

Department of Asian Languages and Literature
University of Washington, Seattle

Faculty Meeting

March 13, 2020

3:30 pm

Conducted via teleconference only: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/740658142>

Agenda

Call to Order

Approval of minutes from previous meeting, held February 14, 2020 (Handel)

Approval of minutes from previous meeting, held March 6, 2020 (Mack)

Faculty Senate update (standing item; Jesty)

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

- For discussion and vote
- Must be completed, including college approval, by the end of Winter Quarter, before our annual merit reviews
- Attachment is the current draft, revised by the executive committee.

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 and Vote: March 13, 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. After that meeting, it was referred back to the committee for further revision. This is the second draft.]

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 eligible voting faculty members will choose from one of five levels of merit: Exceptional Merit, High Merit, Merit, Low Merit, and No 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.
- e. Faculty members who do not meet the Merit threshold in a required category should not be deemed as having High Merit or Exceptional 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.

2. Appointment of Evaluators

After the activity reports have been submitted, the department chair shall appoint a committee of two faculty members to evaluate the merit of colleagues of lower rank, with the exception of professors, who shall be evaluated by one another in a round-robin

¹ A proposal to change the faculty code to rename lecturers as teaching professors is being voted on and therefore these terms may change.

meeting. Regardless of which rank the chair holds, s/he shall be evaluated by the dean of the college, not by departmental colleagues. 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 evaluators 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 evaluators as to whether the person evaluated should be considered meritorious. Finer distinctions of merit shall not be made by the evaluation committee. 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 shall be discussed by eligible voting faculty members holding a higher rank (in the case of professors, the same 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 evaluators 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 *Exceptional Merit*, *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 vote on each other's merit in a round-robin meeting conducted by the chair. Persons being evaluated will leave the room while their merit is being discussed.

9. Results of vote

The voting tallies of the merit meetings shall be provided by the chair in writing to the person evaluated.

10. Chair's recommendations

The chair shall transmit the voting tallies 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 shall 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.

11. 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.

We decline to attempt a mechanical or mathematical model of determining merit, as we do not believe it can be done successfully. Distinctions should be left to the judgment of individual faculty members. These decisions are therefore subjective, but not arbitrary.

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