

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
November 25, 2014
11am – 12:30pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from November 12, 2014
 3. Chair's report
 4. Salary policy - Section 24-35 (Tiers and tier advancement)
 5. Salary policy - Section 24-62 (Collegial reviews)
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Janes at 11am.

2) Review of minutes from November 12, 2014

The minutes from November 12, 2014 were approved as amended.

3) Chair's report

Janes reported that senate leadership has been discussing holding open, public forums to encourage discussion amongst faculty about the salary policy proposal and generate feedback. The forum will likely occur in mid-January and the plan is to host a panel discussion.

4) Salary policy - Section 24-35 (Tiers and tier advancement)

Subsection J – Higher Tiers

A question was raised about what criteria would be used for making the decision to advance a faculty member to a higher tier than those listed in subsections A, B and C. Specifically, the question was raised asking if the dean/chancellor has a role in making the decision if the issues arises. Members discussed the pros and cons of keeping the language vague. A comment was raised noting that there was no specific criteria in the appointment of professors of practice in the recent Class A legislation. Discussion ensued regarding the impact of additional tiers on associate professors, senior lecturers and full professors. A comment was raised noting this seems to be a larger policy issue that needs to be discussed. Discussion ensued about the impact on preemptive retention offers within departments, unusual circumstances, limiting salary to CPI, and "relief valves".

Concern was raised that the language is too vague. A suggestion was raised to add language that addressed retention or something to ensure faculty involvement, such as initiating or approving the tier advancement.

Subsection K – Administrative appointments

Janes read an email from Goldstein indicating his concern regarding exempting faculty members with more than 50% administrative appointments from the tier salary structure. Concern was raised that this would create a deterrent for faculty to move to an academic appointment and is inconsistent to the council's position regarding eligibility for 50% FTEs. Members discussed how deans and vice provosts are evaluated for performance. A suggestion was raised to create a separate system for these appointments. Discussion ensued about how administrative appointments are made in the School of Medicine. Concern was raised that the term is too vague because there are many different types of administrative appointments that could be covered under this definition.

Concern was raised that this process would create a conflict of interest because faculty cannot fairly evaluate the performance of somebody who determines their salary. Additionally, faculty have little involvement in their activities in order to effectively evaluate their work. Discussion ensued about the reporting structure for administrators and their level of control. A comment was raised noting the original intent of the language was to address faculty who take on administrative roles, then return as regular faculty.

Buck will work on revising the code language to address the outstanding concerns. Killien will work on revising code language to incorporate an exceptions policy for subsections J and K.

5) Salary policy - Section 24-62 (Collegial Performance Review)

Janes explained that several of the concerns related to this section have already been discussed when addressing tiers. Janes explained the important issue in this section is to determine how departments will set up the criteria in order to evaluate performance. Janes reminded members that outside letters will not be required for tiered advancements. Discussion ensued about the differences in what faculty would need to assemble when undergoing the performance review process. The intent is not to create a large portfolio because the process is supposed to be more streamlined.

Members discussed how different departments conduct their current merit review process. Janes said that the expectation is that the new system would require the same amount of work for current merit reviews but distributed differently. Janes added that departments would be looking at faculty in more detail but less frequently. Discussion ensued about the raising expectations and standards of accountability.

Subsection C – Initial reviews

Members discussed the need for a written department policy to be forward to the office of the Secretary of the Faculty. A suggestion was raised to strike the language because it was unnecessary.

Subsection D – Developing guideless for the review process

Members discussed who is responsible for assembling a faculty member's record, including a self-assessment. Discussion ensued about peer assessments in the School of Medicine when faculty are promoted. A comment was raised noting that each department has a different process where some do not specify the process. A comment was raised stressing the importance to codify this language because issues may arise in the future. Members discussed possible changes to the code language, the impact on

other subsections, access to the evaluations, and the candidate's responsibilities. Members debated the necessity for self-assessments when undergoing review for tier advancements and promotion. A comment was raised noting this will also apply to individuals with multi-year appointments, such as lecturers and professors of practice, and those serving as research faculty.

Janes explained the goal is to develop a performance review model that is universally used across campuses in different departments. Janes added the policy allows for a subcommittee to conduct the review when can then be affirmed by the voting faculty. Concern was raised that this process still does not do justice for faculty who have multi-year appointments. A comment was raised that this policy is not out of keeping with current practices, such as holding regular conferences every year. Members debated if the language should apply to all faculty or just those who are tier eligible, such as affiliate faculty, clinical-courtesy faculty, or non-competitively recruited.

Janes noted that in order to move more expeditiously the council may want to meet over the holiday break.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Janes at 12:30pm.

Minutes by Grayson Court, council support analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Joe Janes (chair), Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Lea Vaughn
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Ex officio representatives: Judith Henchy
Guests: Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent: **Faculty:** Gordon Watts (sabbatical), Alissa Ackerman, David Goldstein, Chandan Reddy
Ex officio representatives: Shannon Harris, Julian Rees, JoAnne Taricani