

## Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

**Date: Monday February 10, 2014 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM, WCG 322**

### Committee Members

Sam Chung (Institute of Technology, Chair), Rupinder Jindal (Milgard School of Business), Katie Haerling (Nursing), Riki Thompson (Interdisciplinary Arts), Matthew Weinstein (Education), Anne Wessells (Urban studies & Social Workers)

### Attendees

Sam Chung (Institute of Technology, Chair),  
Rupinder Jindal (Milgard School of Business),  
Katie Haerling (Nursing),  
Matthew Weinstein (Education)

### Previous Minutes

- **Approval** of 1/27/14 minutes, delayed.

### Next Meeting - Winter 2014 Schedule

- **Monday, February 24, 2013, 12:30 PM – 1:25 PM, WCG 322**

### Business

#### 1. Lecturer Affairs Committee Meeting

##### a. Schedule

- Feb. 19 (Wednesday) at 1:30 pm in SCI 104. Delayed to 2/26/14.**
- March 5 (Wednesday) at 1:30 pm in SCI 104.

#### 2. Executive Council Meeting

##### a. Schedule

- Tuesday, January 14, Location Tacoma Room, 12:30pm to 1:25pm (attended)
  - Friday, January 31, Location Tacoma Room, 9:00am to 12:00pm (attended)**
  - Tuesday, February 18, Location Tacoma Room, 12:30pm to 1:25pm
  - Friday, March 14, Location TBD, 9:00am to 12:00pm
- b. The ““7 in 7”” Memo of FAC to both the EC Chair (Jill Purdy) and the VCAA (JW Harrington) will be delivered.

#### 3. Faculty Salary Issue

- Meeting with the EC chair (Jill Purdy) on 2/12/14 12:00 PM to 12:30 PM in Metro Coffee
  - To evaluate last year’s salary process and offer advice for this year,
    - A summary of salary outcomes from 12-13
    - A copy of the Provost’s letter.
  - Sections [24-55](#) and [24-71](#) of the Faculty Code, where the procedures for allocating salary increases are described in detail.
- Visiting of Jack Lee (Faculty Senate Chair)
  - Tuesday, February 18, Location Tacoma Room, 12:30pm to 1:25pm
- FA Approach

- i. Qualitative assessment through each unit's faculty meeting (within 1 month)
  1. Feedback about the merit process that was recommended by FA Committee 203.
- ii. Launch Survey to Faculty after 1/24/ 14 faculty assembly meeting
  1. "How well the process worked within units and ask for feedback to identify good practices, areas for improvement and lessons learned."

**From 11/18/13 Meeting Minutes**

From: **Jill Purdy** <jpurdy@uw.edu>  
Date: Fri, Nov 8, 2013 at 4:05 PM  
Subject: Faculty Affairs  
To: Sam Chung <chungsa@u.washington.edu>

Hi Sam,

I want to provide a little more detail regarding the faculty salary issue that EC would like Faculty Affairs to address.

Last year raises were a high priority. **We created principles for merit raises and advised units to develop clear, transparent processes around how merit would be allocated.** Now is a good time to do some assessment of how well the process worked in units. You might survey faculty or ask for feedback so that we can identify good practices, areas of improvement, or lessons learned.

The subtext of this is to ensure that unit-level decisions are made in a fair and transparent way. Last year both Faculty Assembly and the Chancellor agreed that the salary decisions were an important way to advance our knowledge and practices of faculty governance at the unit level. I remember Debra saying that her hope was that after all the decisions had been made, she could walk up to any faculty member and ask them why they, or anyone else in their unit, got what they got, and the faculty member could answer this. Your analysis of the salary process will feed into our continued work on unit-level governance. This year Faculty Assembly and the Chancellor are working to support all units to develop bylaws that outline governance responsibility, procedure and accountability.

Thank you once again for your service as Chair.  
Jill

*Dr. Jill Purdy  
Associate Professor of Management  
Milgard School of Business  
University of Washington, Tacoma*

Dear Colleagues,

Faculty Affairs' assessment of last year's salary process has become more urgent because the review schedule has changed. Salary adjustments will go back to becoming effective July 1 rather than September 1 so decisions will be needed sooner. Please review the message below for more details.

To evaluate last year's salary process and offer advice for this year, we'll need a summary of salary outcomes from 12-13 as well as a copy of the Provost's letter. I'll confer with JW on both and get these to you as soon as possible.

Jill

( Talk to the previous FAC chair)

**From:** John M Lee [mailto:johnmlee@uw.edu]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2014 7:19 PM

**To:** Sandra Silberstein; mpurcell@uw.edu; erice@uw.edu; xlepe@uw.edu; Nancy Beadie; reed@uw.edu; jbourgeo@uw.edu; edresang@uw.edu; Lea B. Vaughn; ellencos@uw.edu; wessells@uw.edu; jts@uw.edu; surawicz@u.washington.edu; BRETT RUBIO; gailmk@uw.edu; Nina Isoherranen; pdobel@uw.edu; stergach@uw.edu; contej@uw.edu; lerum@uw.edu; Jill Purdy

**Cc:** Nancy L. Bradshaw; Marcia G. Killien; James Gregory; Kathleen M. O'Neill; Jed Bradley

**Subject:** 2014-2015 Salary Adjustments

Dear Elected Faculty Council Chairs,

Provost Cauce has just sent instructions to the deans and chancellors regarding the 2014-2015 salary adjustment process. (It's starting earlier than usual this year, because the plan is to finally go back to having salary adjustments take effect on July 1 instead of September 1.) The basic plan is that there will be 2% "regular merit" (equal percentage to all meritorious faculty), another 2% "additional merit" (which goes as an equal percentage to each unit but can be distributed differentially to individuals based on compression, equity, and merit), and an invitation to deans and chancellors to propose unit adjustments to address the "market gaps" of individual units. All of these salary adjustments for faculty will be funded by the schools, colleges, and campuses themselves.

We want to alert you that the Provost has asked the deans and chancellors to share her instructions with their elected faculty councils, and to consult with the councils about the distribution of the 2% "additional merit pool," about whether unit adjustments are warranted, and, if so, about how they should be distributed. In particular, this means that your council should have a chance to examine the peer salary comparisons provided by the Provost's office, which are to be used as a basis for deciding about unit adjustments. If you don't receive a copy of the Provost's letter within a week or

so, please ask your dean or chancellor for a copy, or contact one of us.

We encourage you to look over Sections [24-55](#) and [24-71](#) of the Faculty Code, where the procedures for allocating salary increases are described in detail.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Jack Lee  
Faculty Senate Chair  
Professor of Mathematics

Marcia Killien  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Professor of Family & Child Nursing

---

Uwtexeccouncil mailing list

[Uwtexeccouncil@u.washington.edu](mailto:Uwtexeccouncil@u.washington.edu)

<https://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/uwtexeccouncil>

**Survey to Faculty Draft**  
The first draft on 11/18/2013

**Make anonymous**

**Department or Program**

**Determining Merit**

**Strong agree to disagree**

1. **Do you think your unit used the recommendation of FA Committee?**
2. Do you know how collegial evaluations of teaching are performed?
3. Does your unit have a set of criteria in place to evaluate merit?
4. How specific is the criteria?
5. Do you know what this set of criteria is?
6. How often does the unit have substantial conversations about merit criteria?
7. What materials does each faculty member submit for evaluation?
8. To what degree do you understand the relative weight placed on different kinds of research, teaching and service in the unit?
9. What important elements do the current policies for merit not reflect or fail to take into account? Are these elements measurable? If so, how can they be measured and accounted for in the future merit/raise decisions?
10. Are any elements in your current merit review process over-emphasized? Is there a way to reduce their influence?

**Determining Status Other Than Regular Merit**

11. Do you know how raises outside of regular merit are decided?
12. How does your unit consider compression issues? If so, is that process transparent to the faculty?
13. Does your unit have an “extrameritorious” process? If so, what does that process entail?

**Awarding Merit**

14. Do you know how the results of the merit discussion transmitted to individual faculty members?
15. Does the Director communicate the substance of the merit/raise discussion in his/her annual meeting with each faculty member?
16. Does the Director write a letter summarizing the substance of that meeting?
17. Are the results of all merit and raise determinations known to any faculty other than the faculty member and those above in rank?

**Qualitative data about best practices for the process**

18. What worked well (or not)? What ideas do you have for improvement?