

MINUTES

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
Monday October 10, 2005, 2-3pm
Andy Holt Tower, 4th floor conference room

Members Present: Beauvais Lyons (Chair), Basil Antar, Jennifer Beals, Joanne Deeken, Les Essif, Charles Norman, Bart Rohrbach, Bill Dunne, George Dodds

Members Absent: Muammer Cetingok, Ed Jepson, John Wodarski

Invited Guests: Anne Mayhew, Deseriee Kennedy

1. Approval of the Minutes of September 19, 2005, approved by consensus

2. Report from Beauvais Lyons on pending tasks for the committee

A) A copy of the new Manual for Department Heads was distributed. Beauvais encouraged members of the committee to look over the document and send any thoughts to Les Essif and himself, who will co-author an assessment of the guide. Deseriee talked about the retreat conducted for department heads, and gave the example of exercises that were conducted to address issues heads may confront. She indicated that Susan Martin may have these electronically and will inquire about sending them to the committee.

B) The Manual for Faculty Evaluation is posted as a PDF which may be downloaded from the Chancellor's web site at: <http://chancellor.tennessee.edu/facultyevaluation/> Beauvais will update the bylaws guide posted on the Faculty Senate website at: <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/collegebylawsguide.html>. Bill Dunne and Bart Rohrbach will prepare a summary of changes to the manual in advance the November 21 meeting at which it is hoped that Susan Martin will be present to discuss the new manual.

C) Beauvais indicated that he will be out of town for the October 17th Faculty Senate meeting and that Candace White will present Chapter 7 of the handbook for action.

3. Discussion of Merit Pay Issues with Anne Mayhew

Beauvais: outlined the information items sent in advance of the meeting, which included memos from President Petersen, Chancellor Crabtree, a memo from the UTC Faculty Senate President to President Petersen, a schedule of raises since 2000 provided by Vice-Chancellor Denise Barlow and a copy of 2006 Raise Statistics presented to the Council of Deans.

Anne: stated that for many years faculty have expressed frustration with the across the board raises as dictated by the state, not all of which is funded by the state. She said we usually find out about these late in the game, in June, with decisions due by July. The issue of non-exempt employees needs to be considered as part of this picture, especially

since there is not a good system in place to assure there is objective assessment of merit potential. She stated that President Petersen is committed to merit raises as a concept. He would like all raises to be based on merit. She said that she does not like the term “Cost of Living” and prefers the term “Across the Board” raises. She did acknowledge that awarding across the board raises creates significant differences between higher and lower paid employees. However, she envisions that the university is moving towards a system of raises based entirely on merit raises. This puts a new kind of pressure on us regarding what we mean by merit and the evaluation tools that are used to determine merit raises.

Beauvais: pointed to the Faculty Handbook on the subject (3.8 and 3.9) He asked whether the time frame used with the recent merit raises was too short to honor the handbook. He noted that there was wide variation in the percentage of faculty in various colleges who received merit raises, and asked if she rejected any of the merit raise proposals.

Anne: indicated that the Library was an exception. She also stated that sometimes the variation was the result of an interim Dean who may not have been in the best position to assess merit. She did admit that the Office of the Chancellor was frustrated with the variation among the colleges, but that they did not have the time to send any of the proposals back to the colleges.

Bart: said that in Vet Medicine they were instructed that 1/3 of the faculty from each department were going to be selected for a merit raise. He stated that the raises only a portion of the funds directed toward merit raises were used to address equity or compression rather than merit. Bart is concerned that while you may be rewarding some of the faculty “the system also results in demoralizing more faculty who are serving the mission of the university above and beyond expectations and are not recognized for their efforts and have been designated as meeting expectation for rank. This goes back to having a system that faculty buys into for designation of "beyond expectations".

Anne: talked about the issues of equity and compression – which she stated are very different things. She talked about a process of adjusting salaries in the middle of the year when they feel they have faculty who are deserving of merit or equity.

Deseriee: noted that the Chancellor's Office is reviewing salary equity issues - including gender and race equity.

Anne: admitted that demoralization is an issue. Across the board allows people to feel good – but does not always advance the institution by rewarding its most productive faculty.

George: asked about salary adjustments in other times of the year – if they were one time or recurring funds.

Anne: stated that such raises had to be with recurring funds.

Les: Noted that Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures has a personnel committee, and that many faculty who “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” did not receive a raise. He also asked about heads receiving across the board raises of 3%.

Bill: stated that department heads did not receive across the board. In Arts and Sciences it started as 50% receiving merit, but it grew by the time the exercise was completed.

Les: made the case that some who received merit raises felt bad that many of their colleagues, who they value did not.

Deseriee: noted that if merit raises continue there should be a logical and consistent relationship between evaluation processes and merit raises. She also said that we should explore differentiated levels of merit.

Bill: made the case that the cumulative review process used in the recent past provides a useful case study for how there can be an inflated ranking system when it is tied to faculty raises.

Anne: expressed concern that if too many faculty are designated for merit, the pool will be too shallow and will not achieve the desired results.

Deseriee: suggested that a logical and consistent merit policy could strengthen any arguments President Petersen made to the legislature in support of continued merit pay. she mentioned that position by colleagues at UTC advocating that cost of living be addressed before any merit raises is one approach to the issue.

Beauvais: made the case that President Petersen and the Legislature should be aware of the Faculty Salary Study conducted annually by the UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee which shows that in most disciplines UTK lags behind our THEC and SUG peers.

Anne: stated that we need to be mindful of funding about 1/3 of any raises out of tuition revenues.

Bill: Stressed the annual evaluation process, and that faculty need to address the criteria for rank in their department bylaws.

Beauvais: noted that since so much of faculty compensation comes from tuition revenues, if merit pools should be linked more to faculty engaged in the teaching enterprise rather than those in the research enterprise?

Anne: asserted that the research enterprise enhances the instructional mission.

Bart: stated that funding and recognition by peers are the two things that motivate faculty. He made an argument for including more faculty in merit pools in the future.

Bill: made the case that we need to start at the evaluation end and not at money end of the process.

Deseriee: noted that the chancellor has been very good about listening to the Faculty Senate, and charged the committee with developing a proposal.

Charles: We also need to communicate with President Petersen in concert with the other faculty Senates in the system.

Deseriee: talked about UTC position, which advocated for cost of living plus merit.

Joanne: noted that she thought this solution was not feasible given the emphasis on merit proposed by President Petersen.

Basil: expressed concern why all faculty who meet expectations for rank should not have an across the board raise that matches other state employees.

Beauvais and Charles will collaborate on a position paper with a set of specific recommendation for forming a merit raise policy to be considered by the committee.

4. Adjournment: 3:25pm