**Budget Committee of Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

Brad Yates, Presiding

November 10, 2016

Approved: Pending

Attendance: Liz Baker, O. P. Cooper, Leanne DeFoor, Tom Gainey, Myrna Gantner, Anne Gaquere, Tom Jennings, Shirley Lankford, Kyle Marrero, Meg Pearson, Leslie Shields (substitute for Maurice Crossley), Jim Sutherland, and Brad Yates

1. Call to Order (9:04 a.m.)
2. October 26, 2016 Minutes unanimously approved.
3. Old Business: Update on Post-tenure Review Incentive program for Full Professors
   1. Feedback from Deans about post-tenure review (PTR) incentives was summarized by M. Gantner (see full summary attachment)
      1. Highlights from summary
         1. Deans would like to a reward for successful
         2. Financial sustainability is of great concern
         3. The idea of a one-time “supplemental bonus” is supported
         4. It is important to detail what a “stellar” review is in the *Faculty Handbook* (T. Gainey noted that a stellar PTR is quite different from passing PTR)
         5. There must be equivalency across Colleges and SON
         6. Colleges/SON are already giving rewards (e.g., travel dollars) for successful PTR
         7. Deans agree they need to be involved in the final decision to bring consistency when PTR goes through multiple levels (e.g., department and/or college)
         8. PTR will mean more with incentive dollars attached because it currently doesn’t mean a lot
         9. Deans agree there must be an appeals process in place (B. Yates noted that a PTR Appeals Committee already exists)
         10. Some Deans believe that merit and equity are satisfactory as a reward/incentive for now (this also speaks to the financial sustainability of PTR incentive program)
         11. Some believe compression could still be exacerbated (e.g., it doesn’t help existing compression, but it could help over time)
      2. Committee Commentary on Deans’ Feedback
         1. A. Gaquere asked for clarification on the compression issue; L. Baker explained over time the compression will be wiped (Liz, if you could fill in the “how” here, I would appreciate it. I missed some details.)
         2. A. Gaquere noted that deficiencies in performance should be addressed in annual evaluations
         3. K. Marrero stated that through Engage West practices, no one going through an evaluation process should surprised with an assessment because documentation of quality performance and need for improvement should be addressed continually
         4. K. Marrero explained we want people to be successful and we must guide them along the way
         5. M. Pearson asked under whose purview is the annual review process oversight.
         6. K. Marrero explained that in a shared governance model faculty should develop the nomenclature (e.g., stellar = 1 distinguished, 2 excellent) and matrix of achievement (e.g., what is considered excellent/satisfactory/below average?) for annual evaluations that are in essence quasi-promotion & tenure reviews
   2. Timeline: July 1, 2017 is the goal to implement the incentive to achieve, but it must adhere to BOR policy
      1. K. Marrero asked for the Committee’s input about how quickly we can implement the incentive program
      2. The original conception of the incentive program was that for each successful (e.g., “stellar”) PTR a full professor would be rewarded with additional dollars to the base salary
      3. In an effort to implement the incentive program by July 1, the current discussion has shifted to a one-time award for a successful PTR, which is much cheaper in terms of budget (approximately $176,000 to award 88 full professors $2,000 each)
         1. The Deans would need to be involved in process of giving one-time award
         2. Nomenclature for “stellar” performance would need to come later if we move on an expedited timeline
         3. Discussion shifted briefly to a the idea, suggested by T. Gainey, of looking across the 42 departments to develop best practices evaluating performance
            1. Best practices for annual review could be a focus for a future LDI
            2. K. Marrero suggested a Department Chair Summit to work on best practices for annual review and asked T. Gainey to lead it (K. Marrero’s office will cover food)
            3. T. Gainey suggested starting with a small group to begin the discussion
            4. Should there be an all-chairs meeting on campus? TBD
            5. K. Marrero reminded the Committee that faculty input should be part of the process of developing best practices
      4. J. Sutherland asked if anyone knew how other other USG campuses handle PTR
      5. K. Marrero highlighted the need to keep staff members in mind as the conversation continues
         1. Staff receive annual reviews and may move up in their pay band (which likely comes with additional responsibilities), but for staff who have recorded stellar performances in the same position for 15 years, there is little reward, especially if they are at the top of the pay band
         2. J. Sutherland said staff would appreciate the PTR process that focuses on stellar performance because it would be more in line with staff annual reviews and pay band increases (Jim-if you could offer some clarity here, I would appreciate it. I think I missed the bridge between the two processes.)
      6. J. Sutherland will inquire if BOR policy allows for “one-time bonuses” for staff
      7. T. Jennings asked if the specific criteria for evaluation of full professors, for this first round, covers the most recent five years or composite years since achieving rank
         1. K. Marrero confirmed that PTR should be from last PAR change and cover productivity within 5 years of the PAR change (in other words, the review would be for the most recent 5 years for one-time cash awards)
         2. K. Marrero clarified that those in rank who recently completed PTR would need to send an abbreviated review forward for consideration (last year there were 33 PTRs on record)
         3. As an example, T. Jennings noted someone with 30 years in rank would only be reviewed for the last five years for consideration of the one-time award, and K. Marrero confirmed
         4. For this initial round of incentives, O. Cooper asked if all full professors under consideration for the award would be deemed stellar.
            1. K. Marrero said that is the big question and note it could create difficult situations
            2. K. Marrero noted that the process must be aligned (e.g., establish agreed-upon criteria) by June 1 at the very latest
            3. L. Baker suggested the use of carry-forward funds for next fiscal year, but J. Sutherland noted that certain funds could not be used
      8. M. Pearson, in her role as department chair, emphasized the need to seek input from faculty to determine what is stellar
      9. T. Gainey noted RCOB has a college review, which reinforced the need for faculty input on criteria
      10. T. Gainey emphasized the need to ensure the process is as solid as possible the first time, and K. Marrero asked if we need to put it off a year or get it done by July 1
          1. O. Cooper suggested that for the initial round all who have been successful get an award and allow time to work on criteria for the future
          2. T. Gainey suggested that criteria from associate to full could be a place to start
          3. B. Yates noted that PTR is about broader criteria than associate to full based on his interpretation of the Faculty Handbook language
          4. K. Marrero emphasized there is no reward for time in rank, rather the reward is for continued success in rank
      11. K. Marrero highlighted that the conversation has changed from original intent, which was a base salary increase, to a one-time award
          1. K. Marrero and M. Pearson noted the incentive program is to recognize levels of full professor contribution
          2. J. Sutherland asked how it aligns with merit, and K. Marrero responded that it should align evenly (e.g., if you earn merit then you earn the one-time bonus)
          3. T. Gainey characterized the one-time award as incentive pay
          4. M. Pearson prefers the base salary option
          5. B. Yates suggested two incentive tracks: 1) one-time reward for a successful PTR or 2) a base salary increase for a stellar PTR
      12. K. Marrero reiterated that he is committed to 100% of CUPA median and is committed to the minimum of CIP code for all full professors (Kyle, I am not sure the CIP code note is accurate; I would appreciate any clarification)
   3. K. Marrero shared that at a recent LDI the discussion centered on the need for people vs. equity adjustment (note: no decision has been made on a plan of action because he is waiting for the April budget allocation)
      1. K. Marrero asked for the Committee’s voice: Do we want positions (personnel) or more equity monies for faculty and staff?
         1. Currently the stress points are the greatest concern, but the goal of 100% of the CUPA median has not changed
         2. T. Jennings wondered if a $50 salary bump more often is better than a larger $2K at wider intervals. K. Marrero responded that such an approach speaks more to time in rank conceptually, which is not his goal; the intent and meaning of the incentive program is greater than the dollar amount
         3. K. Marrero noted that payroll adjustment is a month’s worth of work for staff
   4. The July 1st question was presented again
      1. M. Gantner noted that the details will need to be ironed out before moving forward
      2. K. Marrero supported O. Cooper’s suggestion of committing to this year and work on the criteria so it is in place for the second iteration
      3. J. Sutherland explained that only the BOR can provide meritorious (e.g., recurring) dollars, but the President can offer equity. He noted that an incentive clause (e.g., award) for performance is not allowed.
         1. Action item: J. Sutherland will speak with BOR and stress this incentive program is to reward high performance, especially since there is likely no merit dollars from BOR this year
         2. Action item: K. Marrero will report to Faculty Senate about this incentive program and explain he is exploring options
         3. K. Marrero stressed that PTR needs to be wholly defined across colleges/SON and asked if this topic should be discussed with Deans and Chairs at this time (it was suggested we get an answer from BOR about what is allowed before formally moving on it)
         4. T. Gainey noted that the annual review process should be tied to P&T criteria
         5. J. Sutherland consulted the BOR manual and reported that PTR’s primary purpose is to gain a longer term prospective of faculty’s performance; there must be a review every 5 years; specific written PTR criteria must be on the institution’s web site; and faculty performing at high levels should receive incentives (e.g., merit pay increases; study and research leave opportunities). Based on his reading of BOR manual, J. Sutherland thinks we can do recurring dollars, the original concept of the incentive program
         6. It was noted that the Deans are concerned their monies will be eaten away if these recurring dollars for PTR are put in place
         7. J. Sutherland said the PTR incentive dollars are like P&T dollars; they come off the top of the budget allocation, which should alleviate some concerns voiced by the Deans
         8. J. Sutherland noted that UWG’s budget audit has not had any issues for years; thus, the BOR may be more amenable and supportive of the incentive program
   5. Feedback from Faculty Development Chair
      1. B. Yates summarized meeting with David Boldt, FCD chair, and reported that D. Boldt was willing to present suggestion of post-tenure review incentive program to the FDC to craft language for nomenclature that would pass muster across all colleges and THSON.
      2. D. Boldt highlighted the varying levels of post-tenure review criteria whether at a college-level or department-level
   6. Faculty Senate will receive the FY18 funding requests with updates
      1. The summary on the budget topics (4 pages) will be shared. (Action item: L. Baker will prepare updated version for distribution)
      2. K. Marrero asked that we do not post the FY18 budget request before the February BOR budget hearing
      3. J. Sutherland suggested that for those who ask for a copy of the FY18 budget requests a hard copy will be sent in campus mail
4. Next meeting during Finals Week for 1 hour (possibly December 8th)
   1. Action Item: B. Yates will check K. Marrero’s schedule via Tina Bennett and send out a Doodle poll to the Committee
   2. The goal is to meet before Faculty Senate on December 9th so we have an update for the Senate
5. Adjournment (10:43 a.m.)