

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
April 15, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from April 1, 2014
 3. Faculty Salary Policy
 4. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by acting Chair Janes at 9:40 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from April 1, 2014

The minutes from April 1, 2014 were not approved due to lack of quorum.

3) Faculty Salary Policy

Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) was present to discuss recent updates to the new faculty salary proposal. Janes led the discussion and provided questions submitted by Chair Watts who was not present.

Section 24-54 (Procedure for Promotions)

Janes expressed concern that language in the preamble of Section 24-54 was removed which outlines the rationale of the salary policy. Lee explained the deletion was due to redundancy but agreed there would be benefits of keeping the language. Members discussed the pros and cons having the language located in the Faculty Code. Janes expressed support in having the rationale and language added back to the Faculty Code. A comment was raised that when implemented there may be faculty who get lost in the tier structure and would rely on their departments to inform them of the opportunity to be considered for promotion. This would be an opportunity for departments to communicate with faculty the number of years they have until the department's next promotional decision.

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

Section 24-55 will be removed entirely and Janes was not sure how to interpret the changes. A question was raised asking for clarification on where the deleted content will be replaced. While there are no specific concerns about the deleted content it would be nice to know if the language was removed entirely or simply added to another part of the Faculty Code. Lee explained that subsection A is mostly gone because voting faculty members would not be considering the salaries of individuals. Lee clarified that faculty will have a say in whether an individual receives a tiered advancement, but the amount of money that will be attached to the advancement will be determined by the school or college. The important aspect is that faculty should be making decisions on the amount of variable adjustments but

create a process to determine the principles and procedures in assigning those adjustments. The idea of the variable adjustments is to address anomalies including compression and inequities. Lee clarified this is not saying merit does not figure into variable adjustments, but explained there does not need to be a new performance review in the new salary system. A suggestion was made to provide an overall rationale for the changes to help clarify the restructuring of the Faculty Code, such as an executive summary.

Members discussed strategies and timing of introducing the salary proposal. Lee commented that he hopes FCFA will approve a version of this proposal before the end of Spring Quarter and pass it on to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). Once that occurs Lee plans to send out the proposal to all Senators and SEC members prior to the October SEC meeting. This would allow Senators to review the proposal over the summer and developed a clear understanding of the new salary policy system before the academic year begins

Section 24-77 (Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure)

The new salary proposal completely replaces the title of Section 24-77 to read “Periodic Assessment of Faculty”. A comment was raised that the new language makes sense but it may be controversial as it appears to remove procedural safeguards. Lee explained that he did not object to the language because he saw it as describing a process of evaluation. Additionally, there are safeguards built in but that is not what Section 24-77 is primarily about. Members discussed the term “collegial evaluation” and possible substitute language and criteria that could be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Lee explained that he is envisioning that the chair of the department will initiate the tier advancement process, rather than it being forced by the faculty member. Typically, the chair will decide on the year for a tiered advancement but will need some form of evidence to conduct the process. It is suggested in the legislation that the evaluation process could be conducted by the personnel committee which will sort faculty between those who are over their 4-year mark, at 4 years, or have not yet reached the 4-year requirement. If a faculty member in the early tier advancement pool is doing exceptionally well then they could receive an early review. Lee clarified that this would not be a full performance review; rather it would be a short assessment to determine if a faculty member could advance up a tier. Members discussed their own units’ review process and strategies on how to implement this effectively.

Members discussed who will be required to perform this additional effort. Lee stressed that the intent of the legislation is to create a process in which the net amount of work is no more than what is currently required.

Members discussed changes to regular conferences with faculty. Lee explained that the language is supposed to assume the chair or faculty member can initiate the conference. A suggestion was made to alter the language so a review can be no later than 4 years after the previous conference.

New Section 24-60 (Collegial Performance Review)

Lee commented that this new section replaces a majority of the language that was removed from Section 24-55. Concern was raised that there should be parallelism between lecturers and professor tracks, as well as who is reviewing the candidate. For example, if full professors were reviewing other full professors then there would be nobody left to conduct the assessment. A suggestion was made that all professors should review other professors and to extend this same practice to lecturers. Members

discussed how this would affect individual departments. Discussion moved to recent developments related to the tri-campus lecturer committee, bridging funding and positioning professors and research professors within the Faculty Code.

Members discussed collegial performance review and if faculty members could advance in tiers and be promoted at the same time. Lee explained the code was written with the understanding that there was resistance to anything that might encourage entitlements or automatic raises. The decision was made to make it clear that every step of the process must be merit-based. Lee clarified that the only individuals who would receive a raise are those who are meritorious, thus the reason for the language provided in the code.

Members discussed the rationale for changing the term “non-meritorious” to “unsatisfactory performance”. A comment was raised to take into account language consistent with qualifications for faculty ranks earlier in the Chapter. Members discussed the terminology of “satisfactory” and “non-satisfactory” and how it might be implemented in individual departments. Lee explained that if a faculty member is performing at a steady state it will lead to a tiered advancement. “Non-satisfactory” performance would indicate that the faculty member’s performance is falling down.

A comment was raised about the introductory language in Section 24-55 that was removed and wondered if it migrated to another part of the code. Lee read off Section 24-60.D:

“For units where an initial report is produced by a committee, the head of the unit or a designee shall provide the individual being reviewed with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation.”

Lee clarified that the focus of the merit review will evaluate the last 4 years of the faculty member’s performance. Members discussed what could be implemented and the intent of the past and current versions. Lee mentioned that a correction will be made to provide the chair a role in the tier advancement decision at the beginning of the process allowing chairs to have a conference with the candidate before the collegial evaluation. Currently, if the faculty votes in favor of a tiered advancement the decision goes straight to the dean. The change would allow the chair an opportunity to give tier advancements since the decision may require confidential information that is privy only to the chair. Lee explained this creates a delicate balance: while people want to reduce complications by preventing an extra level of reporting, faculty members want a tier promotion process that is open and transparent to everyone.

Members discussed openness and transparency in tier advancements at peer institutions. The current University of California system does not provide faculty a frame of reference when they undergo the process. The difficulty depends on how it impacts people differently in individual schools and colleges. For example, faculty in the humanities require an extensive period of time, sometimes up to eight years, to publish a book which requires the department to determine the appropriate criteria to evaluate a candidate. Lee commented that some mechanism would be developed to address this concern, but expressed uncertainty if this could be written into the code.

Lee explained that the intent of the proposed salary policy should be less onerous than the current system and suggested that a user manual could be created to assist departments in implementing the new changes. For example, the user manual could be aimed at chairs, college council and deans which explain the intent of the policy and how it could be implemented. A suggestion was raised to provide

this in addition to the legislation in order to provide some basis to generate feedback. A comment was raised stressing the importance of matching up the legislation with the intent in what the new salary system will achieve.

Members discussed Watt's concerns in subsection C that annual renewal of the initial review process may be too burdensome for a unit and his suggestion to make the approval biannual. There are several examples of this in the code such as retention raises. Members discussed how this impacts different departments. Lee stated that his goal is to make adjustments flexible and transparent so this is a concern worth considering. However, Lee commented that the process should be voted on every year since situations and available funding will constantly be changing in each unit.

Members discussed subsection I. Lee explained that if the chair does not agree with the recommendation they cannot veto it but may submit a separate recommendation. Members discussed whether a candidate will be able to review the chair's recommendation if it is different than the faculty vote. A comment was raised that the deans are uncomfortable with this idea because it would require chairs to publicly confront individuals who they do not support, creating an awkward working environment.

Lee stated that he will incorporate FCFA's feedback in the salary policy proposal and discuss this with the salary policy committee next week. Based on the feedback from the salary policy committee Lee will draft another version which he will share with FCFA.

4) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by acting Chair Janes at 11:00 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Janes (acting Chair)
 Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy
 Guest: Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate)

Absent: **Faculty:** Adam, Buck, Johnson, Landis, O'Brien, Stygall, Vaughn, Watts
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto, Rees