

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

**Meeting synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Introductions
  3. Plan for the upcoming academic year
  4. Review of the minutes from May 20<sup>th</sup> and June 6<sup>th</sup>
  5. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

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

**2) Introductions**

Members introduced themselves to the council.

**3) Plan for the upcoming academic year**

Faculty Senate Chair Kate O’Neill was present to discuss plans for the upcoming academic year. O’Neill reported on the salary policy proposal and the work done over the last two years. O’Neill recently worked over the summer with Janes, Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien, and immediate-past Faculty Senate Chair Jack Lee to address outstanding issues with the proposal. O’Neill stressed that FCFA is an important body in vetting the proposal and FCFA’s judgment is important in deciding if the proposal goes forward. Lee is currently presenting the proposal with different stakeholder groups across campus in order to educate the community about the impacts of the proposed salary system. O’Neill commented that due to the slow senate process FCFA would have to act and provide the senate with a proposal no later than the beginning of spring quarter. This would require submitting the proposal to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) which will determine if it should go forward to the senate, or back to FCFA for further work. In order for the proposal to be submitted on time for senate approval the proposal must be completed in the middle of winter quarter.

O’Neill suggested that if the salary policy proposal is completed FCFA could address other outstanding issues, such as changes to the Faculty Code with respect to instructional faculty titles. O’Neill explained this issue will address how the university hires, retains and promotes instructional faculty. There is a lot of diversity in the instructional faculty ranks and it is important to provide a clear designation within the code.

A question was raised asking if there has been support for the salary policy proposal as a result of Lee’s outreach to the university community. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that there has been a mixed response and it is important for FCFA to discuss the fundamental merits of the policy. O’Neill does not expect FCFA to draft the actual policy, but to review the major aspects of the policy issues that may

result. If the council is supportive of the proposal then it would be important to develop the code language in time for consideration at SEC and senate. A comment was raised that in speaking with colleagues in the School of Nursing faculty either do not understand the implications of the policy or they are highly skeptical of the proposal due to the massive change to the current system. It was pointed out that supporting/rejecting the proposal depends on where one sits in rank or how close a faculty member is to retirement.

Janes reiterated the statement that FCFA is only concerned about the policy-level issues of the proposal at this time. For example, Jack Lee and Bob Stacey, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, will be at the next meeting to discuss the policy issues rather than focus on the mechanics of the policy. From discussions like these FCFA will have to determine if this policy is desirable in which code language will be proposed. Janes stressed that this proposal has many moving pieces and must go through many steps before it is approved. Janes emphasized that his goal is to ensure each body reviewing the proposal reaches a consensus in approving the new salary system to ensure people are comfortable with the changes being made.

A question was raised asking what the important driving issues are that requires a change from the current salary system. A comment was raised that the proposal is designed to steer university resources into compensating long term, highly productive and loyal faculty. The policy is designed to shift more of whatever resources the UW does have into a predictable merit system based on tier advancement and diminish reliance on retention raises. Additionally, the policy is to address compression issues where certain mid-career faculty salaries are flat-lined. O'Neill commented that the proposed tiered system would create a culture change that would be beneficial for faculty in the long term. However, the proposal hinges on whether this is determined to be the appropriate method to achieve the desired objectives. O'Neill commented that in addition to the changes in the review process faculty would have to weigh in on the transition process, along with possible "off ramps" if the university's funding drops off.

Janes mentioned that work over the summer did not result in substantial changes to the substance of the policy. One possibility is to merge chapters 24 and 25 into a single section that addresses the full life of a faculty member, such as: appointment, academic freedom, tenure, review issues, salary, ranks, titles, tiers and resignation. The merging of the two chapters has not been officially proposed but is still open for discussion for FCFA to review. Discussion ensued about version control and ensuring there is an orderly process to manage the multiple drafts distributed amongst members.

Concern was raised that the council has done a great deal of work and rejecting the proposal would be a disservice to past efforts. A comment was raised that the salary working group has found several complications as the proposal continues to be vetted. It is important to acknowledge FCFA's work from last year but the impact of the policy will have costs and benefits to certain people which requires a second look. A comment was raised that since the proposal will go to the entire faculty for an up or down vote it is important to carefully vet the proposal at every stage. Discussion ensued about the role of the faculty senate and the duty of each senator to engage with their colleagues to educate faculty about the proposal and solicit feedback on outstanding issues and concerns. A comment was raised stating that since FCFA is not representative of the entire faculty body it is important to listen to feedback from constituents and the broader faculty. A question was raised asking if FCFA's constituents include just the schools and colleges each member represents. Killien emphasized the role of the council is to think of the general welfare of the university and faculty as a whole.

Killien noted that in addition to salary policy another issue FCFA will have to address is the revision of the adjudication policy as well as the RCEP process. Both topics have issues that need to be resolved and Killien hopes that FCFA will have the opportunity to address the concerns. Janes suggested that a small working group may be able to take on the issues, such as those members who are not able to attend meetings on a regular basis.

Henchy requested the council address the status of librarians. Janes suggested the topic could be discussed later in the academic year once the council has time to focus on issues other than salary policy.

#### **4) Review of minutes from May 20<sup>th</sup> and June 6<sup>th</sup>**

The minutes from May 20<sup>th</sup> and June 6<sup>th</sup> were approved as amended. Goldstein abstains.

#### **5) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Janes at 12:20pm.

---

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

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Janes (chair), Buck, Goldstein, Johnson, Landis, Vaughn  
                          **Ex officio representatives:** Henchy  
                          **President's designee:** Cameron  
                          **Guests:** Kate O'Neill (Faculty Senate chair), Marcia Killien (secretary of the faculty)

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Watts (sabbatical), Ackerman, Adam, Reddy  
                          **Ex officio representatives:** Taricani, Rees