

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
October 28, 2014
11am – 12:30pm
Gerberding 142

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from October 14, 2014
 3. Salary policy language
 4. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

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

2) Review of minutes from October 14, 2014

The minutes from October 14, 2014 were approved as written.

3) Salary policy language

Janes reported on the recent senate meeting in which Jack Lee (immediate past-chair of the Faculty Senate) and Bob Stacey (Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences) discussed the salary policy proposal. There were a number of concerns and questions that were raised which highlighted some difficulties of the proposal. Janes interpreted the concerns as a result of several details of the plan (impact of incoming grants, fixing inequities that currently exist, implementation) and whether or not the proposal is worth fixing the current system. Comments have arisen questioning whether this new system would actually allow the university to attract and retain the best faculty.

Janes explained that senate leadership will begin studying effective mechanisms to conduct outreach to the faculty community which may result in public forums and online discussions. Killien commented that faculty leadership is interested in any suggestions from the council on how to conduct the public outreach. Janes mentioned that during the senate meeting members were encouraged to discuss the proposal with their constituents and report back to the senate office.

A comment was raised that in personal discussions with colleagues concern has been raised about the complexity of the proposal. However, in reviewing the proposal it is clear that the primary concern is not the complexity, but rather a clear paradigm shift from the current system. A comment was raised that there is concern about the increase workload in conducting merit reviews compared to the current process, as well as creating a post-tenure review process. Janes explained that a user guide will be created to easily communicate the process. Members discussed their personal experiences with communicating the proposal to their colleagues. A comment was raised that these discussions are useful for some departments even if the proposal is not approved.

Section 24-35 (Tiers and tier advancement) *Proposed*

Janes clarified that this proposed language incorporates language that is currently in the Faculty Code.

Discussion ensued about the term “continuing excellent performance” in subsection A. Questions were raised about what “excellence” and “performance” actually means in relation to the tiered system. Members discussed the comparisons between “meritorious” and “excellence”. A comment was raised that the proposal is trying to move away from the concept of merit and focus on productivity. The issue is conceptually difficult as it will eventually identify the type of performance that will influence tier advancements. A suggestion was raised to change the term to “sustained high level of performance”.

Killien emphasized that her worry is how this system will result in adjudications and stressed the importance that the code provide language provide unit-based criteria for what is expected in a faculty member’s given field and department. The intent is to make the process fair and equitable, and in order to accomplish that there needs to be a standard that provides motivation and feedback for faculty who move through the system. Janes noted that this issue is also addressed in portions of the proposal which covers the collegial review process. Discussion ensued about the connection between the two sections of the code.

A suggestion was raised to include an adjudication panel and hearing officer as part of the implementation plan due to the possible adjudications that will result from the new system. A comment was raised stressing the importance in ensuring consistency of terms throughout the entirety of the proposal. Discussion ensued about the structure of the proposal itself to maintain consistency with legislative standards. A suggestion was raised to bring concerns about the code structure to Rebecca Deardorff and focus on the content of the proposal during council meetings. Discussion ensued comparing the structure of the code versus defining content.

Discussion ensued about how tiers are described based on value and functionality. A comment was raised that this first sentence is redundant with future sections. Killien stressed the importance on defining what the tiers will be based on. Discussion ensued about using the terms “applicable” and “given field”. A comment was raised expressing confusion about what “field” means. Discussion ensued about the impacts of this language on non-departmentalized schools. Concern was raised that non-departmentalized schools contain a mix of faculty with diverse academic backgrounds with no consistent standard of achievement. Members discussed their personal experiences. There are variations between units when comparing faculty against one another. A suggestion was raised to replace “a given field” with “their appointing unit”. Members agreed on the following language:

“Tiers are levels within ranks and titles that reflect achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and/or service, commensurate with the expectation for faculty members with a given rank and title in their appointing unit, as fully described below”.

Discussion ensued about including professor of practice (PoP) and clinical faculty in the list of professorial ranks (subsection B). A suggestion was raised to change the term “ranks” to “titles”. Members discussed the differences between associate professor and professor tenure-track who are brought and require a mandatory tenure decision. PoP appointments can range from 1 -5 years and can be renewable. Members discussed whether language addressing PoP appointments should be folded into current language in the proposal or added as a new paragraph. A comment was raised that clinical positions are clarified in the code as annual appointments which are renewable each year, so they

would not be impacted by the new salary policy system. A comment was raised stressing the importance in making this clear to the School of Medicine.

Discussion moved to associate professor and professor without tenure (WOT). A comment was raised that WOT appointments are made as initial 3-year appointments. However, a second reappointment requires a mandatory review in year 5 to determine if the candidate is awarded tenure. Members discussed if this should be covered under the language within the proposal. A comment was raised that WOT looks like an assistant professor except it is more senior and there is no immediate promotion along with tenure. Concern was raised that an adjudication may result if a WOT faculty member receives tenure but not a tier advancement. A suggestion was raised about adding language that an appointment does, or does not, result in a tier advancement. A suggestion was raised to add language indicating WOT faculty are “eligible” for appointment. Concern was raised noting that it becomes strange if a faculty member receives tenure but not a tier advancement. Members discussed whether WOT should be acknowledged with a tier increase when awarded tenure. Janes noted that Cameron will draft a sentence for subsection G (assistant professors) that can be reviewed by the council.

Discussion moved to part-time lecturers and their eligibility for multiple year appointments. The changes impact subsection E (eligibility for tier advancements) which defines who is eligible for the tiered system. Killien explained that as a result of the lecturer task force part-time lecturers that were competitively hired should be eligible to the same type of privileges as full-time lectures who are also competitively hired. Concern was raised that the university could have a competitively-hired lecturer who teaches one course per quarter but is also on the tiered system. Discussion ensued about code language which points to 50% full-time status and competitive recruitment for part-time lecturers which may result in multi-year appointments. At this time the provost is still reviewing the recommendations from the lecturer task forces on how to proceed. A suggestion was raised to deal with the lecturer issue once the terms are finally decided.

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, Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, David Goldstein, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Lea Vaughn

President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron

Ex officio representatives: Judith Henchy, Shannon Harris

Guests: Marcia Killien

Absent: **Faculty:** Gordon Watts (sabbatical), Lisa Coutu

Ex officio representatives: Julian Rees, JoAnne Taricani