

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
November 12, 2014
11am – 12:30pm
Gerberding 26

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from October 28, 2014
 3. Salary policy – Section 24-35 (Tiers and tier advancement)
 4. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

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

2) Review of minutes from October 28, 2014

The minutes from October 28, 2014 were approved as written.

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

Subsection E (Eligibility for tier advancements)

Janes read the draft language drafted by Cameron at the request of the council adjusting language regarding associate professor and professor without tenure (WOT). Discussion ensued about the promotion and tenure process for the different type job types and how they would be impacted by tier advancements. Concern was raised about how tiered advancement would be implemented at the same time of renewal appointments. A question was raised about how this may also apply to research faculty. Discussion ensued regarding the timing of tier reviews for faculty who are serving multiple year appointments. Members debated the language which in order to address discrepancies between the two job types. A comment was raised that being appointed to WOT by reason of funding has its own specific category as well. Members discussed the differences in hiring practices for WOT faculty. Based on the current proposal it appears that WOT faculty could receive tenure without a tier advancement, receive a tier advancement without tenure, receive neither, or receive both.

Concern was raised that if a WOT faculty is reappointed it appears to signal that the individual is doing well. However, if the unit fails to provide them with a tier advancement it will send mixed messages about their performance. A suggestion was made to adjust the language so the review is concurrent with the tenure decision process. Concern was raised that this does not address research faculty who may hold 1-5 year appointments. For example, it may be possible to be considered for a tier advancement one year, then the following year be up for an appointment consideration. A comment was raised noting this is similar to decisions regarding lecturers. A comment was raised stressing that the proposal would create a complex arrangement with an increased frequency of reviews which would complicate the system and impact career interests/trajectories.

Subsections F (Initial appointments) and G (Assistant professors)

A comment was raised to replace the term “rank” with “title”. Members discussed provisions in which the clock stops during the middle of a faculty member’s 3-year appointment. A question was raised asking whether a faculty member can have a say in their initial appointment. A comment was raised that the appointment is assigned by the chair with approval of the faculty member. Discussion ensued regarding language that would accurately describe the initial appointment process. Members debated if promotion and tier advancements would be perceived as status symbols, and if so, how departments would respond. A comment was raised that if a member is charging ahead in their duties he/she may request an advancement earlier than others. A suggestion was raised to break apart “initial appointment” and “promotion” to address the issues separately.

Subsection H (Advancement)

Members discussed the following language:

A tier advancement should be awarded when a faculty member’s accomplishments since the most recent previous appointment, promotion, or tier advancement are commensurate with that of a typical UW faculty member in the field over the course of about four years.

Concern was raised that reviews should, at a minimum, include the most recent previous appointment. A comment was raised that lecturers on an annual appointment may have been reappointed four times since their last tier advancement. Members discussed how annual appointments and time of advancement would impact the timing of faculty promotion. Concern was raised that if the tiered system is a performance evaluation there should be an evaluative process. Members discussed if the language should clarify “every four years” since the proposal is setting a threshold in what the reviews are supposed to cover. A suggestion was made to adjust the language to read:

A tier advancement should be awarded when a faculty member’s accomplishments are commensurate with that of a typical UW faculty member in the field over the course of about four years.

Members debated what an average faculty member would look like and their productivity over the course of several years. Questions were raised wondering if faculty would be entitled to tier advancements or if they will have to demonstrate that they are progressing in some way. A comment was raised noting that the tier advancement was to recognize continued high standards of work which is a relative statement on somebody’s productivity. Members discussed how to measure “accomplishment” and “continued achievement” which would define faculty moving from assistant to full professor. A comment was raised that the criteria used will be much different based on each department and their individual expectations.

Members discussed possible language to properly reflect the intent of the proposal. Concern was raised about codifying specific language in the proposal and the criteria that should be reflected in the wording. A comment was raised that some units may or may not want to stick with 4-year averages. However, the intent of the language appears to set the expectation of what a faculty member’s pace will look like over 4 years. A suggestion was raised to add language indicating that tier advancements are intended to represent a typical faculty member in their field when compared against the achievement of a comparator over the course of four years.

Subsection I (Professor Tier 7)

Members discussed whether the section should strictly denote scholarly distinction in order to achieve Professor Tier 7. A suggestion was raised to revise language to state “scholarly and teaching distinction”, or to simply remove the language. A comment was raised that the expectation of this position is to be used rarely and on an exceptional basis.

Members debated about the term “eminent professor” and other options that could be used as an alternative. A question was raised asking if this title would result in a new rank requiring a new job class code. Members agreed that the intent is not to create a new job title, but rather reward a faculty member who is entitled to be designated as an “eminent professor”.

4) 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), Alissa Ackerman, Steve Buck, Carol Landis, David Goldstein
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Ex officio representatives: Judith Henchy
Guests: Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent: **Faculty:** Gordon Watts (sabbatical), Lisa Coutu, Lea Vaughn, Margaret Adam, Kurt Johnson, Chandan Reddy
Ex officio representatives: Shannon Harris, Julian Rees, JoAnne Taricani