

**College Assembly Minutes
November 12, 2002**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The special meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 2002 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Georgia Gresham announced A&S Night on next Thursday and the production would be “Women and Water”. Dean Scully announced that we now have a College Planning Team. David Moore, Georgia Gresham, Duane Randall, and Leslie Parr were elected to the team and he was looking forward to working with them.

OLD BUSINESS – Dean Scully asked Lynn Koplitz to introduce the recommendation to the College Assembly and asked the assembly if they wanted to vote in part or in whole. The consensus was to divide the motion into parts. Lynn Koplitz proceeded to give an overview of the recommendations. Departments were evaluating in three traditional areas to determine ratings. Last year they used ratings 1 through 4 and the ad hoc committee suggested using 0 through 4 systems. On using equal weights or variable weightings, the committee was split on the issue. Either they would do it as last year or they would have a mechanism for variable weighting. They voted to restrict ranges that could be used for the three areas of 30-50% or 34% for teaching, 33% for scholarship and 33% for service, which is what the ad hoc committee recommended. They also recommended half of the raise pool be based on straight dollars, and the other half be based on percentage basis. She added that they had discussed annual merit raises and not equity adjustments. For the next coming year there was proposed budget amount of \$100,000 to continue to address equity adjustments. The promotion bonus that had been applied for the last few years did not come out of the raise pool and neither did equity adjustments. Although in the future they might have to consider some other mechanism.

A motion was made to accept part “A” that “SORC would review and revise a process and in order to ensure the most equitable distribution of raises.” Brief discussion followed. A friendly amendment was made to put a period after the word “annually”. The question was called. All were in favor of the question and the motion. Dean Scully moved that the whole motion be introduced so that faculty could get an overview of the whole process. The question was called. All were in favor of considering the whole motion. Item “B” was discussed briefly with no change. In Item “C” a motion was made to insert the words “0-does not meet minimum expectations, 1-meets minimum expectations and, 2-exceeds minimum expectations.” It was accepted as a friendly amendment. In Item “D” Mary Blue stated that equal weightings are a possibility in the variable weighting chart – you can choose that. If you choose nothing, you’d go to the default of the equal weighting. Lynn Koplitz stated that things might change for you from year-to-year, and it would be nice if your time were distributed differently to be rewarded differently. Evan Zucker stated that their contract years and evaluation years are different. Lynn Koplitz stated that they assumed that SORC would review their salaries by the end of the spring. Evan Zucker asked when SORC would be revising their evaluation criteria. Lynn Koplitz stated that at this point they did not know. Bill Hammel stated that a lot of his department’s time is spent advising when there are people

in the Assembly who had no advisees. Therefore, he thought the adjustable ratio was a good idea. Bill Walkenhorst asked if a department could choose to change the increments. Lynn Koplitz answered that that was addressed in the plan. Cathy Rogers stated that she would rather see the departments have input into the process. Mark Fernandez stated that even if they had to revert to the default, there would still be the issue of evaluating at the departmental level and there are probably some aspects of this report which would help the departments clarify some things that had been unclear. Gary Herbert stated when you start talking about variable weighting, you potentially introduce politicization in this regard. If you are not a close friend to your chairperson and they don't like you, you can "fix" your salary. The Dean will then probably have to deal with four or five dozen complaints on his desk every year. Dean Scully introduced the concept of how dollars are allocated. Before he came here Dean Rowland distributed dollars on an absolute basis. After he came here, Dean Scully started distributing dollars on a percentage basis. The committee was recommending that there be a 50/50 mixture after evaluations were given with the two added together would obtain the final raise. That is what the committee was proposing. Lynn Koplitz stated that the single number that makes the most difference in the raises is the amount of money that the University gives us for the raise pool and we need more money for the raise pool. Davina McClain stated that she agreed with Gary Herbert, but that's what the equity adjustment dealt with. Dean Scully stated the issue would be considered again at the next regular College Assembly on November 21.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.