

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
May 20, 2014, 11:00 am – 3:00 pm
36 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from April 1st, April 15th and April 29th
 3. Review of Outstanding Issues and Concerns
 4. Salary Policy Discussion
 5. Executive Order 64 (Financial Standards for Faculty Salary Policy)
 6. Salary Policy Discussion - Continued
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by acting Chair Janes at 11:00 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from April 1st, April 15th and April 29th

The minutes from Minutes from April 1st, April 15th and April 29th were approved as written.

3) Review of Outstanding Issues and Concerns

Janes explained that he is serving as acting-chair for Watts who will be late to the meeting. Janes explained the intent of the first part of the meeting is to quickly move through the salary proposal to identify issues and concerns that needed to be addressed in more detail, including the draft Executive Order 64.

Below is a summary of the issues and concerns that were raised (by Section):

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

- Definition of tiers and eligibility

Section 24-53 (Procedure for Renewal of Appointments)

- Subsection A
 - The method in which academic units currently delegate authority to recommend renewal
 - Whether the authority to recommend renewal expires at the end of every year
 - Monitoring issues

Section 24-54 (Procedures for Promotions)

- “At the request of faculty” may be considered discriminatory towards women
- Conflict with Section 24-57 (Procedural Safeguards for Promotion and Tenure Considerations)
- Faculty mentoring through the promotion process

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

- Concern about where the content was relocated
- Tier advancements and salary increase while serving as chairs and deans

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. Suggested change to “process for promotion”.
- 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)
- Subsection B
 - Relationship with timing of annual “Report on Activity”
- Consideration of salary by colleagues during the collegial review process
- Subsection C
 - Documentation of career goals
 - Whether the candidate is allowed to initiate the collegial performance review themselves
 - Take into consideration of job classifications such as lecturers with part-time appointment
 - Every faculty members should have a collegial evaluation regardless of rank
- Scholarship/research is not mentioned

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

4) Salary Policy Discussion

Watts asked members if they felt that this proposal is going in the right direction. A comment was raised indicating this creates a steady career path for those considered meritorious. Concern was raised that the initial tier assignment will be the focal point for future dispute and it is important to develop a transition plan alongside the new salary proposal. Given the complexity of this new system it is very important to effectively communicate the benefits of this plan. Additionally, this system introduces new concepts in terms of promotion and raises that faculty may find intimidating. A comment was raised suggesting that preemptive retention offers will still occur despite the other mechanisms that will be worked into the new system.

Members discussed the likelihood of increasing faculty workload in conducting merit reviews. A comment was raised that the number of actual candidates reviewed each year will reduce, but the attention to each specific candidate will increase. It is important to understand how each unit will operate differently when implementing the new policy. A comment was raised asking whether it is worth implementing this policy in order to resolve the compression issue and if it truly addresses inequities. Lee explained the new system would provide more flexible tools for dealing with existing compression when money is available. A comment was raised that the complexity of the system may be an advantage because it would make it more difficult for the administration to pull out of their commitment to provide raises. Watts indicated this policy can be beneficial in solving inequities in salary.

5) Executive Order 64 (Financial Standards for Faculty Salary Policy)

A question was raised about the transition to biweekly paychecks. Lee clarified that the new Human Resources payroll system wants to change to issuing paycheck every two weeks, rather than twice per month. Watts explained that monthly paychecks are more difficult to compute when dealing with hourly wages which is the reason for the switch. Watts added that Human Resources will remove the delay in implementing raises.

#3: Advancement in Tiers within Ranks

A question was raised about research faculty and how they fit into this section of the EO. Researchers have tiers, but the EO used tenured and WOT professors as benchmarks to explain how the cap would be implemented. Members discussed the implications of this policy. A comment was raised that faculty with high salaries will not get tier advancement and will likely impact the School of Medicine more than

other units. Lee explained that after careful modeling of departments over the span of 10 years the cost to the School of Medicine was affordable. Discussion ensued about the cap and its impact on professional schools and the School of Medicine. Members agreed they are comfortable with this language.

#4: Market Adjustments

Members discussed the use of the United States Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). Lee explained the argument against using Seattle's CPI was due to the fact UW is competing in a national market. Additionally, Lee felt that using an index that is larger makes it more likely the system will continue to push UW in a direction that faculty want to move. As long as the administration is willing to use CPI-U Lee feels comfortable in using it.

#5: Postponements and Modifications

Concern was raised regarding the phrase: "The receipt of any salary increase under the Faculty Salary Policy is expressly subject to the University's right to modify the terms of the Policy at any time before paying such an increase, in accord with the provisions of Faculty Code Sections 24-70D and 24-70E."

6) Salary Policy Discussion - Continued

Killien asked if anyone has looked at what aspects of the code may be adjudicated as a result of the changes. Lee said the issue was not discussed.

Members discussed the definition of tiers. A suggestion was made to retitle Chapter 24 to reflect the tiered system. Members discussed separating the sections related to salary from the appointment and promotion process as these appear to be separate issues. Lee explained that salary still intertwines with the tiered system, so they are appropriate to have together. Members discussed if Chapter 24 should be written as two separate chapters. A comment was raised expressing the complexity of the issue because the merit review process overlaps both salary and appointment/promotion. A suggestion was made to create a more cohesive numbering system. Discussion ensued about rearranging sections within Chapter 24, including Sections 50, 51, 52 and 57. A suggestion was raised to ask Rebecca Deardorff (UW Rules Coordinator) to use a 24-100 numbering system.

A suggestion was made to rewrite the entire Chapter 24 from the beginning. A follow-up suggestion was made to vote on the content of the changes now with the promise to come back and reorganize the sections later. Watts explained that FCFA's effort to make minor housekeeping changes to the Faculty Code, which was supposed to be very simple, turned into a large project which required a lot of work. Additionally, reorganizing the entire Chapter 24 would cause a ripple effect throughout the rest of the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued about rearranging sections within Chapter 24 and specific placement of particular sections. Watts encouraged members to spend time reorganizing sections after the meeting.

A suggestion was made to create a preamble section with language from Section 24-70.A. A suggestion was made to create an entirely new chapter beginning with Section 24.70. A suggestion was made to create a new section focused primarily on academic freedom. Concern was raised that Chapter 25 (Tenure of the Faculty) is redundant and overlaps with Chapter 24 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members).

Watts stated he wants to avoid changing other chapters in the code when dealing strictly with merit tiers and salary policy. A comment was raised that for the sake of transparency faculty need one part of the code they can review when filing a grievance. A suggestion was raised to combine Chapters 24 and 25. Watts restated his concern to avoid becoming too involved in reorganizing the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued about reorganizing the Faculty Code and if it may be good public relations by creating more transparency.

Watts suggested that a task force could work over the summer to identify new section headings to determine how much work will be involved. Watts stressed that he is nervous about the amount of time left to prepare this proposal for submission to the next Senate Executive Committee meeting next fall. Discussion ensued about whether the proposal will be fully developed by the end of the summer. A comment was raised commending the fundamental structure of the proposal but expressed interest in starting from a clean slate. The content is about 80% complete and most of the work would just be repositioning the pieces together.

Members discussed the timeframe in completing the salary proposal. Killien explained that the proposal should incorporate the outcomes resulting from the lecturer committees along with a transition plan. Killien explained that faculty will not likely approve this proposal without a clear transition policy. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised expressing doubt the proposal will be in any shape for the first Senate Executive Committee meeting in the fall. Discussion moved to identifying new section headings for the proposal.

A question was raised asking who is not eligible for tier advancements. Members discussed the lecturer task force and the difficulty in addressing competitively and non-competitively hired lectures. A member commented that raises for lecturers are decided by the chair. Members discussed the collegial performance review and the possible reaction from the School of Medicine.

Watts suggested it would be in the best interest for FCFA to schedule another long meeting to discuss salary policy. Lee mentioned that he would like to publish another version of the salary policy soon to distribute amongst that faculty. There are many misunderstandings about the current proposal and Lee feels this would address the confusion. Watts disagreed saying the recent discussions of reorganizing the entire Chapter 24 would be even more confusing. Watts is not sure the code is yet speaking to the intent of the proposal. A suggestion was made to distribute the proposal to the faculty once it is 85% complete for comments and feedback. Additionally, FCFA could provide a transition plan with a FAQ sheet. FCFA would receive feedback and then submit the proposal to the Senate Executive Committee in the fall.

Watts suggested finding a new time to meet. In the meantime Watts will work to draft new section headings and circulate it amongst the group for feedback.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Watts at 3:00 p.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Gordon (Chair), Adam, Buck, Janes, Landis, Stygall, Vaughn
Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy

Guest: Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate), Kate O'Neill (Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate), Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent:

Faculty: Johnson, O'Brien

President's Designee: Cameron

Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto, Rees