

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
April 29, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from April 1, 2014 and April 15, 2014
 3. Announcements
 4. Faculty Salary Policy
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Watts at 9:35 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from April 1, 2014 and April 15, 2014

The minutes from April 1, 2014 and April 15, 2014 were not approved due to lack of quorum.

3) Announcements

Watts announced that the Professor of Practice (PoP) legislation was not discussed during the recent Senate meeting and will be postponed until the upcoming continuation meeting scheduled for this Thursday. Watts will not be available for the Senate continuation meeting and Johnson has volunteered to present the legislation to the Senate. Watts reported that he is aware of 3 possible amendments for the proposed legislation:

- Changing the term “rarely used” to “sparingly used”
- Allow for PoP voting rights (which were previously removed)
- Change the title of PoP to “Practitioner in Residence”

Members discussed the intent of the hiring and placement of PoP, language provided in the proposal, terminology of the amendments, and how the legislation will be implemented. Concern was raised that PoP are doing essentially the same job as lecturers but receiving a higher title. A comment was raised that the term “distinguished” should make the distinction clear that this is a different job classification. Members discussed the term “research practitioner” and its use at other institutions. Concern was raised about how this name might conflict with titles in the School of Medicine. Watts noted that in researching other institutions he could not find this term used in their university code. However, there is some evidence that the term is being unofficially used in other places.

Discussion ensued about how to present the PoP legislation to the Faculty Senate.

4) Faculty Salary Policy

Members discussed the need to achieve quorum during meetings and the possibility of scheduling special meetings to discuss salary policy. Watts mentioned that the need for special meetings depends on whether the salary policy will actually be completed by the end of this academic year, thus the necessity of having special meetings. Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) explained that he will need FCFA's help in the preparation and approval of a final proposal in order to be finalized by the end of the year.

Janes provided a summary of the last meeting and the council's discussion on the salary policy proposal. Janes commented that there are many changes that are deep and profound in this new proposal and it will be a challenge for many people to fully understand the implications. Additionally, the proposal will become more and more complicated as it moves through the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate and finally to the fully faculty vote. Janes stressed the need to maintain internal consistency at every stage of the process.

Lee provided an update on the recent version that was distributed to the council. Lee mentioned that changes have been made to ensure the diversity criteria are clearly applied to tier advancements. Members discussed different locations to place diversity within the Faculty Code.

Members discussed the complexity of the code revisions and whether the Faculty Code should be concerned about procedures, or just policy. Concern was raised about the complexity of the code and stressed the importance of having a smooth resolution of settling disputes based on code language. A suggestion was made to just write the intent of the Faculty Code, or simplify the code changes, in order to reduce complexity of the overall plan. Members discussed the inclusion of the collegial review process because of the complexities of writing it into code. A comment was raised that when the RCEP process was established and written into code it became more and more complicated as time went on. A question was raised asking if there will be additional adjustments to the salary policy later once it has been codified. Members agreed that future adjustments would likely occur.

Discussion ensued about a possible user's guide. Concern was raised that a user's guide would not have the same authority if the salary policy was codified. A comment was raised expressing concern about the amount of detail and complexity of the salary proposal.

Members discussed the recent Class A legislation on openness in the promotion and review process. A question was raised asking if the salary policy group is learning from this experience in order to guide code writing for the new salary policy system. Members discussed the revisions to the salary policy and whether the Faculty Code acts as a procedures manual. Concern was raised that there is no other document for the procedures of the new salary system to reside in order to be enforceable. A comment was raised that the Faculty Code acts as the constitution, handbook and procedures manual all in one.

Concern was raised that when amendments arise during the Faculty Senate they will inadvertently make contradictory changes to other parts of the code. The problem is that nobody will be paying attention to all the intricacies of the changes creating a number of internal inconsistencies. There are so many intertwining pieces of the salary policy there must be a great amount of attention to ensure internal consistency.

A suggestion was made to simply substitute entire sections of the Faculty Code. A comment was raised stressing the importance of user guidelines. Another suggestion was to provide flowcharts of the salary policy proposal, similar to the last Class A legislation on openness in tenure and promotion. A question

was raised asking if a flowchart would be a primary or derived document. Concern was raised again about the level of detail and wondered if the code could be simplified in any way, such as simplifying the description of the collegial review. Discussion ensued about personal experiences in different departments and how they would respond to this proposal. Discussion moved to the sequencing of collegial review and the timing of the unit conferences and merit reviews. A comment was raised that the concept of tier advancements is a whole new concept for departments and creates a new way of thinking about promotion reviews. Additionally, the new system creates a new method of assessing merit with terms like “satisfactory progress” which creates a lot of uncertainty.

A suggestion was made to have a section of the Faculty Code list the sequence of events to lay out how the timelines and procedures should be followed. Members disagreed if this should be included in a user’s manual or contained in the Faculty Code to ensure consistency across all departments.

Section 24-50

A suggestion was made to add the description of tier advancements. Lee agreed to the recommendation.

Section 24-55

Lee explained that the content in this Section was moved to Section 24-57. Lee reported that there has been no discussion on subsections F and G which relates to deans and chairs. Members discussed how deans and chairs would be impacted by the new salary system. Questions were raised about eligibility, evaluations, and differences between units. Watts requested that the salary policy group address this concern and report back to FCFA.

Section 24-57

Lee reported that the title of this Section has been adjusted in response to FCFA’s feedback. This Section addresses the first stage of the process which involves information gathering of teaching evaluations and other documentation prior to the chair’s conference. This does not have any direct consequences to the process but allows for the gathering of information for a potential review. Members discussed the role of daily activity reports and the need to have “procedural safeguards” included in the title of this Section. Lee explained that the term “merit” has been removed because it has become so fraught in the old code that it is worthwhile to move away from the term. As an alternative, the salary policy group prefers “performance evaluation”.

Members discussed the function of the yearly activity report. Lee explained that the collegial evaluation occurs only when the faculty member is likely for a tier advancement (usually within a 5-year time span) but it needs to be based on evidence. Lee explained the activity report would be the evidence required to initiate a collegial review. Discussion ensued. Members expressed confusion about the merit review process while maintaining the regular chair conference. Lee explained that the chair conference would be changed to a “planning conference” creating an opportunity for information sharing and identifying the goals shared between the department and faculty member. Lee explained this is meant to become a foundation for moving forward on shared goals and ideas between faculty and the department. Members discussed the submission of ROAs and whether this would be an input to the merit review process. Lee reported that the Faculty Council on Women in Academia is concerned that having a process depending on the individual taking the initiative to begin an early tier advancement would

discriminate against women. Lee clarified that FCWA's position is that women are less likely than men to push for an early tier advancement. Adams disagreed with that statement.

A suggestion was made to allow faculty members to opt out if they know they will not receive a tier advancement. Members discussed the possibility of those who feel they need a tier advancement before their 5-year review. ROAs might be inputs to variable adjustments and there are many circumstances in producing an ROA. A comment was raised that having an opt-out clause could be useful.

Members discussed provisions when a chair initiates a conference and a collegial review if they believe there may be a finding of unsatisfactory performance. Lee clarified that in order to do so there needs to be evidence to initiate such a conference. Members discussed how the review would impact different units and how a chair can choose who goes forward with a collegial review. Concern was raised that this could create an arbitrary process which could lead to abuse of the review process. A comment was raised that this abuse could go in both directions. Discussion ensued about how the committees would operate and when to submit the annual activity report because the collegial review needs to be based on sufficient evidence. Members discussed whether this is considered part of the merit review process when members are being asked to generate documents. Concern was raised that this process simply creates additional paper work that might not be necessary. Members discussed the impacts on chairs and deans. A comment was raised that this proposal should be less onerous than the current process in order to generate support for the new salary system.

Watts commented that the recent version of the salary policy creates a tiered system for Artists in Residence (AR). By including ARs in the tiered system it indicates that the job classification is considered a career path similar to lecturers. Watts advised Lee to consider how this will impact the PoP discussions because PoP is similar to AR and is not intended to have a career path. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that the salary policy group should be aware of the parallels between PoP and AR when discussing tiers and career paths. Discussion moved to teaching associates and whether they should be included in the tiered system as well.

5) Adjourn

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

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

Present: **Faculty:** Watts (Chair), Janes, Adam
 Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Guest: Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate), Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent: **Faculty:** Buck, Johnson, Landis, O'Brien, Stygall
 Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto, Rees