Meeting Called to order at: 8:50am

**Present:** Emmanuel Ayim, Anthony Barone, Peter Bayer, Andrew Bell, Carryn Bellomo, Aaron Brown, Bill Culbreth, Marcia Ditmyer, John Filler, Michael Hammer, Karen Harry, Deborah Hart, Kendall Hartley, Cody Hughes, Abbie Kirkendall, Anjala Krishen, Cory Lampert, Gary Larson, Mike Lawrence, Scott Loe, Janis McKay, Eugene Moehring, Rhonda Montgomery, George Pales, Paul Palmer, Michael Pravica, Carola Raab, Bill Robinson, Todd Robinson, Sean Saxon, Lori Slinn, Silvia Southwick, Bryan Spangelo, Shannon Sumpter, Douglas Unger, Susan VanBeuge, Bill Werner, Paul Werth, Dana Williams, Joel Wisner, Matthew Wright, Dan Young.

**Single Meeting Proxy:** Abbie Kirkendall for Cecilia Maldonado; William Culbreth for Neil Opfer; Anne Stevens for Denise Tillery; Michael Hammer for Mike Wilde; Fred Krauss for Kara Wada.

**Absent:** Wolf Bein

**Excused:** Vicki Rosser

Chair Werth began the meeting with welcoming remarks to the faculty senators and guests. Guest speakers for the Senate Retreat included Chancellor Dan Klaich, President Neal Smatresk, Board of Regents Chair Kevin Page, and Executive Vice President and Provost John White.

**Welcoming remarks by Chair Werth covered the following topics.**
- Legislative session concluded in June, with the Board of Regents meeting twice since that time.
- New funding formula was approved and will be implemented
- Merit was approved and discussions are needed regarding where the money is coming from and how the merit will be distributed.
- VP Research search is beginning with two representatives from the Faculty Senate appointed this summer
- Discussions are also needed regarding consultation of the creation and revising of forms/procedural issues.
- Spoke briefly about shared governance defined as the means by which faculty and staff participate in the decision making process within the institution. Referred back to Past Chair Sumpter’s talk about shared governance and the six principles she mentioned.
  1. Faculty and professional staff set academic standards and curriculum.
  2. Faculty and professional staff require academic freedom.
  3. Faculty and professional staff should have primacy in decisions on academic personnel and status.
4. Participation in shared governance should be expanded.
5. Representative assemblies and faculty senates can have significant.
6. Accrediting agencies should support fully the concept of shared governance in the standards.

**Guest Speaker Chancellor Dan Klaich**

I first want to say that I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I can’t tell you how much we rely on the Faculty Senate chairs. We absolutely rely on the Faculty Senate chairs and so please feel free to use Paul to bring issues to us. Also would like to mention that we appreciated the leadership last year by Shannon. It was pleasure to work with her.

This is an interesting time. It is my tenth year in the system and Neal’s 5th year as president. This is the first time we have not had to face the year with budget cuts. Hopefully we won’t argue about the formula but just focus on implementing it.

What is my role as Chancellor and how we can help throughout the system? We are always looking for the appropriate boundaries and if I go beyond that I am sure you will let us know. This is a time not to get rid of things, but to rebuild on the foundations that we have tried to protect over the last 5 years.

Few things we are going to do this year that I will need your help on. These include:

1. Last March we received the report by Katz on e-learning. We didn’t do anything during the legislative session on this topic. But the time has come to implement the recommendations from that report. I have appointed a 17-member group to assist me in implementing the recommendations of that report. I have charged them to implement the recommendations and provided the areas I feel are priorities. All the presidents have appointed representatives from their institutions. I expect significant faculty input into this, especially as it focuses on student-centered learning. This is what I consider a longer-term project. I realize we won’t accomplish anything overnight. The key is to focus on being student-centered.

2. This fall we expect to receive recommendations from Huron Consulting and groups working on business process reform. We will receive that report and implement those recommendations. We lovingly refer to this as Integrate 2 or a continuation of the Integrate project. We need to stop and take a look at what we have in place and look at the “new normal” and economic realities. This, along with understanding that shared services, will mean that more goes into the classroom and research rather than the high-paid administrators.

3. A topic of great concern is to define the role of a research university. As we rebuild the institution, what will we need to do and what will it take to move forward on this issue? What we are hearing from the president is a strong message to move toward a Tier I institution. I embrace this message, but want to do this in a strategic way. There is a serious gap from where UNLV
currently stands compared to appropriate peer institutions, and how we close that gap is going to have to be done strategically. This is not an overnight process but we have to embark on this effort. This certainly will be intertwined with medical education in southern Nevada. My feelings on that: The current state school of medicine has not extended to the south. This lack of medical education impedes the health of those living in the south. We need to have a 4-year track for medical education in the south and UNLV has to be at the table. We can get there as long as the goal is to provide the proper health care to the citizens of Southern Nevada.

Q&A

Senator Bill Robinson: What are the implications of formula to UNLV?
DK: There are things that we have to keep in mind. The decision by the legislature was to use actual data rather than the projected data. What that means is they used data from FY2102. For the next budget cycle they will use FY2014, which starts next week. The formula uses completion of credit hours and completion of degrees. This next year is therefore a very critical year. The formula had at the core to resolve inequities between like institutions in the state. I feel it did that well. What it didn’t address is the adequacy issue. We cannot forget that we lost a great deal over that past few years, from fellow colleagues to entire programs. This means we have to start addressing the adequacy issue and in a fashion that will allow the institutions of higher education [to flourish?] with UNLV being central to the state.

Senator Peter Bayer: I understand the importance of student-centered and the new economics in Nevada. What has me concerned with regard to administration nationwide is a climate of anti-intellectualism in favor of focusing on job skills only—getting ready for the job at the expense of intellect. What are your thoughts on that?
DK: I agree with the core of your comment. With everything there isn’t just 1 side to the story. But we have an obligation to ensure students have reasonable opportunities to get jobs when they graduate and that businesses can expect we meet their goals by providing these graduates. However, having said that, I don’t want to be a widget mill, I feel that skills like critical thinking, problems-solving, etc. are important.

Senator Bryan Spangelo: In the old formula, there was differential in funding between UNR and UNLV. Is there still that sort of differential today?
DK: I understand where the numbers come from and I believe I can derive that number. There is, if you look at overall state funding by UNR and UNLV and divide by FTE – you will still see a difference. But if you look at the weighted formula that difference leaves. The difference is in the Law and Dental School and the Medical School. These differences will still show if you lump them together. If you look at the main campus budget by itself, you will not find those differences.

Senator Doug Unger: Going back to funding, I would first like to thank you for fighting to restore the 2.5% salary. Some of us in the Senate are concerned that
UNLV will actually however receive something less than the 2.5%. Where does that money go and will that affect the merit pool?

DK: That is an un-funded mandate question. The changes in the Board of Regents policy allowed them to reduce salaries by 2.5% a few years ago without filing exigency. Because that expired, we have to restore that pay. This has to do with how the money comes in the budget. There is a good ending of this story so bear with me. The executive budget had no restoration of pay. It had cutting the furlough days in half and the provision of merit in the second year. The cutting the furloughs would be about ½ of the 2.5%. By running that through the formula, those with higher cost are at a disadvantage. UNR has about 24% of the systems weighed credit hours – and 29% of the system payroll. Fewer dollars come by flowing them through the formula. Did the 2 universities get hosed and did some smaller institutions get a wind fall. But we want a 100% to go back to the system. A portion goes to the Board of Examiners to prove what the COLA and they give us the money. So the position should prove up the actual utilization and get those funds back to 100% and that is where we are now.

Guest Speaker President Neal Smatresk.
First like to say thank you for this opportunity to address the Faculty Senate. Over the past few years one of the things I have said is that I won’t take shared governance for granted. In the flow of chairs in that time one of the things that we have been able to do, both in the good and bad times, is work well together. That of course doesn’t mean that we always agreed on everything, but we worked together toward a resolution. We did it for respect and the eye toward ultimately what was best for the institution, students and community. This year Paul gets to be chair during a time we aren’t going to cut the budget. This is a good thing.

I want to cover items we are working on this year. What is this year going to look like? What you need to know is that Dan has allowed the presidents to disagree with him and knock heads on various topics. Yet at the end of the day, we have come together. We have tried to forge a path to move forward. That is what you expect in a partnership. By balancing or attempting to create equity, I want to thank him for doing that.

How is the year starting? The core is our educational efforts. We have taken some hits over the last few years. This year we may have the largest freshmen class ever and more national scholars ever. Not as high as I would like it to be, but we are doing very well. We have more Gorman and Meadows kids, 16 valedictorians, our dorms are filled this year and we are working on an agreement with fire marshal to open up couple hundred more so we will be over 1400. We are also working on a deal for the property north of Cottage Grove to take over and open many more. The honors college has more than doubled the incoming size from last year. All those things are good news and it tells us that UNLV is a college that is desirable.

Now it is time to address the funding adequacy issue. But what is the pitch for more money? What is the business plan, and how does the community benefit? Top
function is to make sure that we are giving a talented student population to engage in the community. We need to increase the number of graduates. How do we do this? We have moved more part-time faculty to full-time faculty. We need to fill gaps at upper division level. That is going to take some funding. If we keep growing where do we get this funding? The formula doesn’t address the growing that we are looking for. If we double the FTE of graduates coming out – need to address the needs for more advisors, faculty, etc. We can’t double-down on the numbers we want.

What are we doing for the diversity in our economic economy? The money is targeted to the state building our economy. This fund of $5 million will slip between all the institutions. We need to let them know we are using it well and bringing in the workforce to engage regional economies. A lot will be wrapped up in CoRE initiatives. We need to bring in more federal dollars with strong competition. We are trying to do it with 25% of the wet lab compared to others. We are limited in the wet lab spaces and difficult to bring in those who need that space. We have to get the state to understand that if you want that activity.

We need to look at funding adequacy for students and research opportunities – if we are going to become a Tier 1 institution. Why does it make sense to have this here at UNLV? Will have a thoughtful gap analysis. With the activities going on right now – we are analyzing what the 100 Top Tier look like and we are asking the question what is it we need to fill that gap? Why we need to be one and hopefully the investments will move us in that direction.

Q&A
Senator Bryan Spangelo: How does our budget this year look in relation to previous years.
NS: We don’t have the budget yet – but we are looking at FTE which grows the budget. On the state side $1.6 or $1.8 more – but better – minimal stable and/or little growth. That is based on 2012 but if we can show growth this year will make the difference in the other years.

Senator Doug Unger: About Tier 1. Is there a way to clear up the process of applying for grants? Can you think of someway to provide incentives for faculty in applying? Just for applying for grants. Can you think creatively how to stimulate faculty – we can’t get them to apply because there is little incentive when they think they are not competitive. But you can’t get grants without applying. So the more you apply the better.
NS: We have been providing seed funding even through the recession. Evaluation shows we peaked out. If you look at the Tier I institutions, they have far more resources to support just what you are talking about. We don’t have wet space or start up for bringing them in. We have to protect those getting funding and given that individual PI has hit reasonable mark for the number of faculty we have – but we have to grow the numbers of faculty. We need to extend and get multi-PI grants.
The more faculty you have the more grants you get. If you increase the number of Multi-PI, you have increased to a new level. Even collaborate with other institutions.

**Guest Speaker Chair of Board of Regents Kevin Page**

I want to follow-up on the previous speakers. We can’t let the talk stop there. It is embarrassing to have a knowledge fund that has no funding. It isn’t the perfect formula, but better than what we had, for sure. We want to seek more information from students, faculty and staff. We want to make sure we are offering high quality education to the students, and you are all a big part of that.

The new southern Nevada system building is going up next to UNLV where it should be. I also want to mention, that it seems like there are a great deal of board policies that are used as excuses for not getting things done. We need to know if there are actually policies that actually prevent things from getting done. I am amazed that we block so many things. For example, on the Provost Search Committee, faculty complain that there are all these members, which makes it very inefficient. However that is an institution bylaw or policy, not necessarily a Board of Regent system policy. But I am happy to look at those things that are perceived as road blocks and work on eliminating unnecessary road blocks.

**Q&A**

Dean Carolyn Yucha: One of the policies that is a roadblock is the use of the term “clinical faculty” which is reserved soli for medical school. This designation should also be used by Nursing and Dental. Is that a system policy?

KP: I am not sure, but you are right it doesn’t make sense if that is the case. Please send me an email so that I can look into this.

Chair Paul Werth: Just curious, was wondering if you can give us some insight about the commitment to build relationships in the community and begin to build relationships between the north and the south.

KP: We are doing media and going out to the chambers to the community. There are many things we are doing and we need to develop a plan now. One of the problems is with term-limits and educating those legislators coming into the legislature. We have to ensure they are educated about the needs of the system and the state. We need to work on that between sessions and not just during sessions. For example, the UNLVNow project is a big initiative. I think they are getting it, but you can help.

Senator Doug Unger: I have a question about university culture in our state. Is there any? Is there any discussions with how we can get together? I am closer with universities in other states and countries than UNR. How can we increase the link between the institutions within the state? What can we do so we are sharing one mission?

KP: We are looking at trying to become more engaged. We have started with the funding formula by keeping the tuition on campuses and let them have more autonomy. But we need more incentives. There aren’t enough dollars to do things independently, so we are forced to do things together. For example, we need to get
everyone to work together when we talk about the healthcare in southern Nevada – that would be a step in right direction.

Senator Bryan Spangelo: You have members talking about the medical school – what is the trajectory?
KP: We do have a health sciences committee and part of that is that agenda topic for the upcoming meeting in Elko. Along with that we are looking at healthcare in southern Nevada and we have a consultant looking at that. We have to build on that. We don’t want competitors to come in and take over. It is definitely something we are addressing.

Senator Bill Culbreth: We need to be involved in diversification. What are we doing to try and reach out with this economic diversification? We can even have students start business.

KP. We are out there talking about what they need and what we can do to ensure UNLV graduates are what employers are looking for. The good news is that the governor has appointed the Chancellor to his cabinet to have a voice at the table. It makes no sense to bring business and not provide graduates.

DK – May I respond, I want you to think about that question and send your questions to me or KP. We really want thoughts coming from faculty regarding this question.
KP: To the board as well – we take them seriously.

Executive Vice President and Provost John White.
This has been a busy year in the provost office. One of the observations in the Tier 1 topic, because we have a small faculty. We have hired quite a few faculty, not where we need to be yet. We engaged in a bit of arbitrage to ensure that these would get filled. We think we went from a low 760 to as high as 850. The consequence of the 2 hiring cycles. In discussing Tier 1 we have to look at how we increase the faculty size.

We have heard this in listening to faculty and urgencies in hiring for these department. This is an issue that burdens faulty. What we have been focusing on where faculty can design in their work. Faculty and Leadership development. Also launched Chair training. We are in the process for faculty development.
Mary-Ann Winkelmes who started last week is going to try and restart the faculty development.

We are still focus on improved processes. The IT master plan process is coming to end, The Integrate 2 is also coming to an end. We are looking at processes in the provost’s office. We also are looking at that faculty salary inequities and salary compression on campus. We need to provide greater support. We need grant writing support as one of many examples to help improve support for faculty.
One key area – leadership renewal. We are about ½ through dean hires. We lost one and so we have another interim. Similarly after some substantial delays. The VPR search is underway. This is the president’s search. In addition to that – embarked on academic project – student completion retention rates over the next six years and are looking at a number of initiatives to do that.

It is necessary to engage the academic master plan use that as a complement for the Tier 1 initiative.

I would like to talk about the P&T process and changes. This year the P&T committee met and produced a list of changes to the process. These were much more extensive than anticipated but on the line of what the president and I are thinking. One is a way to receive them in a way to ensure that they looked similarly with similar rigor. Another means is to produce what the departments are doing is there to help in making that decisions. We want to make sure everything is where it needs to be so that nothing is missed. An example is that one faculty member had two papers accepted but the information wasn’t readily available. Nobody noticed that the information was in fact in the packet but not where it was easy to find. A call to the department straightened it out, but we want to avoid those kinds of things from happening.

This year the one piece we changed is moving the document from a word document to that of a pdf. I have heard it is much more difficult to enter the data. What we are planning to do, is get rid of the form all together – just resumé and statement from the candidate only. Then there are some other suggestions that come from the committee such as someone in the process to look for those things. We think that is doable with input. The last is to include the things that already are included. That is we want to know what was sent to the outside reviewers, for example, so having everything available. This year, other than the form, we haven’t made any changes. What we want to do is to create a new committee to look at all of these. The key is that I don’t want to get ahead of myself. The goal of the P&T process is simply want the department is to provide input to ensure that the faculty are being measured.

Q&A
Senator Bill Robinson: Two part question. Part 1 is aside from determining the faculty were they go, etc. We don’t have the fundamental resources. Don’t hear from anyone on the infrastructure. Part 2 is we have done all these searches, we have hired a whole bunch that look like me [a white guy]. That process does not look diverse. Why do we keep going through this when we keep coming up with that same thing? Why do we pay search firms without value?
JW: So as you know that my area of expertise is employment law. So what we can do is ensure the pools have a certain character. The searches were diverse if you look at those that were invited. But for business we had a pool not robust before, but was more so this time. The use of search firm is that they help in closing the deal when you select the person – not just getting them to the interview. They are on contact to look for diverse faculty. In most of the searches we had one or more drop out after
they were on campus by getting increases at their own college so they wouldn’t lose them. The key issue is that we want diversity in every pool. What I am concerned about is closing the deal because of the financial situation and future growth. We hope to start some more searches. It is a matter of grave concern but hard to ensure results. We have to be cautious to avoid a lawsuit, which makes everything discoverable.

Senator Bill Robinson: When your employees in the pool don’t match the hires, that is a problem.
JW: I know your position to quit national searches for local internal searches. We need to balance this issue. I understand we are not on the same page, but we are focusing on this issue.

Senator John Filler. As chair of P&T this past year I wanted to thank you. Nothing worse than to generate these recommendations and nobody take them seriously.
JW: Yes, and we are taking them seriously.

Senator Anne Stevens for Denise Tillery: Speaking of diversity, our mascot is a confederate general? Can’t we do something about that?
JW: This is something we probably don’t have the choice, and not in my powers. Our athletics department have pushed the mascot actually in the forefront.

Senator Andrew Bell: Comments about diversity. No discussion about deanships. Are you happy with the amount of diversity in the administrators?
JW: The only request I put in was that they were full professors and so there was only 1 and I hired that person at the associate provost. We also hired 1 as the presidential fellow. The pool was only 9 or 10. Will search for Educational outreach and we hope to get that launched soon and not sure it would be worth the national search. Peg is willing to be interim but not forever.

Senator Anjala Krishen: First question is … do we have any information about who we have here, who is tenured, who is not. We don’t have intranet that I know of. How can we fix that data issue? How can I tap into that? Second thing. I am on the faculty mentoring program. Doing something on the full faculty professor level – how do we mentor anyone to go from associate to full professor.
JW: We are in phase 2 which are for mentoring those that have been here for a while. We have done all this hiring at the junior level so we needed to get that implemented, but that is a good idea. Also great idea of the tracking of what people are doing and the CoRE effort will address some of that.

Morning Break

Chair Paul Werth called for introductions
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
New senators
Acknowledgement of past chairs
Deans or their representatives  
Senate Committee Chairs (past and upcoming year)

**Guest Speaker Dr. Robert Correales – UNLV Ombudsman**
Since January 1st been working at university ombuds – have mandate to intervene whenever possible in disputes around the university to try and resolve these problems. The mandate of the ombuds is to find resolution at the lowest level of complexity. The idea is we are a community and have to work together. I have been here since 1998 and ½ appointment in the law school. I want to get to know you all and have worked with many already, and have been well received. Contact me at any time.

**Guest Speaker Dr. Mary-Ann Winkelmes – Coordinator of Instructional Development, Policy and Research.**
I also have appointment in History department. I am glad to be here. It is a field I have been in for 20 years. Two areas that will occupy my time here. Support your efforts to make your time intentional and efficient. Also to help support and engage you on research on teaching and learning. Want to speak to you about the things that will work here. I have worked to get new faculty to work proficiently and efficiently so they can spend time in research. Also involved in transparency research in teaching and learning that has boosted the outcomes. Second floor in FDH and will be set up soon. I would like to have to come and talk to me so I can help.

**Chair Paul Werth**
Introduced other members at UNLV that help and support areas. Informational Topics:

- Signing confidentiality forms for Senators – even if returning Senator.
- On 3rd of Sept will be meeting at FDH in 215 to receive feedback on many areas such as Merit.
- On 5-6 in Sept BOR meeting in Elko
- 17th of Sept – our first regular senate meeting – special hearing election to be held
- Oct 3rd – sabbatical and faculty development leave applications due
- Some colleges need to complete their elections and so these need to be completed to have full contingent
- Next meeting will approve the 2016-2017 academic calendar.
- New campus climate survey this year as follow-up in 2010. Now that we are emerging from recession and interesting to see how we are
- Food pantry payroll deduction form – at the registration – if everyone here the ability to help serve those on campus who need it.
- Retirement plan advisory committee (RPAC) to make recommendations to chancellor by the end of this month.
- Upcoming VP for research – we were asked to act rapidly – we lined up Connie Mobley and Bo Bernhard who agreed to serve as faculty senate reps
on screening committee Need to bring back issues to the senior senator meeting so they can review with these two representatives.

**Prognosis 2013-2014 – Paul Werth**
Background from where we were to where we are. We need to be deeply and actively engaged on where we are going. Second contextual issue – result that we are likely in a reactive mode and we need to be certain our voice is strong.

- Implementation of merit – what is the best way to deal with this 2014 to 2015
- DK spoke of e-learning at UNLV and across the state of Nevada. They referred to the Katz report and will make that available. And the steering committee on that committee is Mark Fink and Kendal Hartley and student Cynthia Clark. We need to be engaged with those representatives as we move forward.
- The goal of Tier 1 institution. Spent many hours in President’s strategic plan on this. The FS chairs from UNLV and UNR to work collaboratively on this. Might think more systematically on how the faculty senate can become more engaged in research.
- Search for the VPR – thought it might move forward over the summer – but it hasn’t. We need to move quickly as candidates begin to arrive.
- Medical education and/or medical school in the south. Our ability to become a Tier 1 is contingent to some extent upon having our own medical school.
- Enrollment management and retention – out of Office of vice-provost Carl Reiber. More on completion rates. Number of initiatives – block scheduling, new policy on course cancellation, faculty on the front line – how are these affecting faculty?
- Bryan S: on block scheduling: this was done without any attention to teaching the course – no consultation. Might not work too well. Need to ensure that the faculty should be consulted.
- Need to assess the Gen Ed reform and how it is going on. There is a new chair of the Gen Ed committee. New initiatives out of Dan Bubb’s office. Should engage those who taught these courses to see how they are going and what changes can improve the outcomes.
- The System office is promoting 15 to finish out of the NSHE office. The data supposedly says that those who take 15 credits are more likely to finish. So this is something we need to keep our eyes on. Crystal Abba called it grandiose and huge for the system office. DK said this is designed to improve student engagement.
- Promotion and tenure. Assimilation of new forms and new procedures that we have to assimilate. P&T forms, Digital measures forms
- Better preparation of a zombie attack.

**Merit Discussion** – so we are to get the 2.5% but what UNLV has received is more like 2% but we are required to make up the difference. Hopefully we can get that
money back, though. Furloughs though are 2.3% and they continue. Contributions are now at 13.25%, up 1%. There is another 1%. So you are balanced because they match and give us another 2% into retirement account. The merit pool is $2.9 million for merit – our job is to ensure equitable distribution. This might be contentious. I feel confident that we can satisfy the widest number of people but our involvement is important.

**Certain constraints on this distribution:**
- At present, must be performance based. There was talk early on to off-set the furloughs – but merit has to be performance-based
- Can’t use this to resolve problems of inequity
- Must have an evaluation on file and won’t affect level of classification?

**Three main questions to focus on...**
- Should merit award achievements over entire period of time when merit was not awarded?
- How to prevent the discounting of achievements over that period compared to those that came before and will come after?
- Is it best to retain the system of seven steps, designated in dollar amounts that existed before the end of merits?

**Q&A**
Senator John Filler: Is this the beginning of discussions?
PW: Just the beginning and if there are other issues we are not here let us know and we can move forward.

Senator Karen Harry: What about people coming up for promotion be eligible for merit?
PW: Good point? Don’t know – have to find out.

**Breakout session 15-20 minutes**
Reconvened as a general group. What the tables/groups discussed. The following is summary of the breakout sessions.

**1. Should merit in 2014-15 award achievements over the entire period when merit was not awarded?**
- No, use prior year information only. Using information for a 5 year period may short change new and younger faculty. Accumulating data from a 5 year period will be too complicated.
- It would be difficult to cover the entire period. Better to implement for the previous year and forward.
- Yes.
- Yes.
Yes.
Yes. Add up everything they would have made over the 5 years.
Yes.
No.
Yes.
Yes – all 5 years.
Yes!!
Yes. Calculate level that each person would have received?
Yes.
Yes.
Evaluations from 2012-13 forward. Don’t go back.
Yes.

2. **How to prevent the discounting of achievements over that period compared to those that came before and after?**
   - Only consider information from the previous year.
   - It would be unfair. Consider the entire 5 years. No before no after. Merit should be pushed on performance.
   - Employment since 2007: 5 years 100%, 4 years 80%, 3 years 60%, 2 years 40%, 1 year 20%
   - Integrate the achievements. Compare these integrated achievements with the same integrated achievements of colleagues within the applicant pool within the same time frame. For differing times of evaluation (i.e. new faculty) then average achievements/ year.
   - Normalize (divide total achievement by # of years?)
   - Don’t go there!
   - Give more lateral and independent judgment to the supervisor who is most familiar with the employees’ accomplishments.
   - Not worth addressing – this cannot be helped.
   - No.
   - It will be unfair – no way to avoid this.
   - Dept. committees should be trusted to make fair decisions.
   - Not something we can deal with.
   - ?
   - Difficult.

3. **Is it best to retain the system of seven steps, designated in dollar amounts, that existed before the end of merit?**
- Do away with the steps. Allow colleges to determine how much is allocated for merit up to some maximum amount.
- These steps should be re-evaluated and implemented. I don’t believe that attaching merit to the four categories in the annual report – that is a vision of the supervisor.
- It’s the best – rather than looking at percentage of salary.
- Yes.
- Yes – easier to spread the $.
- 3 steps.
- 2.9 million/2800 fact staff = $1,039 per employee. Distribution per college.
  1. Did nothing
  2. Did something
  3. Did a lot
- No. The amounts should be to discretion of the supervisor.
- No. Have only 3 (low, medium, high)
- Yes.
- Retain the steps.
- This is a question of faculty governance. Let the dept. committees make these decisions.
- Yes. Note: The only issue I see is that with such a large span of time, the normal bean-counting metrics will lead to several people getting the maximum allotment and then we’ll have to resolve those disputes fairly.
- End the 7 steps. Go to 3 at most. Get rid of the “notion” of only 50%.
  Performance based – yes.
- Fewer steps – more compressed e.g. level 1 = $1500, 2 = $2000, 3 = $2500

Admissions committee membership amendment vote postponed to next meeting.

Public comment. No public comment.

Motion to adjourn – 12:25pm by Senator VanBeuge.