

University Senate

March 12, 2009

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 123

Call to Order

Senate Chair Holum called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Holum asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the February 9, 2009 meeting. Hearing none he declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Chair Holum welcomed everyone. He reminded the Senate of the remaining meetings left on the schedule and gave an overview of upcoming agenda items.

Committee Reports

PCC Proposal to Rename the B.A. in Spanish Language & Literature as the B.A. in Spanish Language, Literatures, and Cultures (Senate Document Number 08-09-17) (Action)

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC committee, gave an overview of the proposal. Holum explained that no second was needed for a committee's report and opened the floor to discussion.

Holum called for a vote. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal.

PCC Proposal to Change designation of the Meyerhoff Center from "Center" to "Program" (Senate Document Number 08-09-18) (Action)

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC committee, gave an overview of the proposal.

Holum opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none he called for a vote. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal.

PCC Proposal to Rename the Maryland Cooperative Extension as the University of Maryland Extension (Senate Document Number 08-09-19) (Action)

Carmen Balthrop, Chair of the PCC committee, gave an overview of the proposal.

Holum opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none he called for a vote. The result was unanimous in favor of the proposal.

Report of Annual Performance Review for Tenured Faculty Policy

Introduction

Holum explained that this was the report was a result of a joint taskforce created by the Provost and himself last summer. They were charged and worked through the Fall 2008 semester. Holum reminded the Senate of the forum held at the last Senate meeting regarding the topic. He explained that today we will discuss and vote on the proposed policy. Holum also thanked Adele Berlin, Chair of the Taskforce and her colleagues for their work.

Amendments

Holum explained that all Amendments to the policy would be discussed in the order they appear in the report. Each one must be moved on the floor. We will look at Amendments received prior to the meeting first and additional Amendments will be allowed from the floor. Holum explained that the entire report as amended would be voted on at the end of the meeting.

Procedure Motion

Holum stated that the SEC has approved a procedure motion. He explained that the aim of the procedure motion was to have a broad debate. The motion includes time limits of three minutes for the presenter and two minutes for everyone else speaking. There is also a 20 minute limit for each Amendment and no limit on debate of the document as a whole. He also explained that everyone may only speak a second time once everyone else has spoken. This procedure motion must be approved by the Senate and is similar to the one used during the Strategic Plan Senate Meeting last year. This procedure motion must be approved by the Senate and can be amended. Holum also explained that the Senate had the option of extending the meeting if needed.

Holum mentioned an Amendment to the procedure motion but Senator Grossman withdrew his Amendment.

Holum opened the floor to discussion on the procedure motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The result was 87 in favor, 15 against and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the procedure motion passed.**

Holum invited Berlin to give an overview of her taskforce's work.

Overview

Berlin thanked the members of the taskforce for their work. She also read the charge given to the taskforce and explained that faculty are involved at every level of the proposed review process.

Holum thanked Berlin for her work and called for discussion of Amendment #4.

Amendment #4

Proposed by: Eric S. Kasischke, Geography, BSOS

Seconded by: Denny Gulick, CMPS

Page#: 2

Paragraph: Paragraph 3 of referenced section

Original Text:

3. The Annual Review Committee gives the results of the reviews to the unit head, who, after noting his or her acceptance or non-acceptance of them, conveys them to individual faculty members. Every faculty member should be informed of the result of his or her Annual Performance Review, and should have an opportunity to respond to it.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

(Insert after first sentence of part 3:)

If the Annual Review Committee and the Chair disagree in their assessments, an independent committee composed of faculty from the unit of equal or higher rank should review the assessments and make the final determination.

Rationale:

Whereas earlier drafts did not give chairs sufficient authority this version seemingly gives too much, since a chair has the power to over-rule assessments of the Annual Review Committee. Thus any favorable review by the ARC could be changed to unsatisfactory by the Chair (and of course vice versa).

Senator Kasischke, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, gave an overview of his Amendment. Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, seconded the motion.

Holum opened floor to discussion.

Senator Doherty, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that the Amendment seems reasonable.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, asked how the review committee is selected.

Senator Kasischke, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that their proposal would be that all faculty at equal or higher rank would be included on the committee.

Senator Falvey, Task Force Member, made a motion to amend Amendment #4 to say "all" faculty.

Senator Unal, Faculty, Robert H. Smith School of Business, asked what is considered a unit because the School of Business does not have departments.

Holum stated that the meaning is clear in the framework of the University.

Hearing no further discussion, he called for a vote on Senator Falvey's Amendment to the Amendment #4. The result was a majority in favor and 5 opposed. **The motion to approve Senator Falvey's Amendment to Amendment #4 passed.**

Holum called for a vote on Amendment #4 as amended. The result was 92 in favor, 10 opposed and 7 abstentions. **The motion to approve Amendment #4 passed.**

Holum called for discussion on Amendment #3.

Amendment #3

Proposed by: Elise Miller-Hooks, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering

Seconded by: Elizabeth Smela, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering

Original Text:

6. If, in the Annual Performance Review following the establishment of the development plan, the Annual Review Committee finds that the faculty member's performance remains substantially below the expectations set for that faculty member, and that insufficient progress has been made to achieve the goals of the development plan, and if the unit head accepts this finding, the case will be brought to the attention of the dean...

7. Recommendation for appropriate action after two consecutive reviews in which the faculty member is found to be substantially below expectations may include actions such as more intense efforts to remedy weaknesses in performance, re-assignment of the faculty member's duties, or the reduction of privileges (such as travel funds). In determining the recommendations for appropriate action, the unit head should consider the needs and responsibility of the unit and the potential to ameliorate the faculty member's performance.

8. In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

6. If, in the Annual Performance Review following the establishment of the development plan, *i.e. the third consecutive review*, the Annual Review Committee finds that the faculty member's performance remains substantially below the expectations set for that faculty member, and that insufficient progress has been made to achieve the goals of the development plan, and if the unit head accepts this finding, the case will be brought to the attention of the dean...

7. Recommendation for appropriate action after *two three* consecutive reviews in which the faculty member's *performance* is found to be substantially below expectations may include actions such as more intense efforts to remedy weaknesses in performance, re-assignment of the faculty member's duties, or the reduction of privileges (such as travel funds). In

determining the recommendations for appropriate action, the unit head should consider the needs and responsibility of the unit and the potential to ameliorate the faculty member's performance.

8. In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed (*paragraphs 6 and 7*), and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate.

Rationale:

In the original text, the sequence of events is not sufficiently clear and it might be thought that the penalty is applied before the faculty member has the opportunity to improve his/her performance following the guidelines set forth in the one-year development plan, because the one-year development plan is proposed only after two consecutive reviews in which the faculty member's overall performance has been found to be substantially below reasonable and equitable expectations (paragraph 5).

The addition of "s performance" in 7 is intended to address a minor typo.

Senator Miller-Hooks, Faculty, College of Engineering and Chair-Elect, gave an overview of the Amendment. A second to the Amendment was received from the floor because the original seconding Senator was unable to attend the meeting.

Holum opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The result was 98 in favor, 0 against and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve Amendment #3 passed.**

Holum called for discussion of Amendment #1

Amendment #1

Proposed by: Aaron Tobiason, Graduate Student Senator, College of Arts and Humanities
Seconded by: Elise Miller-Hooks, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering

Page#: 3

Paragraph: #8

Original Text: In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate.

Proposed Text (Amendment): In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed

inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. *Any such reduction shall be reasonable and appropriate, but will in no cases amount to a reduction of more than 5% of the faculty member's base salary.* The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate. *Because the goal of this policy is improved performance, salary reductions may not be imposed under this policy more than three times over the career of any tenured faculty member.*

Rationale: The draft Policy on Annual Performance Reviews of Tenured Faculty does not include any language describing or delimiting potential salary reductions. A maximum of 5% allows the Special Review Committee sufficient leeway when it comes to determining an appropriate figure, permitting a reduction significant enough to be an effective disincentive, yet not one so severe as to constitute an untenable encroachment on the security of the tenure system. Additionally, this revision would set at three the maximum number of reductions that can be imposed over the course of a faculty member's career.

Senator Tobiason, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, gave an overview of the Amendment and Chair-Elect Miller-Hooks seconded the motion.

Holum opened the floor to discussion.

Senator A'Hearn, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, explained that without this Amendment, tenure can be revoked. He feels that the policy should not be adopted without the Amendment.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, proposed an Amendment to Amendment #1. He would like the Amendment to be split into two parts.

Senator Rokita, Faculty, College of Life Sciences, seconded Senator Zuckerman's Amendment.

Senator Levermore, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that if we do not have a cap, it could leave a backdoor to revoke tenure.

Senator Haldey, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she was opposed to the Amendment to Amendment #1.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, asked what happened after a faculty member suffered a reduction.

Berlin, Chair of the Taskforce, responded that the taskforce considered a cap but did not discuss what would happen after first reduction.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, stated that a cap must be included.

Holum called for a vote on the Senator Zuckerman's Amendment to Amendment #1. The result was a majority against the Amendment. **The motion to approve Senator Zuckerman's Amendment to Amendment #1 failed.**

Senator Cadou, Faculty, College of Engineering, proposed to amend Amendment #1 so that instead of a percentage reduction of salary, the faculty member would receive negative or reverse merit.

Falvey, Task Force Member, stated that we should limit the salary reduction percentage to equal to the maximum merit but no higher than 5%.

Scholnick, Task Force Member, asked what if there is no merit in a given year.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that Cadou's Amendment to Amendment #1 makes it possible to nibble away at someone's salary and contradicts the Amendment.

Holum called for a vote on Cadou's Amendment to Amendment #1. The result was a majority opposed. **The motion to approve Senator Cadou's Amendment to Amendment #1 failed.**

Senator Thorne, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, proposed an Amendment to remove "in a very small number of cases" from the policy.

A point of order was called and the Chair agreed that the Amendment must wait until the appropriate section was discussed.

Senator Zlatic, Undergraduate, Arts and Humanities, proposed to amend Amendment #1 with "the decrease cannot occur more than once in a 3 year period".

Senator Levermore, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, asked for the exact language.

Montfort, Director & Executive Secretary of the Senate projected the language on the amendment slide for clarification.

Holum called for a vote on Senator Zlatic's Amendment to Amendment #1. The result was 56 in favor, 31 against and 16 abstentions. **The motion to approve Senator Zlatic's Amendment to Amendment #1 passed.**

Senator Kruskal, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed to amend Amendment #1 to be a total of 15% instead of 3 times.

Senator A'Hearn, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he does not think that the intent was a total of 15% over 15 years and should remain 3 times.

Holum called for a vote on Senator Kruskal's Amendment to Amendment #1. The result was a majority against. **The motion to approve Senator Kruskal's Amendment to Amendment #1 failed.**

Senator Thorne, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, asked for a clarification of the numbers in the policy regarding how often a reduction would be taken.

Senator Tobiason, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities explained that the faculty member would have 3 years before each reduction.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked if the faculty member is off the hook after 11 years because of the cap.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, asked if after the first reduction of 5% the clock resets.

Drew Baden, Chair of the Department of Physics, stated that the policy makes it easier to reduce salary more than once but that is not what we want. He gave a hypothetical of a faculty member doing the minimum teaching with a business on the side would be the one who could receive the 5% reduction. He encouraged everyone to defeat the amendment and move on to the policy.

Berlin, Chair of the Taskforce, explained that there should be reviews between each salary reduction.

Senator Miller-Hooks, Faculty, College of Engineering and Chair-Elect, explained that the cap was imposed so that a faculty member could not get a salary reduction every year after the first review. The intention of capping at 3 times is that there should be a better mechanism for those going beyond the 3 times.

Senator Zuckerman, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences proposed to strike the last part of the Amendment and make the percentage 2%.

Holum called for a vote on Senator Zuckerman's Amendment to Amendment #1. The result was 31 in favor, 56 against and 16 abstentions. **The motion to approve Senator Zuckerman's Amendment to Amendment #1 failed.**

Holum called for a vote on the Amendment as amended. The result was 55 in favor, 40 against and 6 abstentions. **The motion to approve Amendment #1 passed.**

Holum called for discussion of Amendment #2.

Amendment #2

Proposed by: Elise Miller-Hooks, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering
Seconded by: Elisabeth Smela, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering

Original Text: 8. In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate.

Proposed Text (Amendment): 8. In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as ~~to~~ no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate. *Funds saved through the salary reduction shall be applied solely towards remediating the poor performance, such as by paying for the cost of training, and/or towards mitigating the impact on the unit of the poor performance, such as by paying for an adjunct professor to teach a class that the faculty member would otherwise have taught.*

Rationale:

1. *to* as crossed out is a typo.
2. If the funds are to be used for any other purpose, there may be a conflict of interest.

Senator Miller-Hooks, Faculty, College of Engineering and Chair-Elect, gave an overview of the Amendment. A second to the Amendment was received from the floor because the original seconding Senator was unable to attend the meeting.

Holum opened the floor to discussion.

Stephen Halperin, Dean of the College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, asked if the funds reverted were base budget and if they would be used every year.

Senator Miller-Hooks, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering and Chair-Elect, stated yes, it would be used every year.

Senator Tian, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked if the delinquent faculty member also gets a teaching reduction.

Senator Miller-Hooks, Faculty Senator, College of Engineering and Chair-Elect, stated that some faculty are such poor teachers that they must be removed from teaching.

Ann Wylie, Interim Vice President for Administrative Affairs, stated that the funding reversion would be an administrative nightmare. We would have to tag the money. It would be impossible to identify money within budgets.

Senator Hill, Undergraduate, College of Education stated that she agreed with giving the bad faculty member's teaching to another faculty member but was not supportive of paying for the bad faculty member's training.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she assumes that the faculty member will leave eventually and would not go on forever. She believes the Amendment has something positive. Docking pay will not make them want to improve.

Senator Thorne, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, asked if the salary reduction cost paid for a teaching replacement.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that it did.

Senator Johnson, Faculty, College of Engineering, stated that he was unhappy with the open-endedness of the Amendment.

Holum called for a vote of Amendment #2. The result was a majority against the Amendment. **The motion to approve Amendment #2 failed.**

Falvey, Task Force Member, made a motion to extend the meeting to 5:30.

Holum called for a vote on Falvey's motion. The result was 53 in favor, 39 against and 0 abstentions. **The motion to extend the meeting to 5:30pm passed.**

Holum called for discussion of Amendment #5.

Amendment #5

Proposed by: Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Seconded by: Willie Brown, Staff Senator, OIT

Page#: 3

Paragraph: #8

Original Text:

8. In a very small number of cases, when prior good-faith efforts to remedy performance have failed, and when other recommendations are deemed inappropriate or not considered likely to produce positive results, the recommendation may be a reduction of a faculty member's base salary, if the faculty member's performance has declined to such an extent as to no longer warrant the base salary that is attached to the position. The salary reduction may be permanent or for such time as the dean (or provost) believes appropriate.

Prior to implementing a salary reduction, in order to obtain an independent opinion that there are sufficient grounds for a salary reduction, the dean (or provost) shall appoint a three-member Special Review Committee composed of tenured faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member and knowledgeable of the faculty member's discipline, but not of the same unit as the person under review. The Special Review Committee shall consider the departmental report and may solicit such other information from the unit and the university as it may consider important. The committee shall also offer the faculty member an opportunity to respond in person and/or in writing to the departmental report and

recommendations. The committee shall provide the dean (or provost) its written recommendation concerning a salary reduction, namely, whether and why it agrees or not with the recommendation for salary reduction and for the amount and duration of the reduction. The recommendation of the Special Review Committee is advisory to the dean. The decision of the dean (or provost), along with the recommendation of the Special Review Committee, shall be submitted to the provost (or president) for approval. If approved, it shall be communicated to the faculty member, together with a copy of the Special Review Committee's recommendation.

Proposed Text (Amendment):

Prior to implementation of a salary reduction approved by the Provost (or President), the faculty member shall have an opportunity to seek a review of the reduction under the faculty grievance procedure, and the following special provisions shall apply:

1. The burden shall be on the University to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that:
 - a. The faculty member's overall performance has been substantially below reasonable and equitable expectations; and
 - b. A salary reduction is reasonable under the circumstances; and
 - c. The amount of the reduction is reasonable under the circumstances.
2. The faculty member shall file the grievance directly with the Senate Office within 15 days of receipt of written notification of the Provost's (President's) approval of a reduction in salary. The grievance procedure shall be expedited to begin with consideration of the grievance by the faculty grievance hearing board.

Rationale:

The University of Maryland Faculty Grievance Procedure is the established vehicle to contest an action or inaction by an academic administrator that is thought to be unfair, discriminatory, or improperly reached. Permitted grievance issues include matters pertaining to academic freedom and salary.

This Amendment (1) confirms the availability of the Faculty Grievance Procedure to challenge a reduction in pay prior to it taking effect, and (2) adopts the AAUP position that when the stipulated channel for challenging a substantively or procedurally unfair judgment in a post-tenure review is through a grievance procedure, the burden of proving an improper action should not rest with the faculty member. The ordinary burden of proof under the Faculty Grievance Procedure is on the faculty member. This Amendment reverses that order and puts it on the University in a salary reduction complaint.

The Faculty Grievance Procedure is a multi-stage process with many required informal and formal administrative steps. Typically these take an academic year to navigate. This Amendment moves a salary reduction case directly to the final deliberative faculty body.

Provost Farvardin gave an overview of the Amendment.

Holum opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on Amendment #5. The result was a majority in favor. **The motion to approve Amendment #5 passed.**

Holum called for any further Amendments to the section.

Senator Thorne, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, proposed an Amendment to remove the “very small number of cases” from the text of the policy. The motion was seconded. Holum opened the floor to discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The result was 70 in favor, 14 against and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve Amendment #7 passed.**

Holum called for discussion of Amendment #6.

Amendment #6

Proposed by: Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Seconded by: Willie Brown, Staff Senator, OIT

An additional paragraph is added to the end of the proposed policy:

9. This policy on Annual Performance Reviews of tenured faculty is implemented on a trial basis and shall be evaluated by the University Senate five years from the date of its approval by the President of the University. The review shall consider such Amendments as experience may deem proper to protect academic freedom and ensure the equitable and efficient operation of the policy.

Rationale:

University policies may be reviewed by the Senate at any time. Typically, this occurs on a periodic basis. Because there is concern that a post tenure review procedure may in operation have an unintended effect on academic freedom or similar unforeseen consequence, this Amendment serves to confirm the trial nature of the policy and assure its reconsideration. Because the policy requires at least three years of Performance Reviews prior to initiating a salary reduction, Senate review is scheduled in five years, thus permitting experience with the policy before re-evaluation.

Provost Farvardin gave an overview of the Amendment.

Holum opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Tian, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked how problems will be evaluated.

Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, stated that the Senate will develop a mechanism for proper evaluation.

Senator Tian, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked if there is data of past poor performance and that most of the information seems anecdotal.

Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, stated that the existing policy has not been implemented so there is not a lot of data.

Ellin Scholnick, Task Force Member, stated that the five year review have been done informally or not at all. This policy will allow us to collect data.

Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, stated that the five year review was one of the deficiencies identified during the strategic plan process and the Middle States Review process.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, proposed to amend Amendment #6 to include the word “within” in the following section: “Senate review is scheduled **within** five years”.

Ellin Scholnick, Task Force Member, stated that there will be no data until the policy has been in place for 2-3 years.

Holum called for a vote on Senator Gullickson’s Amendment to Amendment #6. The result was 46 in favor, 41 against and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve Senator Gullickson’s Amendment to Amendment #6 passed.**

Holum called for a vote on Amendment #6. The result was 79 in favor, 1 against and 0 abstentions. **The motion to approve Amendment #6 passed.**

Holum opened the floor to discussion of the overall report as amended.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he was reluctantly against the policy. He believes that salary reduction will decrease performance and is not sure of the functional purpose.

Senator Auchard, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, introduced Linda Kaufmann to speak..

A point of order was called about the 2 minute limit on speakers.

Holum explained that this procedure was voted on and approved at the beginning of the meeting.

Linda Kaufmann, Department of English, stated that Distinguished Scholar-Teachers in English were opposed to the policy. They object in principle to any policy that violates the basic contract of academic employment including base salary. She urged the Senate to kill the proposed policy.

Senator Moses, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that all faculty in both American Studies and Women’s Studies are against sections 1, 2, 3 in the report because they believe this is already part of the existing policy. She further stated that section 4 set too high a standard.

Senator Falvey, Task Force Member, stated that the goal of the salary reduction is not punitive but to help remediate the problem and create a development plan.

Senator Leone, Faculty, Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that sections 7 & 8 should be defeated. He stated that the policy was an attack on tenure and academic freedom which guarantees faculty the ability to teach difficult ideas without academic persecution. He implored everyone to vote against the policy.

Senator Fries-Britt, Faculty, College of Education, read a statement from her colleagues who agree that faculty should be held accountable but believe that existing policies should be able to handle any necessary reprimands. They vote against the policy.

Senator Leone, Faculty, Behavioral & Social Sciences, introduced William Stuart to speak.

William Stuart, Department of Anthropology, stated that the policy forces faculty to excel in every area which seems unreasonable.

Senator Tian, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that there is no rationale for the policy included in the proposal. She also believes that the proposal forces a large workload on the rest of the faculty.

Senator Gullickson, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she was speaking against the proposal. She believes it is counter-productive, unnecessary and not good for anyone. The salary reduction is punitive and will make them worse and divide the faculty. She believes that the faculty have built this University and this policy is punitive.

Senator Newhagen, Faculty, College of Journalism, made a motion to continue the meeting until we can come to a vote but withdrew the motion when advised by the Parliamentarian that someone can move to call the question at any time.

Senator Ades, Faculty, College of Chemical & Life Sciences, stated that the policy would not have helped his bad faculty when he was a department chair and then stated that his colleagues disapproved of the policy. He read an email from a colleague who opposed the policy because the process would be cumbersome.

Senator Orlando, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) is designed for faculty review so this policy would minimize its effectiveness.

Senator Pease, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that the faculty in the Criminal Justice and Sociology departments opposed the policy.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computers, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, made a motion to call the question and his motion was seconded.

Holum called for a vote on the motion to call the question. The result was a majority in favor. **The motion to call the question passed.**

Holum called for vote of report as amended. The result was 25 in favor, 60 against and 4 abstentions. **The motion to approve the Post-Tenure Review Policy Failed.**

Senate Chair Holum adjourned the meeting at: 5:35 p.m.