

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting
February 18, 2014, 12:30 pm – 1:30 pm
GWP 320, Tacoma Room

Present: *Greg Benner, Zhiyan Cao, Sam Chung, Linda Dawson, Denise Drevdahl, Michelle Garner, J.W. Harrington, Matt Kelley, Nita McKinley, Janie Miller, Jill Purdy, Huatong Sun, and Doug Wills.*

Absent: *Sergio Davalos, Rich Furman, Kelly Forrest, Katie Baird, Amos Nascimento, and Orlando Baiocchi*

Proposed Faculty Salary Policy Discussion with Jack Lee, Chair of UW Faculty Senate
Presentation

- ❖ The Faculty Salary Committee has worked on this proposal for two years. While not final, it has support from the Provost and President. The current salary policy was created in the year 2000.
- ❖ The biggest problem with the current policy is that the regularly available raise money is barely enough to keep up with assistant professor entry salaries, which have been going up for a long time at a rate of about 4%. With existing policy we recruit at market rates, and then we give a big retention raise to someone to someone who has been recruited to go somewhere else. The UW salary gap is 12% relative to peer institutions. Entering UW PhD faculty salaries match or exceed peer salaries through year 7, after that the gap grows midcareer and is largest at the end of career. We need to not just recruit and retain, but also motivate and reward faculty. It is a crisis that we have to do something about.
- ❖ The Proposal consists of Four Pillars
 - 1) Rank Promotion Raises: The committee is proposing a 12% raise at promotion to Associate or Full Professor rather than the current 7.5% rank promotion raise.
 - 2) Tiers Within Ranks
 - Each Ranks would be divided into several tiers:
 - Assistant Professor 1,2
 - Associate Profession 1,2,3
 - Professor 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 7,8,9 (to be called “eminent professor”). “Eminent Professor” would mean demonstrating international leadership in one’s field, superb teaching and service. This would motivate and provide a greater raise.
 - Similar tiers in the lecturer ranks (Lecturer 1,2; Senior Lecturer 123; Principal Lecturer: many tiers)
 - Annual merit reviews would no longer be required except for Assistant Professors
 - “Collegial performance reviews” would happen for individuals approximately every four years and mandatory after five years. For Assistant Professors these would occur at time of the three-year reappointment.
 - There would be four possibilities that would incur after a “collegial performance review:”
 - Recommendation of tier advancement
 - Initiation of rank advancement
 - Finding of unsatisfactory performance (currently called “non-meritorious”)
 - Satisfactory performance, but tier advancement not recommended at this time.
 - Highest performing faculty could get tier advancements more often than every four years; others may get advancement less often.
 - Each tier does not trigger a specific salary, but rather comes with a specific raise percentage.
 - These numbers are chosen so that over the long term, the UW salary profile would look like those of peer institutions.

- Inflation needs to be taken into account. Over 25 or 30 years, inflation has been going up about 1% faster per year than the CPI. The HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) was also going up about 1% faster than the CPI. The UW raise history has maintained this gap; it is not worse, just matching the gap.
- 3) Market Adjustments
 - Awarded annually to each faculty member whose last performance was declared satisfactory; it is equal to the percentage increase in the CPI. This will be given whether or not one receives their tier advancement or promotion.
- 4) Peer-Equity Adjustment
 - Because the Market Adjustments won't completely help UW faculty to keep up with peers either, this adjustment will be used within units or schools to adjust and address the equity issues of compression amongst a certain group of professors/lecturers over time.
- ❖ The solution to fix the gap will require funds. The plan is designed so that if resources continued to be tight, we could run this system with no extra cost over the long term. There are some escape hatches built into the system to weather the storm. The accreditation team and the President have listed this gap as the number one problem at UW.
- ❖ Eight to twelve percent raises only happen to a quarter of the faculty every year. Tier and promotion raises require a little less than a 2% increase in the salary pool each year. Keeping the money recovered from those who retire in the system, will fund the promotions and competitive new hire salaries.
 - 1) One hope is to close the gap within 6 years.
 - 2) The other hope is that retired faculty salaries would get funneled back into faculty salaries, not construction projects and/or other growth projects of the university.
 - 3) The third hope is to have this all written into the code next fall. This means that the year 2014-2015 would be one of transition: we would operate under the current code with some tweaks. The challenges are figuring out what tier everyone belongs on and creating a cycle for the four-year reviews, instead of having everyone on the same cycle and reviewing everyone every year. The two possibilities for deciding initial tiers are seniority-based tiers and salary-based tiers. If these produce two different numbers, one could choose which tier to join. The cycles will be dependent on the next mandatory review year, with different transition raises to cover any losses. This would be awarded in the following academic year.

Discussion

- ❖ Faculty asked if the system would vary across schools or campuses (e.g. would higher paid professional schools differ?). Jack responded that it would not for several reasons:
 - 1) An exponential growth curve would mean that people in the end of their career would be receiving the majority of funds. This is not a great use of our funds as a university or in order to keep up with peers.
 - 2) When we look at the very highly-paid professors, they tend to start very high. This formula helps to keep that growth shallow (e.g. professional schools).

However, the proposal allows that a dean or chancellor could set a different percentage with permission from the Provost. This means each campus and school needs to decide what works individually. The purpose of this is to make UW salaries comparable among peers.
- ❖ JW asked when the transition raise would go into effect. Jack said it would be decided next academic year.
- ❖ Jill brought up the point that assistant professors' tier advancement would be based on their hire date rather than a transition schedule. Jack agreed.
- ❖ Faculty clarified that the mandatory review is different from a promotion review. Jack agreed.
- ❖ Jill asked about the procedure of decision rights on how raises and tier assignments and advances would be determined. Jack said that the procedure would be voted on and be the responsibility of the unit or school. The EC has the chance to discuss and present ideas to the faculty. Then each campus implements the policy it has selected. Jack made it clear that the

faculty decides how to award raises, not the dean or administration. People know that this is rolling out, so there is going to be some difficulty in deciding promotion/review year.

- ❖ Jill asked how faculty who receive a portion of their pay from grants would be affected. Jack said this would apply to WOT faculty, competitively-hired lecturers, research faculty and only affects their institutional-based salary. We cannot address funding sources.
- ❖ Michelle wanted clarification whether the gap would be closed in around six years. Jack said it would, if peers keep their raises at 3% and inflation remains at 2% per year. There are things that can get in the way of that, but, again, it is a hope.
- ❖ Matt asked when faculty would vote. Jack said that there is already code being written. FCAA will spend time working on the code changes. Jack hopes to send a link to a discussion board so that in different venues, faculty can discuss these changes. When the code comes close to final form, it will be sent out. Because it is a code change, it needs to be voted on twice.
- ❖ Sam wondered how this would affect the climate within a department when different faculty are awarded their raise and others are not. Jack said the terminology would be satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Not many people are declared non-meritorious or unsatisfactory. Jack said that making sure that these hard decisions are in the hands of faculty is the goal, but there is a potential for emotions to be affected.

Jack offered his email, facsen@uw.edu, to address more questions, comments and suggestions.

The complete faculty salary policy is posted with a discussion board at

<https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/board/senate/35848/>

Meeting adjourned at 1:35pm