.
4. Reduced administrative workload in that post-tenure awards will be automatic after the PTR process is finished, not requiring a separate letter or request.

#### **Cons of Recommendation:**

PTR changes – Places the responsibility of determining potential benefits of PTR entirely on the Comprehensive Salary Plan.

#### Pay Plan changes

1. Allocating 15% of the state-funded Pay Plan to address salary inequities may mean that employees not experiencing a documented pay inequity will receive a smaller raise from a Pay Plan than they otherwise would.
2. Lack of consistent funding makes the Pay Plan a theoretical project.

#### **Technology/Human Resource Impact:**

Changes to the FASRP

Reduced workload for DPCs, chairs, deans

#### **Committee Recommendation:**

*Faculty Personnel Committee*

Amend the FASRP in Part III Section B.2.b.3 , Part III. Section B.2.b.3.b, Part III. Section B.2.f.4.d, Part III. Section B.2.f.6, Part III. Section B.2.f.7, and Part III. Section B.2.f.8

*Compensation & Budget Committee*

Approval of the Comprehensive Salary Plan for 2019-2021

## MOTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The Faculty Personnel Committee:  
by a vote of 7 for to 0 against on 3/5/19

Recommends:

### Amend the FASRP in Part III. Section B.2.b.3

#### 3) Definition of Review Categories

The review will result in the assignment of an overall category reflecting faculty performance. In determining the category, the review shall consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the contractual duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position. All tenured faculty members under review shall be assigned one of the following ~~three~~ categories.

~~a) Exceeds Expectations: This category reflects a significant level of accomplishment through performance of contractual duties beyond what is expected for the institution, college, department, or program as reflected in the approved evaluation plan. All faculty in this category shall be included in the salary adjustment pool as outlined in the Comprehensive Salary Plan approved by the University Senate.~~

~~b) a) Meets expectations. This category reflects the expected level of accomplishment through performance of contractual duties~~ **This category recognizes the faculty member's significant contributions and reflects a level of accomplishment, through performance of contractual duties, at the level expected** for the institution, college, department, or program as reflected in the approved evaluation plan. **All faculty in this category shall be eligible for salary adjustment as outlined in the Comprehensive Salary Plan approved by the University Senate and the chancellor.**

~~c) b) Does not meet expectations. This category reflects a level of accomplishment through performance of contractual duties below the expected level for the institution, college, department, or program as reflected in the approved evaluation plan, and which requires remediation. All reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations," unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.~~

### Amend the FASRP in Part III. Section B.2.f.5

#### 5) Role of the Department Chair in Post-Tenure Review

a) After reviewing the submitted materials, the department chair shall submit a recommendation to the dean, along with the subcommittee report and any written response from the faculty member to the subcommittee report. The chair's letter shall assign the faculty member to one of the ~~three~~ categories outlined in Section f.3.

**Amend the FASRP in Part III. Section B.2.f.6**

- 6) Role of The Dean in Post-Tenure Review
  - a) After reviewing the submitted materials, the dean shall submit a recommendation to the provost, along with the materials from the subcommittee and department chair report. The dean’s letter shall recommend the faculty member be assigned to one of the ~~three~~ categories outlined in Section f.3.

**Amend the FASRP in Part III. Section B.2.f.7**

- 7) Role of the Provost in Post-Tenure Review
  - a) After reviewing the submitted materials, the provost (or designee) shall submit a recommendation to the chancellor, along with materials from the previous reviews. The provost’s letter shall recommend the faculty member be assigned to one of the ~~three~~ categories listed in Section f.3.

**Amend the FASRP in Part III. Section B.2.f.8**

- 8) Role of the Chancellor in Post-Tenure Review
  - a) After reviewing the submitted materials, the chancellor (or designee) shall make a determination that assigns the faculty member to one of the ~~three~~ categories outlined in Section f.3. The chancellor shall forward this determination to the faculty member, the department chair, the dean, and the provost.

Implementation Date: July 1, 2019

Signed:     Geoffrey D. Peterson      
Chair of the Committee

And

The Compensation & Budget Committee:  
by a vote of 4 for to 2 against on 3/8/19

Recommends that  
The attached plan be approved as the 2019-2021 Comprehensive Salary Plan.

Implementation Date: July 1, 2019 or upon approval

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of the Committee