

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
March 10th, 2015
11:00am – 12:30pm
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Approval of the Agenda
 - 3) Approval of the Minutes from February 24th, 2015
 - 4) Pending Issues and Questions / Salary Policy
 - 5) Good of the Order
 - 6) Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Janes at 11:00 a.m.

2) Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the Minutes from February 24th, 2015

The minutes from February 24th, 2015 were approved as written.

4) Pending Issues and Questions / Salary Policy

Faculty Senate Meeting Discussion / Proposed Changes

Janes noted Faculty Senate chair Kate O'Neill and Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting chair Jack Lee were present in the council meeting to discuss the current state of the salary policy. Janes explained members of the Faculty Senate had voiced concerns over the flexibility of the policy, specifically stating that the policy may not suit their unit's needs. He reported there were varying opinions on moving forward with the current salary policy heard in the recent faculty senate meeting, with some individuals requesting that the process be delayed. He explained it has been evidenced that the policy, in its current state, will not pass unanimously in the senate.

Janes noted the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) knows the many complications of the policy better than most. Tier eligibility, for example, has yet to be resolved by the council. Janes explained that on March 6th there was a meeting with constituents from differing units where attendees voiced their

concerns. Janes noted the meeting was very helpful in gleaning the complications that certain units desire to be remedied before considering voting for the policy.

O'Neill explained the faculty leadership had set a deadline for her to decide on pushing the policy through to the senate for a vote in the spring, or not. She explained she had decided not to push through the legislation for two main reasons:

- 1) The policy needs to maximize the number of individuals who will support it for it to be successful.
- 2) There is drafting work to be done. The current code form is not technically sound.

O'Neill noted the timeline to the spring senate meeting is short and does not provide ample time for correcting the code. Moreover, many members of FCFA will not be available during the month of March to aid in the drafting. She explained she is greatly hesitant about pushing through code that is not technically sound.

Moreover, O'Neill mentioned that the current university President has an interim appointment, which creates some uncertainty if a different person were appointed before a new policy can be enacted. However, if the council were to have a "tight" proposal, and there was a new candidate for the presidency, a conversation concerning the proposal may be possibly included in the interview process. O'Neill noted financially, the policy would not be implemented next year regardless if it has been passed this year - a fact that has been stated by university leadership. She remarked there is a plan in place already to move forward with the policy in the fall.

Lee explained the aforementioned March 6th meeting of differing units was conducive to gathering a strong majority in favor of the policy. He noted the Business and Medical schools were among the strongest voices of opposition, and were asked to list their concerns in this meeting. Lee reported the group together produced two changes to the salary policy that seemed to make all parties happy. The Medical school and School of Public Health representatives stated, with these changes, they would support the policy. The representatives from Engineering and the Foster School of Business were pleased with the changes, but were not yet ready to commit to supporting the policy until they had a chance to further discuss it with their constituents. The changes proposed were:

- 1) Let colleges set up their own formulas for all the dollar amounts in the policy, including market adjustments, tier raises (including amounts of 0%), and promotion raises. The process allows for the Provost to veto these amounts based on considerations of financial feasibility and equity.
- 2) Allow departments to delegate the collegial evaluations to a committee of one or more faculty members.

* The second proposed change was noted to be favored by both the Medical School and the Business School

O'Neill noted it is integral to the policy's success to garner votes from the Engineering and Medical School. She added the University President will not sign legislation if there is significant opposition to it on campus. Janes explained the Information School has pledged their support if the proposed changes

are made to the code. The selling point for the Information School, Janes noted, was that they would gain a projection for their future earnings and other career information, with the policy implemented.

O'Neill noted these proposed changes do not negatively affect the position of Arts and Sciences or other constituents in favor of the current policy. Janes noted the single strongest element the policy has in getting passed, is a high majority of faculty and units who are in support of it.

Reddy made a comment in support of creating focus groups within the College of Arts and Sciences to bolster awareness and increased understanding of the policy. Landis noted there was ignorance of the ins and outs of the policy, even in the units who support the policy, and she believes further education of the policy is necessary, notably in regards to tier eligibility.

Janes noted work on the salary policy will be on hold for the time being. He explained there are other areas of interest the FCFA could work within. A few council members expressed wanting to continue work on the code, correcting the existing language according to previously used guiding-documents. O'Neill supported the idea, and suggested the creation of a subcommittee to work through the technical drafting, who would return to the council meetings for review and approval of their changes. There was some discussion of membership for this subcommittee.

5) Good of the Order

Janes noted the existing questions of tier eligibility and changes to the main policy as prescribed by the March 6th meeting of units would be addressed in the next FCFA meeting.

6) Adjourn

Janes adjourned the meeting at 12:10 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, Chandan Reddy, Lea Vaughn
Ex-Officio Representatives: Julian Rees
Guests: Kate O'Neill, Jack Lee

Absent: **Ex-Officio Representatives:** Judith Henchy, Elyse Janzen, JoAnne Taricani
President's Designee: Cheryl Cameron