

unit salary adjustment is the Academic Program Review. Is it fair to ask departments to wait ten years to be evaluated, if there is no other pathway to the adjustment process?

Where conditions warrant, said Steve Olswang, some units have been reviewed out of their ten-year cycle. The School of Nursing, which has been ranked first in the nation for years despite substantially lower salaries than its peers, was reviewed and awarded a unit salary adjustment before their review would normally have been done. This, however, is extremely rare.

In response to Marilyn Roberts' question about the weight of national rankings, Friedman said that considering national rankings alone would be a violation of the kind of conversation that occurs in the Academic Program Review, where many measures of quality are used. Roberts asked what other criteria might be considered outside the ten-year cycle to bring to light undervalued units. Friedman responded that the Academic Program Review isn't just about undervalued units, but is more about high-level review of units and their strategic direction.

Olswang said one of the important ways the Academic Review ties into unit salary adjustment issues - whether or not there should be an expectation that everyone has a fair shot at a salary adjustment - is that it's built into the system. However, not every unit is extraordinarily qualified compared to its peers, or has an extremely disparate salary compared to both its local and national peers - the two features that would combine to warrant a unit adjustment.

Friedman said that the Academic Program Review reveals the help a unit most needs to achieve excellence; there is an exceptionally high bar for unit salary adjustments.

Haley said he had concerns about timing issues for unit salary adjustments - what triggers an adjustment, how does it occur, and if a particular unit is awarded an adjustment in a year when there is no money, what happens?

Friedman responded that the decision should be made regardless of money, and that is true not just for salary adjustments but for all things having to do with help for a unit. Many units need more "X" - graduate fellowships, operating money, salary money, etc. If there is no money available when a need is identified, the unit goes on a queue. Everyone in the Provost's office, said Friedman, is alert to opportunities that arise to help units get what they need; the Academic Program Review identifies those priorities. "Units should not in any way consider themselves harmed by lack of money," said Friedman.

Olswang added that the Code was changed to take away the funding element when it comes to individual promotions - you shall receive - and this has been the President's commitment for 7.5% for promotion. Unit adjustments are a "may" receive.

In general discussion, Kirtley wondered what happens when the unfunded unit salary adjustments go into a queue. "It seems that there's a problem of an ever-lengthening queue," he commented. Katherine Graubard observed that a tremendous amount of work goes into these reviews and that the information should be used as a tool for the development office. In her view, the review should always be coordinated with the development office, so worthy units get a development person to help them get things the University doesn't have the resources to provide, but which could conceivably come from outside donors.

Olswang noted that, between the Academic Program Reviews and the accreditation process, the administration reviews 25 UW segments annually. In each review, issues of support and salary support come up. In the last three years, only three or four units (of approximately 75 reviewed), have received a unit salary adjustment, said Olswang, so these adjustments are truly extraordinary.

The Academic Program Review, said Friedman, looks at faculty participation and particularly the state of mentoring of junior faculty. Problems here reveal problems with unit faculty in general, which must be corrected within 60 days.

Haley asked to what extent reviewers at the University level are looking at existing overall programs to determine whether we are doing, and doing well, everything we should be doing. In addition, does anyone review University programs to make sure we're not doing things we shouldn't be doing?

The first is important, said Friedman, and the second is difficult. The reviews give us time to think about what and how well we're doing. And there are good reasons to be cautious about "taking away" too quickly. The more things get busy, Friedman observed, the more we worry about whether we're doing the right things. And particularly with the new development plans, it's important that we do the right things. Even if we can't answer the question perfectly, it's a question we continue to ask.

Barbara Krieger-Brockett asked how and when faculty epiphanies and ideas are taken into account. Friedman cited the Tools for Transformation program as important in this process.

{NOTE: The Tools for Transformation Website can be found at <http://www.washington.edu/change/index.html#tft>

and includes the following description:

In order to allow programmatic change to go from isolated examples to a way of life at the UW, the Tools for Transformation program was established. These resource and management tools are intended to enable departments and programs to respond to new challenges and to remove impediments to change, in order to achieve institutional and unit goals.

When reviews are done, Friedman said, faculty and senior observers bring forth an array of ideas modest to large - Tools for Transformation provides a mechanism for implementation. Impacts to the budget tend not to be great, but the evidence over the three years of the program shows the ideas that are implemented do make a difference.

Carol Green asked whether it is really practical to have another trigger for unit salary reviews besides the ten-year review. Friedman responded that the Academic Program Review (ten-year review) is tremendously important and should be protected - she worries about adding other triggers, fearing they would have to closely duplicate the Academic Program Review in order to convince the Committee on Planning and Budgeting of their importance. If a department is in distress, she said, there are ways for deans to bring this to the attention of the Provost. Units can also ask to have their review accelerated, or postponed, by a year.

Olswang said he did not see the need for a Code provision stating that a unit salary review shall be done, since there are already several ways to accomplish this. In addition to being part of Academic Program Reviews, unit adjustment reviews can be done

- in extraordinary situations (such as Nursing)
- as part of mergers
- by request of a department chair who asks for a unit adjustment on behalf of his or her faculty. Requests from a chair are routinely routed back to deans for assessment and a statement of support - in the two instances where this was done, the requests were not supported by the dean.
-

Olswang asked the Council to consider, as part of its deliberations on this issue, whether there is an indication that units have not had a fair shot at a unit salary adjustment. Friedman concurred that an additional trigger needs to be looked at only if a fairness issue is involved.

Dan Luchtel commented that the issue is not whether the reviews are fair - the issue is who gets reviewed, how they get reviewed, and when they get reviewed. Luchtel asked how accessible the results of Academic Program Reviews are - Friedman responded that the reports are not online, but are public records and can be put online. Roberts said both the results and the schedule for future reviews should be online.

General discussion centered on pros and cons of codifying a trigger for unit salary reviews, in addition to the Academic Program Review (which is itself not codified). Roberts said she can't see the Council writing another trigger that would make administrators even more unhappy; James Riley said he wants to codify the process. Krieger-Brockett wanted to see more information on the Web about completed reviews and reviews that are scheduled. Haley viewed the fairness issue with the ten-year review as more of a five-year problem - it would be at about the middle of the cycle, or five years, that salary adjustment problems might tend to surface. At five years, waiting for an additional five years to be reviewed (in the absence of some other trigger) might be perceived as unfair. Luchtel commented that the current trigger - the Academic Program Review - is completely dependent upon the current Provost. If another provost comes in, doesn't think the reviews are important, and drops them, what happens then? Luchtel said that lots of importance is currently attached to the Academic Program review - he would like to see it codified.

Haley summed up the divergent viewpoints by noting that the Unit Adjustment Policy is still a live issue for the Council, and one that will require more discussion. Now that the Council has learned more about the Academic Program Review as it relates to Unit Salary Adjustment Policy, Haley will ask Brad Holt to speak to the Council again on the subject.

Chapter 24

This item was postponed until next meeting, due to lack of time. The Faculty Senate agenda does allow time for any needed changes to be accomplished by the end of Spring Quarter.

Vote of Emeritus Faculty

The question of whether to grant Norm Rose the vote as emeritus faculty was postponed until Rose is present at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*