Rationale for proposed changes in the alternative proposal (included in Exhibit J of May 19, 2016, Faculty Senate agenda). (Line numbering corrected May 17, 2016.)

In general, the major concerns are related to providing adequate protection to faculty from units who elect to opt-out of the tier adjustments, including providing more flexibility in timelines and requiring additional information in the proposals for opting out. Other concerns are related to insufficient clarity in the proposed legislation that might lead to confusion or misinterpretation and possible future adjudications or lawsuits. The rationale for specific required changes are summarized below along with changes suggested by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations made by a subsequent amendment, referencing line numbers in Exhibit J. The president’s proposed changes are in red and blue; the advisory committee’s changes are noted in green.

Please note, the changes in blue and red in Exhibit J are changes the president would require to be able to sign the legislation if approved by the faculty.

Line 142-------- Replace the word merit with performance because merit has special meaning in the current salary policy. This change has been uniformly made throughout the document in an attempt to be as clear and consistent as possible.

Line 629-------- Administrator exemption from the tier system when the administrator participates in the evaluation of faculty and has a conflict of interest needs to be consistent.

Line 644-669 --- Exemption from the tier system. Additional guidance needs to be added as to information needed in the proposed plan for the protection of the faculty. Enough specificity needs to be provided to guide the faculty in knowing what they can expect. Changes are needed to provide additional clarity and consistency that includes options both to opt out and opt in. The effective date will need to be specified for each proposal. Additions are needed to clarify procedures when a faculty member has a joint appointment.

Line 660-------- Change 45 days to ‘as soon as practicable’ in response to information that there may be multiple requests for exemptions. If that occurs, more time will be needed to review them all.

Line 1409------ Conditional phrase added to avoid conflict with other provisions in the Faculty Code.

Line 1443------ Move text to Section 24-62, lines 1507 – 1512, on performance reviews for clarity.

Line 1499------ Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommendation, should explicitly state that faculty exempt from the tier system (i.e. administrators who are also faculty) are exempt from collegial performance reviews.

Line 1520------ Reword to focus on outcome of performance reviews instead of distribution of variable adjustments.

Line 1569------ Clarification of requirements.

Line 1625------ Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommendation, remove ‘early tier advancements’ and delete the parentheses, to improve clarity.

Line 1755------ Necessary to add specific provision to provide for salary increases for faculty who are not tier-eligible

Line 1799------ Necessary to provide more flexibility to the timeline.

Line 1809------ Need to address units where all adjustments are variable.

Line 1857------ Necessary to add specific provision to provide for salary increases for faculty who are not tier-eligible

Line 1903------ Necessary to require additional detail related to variable adjustment proposals and performance reviews for the protection of faculty

Line 1922-1930 Clarifies text related to variable adjustment procedures and performance reviews.

Line 1945-1951Parallels current salary policy provisions to attend to equity considerations.

Line 1998------ Timeline flexibility is needed, due to the complexity for transitions and pre-transitions.

Line 2418------ SEC amended to make proposal conform with the organization and style of the Code.