

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes

March 25, 2014
LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm



Present: Mark Bracken, Tyler Brklacich, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Matt Draper, Lars Eggertsen, Matthew Holland, Dan McDonald, Gary Measom, Rick Moody, Dennis Potter, Russ Thornley, Marcus Vincent, Ian Wilson, Linda Makin, Mark Wiesenberg

Excused or Absent:

- Call to order – 3:03 PM
- Approval of Minutes from March 4, 2014. Executive meeting. Minutes approved.
- UVUSA
 - Tyler Brklacich (Team Rise) won the elections for next year. Mallory Wallin will be the new Vice President of Academics.
- Elections
 - Have tried to adopt the practice of having new senators voted on early so they can attend the final Faculty Senate meeting. Please encourage your departments to hold elections soon.
- Post-Tenure Discussion
 - There are currently two proposals on the table that were submitted by Dennis Potter and Alan Clarke at the previous senate meeting. Senate was asked to review each proposal, consider the implications, and be prepared to discuss at the next senate meeting. The Post-Tenure policy is currently in Stage 2.
 - Potter still maintains that the policy needs to be minimalist and have only positive implications. He provided an overview of the two proposals that were presented on March 18, 2014. He reiterated that the language needs to exclude words such as termination, discipline, etc.
 - Draper expressed concern that if the policy is written at the department level, what policy will cover the individual(s) at the university level.
 - Bracken commented that we need to consider accreditation implications. There is no post-tenure review for a faculty member unless a trigger is activated. He noted that his faculty does like this aspect. Potter expressed that the policy currently does not reflect this model.
 - Connelly noted there needs to be procedures in place to not only protect the faculty member, but the institution.
 - President Holland commented that Faculty Senate needs to consider what is appropriate at this stage of the policy. Need to consider the overall process of tenure and be sure we are granting tenure to the right faculty. He suggested the possibility of connecting post-tenure review with a merit pay system to provide a carrot to the faculty

on how they perform. He is willing to begin discussion on the subject. Potter noted that the policy would still need to clarify the language as to what the incentives or rewards might be. Bracken feels that merit pay needs to be tied to annual reviews or some hybrid model tied with rank advancement.

- Ian expressed his struggle with the proposal to rewrite the policy as it does not fit the current process, but on the other hand suggested a document outlining concerns and issues and this is what we suggest. His concern is Stage 2 is a comment stage and other groups are addressing it in this manner. Ian agrees that the intent of the Post-Tenure policy is not to end in termination. If we do not use annual reviews or post-tenure to verify/show cause, what documentation do we obtain in order to show cause when a faculty member is not performing as they should. He noted that if you look at the end result, what is needed to take action. Connelly agreed that in whatever process is utilized that it be heavy on remediation and the very last step that a faculty member is showing they are not willing to do anything, then the university takes action.
- Kat Brown agreed that there was a problem in that post-tenure review was supposed to come forward with the annual review policy which did not happen. The annual review policy is completely controlled by the department and remediated at the department level.
- Vincent conducted research to see where the disciplinary/termination policy kicked in, but did not find a specific process. He feels there needs to be a specific mechanism when it comes to discipline/termination for cause.
- Bracken noted that if faculty need remediation for post-tenure, there needs to be resources available for faculty to help them improve. Thornley expressed concern over the annual review process that it is not as robust as it needs to be. Need to wait until it comes to Stage 2. Connelly noted the need for a faculty member's ability to defend their annual review.
- Ian expressed concern over leaving the annual reviews and recommendations solely in the hands of department chairs. Some of the chairs are either soft or overly harsh. Academic Affairs continually hears that there is concern if they give a negative review as they will return to faculty in a few years and the possibility of retaliation. To leave the evaluation solely in the department chairs' hands without a dean who has more experience and a different set of eyes could be problematic.
- Connelly reviewed the department level model as outlined in the Post-Tenure policy under discussion, then reviewed the process and implications. He recommended two potential directions: 1) preferred path, do a revision so entities know how the Faculty Senate stands, or 2) reject the policy altogether.
- Thornley would like to synchronize the Annual Review and Post-Tenure policies before moving forward.
- Recommendation is to continue the discussion with parameters before the end of semester. Senate needs to work on draft language and identify specific sections that need to be addressed within the context of the annual review. Connelly will initiate the senate discussion.

- Compensation
 - President Holland presented the 2014-2015 Compensation Changes that will be presented to Board of Trustees. He reminded Faculty Senate that there are different pots of money which direct where the funds are allocated.
 - Compensation funded a 1.25% COLA
 - 1st Tier tuition increase will be 4% (75% covered by new tax funds with 25% covered by 1st Tier tuition increase).
 - 2.2% medical premium increase
 - 8.5% state retirement increase
 - Adjust Summer ICHE rate to 3% of the average faculty salaries.
 - Benefits – There will not be a cost increase for base plan, but have provided increased opportunities and choice which addressed the needs that faculty and staff requested.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm