CLA P&A Board Meeting  
November 20th, 2014, 1:00 PM  
Johnston Hall 433

**Board members present:** Holly Hash, Kevin Haroyan, Rich Kott, Margaret Rodgers, Mike Baxter-Kauf, Deborah Jane, Jeremy Rose

**Others present:** Dean John Coleman, Lisa Bachman

**Introductions**

**Description of P&A**

Kevin distributes “annual graph” detailing P&A employees—the number of employees has increased to over 400—describes our membership, notes that we are the second largest group of employees in the college (Lisa Bachman notes that she saw a number more like 500, but that included temp employees etc.)

**Community Fund Drive**

The University did not do as well as 2013, shrinking both in terms of percentage participation and monetary contributions (compared to the state, the 100k drop is considered to be good).

By comparison, the CLA specific numbers increased by 3.7% to nearly 40% (39.8). The dollar figure also increased by $3125. Demonstrates engagement with the community as a public institution and our commitment to that.

**Multi-year Contracts**

The Multi-Year Contract Proposal is a work in progress, based on the request from former Dean Duvall. The goal of the document is to outline criteria and the process of a potential multi-year contract system.

Multi-year contracts have been an important issue for the P&A board and there is great desire for such a process.

Lisa Bachman suggests that the Dean may have something to say regarding the general P&A contract process.

Dean Coleman understands how the multitudes of P&A employees are contributing to the goals of the college from top to bottom. The Dean recently issued a roadmap to achieve their vision for the college, research, creative excellence, student engagement, moving forward with diversity initiatives and also a desire to connect campus life and the liberal arts with the broader community. Notes that P&A staff is represented in the working groups to address each of these questions and will depend upon their effort to succeed.

The Dean is pleased that the committee has been working at the question of multiple year contracts and understands the difference such a contract system can make.

Kevin describes the policy analysis briefly, what the limitations might be in terms of University needs to retain non-continuing contracts. Jeremy describes the Annual Renewable contract process. Margaret
details the evaluation process for determining eligibility, noting that this process is modeled off the current departmental review process. The dossier process is very beginning, but involves the attempt to create some basic college-wide standards, while still recognizing that departments will need to be flexible.

The Dean speaks with regard to his experience with multi-year contracts at the University of Wisconsin. He believes that the process was less formalized than what has been described in the document. The process of moving an employee to a rolling horizon contract required simply a brief letter that was sent to HR (as best he can remember), though he did not know the “behind the scenes” HR and administrative perspective. This may have been due to the fact that these contracts had become institutionalized and part of the culture at Wisconsin.

Holly and Kevin both ask questions regarding the implementation of such contracts for departments with lots of P&A staff. The dean believes that approximately 50% of the eligible staff members in his former department at Wisconsin were on these contracts. The actual number was still something that could be adjusted by an individual department, though he is unsure about how that was handled at the broader college level.

Lisa asks a question about establishing what constitutes “need” as a criteria as laid out in the appointment. Kevin replies citing the phrase “integral to the continuing mission of the department” and notes that this is inherently connected to the appraisal and evaluation process.

Dean Coleman believes the clear and well defined criteria is useful and would help to streamline the process involved in implementation. Lisa Bachman also suggests that modeling the timeline and criteria off of existing promotional processes makes it predictable and easily understandable. She also notes that the newly endorsed Staff Performance Evaluation (which is optional for P&A employees) would be something that this committee should look at in terms of evaluating collegiate consistency.

Holly asks about the question of funding for multi-year contracts: could the college be in a position to deny an otherwise eligible employee such a contract due to funding concerns? The Dean suggests that such a thing could of course be possible.

Rich mentions the elimination of the “rolling J” contract from the University of Minnesota in the mid-1980s and wonders if there might be opposition from long-term employees and administrators from that time. The contracts were originally eliminated based on a need for departmental flexibility. Kevin notes that the strategic plan also mentions the multi-year contracts, and Lisa Bachman confirms that other meetings have suggested that there are signs of support in other areas.

The Dean and Lisa Bachman believe that the next step will likely involve speaking to The Dean’s Group and The Council of Chairs, especially since they will need to be trained in the understanding of this new policy. Lisa specifically suggests that it would be nice to get this process in place before next year’s appointment dates (mid-May or mid-June). The Dean would hope to get feedback from the CEDD or the COC in the early part of the spring semester.

Rich also notes some concern about small (single P&A departments) and what concerns about committing all P&A funding for multiple years in that situation.