Present: Lucy Arendt, Sue Bodilly, Paula Ganyard, Dave Dettman, Samantha Surowiec, Jane Swan, Grant Winslow

## 1. Call to Order by Chair at $12: 32$

2. Minutes from last meeting were taken but not typed and distributed. We will review two sets of minutes at the April $11^{\text {th }}$ meeting.

## 3. New Business

A. Review administrator evaluation instrument

Lucy shared with the group a copy of the Senior Administrators Performance Survey, last completed in 1999. The University Committee is considering doing the survey again and asked that the Academic Staff Committee provide feedback.

The committee agreed that governance has a responsibility to hold management accountable but also agreed that the survey, in its present paper form, is not an effective instrument for gauging the performance of administrators. The committee fears that positive comments may be disregarded in favor of giving attention to whatever negative comments are submitted.

The group thought a more appropriate approach would be to solicit comments from academic staff (not written) and present those comments to administrators in an annual face to face meeting.

## B. Discuss SOFAS replacement process

The committee agreed that the position description is fine and we don't see any need for changes.

## 4. Old Business

A. Finalize budget memo

Lucy distributed a budget memo she constructed using feedback from other Committee members and Academic Staff members campus wide. She asked that we review the document before it is forwarded to the Chancellor.
B. Continue developing preliminary performance evaluation policy recommendations -Tabled
5. Information Items
A. ASC Chair update: Limited appointments, CBC, pay plan, Chancellor's performance evaluation

Lucy informed the committee that there is a possibility that limited term appointments may be eligible for a zero percent concurrent appointment which would allow them to participate in Academic Staff Governance. Lucy will update the group on this issue during our next meeting.

Lucy reported that both faculty and student representatives think that a Community Building Committee is a good idea. Lucy will contact a classified staff representative before reporting back to the Chancellor. The committee agrees that this committee (currently assembled and meeting regularly) should be officially recognized and supported by the Chancellor.

Lucy informed the committee of her participation in the Chancellor's performance evaluation.
B. Provost update (not available on 4/4)
C. Academic staff committee updates, including System Academic Staff Reps report None
D. Added item $\rightarrow$ Potential 2006-07 Unclassified Parity Adjustment

It is possible that the pay plan may be 2.25 in April instead of 1.0.The Academic Staff Committee discussed and unanimously agreed that:

1. The performance evaluation process should not be revisited in the event of an additional salary increase. Rather, the additional funds should be used to make the raises somewhat larger, proportional to what has already been done, as you describe below.
2. The Chancellor's $10 \%$ should be extracted from the additional salary increase, and applied to any career progressions, title reviews, and/or market/equity adjustments not already funded at the $56 \%$ or $\$ 2,100$ level. It is our understanding that not all approved requests were funded as described, due to insufficient funds with the previously anticipated salary increases. On principle, we believe that the $10 \%$ should be extracted and used in this instance, for the same reasons that it is generally extracted and used. Affected units will therefore have a small amount of salary flexibility that may be used to address other pressing concerns.

## E. General

1. Information of interest to academic staff is posted on the SOFAS website: http:/www.uwgb.edu/sofas/

All meetings are open unless otherwise stated.
Adjourned at 2:00
Respectfully Submitted by Dave Dettman

