HeadsUp Steering Committee Meeting Summary  
8:30-10:00 am Monday, November 14, 2016  
Michael Brewer host  
Main Library, Room A204C  
(Map: http://uanow.org/842X)

DECISIONS
Plan four lunch meetings for spring 2017:
  o Accreditation 2020 with Gail Burd.
  o UA On-line.
  o Development 2.1.
  o Inclusion with Jesus Trevino.

PLANS for addressing unresolved problems
Revise memo on RCM oversight committee to send to Provost.

PROBLEMS emerging from discussions
Find out why some heads don’t come to the HeadsUp lunch meetings.

TASK ASSIGNMENTS [Who is doing What by When?]

By 11/15. Anthony Muscat will contact Jesus Trevino to inquire about statement on inclusion that the University will issue and that units can use on their web sites.

By 11/15. Anthony will contact Melissa Vito to obtain data on textbook adoption by department.

By 11/15. Anthony will revise memo on RCM oversight committee based on discussion.

By 11/15. Anthony will ask Asya to send a Doodle poll to determine meeting times for spring.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS
The RCM implementation plan for each College is available on the RCM web site. Log in to RCM Model and at the bottom of the page the pdf file is named “College Implementation Plans”.

Agenda and Notes
- 8:30-8:35 am: New items.
  o Does anyone have items to consider? If pressing, we will discuss at this meeting, otherwise will put on agenda for next meeting.

Diversity and inclusion statements.
Ask if heads and directors who have prepared statements will share. Some units will add to the University statement to make unique to their programs.

Ask Jesus Trevino about plans on a statement on inclusion that the University will issue and units can use on their web sites.

Why is attendance relatively low at HeadsUp events? About 65 people came to the Development lunch and about 30 to the RCM allocation lunch.

- 8:35-8:45 am: Follow-up on lunch meeting on RCM allocations and taxes with Andrew Comrie and Jim Florian. What worked? What did not?

Show committee handout that was used to describe how money is allocated and taxed. Ask for input from those who attended.

- 8:45-9:15 am: Discussion of whether we want to suggest building a merit raise plan for faculty and staff.

Background

Raises earlier this year were mandated by UA leadership. Faculty raises across three categories merit, market, and equity. Minimum percentage in each category that each College had to hit. Salaries benchmarked by unit relative to basket of other universities. AAU or similar. Merit, market, and equity decided by unit heads. No new money. Raises came out of existing college budgets.

On average, UA faculty salaries across campus are below average (need data to support outside of engineering). This does two things: makes a unit vulnerable to losing faculty and introduces politics into the unit. What ends up happening is that the unit head or the faculty member themselves make a case to the Dean for special treatment and a retention package is put together. In some cases the package is only put together in response to an offer from another university. This is a poor way to do business if you want to build a group of committed employees. Uneven treatment sets a bad precedent and weakens the unit. Even in units run by heads who are not political, politics are introduced into the unit unintentionally by this mechanism. “Squeaky wheel gets the grease."

An alternative is to build a raise plan and carry it out over time. A clear plan based on merit, market, and equity sends the message that everyone will be treated in the same way. This approach will build a group of committed employees (and in some cases could motivate people
to increase their output). It might increase faculty retention. Also it takes much of the politics out of the unit.

I think that heads are in the right position to initiate a raise plan. Units generate revenue by teaching students and doing research. Also we have the most to lose when faculty leave. In addition to losing a valuable colleague, we have to initiate a faculty search and generate a new startup package, which are costly in terms of money and time.

A raise plan should not be undertaken under pressure. It will take time to gather input from across campus and develop a clear plan. This may be a good time. We are coming off of a raise and the UA budget is up about $30M this year (check). Will have to work closely with Deans who allocate RCM dollars and the Provost.

Comment
A raise plan may be premature since the UA leadership is in flux.
There was general agreement on continuing the conversation and collecting data.

- 9:15-9:30 am: Draft memo on RCM oversight to Provost.

Hand out draft memo. Thank Linda Shaw and Tricia Serio for offering comments and revising the letter. I made another edit to include the possibility for new ideas. Not just concerns but new ideas to improve RCM.

Discussed changes.

- 9:30-9:45 am: Areas to work with faculty senate–follow up on meeting with Lynn Nadel and Michael Brewer.

Ideas that were brought up at the last meeting that Lynn Nadel attended.
Lynn made the point that the faculty senate wants to be out in front on policies, proactive rather than reactive.
1. RCM steering committee.
2. Textbook adoption.
3. Hiring plans.

- 9:45-10:00 am: Ideas for spring lunch meetings.
  o Accreditation 2020 with Gail Burd.
  o UA On-line.
  o Development 2.1.
  o Inclusion efforts – invite Jesus Trevino.
Attendance
Present: Austin, Brewer Medovoi, Muscat, Proebsting, Serio, Shaw.
Absent: Chorover, Cuillier, Ghosh, Gregorio, Lyons, Welter.

Next HeadsUp Steering Committee meeting: January 2017 Host TBD – will decide based on
doodle poll. Diane Austin and Todd Proebsting both volunteered.

All meeting agendas and minutes are posted at http://headsup.arizona.edu/steering-meetings.