

**Resolution concerning an alternative salary policy proposal.**

WHEREAS, throughout the long and dedicated efforts of the Salary Policy Task Force and the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to develop, negotiate, draft, and revise the elements of the proposed and newly amended faculty salary policy, a general consensus has persisted about the following goals:

The UW must:

- pay its faculty competitively upon hire and throughout a productive career;
- remove inequities in compensation for continuing, productive faculty;
- remedy compression for long-serving, productive faculty,
- motivate continuing productivity for mid- to senior- level faculty,
- limit the incentives for faculty to pursue retention raises and reward loyalty; and
- provide units with more salary policy flexibility, including at the departmental and individual level; and

WHEREAS, for over two years, it has proved difficult to achieve consensus among the faculty and administrators of UW's diverse schools, colleges, and campuses ("units"), about the specific elements of an effective and administrable new faculty salary policy that would achieve the goals above; and

WHEREAS, it has been difficult to draft a new policy that achieves the goals outlined in the attached rationale for all UW faculty in large part because the units have different faculty demographics, different funding models, and different competitive challenges in hiring and retention; and

WHEREAS, in order to garner support from the senators and faculty from these diverse units, the newly amended proposed Class A legislation for a new faculty salary policy permits every unit to adopt local formulas for market adjustment and flexible adjustment raises, and to opt out of tier advancement raises altogether; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility permits any unit to opt out of the central feature of the new salary policy's design – tier advancement raises for long-serving, meritorious faculty; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility also permits any unit to adjust the default formulas for market adjustment and flexible adjustment raises; and

WHEREAS, this local ability to adjust the default formula for market adjustment raises may reduce raise predictability for basic merit, and

WHEREAS, local flexibility means that UW faculty in different units may be subject to different timing and criteria for various kinds of merit-based raises, and to different expectations about career salary progressions; and

WHEREAS, the opportunity for local flexibility has the potential to add complexity and reduce transparency about the bases for merit-based raises, given the diversity of formulas and categories that may be adopted; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility requires administrative procedures and associated costs at the unit level to opt out of the proposed default formulas and tier-advancement review processes, and central and unit administrative procedures and costs to monitor and implement the opt-outs; and

WHEREAS, the proposal makes extensive and complex amendments to the faculty code to transition to and implement the default processes and formulas, including especially the tier advancement processes and raises, while simultaneously requiring other code amendments to permit units to opt out of the default processes and formulas; and

WHEREAS, the proposal is likely to generate significant administrative costs to effect the transition and ongoing administrative costs to monitor implementation of the default policy as well as the opt outs; and

WHEREAS, it appears likely that many units will indeed choose to opt out of the default processes and formulas; and

WHEREAS, the potential of local flexibility in regards to raise formulas and types means that faculty are now asked to approve Class A legislation to approve a new faculty salary policy without having adequate information about how it would apply in their units; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the consensus goals above should be achieved without the numerous, substantial changes to the faculty code proposed by the proposed Class A legislation, presented to the Senate Executive Committee on April 4, 2016, and the new administrative processes and costs associated with those changes; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the faculty senate leadership shall work with the UW administration to present proposed Class A legislation to the Senate Executive Committee for forwarding to the Faculty Senate in time for the SEC's first meeting in Autumn 2016; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a duly constituted committee shall consider proposed Class A legislation to implement substantive elements of a faculty salary policy:

#### **I. The key elements of an Alternative Salary Policy Proposal**

1. **Coverage.** All persons with faculty appointments are covered. Inclusion of Librarians is an administrative option.

2. **Promotion Raises shall be 12%.**

#### **3. Annual Market Adjustment Raises for Meritorious Faculty**

3.1. Market Adjustment Raises in any given year shall equal the CPI-U for the previous year, **or 2% of salary, whichever is more**, provided that the Market Adjustment Raises may not exceed 4% of salary. The Provost will determine the percentage each year after consultation with the SCPB.

[There will be an off-ramp, as in existing policy, if matching the rate of inflation for basic merit raises would cause severe financial distress and damage essential UW teaching, research, or administrative missions.]

3.2. The Market Adjustment percentage raise shall be uniform across all units.

[No change from the current salary policy].

3.3. All meritorious faculty shall be eligible for a Market Adjustment Raise. Each faculty member's eligibility for a Market Adjustment Raise shall be based on the most recent regular performance review.

[The processes and criteria for merit determinations are unchanged from the current salary policy.]

#### **4. Additional Merit Raises**

4.1 The Provost shall determine the percentage raise for Additional Merit for the succeeding academic year after consultation with the SCPB. The percentage shall be determined based on the maximum amount of funds reasonably available to the University to provide, or make sustained and substantial progress toward providing, competitive salaries to all eligible faculty.

**[This is a change from the current code. I think it would be more appropriate to have this policy stated in an EO.]**

4.2. The percentage raise for Additional Merit shall be distributed uniformly to all units. After consultation with elected faculty councils, deans may distribute different percentage raises to individuals.

[The process for determining “Additional Merit” under the current code is not altered.]

- 4.3. To be eligible for any Additional Merit raise, a faculty member’s performance must have been deemed at least meritorious in the last regular performance review. In determining the degree of Additional Merit and the appropriate percentage raise for individual faculty, units should engage in a holistic review of the faculty member’s cumulative career performance relative to peers, including exemplary teaching or service, or both, in addition to scholarship. In accord with the University’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

[This is not changed from the existing criteria except to make more explicit that teaching and service and diversity goals and efforts count.]

- 4.4. In determining the total amount of funds to be distributed for Additional Merit by a unit, and after consultation with and approval by a vote of the unit’s Elected Faculty Council, a dean may retain a portion of the additional merit pool [not to exceed \_\_\_ % of the pool in any given year?] to fund Unit Adjustment Raises under ¶5 below or Tier Advancements under ¶6 below.

[This is a bit different than the present code. It’s designed to give units flexibility, promote transparency, and also give faculty a say in setting priorities. It’s also designed to encourage units to build up a reserve, at least if there’s any money to do so. Perhaps the Provost should have power to intervene here and order certain deans to withhold a % or to contribute additional funds to enable units to build reserves for these purposes.]

- 4.5. As unit resources allow, after consultation with and approval by a vote of the Elected Faculty Council, a Dean may make additional funds available for Additional Merit raises, Unit Adjustments, or Tier Advancements, in addition to those provided by ¶ 4.4.
- 4.6. In the dean’s annual budget request to the Provost, the dean shall detail the unit’s plan and rationale for funding Raises for Additional Merit, Unit Adjustments, and Tier Advancement Raises, confirm consultation with and vote of the unit’s Elected Faculty Council on the plan, and describe the past year’s actual allocation, if any, under ¶¶4.4 and 4.5 to fund Unit Adjustment raises or Tier Advancement Raises, or both, and explain any deviation from the prior year’s plan. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting shall review and advise the Provost about unit’s annual budget requests.

## 5. Unit Adjustments

- 5.1. To the extent funds are available to a unit, and after consultation with and approval by a vote of the Elected Faculty Council and by the Provost, the dean shall give meritorious individual faculty members, groups of meritorious faculty, or all meritorious faculty in the unit, Unit Adjustment raises for the purpose of removing salary inequities, compression or inversion, or other phenomena that render a salary or salaries uncompetitive or unfair.

[Same as present code, but more explicit that unit adjustments can be used to remedy individual inequities.]

[Unit Adjustments differ from Additional Merit raises because the Provost would not be obligated to authorize the same % to every unit.]

6. **Tier Advancements for Full and Associate Professors (TT, WOT, and Research), Principal and Senior Lecturers, Senior Artist in Residence.**

- 6.1 A faculty member who is initially promoted to, or holds the rank of, Professor, Associate Professor, Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Senior Artist in Residence, on or after the date that this policy takes effect, will be assigned to Tier 1 in that appointment title. Lateral hires may be assigned to the tier the unit faculty and dean deem appropriate, subject to approval by President and Regents.

[This is very different from the amended Class A – which has rules for determining initial tiers and when advancement reviews are mandatory.]

- 6.2 Each Professor (TT, WOT and Research), Principal Lecturer and Senior Artist in Residence has the right to be considered for up to three Tier Advancements Raises. Associate Professors and Senior Lecturers have the right to be considered for up to three Tier Advancement Raises. No person may receive a Tier Advancement raise unless at least five years have passed since the effective date of that person's last promotion or tier advancement

[This is a big change from present code and also very different from the proposed Class A legislation. This provides a right and an opt-in by an individual, rather than a mandatory requirement with a unit opt-out. It provides a mechanism by which long-serving faculty can trigger a unique review of their accomplishments and secure a substantial raise.

This right is designed to reduce the incentives to shop for outside offers and thus reduce the use of preemptive, or actual, retention raises. At the same time, it reduces the burden on units to review approximately 25% of continuing faculty every year. Unlike the proposed Class A legislation, tier advancement raises, as described here, are not designed to be the principal mechanism for providing adequate compensation to loyal, meritorious faculty. They are designed to increase the tools and transparency with which a unit may provide competitive salaries to long-serving, very productive faculty.

- 6.3. Eligibility for Tier Advancement Raises – Eligibility for a tier advancement requires an extraordinary record of accomplishment during the period since the last promotion or tier advancement in teaching, research or service, combined with at least meritorious performance in both other categories. An extraordinary record of research requires evidence of significant national recognition, accomplishments that surpass the average of peers in the unit; an extraordinary record of teaching or service requires substantial evidence of significant recognition by the appointing unit. A recommendation for a tier advancement shall be approved by the voting faculty superior in rank of the unit, or in the case of full professors by the voting faculty equal in rank of the unit, by the Elected Faculty Council of the unit, by the Dean, and by the Provost.

[The point here is to give truly meritorious faculty, who due to compression or other factors may not be paid competitively, a right to trigger a review. In addition, this tries to make a tier advancement truly distinct from and more rigorous than the criteria for additional merit. This is a change from the present code and from the Class A proposal.

- 6.4 A faculty member whose tier advancement is approved under ¶ 6.3 is entitled to a tier advancement raise. A tier advancement raise for an Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer, or Senior Artist in Residence equals 8%. A tier advancement raise for a Full Professor or Principal Lecturer equals 10%.
- 6.5. Unit faculty may adopt by-laws requiring periodic reviews of faculty every five years up to without regard to whether the faculty member wishes to apply for a tier advancement.

[This is designed to make it clear that units can still do post-tenure reviews regardless of whether a faculty member applies for a tier advancement. These reviews could provide a basis for Additional Merit Raises. They are also an accreditation requirement, I believe.]

## 7. Retention Raises

- 7.1. Retention Raises will remain available as market conditions warrant, but they will require credible evidence of an actual or credible impending offer and a genuine intention by the faculty member to accept the offer unless the UW provides an acceptable retention raise. Retention raises in excess of \_\_\_% must be approved by the Provost.

[No change, except that more evidence of a likely offer is required. The goal is to make it easier to retain highly meritorious faculty through flexible, but transparent, use of Additional Merit Raises, Tier Advancement Raises, and Unit Adjustments, rather than through retentions]

*Submitted by:*

Kate O'Neill, Faculty Senate Past Chair  
Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

*Approved by:*

Senate Executive Committee  
April 4, 2016