

UMM Consultative Committee
Meeting Date: December 8, 2003

Present: Joyce Amborn, Brenda Boever, Kevin Ely, Bart Finzel, Lee Korby, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Michelle Page (chair), Jeff Ratliff-Crain (XO), Rebecca Webb, Mary Zosel

Absent: Tim Brooks, Reggie Davis, David Wuolu

Guests: None

- Minutes of Dec. 5 meeting approved with minor corrections
- Update on Budget Task Force: A general timeline has been discussed. Unit managers have been asked to identify cuts. Those reports will be turned in January 2004. The BTF will then create a preliminary report and will allow two weeks for feedback. A subsequent draft will be created. A final draft report will be ready near Spring Break time. The Consultative Committee should be prepared to offer feedback regarding budgetary issues in February and to respond to the campus community when the reports are issued. The following questions were raised, but information was not available at this time: Are there guiding principles for any potential unit cuts (for example, is it all about numbers of majors, a sense of if different disciplines are valued differently, etc.)? It has been rumored that there might be a faculty salary increase next year—is this true and if so, could we “give it back” in order to help with the budget crisis? Or would that simply complicate salary issues that already exist? How can we communicate to the University to not raise the university fee for students (they cannot claim a tax credit for this)?
- Discussion of faculty salary augmentation plan: The committee discusses several potential benefits and drawbacks to the plan, summarized below.

Potential Benefits/Compelling Points	Potential Drawbacks/Questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some positions carry comparable salary but not comparable responsibility to tenure-line positions; the plan would “level the field”• This plan doesn’t fall on the backs of the students in terms of raising tuition, cutting classes, etc.• Faculty will likely appreciate the effort to attend to salary issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Difficult to have a consistent plan or policy with so much variability among disciplines• How exactly will savings accrue, especially if additional sixth courses are scattered across disciplines and divisions ? Decrease in paying people for FYS, cutting contract or adjunct positions, etc.?• Are some adjuncts (i.e., those already teaching on a per course basis) being asked, in essence, to take a pay cut by raising the full-time load to 6? How

	<p>are their salaries figured?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exactly how much money might the plan yield? Concrete examples would be helpful. • It's likely that disciplines would employ contract/adjunct faculty to teach lower level courses—is this in the best interest of our students? • Could this inadvertently serve to “steal” attention from other salary discussions/issues? • This could potentially be a disincentive to convert positions from contract to the tenure line • Could possibly be divisive, with the reality or the perception of some colleagues receiving bonuses at the expense of other colleagues • Would the potential bonus really be enough to affect UMM's ratings in publications or to retain faculty? • How might this affect spousal hires, given that a significant number of contract positions provide meaningful employment to tenured and tenure-track faculty spouses?
--	--

The Consultative Committee has decided not to endorse the plan at this time. The Committee is open to hearing revisions or clarifications of the plan, if asked.

- A few spring issues mentioned: progress on receiving funding for Native American tuition waiver; budgetary issues; “leftover” fall issues

Meeting adjourned 9:45