Call to Order

Remarks by Divisional Dean Brian Reed regarding the consolidation of undergraduate advising at the divisional level, and related matters, followed by q&a

Approval of minutes from previous meeting, held November 1, 2019 (Handel)

Faculty Senate update (standing item; Jesty)

Department colloquium brief update (Mack)

Pedagogy forum brief update (Cho)

Establishment of written merit review procedures (Atkins; see attachments)
- For discussion and possible referral to executive committee
- Needs to be voted on at our next meeting (February 14, 2020)
- Must be completed, including college approval, by the end of Winter Quarter, before our annual merit reviews
- Attachments are (1) the pertinent section of the Faculty Code addressing salary increases based on merit, and (2) a draft of the procedures that simply describes our current practices (unchanged from last faculty meeting)

Adjourn (Personnel meeting to follow in executive session)
We hereby establish the following procedures for merit reviews, which shall be followed by the department chair and all faculty members in conformance with Section 24-55 of the University of Washington Faculty Code, “Procedure for Salary Increases Based on Merit.”

1. Submission of Activity Reports
The merit review procedure shall begin with the submission of annual faculty activity reports, which shall be due in early spring quarter on a date and in a format determined by the chair. The report shall cover the previous spring, summer, autumn, and winter quarters.

2. Appointment of Evaluators
After the activity reports have been submitted, the department chair shall appoint faculty members to evaluate the merit of colleagues of lower rank, with the exception of professors, who shall be evaluated directly by the chair. Regardless of which rank the chair holds, s/he shall be evaluated by the dean of the college. The identity of evaluators shall not be disclosed to the person being evaluated. Evaluators who have a pertinent conflict of interest shall decline the assignment.

3. Updating faculty files
Faculty members being evaluated shall be advised that they will be reviewed, and given sufficient time to ensure that their files are up to date. Normally this period will be two weeks or more.

4. Documents for review and access
The documentary basis of the review shall be the current curriculum vitae, annual reports for the past three years, peer and student teaching evaluations for the past three years, teaching materials for the past three years, and cumulative publications. These materials shall be made available to the evaluator digitally by department staff.

5. Report and recommendation
After the person evaluated has had the opportunity to update the file, the evaluator shall be given access to the file and produce a written report. An in-person meeting shall not be conducted; the file shall provide the sole basis for the report. The report shall
include a recommendation by the evaluator as to whether the person evaluated should be considered meritorious, using one of the following categories: *High Merit, Merit, Low Merit,* or *No Merit.* The report shall be submitted in hard copy to the department office and signed or initialed by the evaluator.

6. **Scheduling review meetings**
   The department chair shall schedule merit review meetings at which the merit of each faculty member, except professors, shall be discussed by eligible voting faculty members holding a higher rank.
   
   The meetings shall be scheduled so as to permit the pertinent faculty members sufficient time to read the written merit reviews in advance of the meeting, normally one week or more. In general, the merit of associate professors and assistant professors is discussed at one meeting, and the merit of principal lecturers, senior lecturers, and lecturers is discussed at another, but these discussions may be grouped as appropriate at the discretion of the chair. When multiple ranks of faculty are discussed at a single meeting, it is most efficient to discuss faculty members in reverse order of rank, so that faculty members may be excused in turn when their rank is up for discussion.

7. **Conducting review meetings**
   Review meetings shall be conducted in person with the department chair presiding. The evaluator shall summarize the report and present the recommendation. Those present shall discuss and vote by secret ballot. Absentee ballots shall not be permitted. Persons with conflict of interests shall recuse themselves from the discussion and vote. The ballot shall include the categories *High Merit, Merit, Low Merit, No Merit,* and *Abstain.* The role of the chair shall be to listen to and guide the discussion. The chair is entitled to vote as an individual faculty member, but may exercise her/his right to abstain from voting. The chair shall take written notes of the discussions and votes, including the vote counts, and deposit the signed notes in the personnel files of the department.

8. **Evaluation of professors**
   Full professors shall be evaluated by the chair, based on a review of their files.

9. **Chair’s recommendations**
   The chair shall transmit the recommendations of the faculty to the dean of the college. Drawing upon the candidates’ files, the reports and recommendations, and, if applicable, the merit review meetings, the chair may make confidential recommendations to the dean regarding the merit of each faculty member, indicating whether in her/his opinion the faculty member is meritorious and suggesting a specific salary increase.

10. **Basis for evaluations of merit**
    In developing recommendations, evaluators and voting faculty members are free to consider any legitimate measure of merit in teaching, research, and service, as applicable. Evaluations are cumulative, not based on the current year alone, and may take into account such factors as salary compression, salary inversion, and equity.
Section 24-55  Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this section, to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, University, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities.

The evaluation of a faculty member's merit and salary shall be arrived at after review of the individual's performance in relation to that of their colleagues and by comparison of individuals' present salaries to those of their peers. In evaluating a faculty member's eligibility for merit-based salary increases (Section 24-70, Subsections B.1 and B.4; Section 24-71, Subsections A.1 and B.1) and for "market gap" salary increases (Section 24-71, Subsection B.2), the following procedure shall be followed.

A.  In arriving at their recommendations for salary decisions the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, and deans shall each consider the following:

1. The cumulative record of the candidate, taking into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles;

2. The candidate's current salary;

3. Documentation of the review conference required by Section 24-57, Subsection D; and

4. Any documents produced under Subsection H of this section.

Salary recommendations shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of merit funds available over time, may be considered in making merit salary recommendations.

B. The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited.

C. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college, shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his or her recommendations the chair (or dean in an
undepartmentalized school/college) shall seek the advice of the full professors according to a procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.

D. If the recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean with any supporting data the dean may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendations he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

E. The dean shall review the department’s recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.

F. The dean of each college/school shall review the record and salary of the chair of each department and shall recommend an appropriate salary increase to the President.

G. The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.

H. At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit (as a result of reviews under this section), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee’s report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 58, May 16, 1978; S-A 75, April 6, 1987; S-A 82, November 21, 1990; S-A 99, July 9, 1999; S-A 124, July 5, 2011: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]