**Faculty Senate Minutes**

March 10, 2015

LC 243, 3:00-5:00 pm

***Present***: Scott Abbott, Kim Abunuwara, Christa Albrecht-Crane, Steve Allred, Jon Anderson, Anne Arendt, Nicholas Ball, Howard Bezzant, Debanjan Bhattacharjee, Dean Bohl, Mark Bracken, Clayton Brown, Kat Brown, Monica Campbell, Marty Clayton, David Connelly, Karen Cushing, Courtney Davis, Matthew Draper, Wioleta Fedeczko, Doug Gardner, Barry Hallsted, John Hunt, Ellis Jensen, Dianne Knight, Ryan Leick, Gary Measom, Gary Mercado, Rick Moody, David Morin, CheolHwan Oh, Jeff Olson, Dennis Potter, Makenzie Selland, Cyrill Slezak, Allison Swenson, Craig Thulin, Violeta Vasilevska, Mallory Wallin (UVUSA)

**Guests**: Approximately 54 faculty, staff, and administrators

***Excused or Absent***: Deborah Baird, Kathy Black, Mark Borchelt, Joel Bradford, Leo Chan, David Dean, Debora Escalante, Tracy Golden, Laurie Harrop-Purser, Vance Hillman, Carolyn Howard, Matthew Holland, Yang Huo, Dianne McAdams-Jones, Tyler Nelson, Sheri Rysdam, Leslie Simon, Alex Yuan

Call to order – 3:05 p.m.

Merit Pay Presentation and Discussion

Connelly presented information developed from the Merit Pay Committee as charged by President Holland.

* Provided an overview of how we got to Merit Pay. President Holland has discussed moving to a merit pay system for a few years. The Legislature continues to address performance-based/merit funding as part of compensation. State economic issues have delayed merit conversations until now. President’s Council asked HR to explore merit pay for both faculty and staff. Two committees were formed, one for faculty and one for staff.
* The following discussion and proposal is based on the belief that UVU has the organizational maturity to evaluate one another critically. Today’s meeting is to seek feedback.
* From the first meetings, the committee felt strongly that these areas be considered in developing a merit system.
  + COLA should be maintained
  + Salary levels should be achieved per CUPA
  + Merit must be meaningful
  + Transparency must be hallmark of any system
  + Should not deter adjunct pay increases
  + Merit needs sustainability
  + System will only cover tenured faculty. Tenure Track receive an increase upon successful third year evaluation. Lecturers need to be addressed.
* It was determined that the following priorities be established for financially difficult times.
  + Protect jobs and benefits
  + COLA across the board
  + Market equity initiatives (only when market fluctuations cause a significant gap)
  + Merit pay programs
* Discussion regarding the reality of meaningful merit. Research on merit indicates meaningful start around 4-10% of salary. The Committee recommended a 5% increase of base salary. If only 20% qualified each year, the reserves would need $300,000 each year. For overall sustainability, reserves would need $1-1.5 million from base funds to create a pool to provide funding for 3-5 years. Makin noted that this would need to be taken off the table now to make merit sustainable. However, in order to reach these reserves, there are trade-offs which will take away funds from the following:
  + Hire more faculty in given year
  + Increase adjunct pay
  + Increase departmental budgets
  + Fund research projects
  + Increase rank/promotion awards
  + Provide scholarships, etc.

Administration is committed to funding as sustainable a merit program as possible. Linda Makin provided clarification of the four components for pay: Rank/Tenure, COLA, Equity, and Merit.

* The model proposed is a point-based system (transparency) with the intention that one could achieve merit every two years. It is a 100 point system with points expiring on rolling four-year basis. Point accumulation will be comprised of 60% Teaching, 10% Scholarship, 10% Service, and 20% distributed at the faculty member’s discretion, with the discretion committed at the goal-setting portion of the annual review.
* Could be serious issues in the academy if “administrators” had sole discretion over who “merits” merit pay. Point-based system where bulk of points are awarded and determined at the department level would provide better transparency. With a point-based system, either you receive points for completing a task or you do not. Some things are more difficult to measure. Checks built into the system allowing one to challenge a rating – think “excellence in teaching”. Departments need to discuss what constitutes excellence in teaching. Teaching does not always need to be what is done in the classroom.
* Where do the points come from and how much is something worth? Departments are the best determinants of what constitutes “pointable” activities and what the value should be. Some uniformity and consistency is needed to ensure equity in the system and the institution is rewarding what it values. Real issue is awarding points for something meritorious vs. “normal” job duties. On the University side need to consider teaching – not the evaluation but what teaching is worth; university service – senate, curriculum, graduate council, etc.; and program assistance such as honors. On the Departmental side consider scholarly activities, departmental and college service, and teaching evaluation.
* Other options to consider might be an interim step to full point based system. This could be College/School committees comprised solely of faculty that review “applications” or another option could be to attach a pay increase with successful completion of post-tenure review – every five years by Regents policy – this is not merit.
* Q&A
  + Several faculty members inquired if the merit program is a done deal. Connelly and Brown informed them no, but the President needs to report back to the Legislature for accountability purposes.
  + Some untenured faculty go above and beyond service expectations prior to receiving tenure, but wouldn’t receive merit until post-tenure. Connelly noted that service is a major component for receiving tenure.
  + Department merit criteria need to reflect what is appropriate overall.
  + Faculty inquired about the timeline and implementation. Connelly responded that the proposal is to begin on the calendar year not the academic year. Timeline proposed is 1) Receive feedback on proposal; 2) Departments would be given charge to deal with list of activities and assigning point values over the next year; 3) Begin implementation January 2016 for first year to accrue points; and 4) 2017 would be the second year with merit increase to base salary occurring in July 2018.
  + Someone mentioned 20% of faculty each year to receive merit seems high.
  + Concern voiced about 60% teaching seems fuzzy, hard to measure adoration of students.
  + Need to develop a university standard for faculty who have non-faculty appointments.
  + Consider rewarding groups that are collaborating vs. individuals.
  + Recommendation was to make teaching/scholarship/service be more prescriptive and not assign specific percentages.
  + Faculty want the Faculty Senate to discuss the issue in two weeks to determine if there is consensus among faculty to keep moving forward in the current direction the committee has proposed. Faculty encouraged to take the information back to their departments for discussion.
  + The merit pay will be a completely separate process from rank advancement.
  + Connelly will send slides to Senators for them to discuss with their faculty.
  + Faculty Senate will review the merit criteria with input from faculty at large with final approval by SVPAA.
  + Connelly shared that the committee recommended setting up College/School level committees to adjudicate any discrepancies.
  + Committee and Senate encouraged by Faculty to address some of the issues with collegiality, collaboration and not buying into a system of competition and negativity
  + Connelly will provide research data to faculty on merit systems.
  + Some faculty expressed skepticism over merit pay and commented they really are not sure they want to go down the road.
  + Regardless of the proposed merit system, faculty want transparency now on equity/retention funds distributed by the deans.

Senate Business

Approval of Minutes from February 24, 2015. Minutes approved.

* Connelly informed the senate that there is a group constituted from staff working on merit pay as well.
* Constitution
  + AAC discussed potential term limits on senators amongst themselves. Suggestion was to have senator serve, take a term off, then could serve again. Potter asked why senators need term limits. He feels there’s really no reason to have term limits. Consider changing language to “vote.” Connelly will prepare some language and address matter at the next senate meeting.
  + Moved service into the purview of the document. Made GE/GI/Graduate Council as elected bodies of the Faculty Senate. Shared governance is the population of committees. Faculty need to stand up and take ownership. Measom noted that Faculty Senate currently has three committees that are being productive and if other faculty see what is being accomplished, they might be more willing to step up and serve.
  + **MOTION** – Potter motioned to address ratification and post-pone others until the next meeting. Bracken seconded. All in favor? Motion passed.
  + Senate President Election – Post-poned
  + Ratification
    - Connelly provided background on the process of the policy and that nothing is approved until it goes before the Board of Trustees. Bodies are allowed to comment through Stage 3 and Brown noted that some changes have been incorporated at that point in the past. Bracken recommended that the Senate ratify towards the end of Stage 3 prior to going to Board of Trustees. Leick recommended ratifying at the end of Stage 2.
    - **MOTION** – Draper motioned to conduct ratification at end of Stage 2. Bracken seconded. All in favor? Absentions - 2. Motion passed.
  + Representation – Post-poned

Bezzant motioned to adjourn at 5:00 p.m.