

Department of Asian Languages and Literature
University of Washington, Seattle
Faculty Meeting
February 14, 2020
3:30 pm, Savery 138

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of minutes from previous meeting, held January 17, 2020 (Handel)

Faculty Senate update (standing item; Jesty)

Departmental chair search (Dubrow)

Establishment of written merit review procedures (Atkins; see attachment)

- For discussion and vote
- 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)

Merit Review Procedures
Department of Asian Languages and Literature
University of Washington, Seattle

Draft for Faculty Discussion: February 11, 2020

[This draft was prepared by the Executive Committee on February 10, 2020 for circulation to the faculty prior to the February 14 faculty meeting. It is a working proposal, intended as a starting point for discussion and revision.]

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.”

0. Basic Principles

- a. The Merit rubric for professors and lecturers¹ will have separate standards for determining levels of merit.
- b. The department will assign one of four levels of merit: No Merit, Low Merit, Merit, and High Merit. Faculty who meet the expected requirements will be judged to have Merit.
- c. For lecturers, Teaching is the primary responsibility. For professors, Research and Teaching are both equally important responsibilities. Meritorious Service is a part of the expected requirement for both categories of faculty.
- d. Evaluation of merit is to be cumulative over a period of n years, with meritorious activities taken into consideration in the determination of merit over the next several years.
- e. If a faculty member does not meet the Merit threshold in a required category, they cannot receive Merit or High Merit overall, regardless of performance in other categories.

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.

¹ There will be a university-wide faculty vote in March on a proposal to change the faculty code to rename lecturers to be teaching professors.

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(s) digitally by department staff.

5. Report and recommendation

After the person evaluated has had the opportunity to update the file, the evaluator(s) 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(s) as to whether the person evaluated should be considered meritorious, using one of the following categories: *High Merit*, *Merit*, *Low Merit*, or *No Merit*, in light of the criteria listed below in section 10. The report shall be submitted in hard copy to the department office and signed or initialed by the evaluator(s).

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(s) 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

The following activities and achievements are criteria for determining merit in each of the three categories of teaching, research, and service. A faculty member need not satisfy each bullet point to have merit in a category; nor is the list of criteria meant to be exhaustive or comprehensive. As general guidelines, the bullet points are presented here without explicit weightings or rankings, and without distinguishing those that are more important for or appropriate to professorial vs. lecturer faculty.

Research

- The publication of an authored or co-authored book
- An edited book/textbook published
- Publication of critical editions, anthologies, or similar works involving a scholarly contribution
- Articles/book chapters/essays/translations, research reports or digital equivalents published
- Digital Humanities projects such as the creation of a scholarly database or platform
- Reviews, encyclopedia or reference book/reference site entries, or guidelines published
- Serving as an editor of a national or international journal or book series
- Presentations of scholarship as a speaker or discussant at a conference, symposium, workshop, or invited lecture
- Serving as a reviewer for book and article manuscripts
- Awards and prizes related to research

Teaching

- Experimenting with innovative formats and new courses

- Demonstrated commitment to ongoing improvements in existing courses
- Demonstrating commitment to and success in supporting equity, access, and inclusion in the classroom
- Receiving student evaluations that are numerically high across the board, and qualitatively high evaluations from department peers
- Training teachers (including student teaching assistants) and involvement in teacher preparation
- Advising students, including thesis committees, independent studies, undergraduate student mentoring, exam and dissertation committees, and student placements
- Achieving professional certification (such as ACTFL)
- Actively engaging in peer mentoring, including reading and giving feedback on teaching and scholarship
- Receiving awards and prizes related to teaching and mentoring

Service

- Serving in administrative positions (chair, associate chair, summer coordinator, GPC, etc.)
- Chairing committees
- Participating in *ad-hoc* committees (such as promotion and tenure committees, search committees, etc.)
- **Serving on departmental committees**
- Serving on college or university committees
- Service to one's professional field outside the university (e.g. serving on editorial boards, doing editorial work, chairing or serving on executive committees of national organizations, chairing national award committees, etc.)
- Engaging in public scholarship and outreach for communities beyond the university
- Participating as external reviewer in tenure and promotion cases
- Awards and prizes related to service
- Organizing/running conferences, workshops, symposia
- Mentoring of students and peers outside of formal mentoring structures, especially for traditionally disadvantaged or underserved communities