

UHD Faculty Assembly

January 24, 2014

Minutes

Present: T. Hale (President), R. Beebe (President Elect), G. Preuss (Past President), S. Henney (Secretary), M. Duncan, R. Johnson, F. Khoja, J. Davis, K. Hagen, A. Lopez Pedrana, J. Quander, R. Sadana, S. Koshkin, C. Stewart, G. Lund, HM. Wang, T. Chiaviello, A. Lopez Pedrana,

Absent: U. Bose, P. Deo, J. Herrera, J. Johnson, P. Mandell, S. Penkar, M. Portillo, C. Rubinson, P. Simeonov, J. Tito-Izquierdo, S. Zhou,

Call to order: 2:37 [102 persons in attendance]

Salary Study

Hale: Introduction of Dan Ulibarri of UM Global

Please see PowerPoint presentation that is attached, which provides the content of the presentation.

Question and Answer:

Q: Did you consider the salary increase from Assistant to Associate when making calculations?

A: Yes, it was discussed. However, this is something that happens everywhere, and it is in policy for all faculty. The more important issue is looking at the disciplinary differences. Equitable and consistent distribution is the key.

Hugetz states that this model addresses the equitable distribution issue. However, distribution is not only going to be based on the salary study. Merit also must be considered. Faculty retention needs will also be considered.

Q: If we allocate based on CUPA, but it can only be distributed based on merit, isn't there a circular problem of people with low merit continuously being below market?

Hugetz acknowledges this point. However, we have no choice about considering merit; the BOR requires it.

Hugetz notes that there is not enough money available (\$458,400) to address all needs. About 87% will go to faculty, and 13% to lecturers. However, both are important; faculty AND lecturers must be brought to market.

Hugetz states that decisions about distribution to individual faculty will be made by Chairs and Deans, guided by this study. Then Provost will review and recommend to President. Overall percentage amounts to academic units will be primarily based on the percentages identified in the study (not the total dollar cost identified).

Q: This impacts hiring, we are not competitive for top candidates.

A: Yes. We cannot hope to hire the best faculty if we cannot pay them competitively.

Performance Evaluation Policy

Hugetz begins by thanking the committee for their work.

We do not have a clear set of expectations for what faculty will be evaluated on. Three departments have no annual evaluation rubrics at all. Communication is key; what kind of performance and activities are being evaluated? What are our expectations?

Hugetz will ask the departments to write rubrics in February and March that set clear expectations for each part of the Performance Evaluation Scale.

Hugetz wants to come to speak to each department about this effort.

Maybe we should have done the rubrics first, then the scale. However, we are where we are; we need to have a conversation about the rubric.

Q: Congratulations on the anchors; good job on removing Areas of Excellence. The 4-6 category is still combined. Will we create rubrics for 4, 5, & 6?

A: Need ways of distinguishing between “good” professors. Should have rubric points for 4, 5, and 6.

Q: We undervalue “meeting expectations.” It is too low on the scale.

A: The “area of excellence” may have addressed this, but it has been removed. We will have to do a good job at informing faculty about the scale

Q: Will we be evaluated in each area separately? Averaged?

A: 50-25-25 split is in policy.

Q: What point is eligible for merit raises?

A: Three or above.

Q: Who will be eligible to apply for tenure? What scale point?

A: We need to look at the alignment between the R & T policy and evaluation policy. This is one of FAC’s charges this year.

Note: Lecturers will also be included in this policy.

Q: Are the departments now charged with proceeding with the rubrics?

A: No. In February, guidelines will be sent out for proceeding with developing the rubrics.

Q: There were other things in the policy draft. Can we get a mark-up policy, so we can see the changes?

A: Yes, we should.

Hugetz wants rubric development to focus on student success and retention. We have to not only look at disciplinary performance, but also at the performance/health of the university as a whole. We need consistent salary increases, but these are funded on enrollment increases. Faculty need to help in the effort to retain students through course and curriculum design.

Q: If student success and accountability language is added, will the CTLE help enable faculty to do some of these things?

A: That is the goal.

Q: Sounds like the salary study implies that more salary increases are needed.

A: Hugetz states that annual salary increases are essential. We will 'try' to have more salary increases in 2015.

We don't have a definition for HIPS, but many are doing it. We need to acknowledge it. This is the same for service-learning.

Q: Doesn't the HIPs language belong in the rubrics instead of the policy?

A: Yes.

Note: Hugetz states we are choosing to get the 2% raise into paychecks on March 1. It will have been effective Jan 15. Those who are on a 9 month pay is straightforward. It is less straightforward for pay-12. Will use 2013 merit scores, but Chairs and deans will make a broader evaluation of faculty; they will "look at their career as a whole."

Adjourn: 4:02