Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from November 25, 2014
3. Chair’s report
4. Salary policy - Section 24-62 (Collegial reviews)
5. Good of the Order
6. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Janes at 11am.

2) Review of minutes from November 25, 2014

The minutes from November 25, 2014 were approved as written.

3) Chair’s report

Janes reported on a discussion at the last Faculty Senate meeting which covered the salary policy proposal. The conversation provided a great deal of feedback for the council to review and identified some key drawbacks that members should consider. The senate is also planning to host an open forum to discuss the proposal sometime in early Winter Quarter.

4) Salary policy - Section 24-62 (Collegial Performance Review)

Subsection G – Written summary of the committee’s report and recommendation

Members agreed on the proposed language without changes.

Subsection H – Actions

Janes explained the key feature to this subsection is the term “satisfactory” which is changed from “meritorious”. Members discussed the language and the three types of actions that can be taken: tier advancement, consideration for possible promotion in rank and title, and reappointment. A comment was raised that merit review experiences vary across campus and this subsection is an attempt to reset the process while setting a new standard. Concern was raised that this may complicate the career trajectory of those who are rapidly moving through the system. If a faculty member advances more than on tier at a time, such as two at once, it would result in receiving two salary increases of 8%. Discussion ensued about the normal career cycle for university faculty. A comment was raised that this process may complicate the timing and logistics of promotion decisions, tier advancements, and reappointment.
decisions. For example, complications may arise when determining which review counts for which type of action and the type of event that may trigger a decision. This may result in a perceived burden for particular departments because it is up to each unit to coordinate the timeframe of the review process.

**Subsection I – Formal report of the proceedings**

Members discussed the impacts on assistant professors at different tier levels. A comment was raised mentioning that if reviews use similar documents it may reduce the burden for departments. Janes explained this process would be similar to what currently exists for the reappointment process for assistant professors in which faculty vote either satisfactory/unsatisfactory on merit and for reappointments.

**Subsections J and K – Transmitting recommendation with candidate’s response and final decision on tier advancement**

Janes proposed a hypothetical question asking if a chair or dean can reverse a decision if the recommendation is not for a tier advancement. The current language as it exists does not provide a clear answer to this issue. Discussion ensued about language found elsewhere in the code that might address the scenario. Janes explained this issue is important since it may allow a chair to override a faculty decision if the individual is believed to not be ready for a tier advancement. Members discussed how candidates are assessed by chairs and other faculty. Janes provided a possible scenario where a chair supports a faculty member hired to do interdisciplinary work (work that is not core to the department) which is not valued by his/her peers who conduct the evaluation. Members discussed their personal experiences in departmentalized and non-departmentalized units. A comment was raised that when faculty vote unanimously to promote a candidate, and the chair does not agree, the decision is forwarded to the college level with the chair’s dissent which would be a nice parallel to this scenario. Concern was raised stressing the importance of creating proper procedures to protect faculty without making the process too cumbersome.

A comment was made that these procedures are not about administrative review, especially since the section is titled “collegial review”. A comment was raised that the process could be an appropriate protection if a faculty member is being treated unfairly. Members discussed changes to the language and the impact on different scenarios. Members decided not to make additional changes to the proposal, indicating that if faculty do not support a tier advancement the decisions should end there.

Discussion moved to the role of elected faculty councils. Some councils will act at the appointment and promotion/tenure committee while others will have separate subcommittees. Members discussed their personal experiences in their own units and their reporting structures.

**Subsection L – Reviewing performance of non-tier eligible faculty**

Members discussed the commentary provided by the salary group about faculty members serving part-time or full-time in administrative positions and how their performance will be evaluated by administrative supervisors.

5) **Good of the order**
Janes explained that the council will have to decide how to continue revising code language in order to submit legislation by the beginning of Spring Quarter. Janes noted there are still substantial portions left to discuss, such as the transition plan and off-ramps, and the legislation needs to be introduced to the Senate Executive Committee no later than March 1\textsuperscript{st}. Members discussed the timeline in which the Faculty Senate reviews Class A legislation and strategic approaches to submitting the legislation for consideration.

Members agreed the best option would be to hold a long meeting during winter break in order to make further progress. A suggestion was raised that council meetings could be extended during the Winter Quarter in order to cover more code language.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Janes at 12:10.

---

Minutes by Grayson Court, council support analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: Faculty: Joe Janes (chair), Margaret Adam, David Goldstein, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Ex officio representatives: Judith Henchy, Shannon Harris

Absent: Faculty: Alissa Ackerman, Steve Buck, Chandan Reddy, Lea Vaughn, Lisa Coutu, Gordon Watts
Ex officio representatives: Julian Rees, JoAnne Taricani