

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting (Agenda)
Date: Monday November 18, 2014 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM, WCG 322

Members

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

Autumn 2013 Schedule (Next Meeting in Bolad)

- *Monday, October 14, 2013, 12:30 PM – 1:25 PM, WCG 322*
- *Monday, October 28, 2013, 12:30 PM – 1:25 PM, WCG 322*
- *Monday, November 18, 2013, 12:30 PM – 1:25 PM, WCG 322 (Katie Haerling as an interim chair)*
- **Monday, December 2, 2013, 12:30 PM – 1:25 PM, WCG 322**

Attendees:

- Katie. Haerling, Tom Diehm (representative from Lecturer Affairs), Rupinder Jindal, Riki Thompson

Approval of 10/28/13 minutes- Motion by Katie Haerling, 2nd by Riki Thompson, full vote via e-mail (no quorum)

Agenda

1. Committee chair confirmed- Sam Chung Confirmed!
2. Tom Diehm LA Subcommittee met with JW to get clarity about procedures for moving forward with competitive lecturer hires. (Sam was at this meeting and can access notes).
 Summary: within 5 years there would no longer be non-competitively hired full-time lecturers at UWT. This will be a time-intensive process. IAS disproportionately affected. Part-time positions would, ideally, also be competitively hired- getting the full-time issues taken care of are a priority. Directors and Deans have been sent guidelines for hiring full-time lecturers. All newly approved full-time lecturer hires will be competitive. Timeline for promotion does not exist.
3. Faculty Affairs 2013-2014 Priorities (WebQ Survey) (REOPENED SURVEY UNTIL END OF NOV 2013)
 - a. URL: <https://catalyst.uw.edu/webq/survey/rikiki/216885>
 - b. 95 submissions
 - c. Priorities
 - i. **Investigating impact of 7 in 7 on faculty composition got 32% of HIGHEST priority votes**
 - ii. Investigating within rank promotion changes got 25%.
 - iii. COACH got 24.5
 - iv. Teaching evaluation/ reporting got 18.5%
4. Other write-in options:
 - a. Salary compression issues. (e.g. Assistant professors making more salary then associate professors)
 - b. faculty offices for PT lecturers
 - c. Expanding service load beyond sustainability; discuss appalling level of historical knowledge among students and need for required world history.
 - d. Child care for students, faculty, staff
 - e. Lecturer affairs, both full-time and part-time folks

- f. Lecturer conversion
 - g. not sure what the first one on this list is
 - h. Faculty morale and labor equity issues are of utmost importance and seem to continually be deferred.
 - i. Faculty Diversity!
 - j. I think the Chancellor should be asked to address the COACH survey. Why let them pass the buck to us?
 - k. I am unfamiliar with the 7 on 7 questions, so disregard my scoring of it as "low."
 - l. Process of deciding on national searches for lecturer positions
 - m. I rated COACHE low because I believe EC is organizing a committee to look at COACHE.
 - n. I ranked these because that is what the survey requested, but all 4 issues are of highest priority. Adjusted medians should just be implemented.
 - o. discussion of class size differences in different disciplines and teaching loads
 - p. Lecturer Affairs, Equity adjustments
 - q. I don't really understand the last issue.
 - r. Commitment to diverse faculty hires
 - s. With 7 in 7 and increasing untended faculty demographic, the 6 course teaching load for TT faculty is too much. Tenured service needs are crushing.
5. Faculty Salary Issue
- Email from Jill Purdy (Faculty Assembly Chair)
 - What will we do?
 - Reviewed 2012-2013 FA recommendations related to merit determination and compensation
 - Will be drafting a faculty survey to assess "how well the process worked within units and ask for feedback to identify good practices, areas for improvement and lessons learned." Start with questions for consideration for determining merit below Jill's e-mail:

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*

Survey to Faculty Draft

Make anonymous

Department or Program

Determining Merit

Strong agree to disagree

1. Do you know how collegial evaluations of teaching are performed?
2. Does your unit have a set of criteria in place to evaluate merit?
3. How specific is the criteria?
4. Do you know what this set of criteria is?
5. How often does the unit have substantial conversations about merit criteria?
6. What materials does each faculty member submit for evaluation?

6. To what degree do you understand the relative weight placed on different kinds of research, teaching and service in the unit?
7. 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?
8. 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

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

Awarding Merit

1. Do you know how the results of the merit discussion transmitted to individual faculty members?
2. Does the Director communicate the substance of the merit/raise discussion in his/her annual meeting with each faculty member?
3. Does the Director write a letter summarizing the substance of that meeting?
4. 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

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

Fac Affairs created this doc, see the link for a refresher

Plan to work on survey during 12/2 meeting

Meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m.