

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

June 9th, 2015
11:00am – 12:30pm
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Approval of the Agenda
 3. Discussion of changes to Chapter 28 of the faculty code / Adjudications (Exhibit 1)
 4. Salary policy proposal – decision to adopt the latest compromise plan
 5. Good of the Order
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

Janes called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m. The council expressed gratitude to Cheryl Cameron (president's designee) for providing food and drinks to commemorate the final FCFA meeting of the 2014-2015 academic year.

2) Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Discussion of changes to Chapter 28 of the faculty code / Adjudications (Exhibit 1)

Janes noted the meeting today will be used to conclude business on revisions to Chapter 28 of the faculty code on adjudications, and will also be used to decide action on the salary policy.

Janes explained that a document showing new prescribed changes to Chapter 28 of the faculty code had been sent around electronically to the council with a request that they be prepared to give their opinion on it in this meeting (Exhibit 1). Janes explained a large amount of individuals have been involved in crafting revisions to Chapter 28 on adjudications, and the council saw some of the revisions and made judgments on whether or not they approved of them in the last council meeting. There have been additional revisions to the code language since the May FCFA meeting, and the council will decide on these changes in today's meeting.

Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty) noted because the adjudication process encompasses legal implications, it is important to draft language for the code that is precise. She noted she was involved in several meetings including current adjudication panel members and administrative stakeholders in which code language for Chapter 28 was discussed in extreme detail.

Janes noted because this FCFA meeting is the final meeting of the 2014-2015 academic year, if approved, changes to Chapter 28 of the faculty code will go before the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in the fall, at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year.

Council feedback on changes to chapter 28 of faculty code

Janes asked if council members had any substantive concerns or points of inquiry over the revisions broadcasted. Killien noted she wants to make sure that any concerns are addressed in this FCFA meeting, and that everything is left on the table. Janes noted he has minor questions and asked that the council begin with these, and proceed from there in approving the code language.

Section 28.33 / subsection B / final sentence:

“In the event that a Chair and/or Vice-Chair cannot be identified from among the faculty, a Hearing Officer may be appointed in the same manner to serve as Adjudication Panel Chair.”

Janes questioned if any alternative idea had been discussed for remedying a situation wherein an adjudication panel chair was unable to be identified from among the faculty - other than the current recommendation for an appointment of a temporary hearing officer. Killien explained a vice-chair had been added in the past, but noted it is equally difficult to recruit a vice-chair to serve. Discussion ensued.

On the recommendation of appointing a hearing officer under the circumstance that an adjudication panel chair was unable to serve, the council expressed hesitancy, but affirmed that the precaution is necessary, and approved the change, as it will be an important safeguard if a chair cannot be identified. Doubts on behalf of the council surrounded notions that a faculty member should serve as chair of the panel, and not a professional legal consultant from outside the institution who may not know it thoroughly.

The group considered adding the word “temporarily” to Subsection B, at the end of the final sentence, before the word “appointed,” – with the intention of hiring a hearing officer as the adjudication panel chair exclusively for defined by specific start and end dates. The wording change was approved. Janes explained this wording change caused the council to feel a little better about the overall revision to Subsection B. Janes requested the word “extraordinary” also be added to the same sentence, before the word “event.” This change was also approved.

Revised text:

“In the extraordinary event that a Chair and/or Vice-Chair cannot be identified from among the faculty, a Hearing Officer may be temporarily appointed in the same manner to serve as Adjudication Panel Chair” (Exhibit 1).

Additional revisions to Chapter 28 code language

The council and guests then went through the proposed code language and recommended additional language and/or changes to existing language. Each listed change below was affirmed by council consensus, and can be seen in Exhibit 1, attached in these minutes. The changes agreed on were:

Section 28.33

- **Insertion of the language:** “vice chancellor or chancellor” (lines 14-15, pg. 5).
- **Deletion of the language:** “from among the adjudication panel faculty members” (line 21, pg. 5).
- **Deletion of the language:** “other” (line 33) (pg. 5).

Section 28.36

- **Insertion of the language:** “dean, chancellor, or” (line 7, pg. 10)
- **Deletion of the language:** “removal” (line 8, pg. 10)
- **Insertion of the language:** “reassignment” (line 8, pg. 10)
- **Deletion of the language:** “remove” (line 11, pg. 10)
- **Insertion of the language:** “reassign” (line 11, pg. 10)

Section 28.61

- **Deletion of the language:** “the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the University Ombud for the information of the Conciliation Board” (lines 38-39, pg. 22)
- **Insertion of the language:** “and” (line 38, pg. 22)

Section 28.71

- **Deletion of the language:** “granted” (line 15, pg. 23)
- **Insertion of the language:** “decided” (line 15, pg. 23)

Conclusion of business on Chapter 28 (adjudications)

Janes noted that in hearing no further discussion, all changes prescribed by the council in this meeting will be incorporated into the final version of Chapter 28 language to be sent to the SEC and the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2015.

4) Salary Policy Proposal – decision to adopt the latest compromise plan

Killien noted Jack Lee (Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, chair) had contacted members of the FCFA electronically concerning a proposed substitution of the current salary policy for a newly configured “compromise proposal” salary policy, asking that they give their input on the proposal in today’s meeting.

Lee proceeded to explain the ways in which the “compromise plan” differs from the current proposal:

- 1) In the description of the “collegial performance review” (the process by which departments decide when each individual faculty member receives a tier advancement), by popular request, an option has been added for the voting faculty of a department to delegate responsibility for tier-advancement recommendations to a committee.
- 2) The process for customization of tier raises at the school, college, campus, or department level has been refined: First, customization is limited to the range of 30% - 150% of the university-

wide defaults set by the president; and second, any local modification of the formulas for tier raises must be approved by the voting faculty of the school, college, or campus, with an opportunity for the provost to veto the change based on financial feasibility or equity.

- 3) Detailed modeling has shown that in some units, customization of tier raises alone might not provide sufficient flexibility to adequately reward excellence without creating a career salary path that is wildly out of line with those of peers. For this reason, the proposal now provides that a school, college, or campus can also customize the formula for market adjustments if necessary. Any such customization must result in market adjustment raises between 30% and 100% of the university-wide defaults, and must be approved by the voting faculty of the school, college, or campus, with an opportunity for the provost to veto the change based on financial feasibility or equity.

Council feedback on compromise proposal

Janes explained the council will vote on whether or not to accept the compromise plan at the culmination of discussion.

Delegation: Discussion centered on hesitancy over delegating tier advancement responsibilities to small committees, possibly composed of only two or three members. A member noted these committee members may have their decisions heavily scrutinized, which is not the case when entire departments vote. It was noted, however, that it is very difficult to induce entire departments to vote, and that many department members do not vote when they are prompted to.

A member expressed optimism for delegation, noting that a “reset” of the system is an opportunity for faculty to take back control of departments which may currently be ran by only a handful of key players. It was noted that with this “reset” there is a chance and opportunity to establish structures which improve upon the current way advancement is decided upon.

Lee noted the University of California system utilizes a similar structure to the one proposed for implementing advancements, which was a large factor in its incorporation to the proposal. He noted that members of UC gave the impression that the system works well, though there are adjudications from time to time.

Customization: O’Neill (chair, Faculty Senate) noted she has two concerns over the flexibility piece of the compromise plan (the ability for departments to adjust their own universal raise amounts).

- 1) President Cauce has indicated that she sought a “uniform” faculty salary policy, and the revision could provide a lot of variation on campus.
- 2) Concerns over how the unit vote (to set adjustment rates) is going to work.

Council decision on accepting the compromise plan

After discussion, Janes called for a vote on whether or not to forward the compromise plan into a summer process (yet to be determined) to work on clarifying code language. He explained the question

for the council is whether or not to adopt the compromise proposal both surrounding customization and delegation.

After a vote, the council unanimously approved forwarding on the compromise proposal.

Janes explained thanked the staff and council members for persevering through “quite a year” for the FCFA. He explained that he will be going on sabbatical in a few days. He also noted that Gordon Watts (physics) will be chair of the council for the 2015-2016 academic year, and that Watts will be very capable in moving the business of the council along. Many remarks were made congratulating and thanking Janes for his leadership and dedication to the FCFA.

5) Good of the Order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

6) Adjourn

Janes adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes (chair), Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis
Ex-Officio reps: Judith Henchy
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Marcia Killien, Kate O’Neill, Jack Lee

Absent: **Faculty:** Lisa Coutu, Chandan Reddy, Lea Vaughn, Gordon Watts
Ex-Officio reps: Elyse Janzen, Julian Rees

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCG Chapter 28_revised_060915_byFCFA_final

Exhibit 2 – Modifications to salary proposal_060915