

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
June 6, 2014, 9:00 am – 1:00 pm  
26 Gerberding

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Review of the Minutes from May 20th
  3. Salary Transition Plan
  4. Faculty Salary Policy
  5. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to Order**

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

**2) Approval of the Minutes from May 20<sup>th</sup>**

The minutes from Minutes from May 20<sup>th</sup> were not approved due to lack of quorum.

**3) Salary Transition Plan**

Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) provided an update on the salary policy working group. During its last meeting the group did not specifically address the code changes but discussed the transition plan. The group is close to finalizing the implementation plan and there are several options to pursue:

- Executive Order
- Incorporate as part of the code changes with a sunset clause
- Class B legislation
- Administrative order from the Provost

A comment was raised expressing interest in having faculty vote on the transition plan because it will impact all faculty and they should have a voice in approving the changes. Additionally, the Senate can anticipate the potential for a number of adjudications surrounding the changes and legislation would allow an opportunity for faculty to raise objections. A suggestion was made to include both the transition plan and salary policy together because faculty will only vote on the salary policy as long as they know how the new system will impact them.

Lee discussed the main components of the transition plan:

Lee expressed a desire for a goal of AY 2014-15 to 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

Lee explained there will be a table for every department describing hiring salary and corresponding tiers allowing each faculty member to find the hypothetical estimate of their salary if they had been in the new salary system since the beginning of their UW career. If their current salary is below their hypothetical salary they can choose a lower tier to enter when the new system is in place. Members discussed the formula used in the spreadsheet. Lee explained this exercise will communicate how compressed each department is in terms of faculty salary. A comment was raised that this may encourage faculty to vote against the proposal if they believe the current system is more favorable to them.

Concern was raised that departments may be encouraged to inflate their numbers to show they are compressed. Lee explained the numbers have to be reviewed and approved by the Provost. Concern was raised about creating grounds for complaints by faculty who feel they are being discriminated against when comparing salaries. A comment was raised that in some non-departmental schools there is a wide range of salaries since faculty are being brought in from a variety of different fields, such as the I-School. Discussion moved to faculty in different ranks and where members would want to be initially placed. Concern was raised that many associate professors would try to be placed at Tier 1 in order to gain as many steps as possible during their UW career, especially if they have no intent to becoming a full professor. Lee commented there is the possibility of additional steps for the associate ranks. Discussion ensued about initial tier rankings, the impact on performance evaluations and how individual faculty members will lobby chairs for tier advancements.

Discussion moved to the assignment of the initial rotation and transition raises. Lee commented that the initial rotation will be determined by random drawing. Concern was raised about how a random drawing for initial transition raises will impact faculty retirement plans. Discussion ensued. Concern was raised that there does not seem to be a better alternative than random assignment. Watts emphasized the importance of reviewing proposed code language before deciding on this issue. Lee asked members to provide suggested alternatives.

Watts commented that FCFA should work to develop a proper way to draft the code to ensure complete transparency. Most importantly, the proposal should be drafted in order to clearly point out the “pain points” in order for faculty to fully understand the pros and cons of the new system. The solution is not

to derail the process but to present the system clearly and effectively. Members discussed how to strategically present the new system to faculty and the university.

A suggestion was made to fold the new salary policy system into a complete revision of several chapters of the code. This could entail an entire re-write of Section 24-25 which would include the new salary policy system and the transition plan. In order to properly present the code changes the council would communicate the need to reorganize the code while making key changes to the salary policy in the process. Lee stated his intent is to move forward on completely rewriting Sections 24-25 with the goal to only change content related salary policy. In order to achieve this goal Lee will need the approval of Senate leadership and require members from FCFA to assist in the drafting of the code language.

#### **4) Faculty Salary Policy**

Members discussed the key issues and concerns that were raised during the previous meeting:

##### **Section 24-32 (Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members)**

- Definition of tiers and eligibility.
  - DISCUSSION - This item was resolved since a new section dedicated to definitions will be included in the chapter.

##### **Section 24-53 (Procedure for Renewal of Appointments)**

- Subsection A
  - Whether the authority to recommend renewal expires at the end of every year.
    - DISCUSSION – Members agreed to find all cases in the Faculty Code which address current procedures to determine if 1-2 years makes sense. Variable adjustments should be determined on a 1-year cycle.
  - Monitoring issues.
    - DISCUSSION – Currently, there is no requirement to file renewals in the Secretary's office and no consequence of inaction. This could likely result in adjudications.

##### **Section 24-54 (Procedures for Promotions)**

- "At the request of faculty member" may be considered discriminatory towards women.
  - DISCUSSION - Members agreed to keep the original proposed recommendations. This could be addressed at a later time for possible code clean-up.
- Conflict with Section 24-57 (Procedural Safeguards for Promotion and Tenure Considerations).
  - DISCUSSION – Members agreed this will be addressed during the rewrite of the Faculty Code.
- Faculty mentoring through the promotion process.
  - DISCUSSION – Members agreed to have this as a future agenda item once the salary proposal has passed. A comment was raised to make this part of the recommendations for the lecturer task force.

##### **Section 24-55 (Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit) \*Entirely Removed**

- Concern about where the content was relocated.
  - DISCUSSION – Members agreed this will be addressed during the rewrite of the Faculty Code.
- Tier advancements and salary increase while serving as chairs and deans.
  - DISCUSSION – A suggestion was made to move this item to Section 24-62.J. Raises should not be directly connected to the tier system. However, they should be the same size of a tier raised so there is consistency when the faculty member completes their service. Concern was raised about faculty input. Concern was raised about partial administrative appointments. A suggestion was made that code language should define this as a 50% or greater, tier-exempt, administrative appointment designated by the Provost or dean. A suggestion was raised to place this in Section 24-62.B.7. A suggestion was raised that the administrative supervisor should consult with the department to ensure that the metric is being properly measured. A suggestion was made that the designation should occur at the time of appointment.

#### **Section 24-57 (Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations)**

- Concern about the term “safeguards” when this section is focused on the information gathering stage.
  - DISCUSSION – Members agreed this will be resolved during the rewrite of the Faculty Code.
- Subsection A
  - Question about timing of the evaluation (every 2 years for associate professors and senior lectures, every 4 years for professors and principle lecturers).
    - DISCUSSION – The timing of the evaluation is consistent with tier advancements. The issue was resolved.
- Subsection B
  - Relationship with timing of annual “Report on Activity”.
    - DISCUSSION – The Report on Activity is part of the code which can trigger a tier advancement. A comment was raised that this prevents tier advancements from falling entirely on faculty members to solicit their chairs each year. The issue was resolved.
- Consideration of salary by colleagues during the collegial review process.
  - DISCUSSION – The issues surrounding inequities in salary can be addressed by variable adjustments as described in the proposal. A suggestion was raised to add the term “when available” because the Provost has to approve salary variable adjustments.
- Subsection C
  - Documentation of career goals.
    - DISCUSSION – A suggestion was raised to change the wording to “distribution of responsibilities” since it better reflects the negotiation of career goals.
  - Whether the candidate is allowed to initiate the collegial performance review themselves.
    - DISCUSSION – A comment was raised stressing the importance of a planning conference before a collegial performance review. A suggestion was made to include a deadline for a mandatory collegial review at the 5-year mark. A suggestion was raised to cross-reference Section 24-41 to the need for a

planning conference and collegial review before an appointment is made. A suggestion was made to revisit the implications of this language regarding workload surrounding appointment renewals. A comment was raised that collegial performance reviews are detailed and does take into consideration activity reports and conferences as part of the promotion process which very detailed. Concern was raised about who this applies to. A suggestion was raised to use different examples of faculty at different stages and run through hypothetical situations.

- Take into consideration of job classifications such as lecturers with part-time appointment.
  - This issue was not addressed.
- Every faculty members should have a collegial performance review regardless of rank.
  - DISCUSSION – A suggestion was raised to add this to Section 24-60.

## OUTSTANDING ISSUES AND CONCERNS NOT DISCUSSED

### **Section 24-60 (Collegial Performance Review) \*New Section**

- Include language that this section pertains to the individual as appropriate for rank and title
- Full professor now requires review by members of equal or greater rank
- Strike the phrase “to consider reappointment of a nontenure faculty member”
- Remove bullets in the second paragraph
- Include benchmark qualifications for tiers
- Subsection A
  - Concern about the phrase “reviewers must be voting members of the department (or undepartmentalized school or college) of the individual being reviewed”.
    - There may not be enough members in certain units to conduct a review
- Subsection C
  - Using the term “must” vs. “shall”
- Whether a candidate has veto power over the chair or other committee members
- Consider changing the terms “cumulative performance” and “teaching performance”
- There is no subsection “F”
- Concern that if the committee sets its own requirements then individual units will be developing their own policies without any consistency across campus
- Subsection E
  - 3 – Rename to “planning conference” as it refers to discussion of future plans
- The allowed time for a candidate to respond during the feedback process seems to vary
- Subsection J
  - The chair’s recommendation should be shared with the candidate
- Subsection H
  - There should be language which describes where non-meritorious decisions are made
- Subsection K
  - Confusion about the role of the elected faculty council
- Subsection L
  - 1 – Language is confusing
  - The role of the dean

### **Section 24-61 (Consequences of Unsatisfactory Performance) \*New Section**

- Suggestion to reorder the first paragraph
- Suggestion to change the name of “conference”
- Adding language that a faculty member can request an ad hoc committee in the event of two consecutive determinations of unsatisfactory performance
- Question about including senior lecturers in the process
- Suggestion to strike language related to salary inequities as it does not deal with findings of unsatisfactory performance
- Question about what to do with the written report

### **Section 24-62 (Tier Advancement) \*New Section**

- Concern about how variable adjustments interact with the tier system
- Concern that tiers may create monotonic progression in terms of salaries
- Concern about enforcement implications
- Subsection A
  - Question about the number of tiers for associate/assistant professors and whether they fully describe how faculty advanced within these ranks
- Subsection C
  - Concern about Artist in Residence and Professor or Practice
- Subsection D
  - Part-time lecturers and eligibility for multi-year appointments
- Subsection E
  - Question about the term “career stage” and how it will be initially assigned
  - Concern about negotiations between the faculty member and the unit
- Subsection F
  - Concern that the initial tier is established by the dean without faculty approval
- Subsection G
  - Concern about the term “field”. Suggestion to include language regarding rank and title
- Subsection H
  - Suggestion to change language related to external letters of review for tier 7
  - Question about whether a faculty member can be hired in at a tier level 7-9
  - Concern about how this subsection affects professorship for chairs
- Concern about the title “eminent professor”
- Subsection I
  - Whether the additional tier is necessary
- Subsection J
  - Concern about the number of administrative appointments and the uncertainty if certain appointments falls under this section

### **Section 24-70 (Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles)**

- Language in the first two paragraphs is critical in determining eligibility for a raise
  - Suggestion to put the paragraphs earlier in the code as a preamble or “finding of facts”
- Concerns regarding the term “market gaps” and its ambiguity compared to other academic units
- Concern about inequity in compensation across units

- Subsection B
  - Concern about language, such as “attend”
  - 7 – Question about who decides the performance of administrators
- Subsection C
  - The term “formula” is new to the code and should be replaced
- Subsection D
  - Concern about certain units and their desire to opt out of the tier structure
- Subsection E
  - No president can permanently set a formula unless through an Executive Order.
    - Suggestion to drop the language
  - Suggestion to change language to state SCPB “advises” on the new formula
- Whether to use the term “Provost” or “President” consistently throughout this section and in the rest of the code
- Concern about the term “market adjustments” vs. “variable adjustments”.

#### **Section 24-73 (Variable Adjustments) \*New Section**

- Faculty members have the right to request the salaries of peers.
  - Suggestion was made to add this somewhere within the code.

#### **Section 24-75 (Retention Increases) \*New Section**

- Concern whether this section has the incentive to discourage the normal use of retention raises
  - Suggestion to add a sentence that retention raises should not be used under normal circumstances, only as an exception.
- Concern about preemptive retention vs. responsive retention raises

#### **Outstanding Issues and Concerns**

- How often a committee can re-vote on a merit increase
- Concern about what may be adjudicated as a result of these changes
- Suggestion to move the entire Section 24-62 (Tier Advancement) and become 24-46
- Suggestion to create a new chapter starting with Section 24-70 (Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles)
  - Section 24-70 is solely focused on the salary system and should be separated
- Suggestion that Section 24-50 (Conflict of Interest) should be move to the beginning of the entire Chapter 24
- Suggestion to create a new section that deals primarily with academic freedom
- Suggestion to move Chapter 25 elsewhere in the code
- Suggestion to rewrite the entire Chapter 24
- Suggestion to modify Section 24-70.B.7 (Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles) to connect with Section 24.60 (Collegial Performance Review)
- Suggestion to broaden Section 24.60 (Collegial Performance Review) so it clearly applies to performance of non-tier eligible faculty
- Sequencing subsections correctly

#### **5) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Watts at 1:00 p.m.

---

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

**Present:**       **Faculty:** Watts (Chair), Buck, Janes, Landis.  
                  **President's Designee:** Cameron  
                  **Ex-Officio Reps:** n/a  
                  **Guest:** Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate), Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

**Absent:**       **Faculty:** Adam, Johnson, O'Brien, Stygall, Vaughn  
                  **Ex-Officio Reps:** Zanotto, Henchy, Rees