

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
May 22, 2014, 9:00 am – 10:30 am
Gerberding 36

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Introductions
 3. Review of the Minutes from April 24, 2014
 4. Chair's Report – End of Quarter/Summer Council Activities
 5. Trends in Faculty Rank/Demographics Across the Three Campuses
 6. Faculty Salary Proposal Review
 7. Adjourn
-

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Erdly at 9:00 a.m.

2. Introductions

Members introduced themselves to the council.

3. Review of the Minutes from April 24, 2014

The minutes from April 24, 2014 were approved as written.

4. Chair's Report – End of Quarter/Summer Council Activities

Erdly reported he is working on the annual report and will identify issues to be discussed next year. This has been a record year for new degree approvals and Erdly thanked the subcommittee for all their hard work. Erdly mentioned there were a number of challenging reviews on certain items, such as formatting DL degrees and other issues related to the notification of intent process. Erdly mentioned that the subcommittee will likely meet soon to prepare legislation that outlines the new process.

5. Trends in Faculty Rank/Demographics Across the Three Campuses

Erdly reported on the recent Faculty Senate meeting which discussed faculty demographics and mentioned that UW Bothell and Tacoma were prominently displayed. Faculty demographics created a great deal of discussion and there are many questions as to why demographics are so poor at UW.

A comment was raised stressing the importance of understanding whether the problem lies on the type of candidates applying to UW, or hiring trends. It is important to know the distinction between the two in order to remedy the problem. For example, if there are plenty of applicants but UW cannot hire them, then the administration needs better packages to attract them. If not enough are applying then UW needs to conduct more outreach. A comment was raised pointing out that the problem will also be different across different campuses and disciplines.

A question was raised asking if there is any detail about applicant pools and who moves through the interview process. Harrington explained that when a candidate applies they fill out a demographic survey which is sent to UW. The search committee never sees this survey, and once the search is winding down UW can review a summary of the applicants. Harrington noted that in most cases there are very few, if any, candidates who submit demographic information. Most often UW is left with anecdotal information, such as departments getting outbid by peer institutions who are throwing money to diversify their faculty. A comment was raised that in absence of better information the best course of action is to identify best practices at all levels of the process. Discussion ensued about inequity in pay between men and women. A comment was raised that the new tableau site will be available sometime next year and the council will be able to study the available data.

A comment was raised stating another metric that can be used is studying the rate in the candidates who accept the first offer. Anecdotally, UW rarely gets its first choice. A comment was raised that UW Libraries is also struggling to be competitive in recruiting top candidates. For example, UW librarians are receiving lower offers compared to community colleges. Discussion ensued. Loss in competitiveness is a direct result of the past salary freezes and no cost of living adjustments.

Discussion moved to the hiring of lecturers compared to tenure-track faculty. Harrington noted that UW-Tacoma once relied on lecturer appointments early on as the campus began to grow. Currently, UW-Tacoma is working to reduce the number of 1-year positions and hiring for more long-term appointments. Harrington added this is consistent with UW moving from the practice of using non-competitively hired to competitively hired positions. However, professional programs do rely on part-time positions that teach narrowly-focused courses but cannot be hired on as part-time faculty. Discussion moved to affiliate faculty. A comment was raised that affiliate faculty are not counted as part-time unless they teach and are paid part-time.

Discussion moved to lecturers at UW-Bothell. UW has been paying close attention to the distribution of full and part-time faculty. Similar to UW-Tacoma, UW-Bothell hired for many part-time positions during the growth area but is making substantial improvements in creating more full-time, multi-year positions available. Additionally, some of the part-time faculty are being considered for these new positions as well.

A comment was raised expressing interest if there is specific optimum level or threshold for contingent faculty versus tenure-track faculty. Lee explained that the use of non-competitively hired lecturer positions will eventually disappear. While the type of professor is not located in the Faculty Code there will be need for the classification to allow for flexibility in hiring. However, the term "non-competitively hired" will likely be replaced with a different title. Lee clarified that part-time is categorized as less than 100%. A comment was raised expressing interest to review the breakout of part-time faculty rather than being lumped together. Lee explained the new human resources payroll system will be able to access this data. In order to have influence on determining the percentage of part-time lecturers in a department the Faculty Senate would be able to pressure the Provost. However, Lee pointed out that at the departmental level faculty vote on new hires, so ultimately it is up to the individual unit to make those decisions. Jeffords mentioned that the Provost has already put pressure on UW-Bothell and they are already paying attention to the lecturer issue. A question was raised asking if UW-Bothell has a target. Jeffords explained that UW-Tacoma had a retreat in the fall and agreed on a target for 60% tenure-track, 30% lecturer and 10% other. Jeffords added that much of their resources are ending up in operations to pay for facilities as part of their expansion. Harrington explained that UW-Tacoma is still

figuring out its long-term academic plans. Once that is finalized UW-Tacoma will then review each program and unit to determine their growth and realities.

Erdly suggested that faculty leaders from UW Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma should put together a statement about where things are going and summarize the faculty perspective while outlining strategies for the three campuses.

6. Faculty Salary Proposal Review

Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) provided a summary of the recent faculty salary proposal. Lee explained the salary system should be seen as a function as time-to-degree. When reviewing peer salaries faculty at the end of their career have approximately twice the salary of incoming assistant professors. However, the ratio of retiring/new faculty at UW is 1.5:1. Lee explained that in addition to not having enough money in the system the distribution of salaries is not effective at providing reliable growth over a career. While the salary policy will not fix the financial problem it will fix the distribution of salary raises.

Lee discussed the four pillars of the proposed faculty salary system:

- Rank promotion raises
- Tiers within ranks
- Market adjustments
- Variable adjustments

Rank Promotion Raises

The rank promotion raise would increase to 12% to more closely match peer salaries.

Tiers within Ranks

Professorial ranks will be divided into several “tiers”:

- Assistant Professor 1,2
- Associate Professor 1,2,3
- Professor 1,2,3,4,5,6; and 7,8,9 (to be called “eminent prof”)
- Similar tiers in the Lecturer ranks

Lee explained the system is not meant to be an entitlement system. Rather, the salary policy is to promote excellence. The goal is to move from annual evaluations that lead to small raises to a 4-year cycle with significant performance raises. Lee explained the result of the performance review could result in:

- Recommendation for tier advancement
- Initiation of consideration for rank promotion
- Finding of unsatisfactory performance
- Satisfactory, but no tier advancement at the present time

Lee explained the highest performing faculty will get tier advancements more often than every 4 years, some other less often. Each tier advancement would come with the following raise:

- 8% of the UW average (\$125,000 in AY2012-13) for faculty whose salaries are above UW full professor average.
- 8% of the individual's salary for those below the UW average.

Lee explained that in order to prevent exponential salary growth, once an individual's salary reaches the average UW full professor's salary (\$125,000) tier raises are calculated by the UW average, not their individual salary. For example, raises become larger until the individual hits \$125,000. From that point on salary raises become linear.

A question was raised asking how far up the approval must go. Lee explained the raises must be approved by the dean since they has discretion over the budget. A question was raised is a candidate can skip a tier advancement. Lee explained this would result in a double tier promotion and there is nothing to prevent that in the code. A question was raised how the criteria is established. Lee explained there is not set criteria associated with tiers or salary, and once the system is in place the only criterion in the code is that tier advancements should happen when you accomplished what is expected of a typical UW faculty member over a 4-year period. For example, a Professor 3 represents someone who has been a professor at UW for 8 years.

Market Adjustments

Market adjustments are awarded annually to each faculty member whose last performance review was satisfactory. The percentage raise is usually equal to the percent increase in the CPI during the past year, which is about 3% per year from 1983-2008. Since 2008 the percent increase was approximately 1.5%.

Variable Adjustments

Variable adjustments can be used in any way the unit sees fit. For example, a college could provide raises across the board, use it to address inequities, or focus on unit adjustments to target specific departments. After reviewing the University of California (UC) system which uses a step system the salary policy group decided on a tiered system because of the continuous alterations to the UC system. However, a tiered system will create inequities for faculty who are at the same level. In order to address inequities the salary policy group suggested variable adjustments to fix this issue. A question was raised asking if there are best practices in order to appropriately use variable adjustments. Lee explained the salary policy group will develop a user's guide to help units implement the variable adjustments.

The Cost

Lee explained the new salary system would be funded without additional revenue. Lee presented two alternatives to the salary system.

Minimum investment to run the system and not fall behind (without variable adjustments):

- 1.8% Cost of tier and promotion raises
- 1.5% Market adjustment (current rate of CPI increase)
- 0% Variable adjustment

- -0.8% Retirement recapture
- = 2.5% Additional permanent funds each year (CPI + 1%)

Strategic investment to close the gap in 6 years (with variable adjustments):

- 1.8% Cost of tier and promotion raises
 - 1.5% Market adjustment (current rate of CPI increase)
 - 2% Variable adjustment (distributed to departments depending on gaps)
 - -0.8% Retirement recapture
- = 4.5% Additional permanent funds each year (CPI + 3%)

As Lee explained, including 2% variable adjustments the new salary system would be able to close the gap between UW and its peers within 6 years. Once that is complete Lee explained that retirement recapture would be able to fully cover tier and promotion raises:

- 1.8% Cost of tier and promotion raises
 - 3% Market adjustment (estimated long-term rate of CPI increase)
 - 1% Variable adjustment (assuming peer salary trend continues)
 - -1.8% Retirement recapture
- = 4% additional permanent funds each year (CPI + 1%)

The Transition

Lee explained that the AY 2014-15 will be the transition year with the new salary system beginning Fall 2015. Lee explained that the transition plan will allow flexibility for departments to design their initial tier system but require staggered review cycles. The initial tier will be somewhere between the following values:

- Seniority-based tier (based on years in rank)
- Salary-based tier (based on what current salary would represent)

Based on the assignment of initial rotation and transition raise, the salary policy group suggests:

- Transition raise of 2% if the mandatory review year is 2015-16
- Transition raise of 4% if the mandatory review year is 2016-17
- Transition raise of 6% if the mandatory review year is 2017-18
- Transition raise of 8% if the mandatory review year is 2018-19

The final step of the transition would be phasing in rank promotion raises:

- 9% in Fall 2014
- 11% in Fall 2015
- 12% thereafter

Discussion ensued about where faculty might fall in and how they might choose their tier leave. A question was raised about how retention raises will work in the new system. Lee explained that when

implemented, retention raises should be incorporated into tier advancements as part of the new system.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Erdly at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Crowder, Kucher, Mobus
President's Designee: Moy, Jeffords, Harrington
Ex Officio: Resnick, McKinley, Deardorff, Leadley

Absent: **Faculty:** Dolsak, Endicott-Popovsky
Ex Officio: O'Neill, Brown, Fridley, Taricani