Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of the minutes from December 9, 2014, December 19, 2014, and January 20, 2015
4. Transition plan
   a. Section 77
5. Procedural safeguards for evaluation reviews
   a. Section 61
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Janes at 11:05 a.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.


The three sets of minutes were approved as written.

4. Transition Plan

Chair Janes started the discussion on the transition plan by reminding members of the faculty town hall to discuss the salary policy proposal scheduled for Wednesday, February 4 at 2:45 p.m. in Architecture 147 (subsequently moved to Walker Ames in Kane Hall). He went on to encourage FCFA members to attend, if possible, in order to hear the discussion and help answer questions. Janes attended a panel planning meeting yesterday to talk about the forum format which will consist of 5 panelists and a moderator to facilitate the discussion.

Explaining the strategy moving forward the chair thought it is likely the group will complete the remaining sections today (Sections 77 and 61) and will have a good rough draft of the entire policy. He recommended consolidating the information into one document and forwarding a rough draft to the SEC as an informational item for its February 9 meeting and then share the language with the Senate at its February 26 meeting. The hope is that it will allow the SEC and Senate the opportunity to provide
feedback before formally presenting the legislation for vote. The consensus of the group was the sooner it goes to SEC and Senate for discussion and feedback the better.

A brief discussion ensued about the possibility and impact of extra staff workload during the transition period.

a) Section 77 Transition Period Salary Policy
Discussion resumed in section 77.C from where the group left off at the last meeting. Since the policy will not be in place during this transition period, this section is meant to take the place of tier raises or market adjustments. There are two plans to choose from, one is the default plan and the second is the alternative plan. Some wondered why both were included. The alternative plan was devised to provide another mechanism besides the default, and couldn’t be based on which plan cost less. Instead of having two options, one suggestion was to simply give everybody a 2 percent across the board instead of variable distributions. The group decided to stay with the existing language.

A question was asked will collegial reviews and the merit reviews be available during the transition period. When do collegial reviews become possible? The chair will follow up and answer at a later meeting.

Another brief discussion centered on faculty appointments. Faculty will be assigned a primary unit including those with multiple appointments. Faculty who do have multiple appointments cannot simply choose which unit they would like to be their primary. However, if a faculty member would like to change their appointment there is a process in place. It would mean that if all areas agree, funding would be moved to the new primary appointment, and the faculty member would need to resign from their permanent position and then a new appointment would be made in the new unit.

Revisions:
- The word . . . “eligible” voting faculty . . . was added to the alternative plan to clarify the quorum majority for such a vote.
- Under alternative plan, first sentence of second paragraph, change . . . salary pool “is” to “shall be” available . . .
- Add to the last sentence in the first paragraph of the Alternative Plan, “such a decision must be reported to the dean.” Some members wondered if the dean would have a role in deciding which plan would be used; would they simply be informed or have approving authority? Since deans have control over the budget it seems obvious the unit would need the dean’s approval. However, it was noted that some deans control fund distribution and some have delegated distribution to departments.

5. Procedural Safeguards for Evaluation Reviews (24-61)
Revisions to Section 61
- 24. 61, the new language is in the first two sentences. The rest remains the same as original code.
- 24.61 A. Swap first and second paragraphs. Add “with teaching responsibilities” to the new first sentence after “Each faculty member.”
• 24.61C, no change but a question was asked if this section applied to non-tier faculty? Who is tier eligible? Some understood that the salary policy only addresses tier eligible faculty and does not address non-tier eligible faculty.

• 24.61.D, how much of the documentation of the planning conference is open for review during the collegial review? After brief discussion add “and shall be considered during the collegial performance review” to the end of the last sentence in this section.

There were no objections so all of the changes were approved. This marks the day that the council has now made it all the way through the proposal. The second round of review will begin after the documents are consolidated and placed in legislative format. The input from the faculty town hall, SEC and Faculty Senate will also be available.

6. Good of the Order

There was no good of the order.

7. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, council support analyst, jmbg@uw.edu
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