

Minutes

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Thursday, December 5, 1991
3:15 p.m.
238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Avner Ben-Ner (Chair), Carol Carrier, Mary Dempsey, Ann Fallon, Daniel Feeney, Audrey Grosch, Morris Kleiner, Diane Mulvihill, Donald Rasmusson, Lori Schack, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, Gayle Graham Yates

Guest: Robert Fahnhorst

MINUTES

The November 14, 1991 Minutes were approved.

RECEIVERSHIP OF DEPARTMENTS

Professor Dempsey, chair of the subcommittee reviewing receivership of departments, reviewed SCFA's October 24 discussion on the issue. She then presented an advanced draft of the Policy on Receivership of Departments incorporating SCFA's recommendations. It read:

In the rare and unusual instance that a department becomes ungovernable or its affairs unmanageable or it is inexorably headed in either or both of these directions, it is the responsibility of the Dean of the college or unit to take remedial action to restore order. Before taking actions, the Dean will consult with the Consultative Committee of the college or unit, the Senate Faculty Consultative Committee, and the Provost (Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs). Approval of the Provost is required for actions by the Dean, such as appointment of a temporary chair and, if appropriate, outside interim faculty to the department. These appointees have full voting rights (e.g. on matters of educational policy, promotion, and tenure), but their terms are limited to one year, or at the most, two years.

At the October 24 meeting it had been recommended that the policy be published in college constitutions; however, SCFA members agreed that to accomplish that would be burdensome and difficult to do in a timely fashion. One committee member suggested a more appropriate avenue would be to forward the policy to the Faculty Senate through the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The committee then unanimously approved the following motion:

To adopt the policy as written and to forward it to the Faculty Consultative Committee for action and advancement to the Faculty Senate.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND SALARY INCREASES WORKING GROUP

Professor Kleiner, chair of the Working Group, reviewed SCFA's November 14 discussion of this issue and its subsequent recommendations. He said that other groups were also reviewing the Working Group's proposals, including the Council of Deans and the professional and administrative staff. To follow-up on SCFA's inquiries of November 14, he reported the following:

Common features of all three options

1. greater faculty involvement in salary determination process
2. requirement of periodic reviews
3. greater sharing of information on salary determination process

Different features of three options

1. Option 1 includes annual salary increases that are linked to performance while Options 2 and 3 include across-the-board salary increases
2. timing of reviews-- Option 1 requires annual reviews and Options 2 and 3 allow for reviews every 3-5 years

Benefits over present system

1. all three options positively affect the role of faculty in the salary determination process
2. all three provide better information on the process and outcome

Definition of cost-of-living

The Working Group defined cost-of-living as "the amount available for salary increases."

Costs

Options 2 and 3 require minimum salaries for associate and full professors and depending on what the minimum salary is, the costs will vary. For example, if the minimum salary is set at \$45,000 for full professors, it will cost the University \$756,000 to bring all full professors up to that minimum. If the minimum is \$50,000, it will cost the University \$2,261,000.

Time and cost of reviews

The Working Group did not have figures for this item because each department varies in the time it allocates to reviews. Without an extensive survey, accurate figures cannot be calculated.

Professor Kleiner said his Working Group had received support for each option and that there is diversity of opinion among Working Group members, the deans, and central administrators, with each option having its own champions.

One SCFA member strongly recommended that whatever process is selected, it be nondiscriminatory and one that encourages rather than discourages the faculty.

In addition, it was recommended that more specific language be used to describe faculty involvement in the salary determination process and that it be stated more strongly in all three options. SCFA members also asked Professor Kleiner's group to indicate in their report the distinctions and parallels of each option and the broader motivation of the compensation system.

If possible, Professor Kleiner will bring an advanced draft to SCFA on January 9.

OMBUDS REPORT

Professor Fallon, member of the Subcommittee on Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy & Grievance Advisory Program, presented the subcommittee's evaluation of the Ombuds Committee Report. She said the subcommittee consulted with Ombuds Committee members, other individuals, and SCFA members, and came to the conclusion that the process followed by the Ombuds Committee in preparation of its report was flawed and that additional research and study of the issues should be done.

The following motion was then moved and approved:

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs does not support the recommendations contained in the Ombuds Committee Report and recommends further study of the issue either by persons internal or external to the University.

The motion will be forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

-- Martha Kvanbeck