Committee on Committee’s report on changes to FSH 1640.42 – Faculty Affairs was given by Torrey Lawrence. He noted that adding the VP of Faculty was approved, but not the time change.

A motion (Brown/Powell) to approve the minutes of September 7 passed (8-0).

Chair Ytreberg introduced Patrick Hrdlicka once again, indicating that the task at hand was to determine how, or if, we can draft policy (FSH) that would increase transparency on how performance pay is distributed. Discussion on this topic included:

- Past procedure has been at dean’s discretion which varies across university.
- FAC’s objective is to provide guidance using policy, not to take the role from deans.
- The terms ‘performance’ and ‘merit’ are misunderstood and not used consistently across the university.
  - The State Board uses the term ‘merit’ when referring to market-based longevity adjustments that are only given if a faculty member ‘met expectations’.
  - ‘Performance’ adjustments – defined as above and beyond performance.
  - Communication, training and guidance are needed (e.g., a website, open forums and discussions) to reduce misunderstanding and to increase consistency. The chair noted that if FAC could begin using the term performance instead of merit, it would be one positive step in addressing the misunderstandings.
- Important to provide to overall guiding principles that ensure consistency university-wide (transparency); but allow criteria is to be determined at the college level (each college has a different standard).
- Criteria should be established in advance of the evaluation year so that expectations are known.
- What to do for years where there is no performance pay and someone does terrific – catch up (e.g., use allocation that is approved for ‘discretion’)
- It was suggested that FAC would not be able to resolve this problem at this time, because there are too many unknowns. A counter argument was made that the current climate within upper administration is supportive – i.e., they are asking for help and there is no better time like the present otherwise we will continue with inconsistencies across campus.

A motion (McCollough/ Freeman) to defer, until a later date, further action on changes to FSH regarding how performance pay is distributed was not approved (7-2).

Isenbarger summarized the discussion in the form of goals for which FAC should aim:

- Change language in faculty staff handbook (e.g., FSH 3420). We need to make policy change.
- Provide guidance (in FSH), that will help deans make decisions that aren’t made in isolation.
- Create a process for transparency on a local level, while also offering some consistency across the institution.
- Find a human side/beneficial discussion that creates a check on simply following criteria.
- Identify and propose a process (in FSH) for making decisions – e.g., requiring a committee in each college, requiring a process similar to the one that CLASS implemented last year where information is gathered in a structured way and brought up to the Dean.
• Specify who determines criteria for making decisions, while acknowledging complete “fairness” is not likely:
  o Determine & share criteria a year ahead.
  o Perhaps ask colleges to offer this language in their by-laws
• Propose FSH language to:
  o guide decision-making – e.g., “this more than just for scholarship”, “look back to high performers in years prior where there wasn’t performance $ available
  o point faculty to the specific data base for information about the current approach to compensation
  o explain that there are multiple pots of money, if the pot that is performance-based is above zero, here’s what you can do...

The chair asked members to be prepared for next week’s meeting by thinking about what a reasonable process should be, whether it be a committee, associate deans/ chairs, a list (percentage) of top performers from each unit, etc. He suggested that if we get some ideas and commonalities, we can start to focus on the process itself.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dan Eveleth