## Updates to the Class A Legislation, Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code regarding the faculty salary policy.

At the Faculty Senate meeting on March 3, 2016, the proposed changes to the FSP were discussed. At that meeting, it emerged that as a result of recent consultations among many people who contributed to the development of the proposed policy, a consensus had developed that to work well across the university, the proposed legislation required two additional key changes:

1. The code needs to be clarified to ensure that Variable Adjustments can be used to reward performance on a continuing basis. (This was always the intent of the working group that developed the policy and the FCFA, but the AG's office interpreted the proposed code to disallow this.)
2. At the request of some schools/colleges, a way was needed to opt out of the tier system.

After extensive discussion at the March 3 meeting, the senate decided that the most expedient thing to do was to reject the legislation and re-submit it in time for a first consideration at the April $21^{\text {st }}$ Faculty Senate meeting.

With this in mind, Senate Chair Norm Beauchamp appointed a task force consisting of Gordon Watts, Paul Hopkins, and Jack Lee to suggest revisions to the proposed Class A legislation to address these two points. The attached version of the proposal contains those revisions. In addition, we have reviewed all of the changes proposed by the president's office and the Code Cops (officially the "Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations," a faculty senate committee that reviews proposed Class A legislation for clarity and consistency with other parts of the code). Where appropriate the proposed changes have been absorbed into the proposed legislation.

## Notes on changes to address points 1 and 2

1. Section 24-35.L: The procedure to opt-out of the tier system. By default, faculty throughout the University who are defined as "tier eligible" will be in the tier system. At any time after this legislation has passed, a school, college, or campus may opt out by a majority vote of all the affected faculty. Once opted out, it is also possible to opt back in by the same procedure. As written, opting out (or back in) can't happen at the department level - school, college, or campus is the smallest unit of granularity. For the purposes of the code, faculty are considered as non-tier-eligible if their school, campus, or college has opted out of the tier system.
2. Section 24-61.D: The language describing the expected rate of the collegial review (and tier advancements) was clarified to make clear it was advisory. The code mandates at least one collegial review every five years - a requirement for accreditation. In the case of a non-tier-eligible school, college, or campus, deans might choose to require reviews as frequently as annually. As in the current code, the procedure for this review will be determined at the unit level.
3. Section 24-62: One of the possible outcomes of a collegial performance review is to recommend performance-based raises in a college, campus, or school that has opted out of the tier system. Performance-based raises will be distributed via variable adjustments.
4. Section 24-62.C: In a college, school, or campus that has opted out, all faculty are considered nontier eligible. This text was updated to give more flexibility in defining which categories of faculty are included when delegating performance reviews to a committee. This flexibility will also exist for tiereligible units.
5. Section 24-62.E: These lines make it clear that not only should the review make a determination of satisfactory/non-satisfactory, but it should also assess quality of performance. This will be important in schools, colleges, or campuses that have opted out of tiers and thus need a measure of performance to distribute variable adjustments.
6. Section 24-72.I.1: Extends the uses of variable raises for performance and other purposes the faculty and university might come up with later, with limits described below.
7. Section 24-72.I.2: Modified to make it clear the code allows variable adjustments to be initiated by the provost or dean or chancellor. In all cases the final distribution must be approved by the provost, no matter who initiates the process.
8. Section 24-72.I.3: Although the plan for distribution of variable adjustments must be approved every year, if it is to be used regularly for rewarding performance, it is expected that once first approved, the plan can be re-approved with a cursory vote by the SCPB.
9. Section 24-72.I.7-9: These paragraphs make sure that when "performance" is a factor in distributing variable adjustments, a fair consideration of the faculty member's full record is performed. These paragraphs are adopted with only minor modifications from the current code language describing merit raises.
10. Section 24-72.K: This clarifies that the expectation that a tier advancement will accompany a retention raise applies only to tier-eligible faculty; it won't apply in colleges that have opted out of the tier system.
11. Section 24.77.A: This change makes it clear that those who are in college, schools, or campuses that have already opted out of the tier system can receive market adjustments during the transition year.
12. Section 24-77.C: Restrict the determination of next mandatory collegial review to tier-eligible faculty. Non-tier-eligible faculty members who are subject to renewal will have their next mandatory review when they are up to renewal. In colleges that have opted out of the tier system, units will set their own expectations for time of next collegial evaluation.

## Notes on the changes proposed by the Code Cops and the President's office

Almost all changes are clarifications or minor corrections. While they are highlighted for the most part in the code below, the major changes are summarized here. In particular, those that were not accepted wholesale:

1. Throughout: Numerous subsection headings were added by the administration's Rules Coordination Office, as part of a general policy designed to make the code more easily navigable. These are not highlighted, but new headings are marked (like all other new text) with single underlines. They should accurately reflect the contents of their subsections, but they should not affect the substantive meaning of any part of the code.
2. Section 24-35.K: The original intention was to provide a way for someone to request an administrator exemption if they are not exempted by default, or to request that an administrator exemption should not be applied if they would have been exempted by default. The original language was not clear on intent, and the president's suggested changes limited the ability to opt out of an administrative exemption. This change also reflects the president's request to have the provost involved in all such decisions (not just the dean).
3. Section 24-43.A and 24-62.G: The president's office requested that the final decision for renewal of appointments, actions on a collegial review, be made by the full faculty in the appointing unit rather than by a delegated committee (if there was one formed in the first place). The delegated committee can still do all the work, come up with the recommendation, and present a simple list to the full unit to be quickly voted on.
4. Section 24-62.C: Deleted. The president's office has asked that the final vote on faculty performance must be approved by the unit's full faculty. As a result, there is no longer a need to specify if a delegated committee can approve or must send the results back to the faculty for approval - it must do the latter.
5. Section 24-62.J: The President's office had requested that deans be able to deny any tier advancement for financial reasons. It has been reworded to limit it to early tier advancements. We fully expect deans to request a schedule of upcoming tier advancements to plan their budgets sufficiently in advance to accommodate the inevitable statistical variations.
6. Section 24-72.C: The President's office has changed the subsection heading from "Financial Hardship" to "Financial Stress," because the former might have legal ramifications that are too restrictive for the present purposes (for example, if a declaration of financial hardship is required to deny or reduce raises to faculty, in a situation that fell just short of financial hardship, the university might be forced to lay off professional or classified staff before modifying faculty raises). We agreed that this wording adequately expresses the purpose of the subsection.
7. Section 24-72.C: The president's office extended somewhat the scope of changes that could be made in time of financial stress.
8. Section 24-72.C. 1. b: The President's office wanted 10 days' review by the SCPB. The time should be sufficient to allow two regular meetings of the SCPB for such an important discussion (plus likely a number of extraordinary meetings), so we are proposing to change the time frame to 15 days. The faculty as a whole still has 30 days review this (paragraph c).
9. Section 24-72.C.2: The president's office requested that the wording be clarified to say clearly that the delayed tier raises after a period of financial stress would be given at the rate in effect after the delay. This was always the intention of the working group and FCFA, and we recommend accepting this change of wording.
10. Section 24-72.I.9: The final distribution of variable adjustments must be signed off on by the dean and provost.
11. Section 24-73.A: The president's office requested three years to implement the salary policy, with a possible fourth year that required just informing the SCPB. We have proposed changing this back to two years, and made the third year require a bit more of a discussion in the SCPB.
12. Section 24-77.B.2: Rank and Title are different aspects (many faculty have both). This makes it clear that when calculating the proper initial tier both are taken into account. The president's office had suggested "rank or title," which is sufficient in most places in the code, but not here.
13. Section 24-77.E: Brings this text into line with the changes at Section 24-72.C.

## Other Changes

As we studied the document, we discovered some other issues that had nothing to do with the above concerns. They are summarized here:

1. Section 24-61.C: The original proposal here accidentally swept up a much broader class of people into the review and planning process (including, for example, research associates/post-docs). In this version, the list of faculty members who are required to have planning conferences is directly copied from the current code.
2. Section 24-77.A.1: The original proposal said "no market adjustments." The market adjustment for tier-eligible faculty was already factored into the transition raise; but this is not the case for non-tiereligible faculty, so the latter should get market adjustments. This fixes that oversight in the code.

Respectfully,
Gordon Watts
Jack Lee
Paul Hopkins

Below find the original preamble and the modified proposed legislation. Note that the conflict of interest legislation has to be updated. Its voting period hasn't completed yet.

## Commented [NLB1]:

Note: This language was converted back to the previous text at the request of the president's office. (Third academic year.)

## Commented [NLB2]

Update: The conflict of interest section has been updated to show revisions approved in Class A legislation 137.

## Class A Legislation. <br> Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code regarding the faculty salary policy.

Rationale for proposed Class A legislation: Chapters 24 and 25, "Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members" and "Tenure of the Faculty" (which are combined into a single Chapter 24, "Appointment Provisions of the Faculty", by this proposed change)

The current salary policy has the following stated goal: "The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit and retain the best faculty." This work grew out of a general feeling that the current policy was not living up to the second part of this goal retention. In particular, the phenomenon of salary compression was thought to be widespread - new hires were coming in at salaries that were close to or in some cases above their senior colleagues. As our peer institutions were giving better raises on average, UW left itself more open to poaching than it might otherwise have.

The current faculty code provides for regular and additional merit raises that have averaged less than $3 \%$. The proposed changes add tiers for members of the faculty who are appointed as tenure track, WOT track, or research professorial track, or as full-time lecturers, full-time senior lecturers, principal lecturers, artists in residence, or senior artists in residence (24-35). A member of the faculty performing normally is expected to advance a tier every four years on average ( $24-35 \mathrm{H}$ ). A tier raise is proposed to be $8 \%$ (though it is capped at $8 \%$ of the average faculty salary).

Further, each year, meritorious faculty will receive a market adjustment, which is in the amount of the percentage increase in the CPI-U (US Consumer price index for all urban consumers). Draft EO 65 sets the Tier and market adjustment sizes. The proposed faculty code changes and the draft EO allow for modifications on a by-unit or by-school basis of these numbers within limits (EO 65, 24-72 B).

There is also a provision for Variable Adjustments, which will be made available when possible, and have a lot of flexibility as to how they are applied (24-72 I). They are designed to address inappropriate salary differences between peers at the university to individual level. To keep track with peer institutions, this means about 1\% per year on average (in addition to the CPI-U above).

Promotions (and their timing) are not affected by this policy. Promotion raises are $12 \%$ in the current draft EO.

Retention offers are not affected directly by the proposed changes, though it is hoped the need for them will be reduced by this policy (24-72 K). Further it is hoped that the codifying of tier advancements and raises will increase the likelihood that salaries recaptured by retirement are redirected back into faculty salaries. If a retention offer occurs, it is expected that a tier advancement will also occur commensurate with the size of the retention offer.

The decision for tier advancement is made after a collegial performance review (24-62). This is meant to be a careful review by peers, and does not require outside letters as does a full promotion review. It is possible to delegate a performance review to a committee of faculty in the unit (24-62 C). Each faculty member will have a planning conference with the chair on a schedule determined by rank (at least every four years for full professors and principal lecturers, every two years for associate professors, senior lecturers, and senior artists in residence, and every year for others). After the planning conference, a collegial review may be initiated by either the faculty member or the chair, and in any case no later than five years after the previous review. An individual faculty member may request an early planning conference and/or an early collegial review at any time.

Tiers 7, 8, and 9 of the Professor rank are special, reserved for exceptional members of the faculty (24-35 I). Tier advancement to tier 7 of professor requires a careful review, including external letters. Finally, there are three time periods: pre-transition, transition ( 1 year), and post-transition. During the pretransition period, which would start with the approval of this legislation, the faculty salary policy operates under the same rules as the faculty does currently. During the transition period all faculty will have their
collegial review schedules set and those who are meritorious will receive a transition raise whose size depends on the time of their post transition review (24-77 D).

Every attempt was made to keep the code policy neutral, except where the new policy forced changes. In many cases the old code language was copied to new locations. The proposal uses the standard formatting to indicate this: underlined text is new, strikeout is deleted, and double underline is existing language (that has been moved). As chapters 24 and 25 have been combined, there is a lot of moved code.

Here is a brief summary of new and deleted or significantly altered sections:

1. 24-25 - Note that the Conflict of Interest is being considered in separate Class A legislation. Whatever the outcome of that process will be reflected here.
2. 24-35 - New section defining what ranks have associated tiers and how faculty progress across tiers and promotions.
3. $24-55$ - Make it clear how collegial reviews fit into the procedure for promotions; one possible outcome of the collegial review is a recommendation for promotion, which will trigger a promotion review.
4. 24-60/24-61-24-60 is now a heading, and also contains the proposed removal of the old 24-55 "Procedure for Salary Increases based Upon Merit". 24-61 details the process by which reviews occur, documentation, etc. - and contains a good deal of the code (reworded and clarified) from the old merit review section.
5. 24-62 Describes collegial performance reviews.
6. 24-63 Consequences of unsatisfactory performance was updated to reflect the new tier system and also clarified. It is also made explicit what section of the code to follow if no resolution can be attained by the procedure detailed here (25-71 D - as this is the current practice).
7. 24-71 Statement of principles of the faculty salary policy
8. 27-72 How salary increases are allocated (including provisions for per-unit customization). Includes details on each type of possible raise.
9. 24-73 Details how the transition to the new policy will proceed. This code and code sections after concerning the pre-transition or transitions periods will be removed automatically as they become irrelevant.
10. 24-74/75/76 Pre-transition code - which is a copy of the current code for merit raises and reviews.
11. 24-77 Details the transition period, how tiers will be assigned, transition raises, and assignment of each faculty member's first collegial review.

## University of Washington <br> Faculty Code and Governance

## Faculty Code

Chapter 24

Appointment, Evaluation, and-Promotion, and Salary of the Faculty Members

Part 24-10 Statutory Provisions and Regent Statement
Section 24-11 Statute Relating to Faculty
[For a statute relating to faculty, see RCW 28B.20.200]

Section 24-12 25-01 Statute Relating to Tenure Statute Describing Powers and Duties of Regents Relating to Faculty

FFor a statute describing powers and duties of regents relating to faculty relating to tenure, see RCW 28B.20.130 (1) and (2).]

## Section 24-13 25-11 Statement of Policy by the Board of Regents Regent Policy on Tenure of the Faculty

[See Board of Regents Governance, Regent Policy No. 2.]

Part 24-20 General Principles and Policies

## Section 24-21 24-31 General Faculty Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

## Section 24-22 24-32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. 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 ${ }_{2}$-and promotion, and tier advancement outlined below.
A. Scholarship

Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.
B. Inquiry and Research

The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. For each of these realms, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member's published or other creative work.

Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching: participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees. In all these, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included.
C. Scope of Instruction

The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or educational outreach. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring:
- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
- The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
- The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.
D. Professional and Public Service

Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.
E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties. including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.
F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in udging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.

## Section 24-23 24-33 A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in teaching, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to shared governance and the general welfare of the University.

Faculty members have the right to academic freedom and the right to examine and communicate ideas by any lawful means even should such activities generate hostility or pressure against the faculty member or the University. Their exercise of constitutionally protected freedom of association, assembly, and expression, including participation in political activities, does not constitute a violation of duties to the University, to their profession, or to students and may not result in disciplinary action or adverse merit evaluation.

A faculty member's academic responsibility requires the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.

Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and regents an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways that injure individuals and damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's instructors or colleagues. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but also be given an opportunity to be heard. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that clearly and significantly impede the functions of the University.

## Commented [NLB3]:

Whenever the transition sections of this chapter have been implemented, references to "merit" and/or "meritorious" elsewhere in the code must be reviewed for potential housekeeping changes

Students and faculty are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to evenhanded treatment in all aspects of the instructor-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach a student because of the student's beliefs or the possible uses to which the student may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. Students should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional relationship to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own roles in society. Evaluation of students and the award of credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance. (Examples of such matters include but are not limited to personality, personal beliefs, race, sex, gender, religion, political activity, sexual orientation, or sexual, romantic, familial, or other personal relationships.)

It is the responsibility of the faculty members to present the subject matter of their courses as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. Within the approved curriculum, faculty members are free to express ideas and teach as they see fit, based on their mastery of their subjects and their own scholarship.

## Section 24-24 23-46 H Right to Information

Upon request, the chancellor of a campus, the dean of a college or school, or the chair of a department shall provide a member of his or her faculty with information concerning salaries, teaching schedules, salary and operations budget requests, appropriations, allotments, disbursements, and similar data pertaining to his or her campus, college, school, or department.

## Section 24-25 24-50_Conflict of Interest Regarding Appointment, Employment, and Academic Decisions

A conflict of interest exists when a person participating in a decision has a substantial connection or interest related to individual(s) affected by the decision that might bias or otherwise threaten the integrity of the decision process or that might be perceived by a reasonable person as biasing or threatening such decisions. This includes familial, romantic, or sexual relationships and financial conflicts of interest. This may also include some professional relationships. No list of rules can provide direction for all the varying circumstances that may arise; good judgement of individuals is essential.

The procedures set forth in this chapter shall apply in all cases, except that no faculty member, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, or other status or interest of such person's parent, child, spouse, household member, sibling, or in-law a faculty or staff member with whom he or she has a conflict of interest. [See also Executive Order No. 32.]

In addition, no faculty member, teaching assistant, research assistant, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, promotion, academic status or evaluation of a student with whom he or she has a conflict of interest.

Conflicts of interest resulting from romantic or sexual relationships are detrimental to the functioning of the University because, if present, the professional authority under which decisions are made may be called into question. The University's responsibilities to the public and to individual members of the University community may be compromised if such conflicts of interest are not avoided.

The faculty's decision-making responsibilities should not restrict the faculty's rights as citizens, including the personal rights of association and expression, unless the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions. In that case, the faculty member must restrict his or her participation in such decisions.

> State law and University rules preclude a faculty member from participating in decisions which directly benefit a member of his or her family. The same rules should apply to decisions involving sexual or romantic relationships between faculty and students, since these relationships, like formal family relationships, may call into question the ability of the faculty member to assess the performance of another solely on academic or professional merit.

> Romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and students may in some instances infringe on the rights of that student or other students or colleagues. The possibility of sexual harassment may arise, if the faculty member's immediate power to influence a student's academic progress brings into question the ability of the student genuinely to consent freely to the relationship. The possibility of impeding the student's academic or professional progress may also arise if the faculty member is already in a position of significant decision-making authority with respect to the student, since the faculty member must abstain from further participation in such decisions, thereby denying the student access to the faculty member's professional assessment. The possibility of an unwelcome, hostile or offensive academic environment may also arise if the faculty member fails clearly to separate personal interests from his or her professional decision-making.

> Faculty members should be aware that the harms listed above do not arise only from existing relationships, but may also arise if an individual in a position of authority to a student makes overt sexual or romantic advances upon that student. Even if the advances are welcome, the faculty member should remove him or herself from the teaching or supervisory role, which may impede the student's academic progress. If the advances are unwelcome, the student may suffer unneeded stress, and the academic relationship may suffer.

## Section 24-26 25-71 Standard of Conduct

A. Obligation to Comply with University Rules and Regulations

The University is an institution having special public responsibility for providing instruction in higher education, for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research, and for providing related services to the community. As a center of learning, the University also has the obligation to maintain conditions which are conducive to freedom of inquiry and expression in the maximum degree compatible with the orderly conduct of its functions. For these purposes the University is governed by rules and regulations which safeguard its functions, and which, at the same time, protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. All members of the academic community, including members of the faculty, have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments.
B. Allegations of Research Misconduct

In cases concerning allegations of research misconduct against a member of the faculty, the procedures outlined in Executive Order No. 61 shall apply.
C. Allegations of Unlawful Discrimination, Harassment or Sexual Harassment, or Retaliation

In cases concerning allegations of unlawful discrimination, harassment or sexual harassment, or retaliation against a member of the faculty, where the dean has determined under Executive Order No. 31 that the allegations require an institutional investigation, the matter shall be referred to the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO).
D. Other Allegations

In cases where a member of the faculty is alleged to have violated another rule or regulation of the University, its schools, colleges, or departments, the following procedure shall apply:

1. The department chair or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college shall inform the faculty member of the nature and specific content of the alleged violation and shall offer to discuss the alleged violation with the faculty member and with the party raising the issue. The faculty member and the party raising the issue may each be accompanied by one person. The matter may be concluded at this point by the mutual consent of all parties.
2. If he or she so wishes, the department chair, the dean, or the faculty member may initiate conciliatory proceedings at any time by contacting the University Ombud as provided in Chapter $\underline{\underline{27 .}}$
3. If a mutually agreeable resolution is not achieved under Subsections D. 1 or D. 2 of this section, and if the dean (after consultation in the case of a departmentalized school or college with the department chair and the faculty member) determines that the alleged violation is of sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal statement of charges that might lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension for more than one quarter, then:
a. The dean shall appoint a special investigating committee of three faculty members who are not directly involved in the matter being considered.
b. The committee shall assist the dean in the informal and confidential gathering of information and documentation and shall advise the dean in its interpretation.
c. If as a result of the foregoing investigation the dean concludes that further action is not merited, then the matter shall be dropped.
d. A faculty member aggrieved as a result of these activities has potential recourse through the conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27 and the adjudicative proceedings described in Chapter 28, Section 28-32, Subsection A.
E. Dean's Written Report Filed with the Provost

If, after engaging in the procedures specified in Subsection B or D. 3 above, the dean concludes that further action is warranted, he or she shall deliver to the Provost a written record stating that reasonable cause exists to adjudicate charges of wrongdoing brought against the faculty member, with enough of the underlying facts to inform the Provost of the reasons for this conclusion. Upon filing of the written report with the Provost, the case shall be decided in the manner prescribed in Chapter 28.

## Part 24-30 Appointment Types and Qualifications

## Section 24-31 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability that evidences promise of a successful career.
2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.
3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.
B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles
4. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-43.
5. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-43.
6. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-43.
7. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or nonrenewal of the appointment of a research professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-43.

Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years (see Section 24-44, Subsection E.) The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-44.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-43.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24-32.
5. Appointment with the title of professor of practice is made to a person who is a distinguished practitioner or distinguished academician, and who has had a major impact on a field important to the University's teaching, research, and/or service mission.

Professor of practice appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-43. This title is available to address a unique appointment need and is intended to be sparingly used. Tenure is not acquired through service in this title.
6. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.
7. An affiliate appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
8. An adjunct appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.
9. A joint appointment recognizes a faculty member's long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.
10. A clinical appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
11. Appointment with the title of teaching associate is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or
shorter; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
12. The emeritus appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another state of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an administrator at the level of dean or vice president, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.
13. The acting title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.
14. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a visiting title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting lecturer.
15. The visiting scholar title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor's presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.

## Section 24-32-24-35 Research Personnel Appointments

A. Research Titles

Research titles designate appointments for faculty whose primary responsibility is research. The research titles are:

- Research professor
- Research associate professor
- Research assistant professor
- Research associate
B. Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Assistant Professor

Research professors, research associate professors, and research assistant professors are eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty, are expected to take active roles in generating research funding, and are eligible to act as principal investigators for grants and contracts. Research faculty may participate in the regular instructional program but are not required to do so, except insofar as required by their funding source.

## C. Research Associate

Research associate is considered a junior rank equivalent to instructor. This junior faculty appointment, which requires the same qualifications as those of an instructor, normally serves to
advance the competence of a person who has recently completed higher professional training, in most fields marked by a doctoral degree. Appointees will work under the direction of principal investigators for the benefit of the research programs, the department's educational program, and their own professional growth. Research associates may not be principal investigators on research grants or contracts.

## Section 24-33 24-40 Faculty Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT)

A. Professor or Associate Professor (WOT)

A professor or associate professor without tenure by reason of funding (WOT) is qualified for tenure by virtue of rank. Such a faculty member holds his or her appointment on a continuing basis. The term of appointment of an assistant professor WOT is governed by Section 24-44, Subsections A and D.
B. WOT Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Obligations

Faculty appointed WOT do not hold tenure because all or part of his or her annual Universityadministered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same. Except for termination of funding as defined in Section 24-44, Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 24-83), such faculty members are not subject to removal, or discriminatory reduction in salary, except for cause (see Section 24-82.)
C. WOT Faculty-Integration into Research, Instruction, and Service

Faculty members WOT are expected to be integrated fully into the research, instructional, and service activities of their departments, schools, and colleges, warranting their status as voting members of the University. This expectation is the basis for their appointment being continuing and distinguishes such faculty from other non-tenured and term appointments (see Section 24-44.)
D. WOT Faculty-Funding Support

Faculty members WOT have their salaries supported from a variety of department, school, and college resources, including, but not limited to, state funds, grant and contract funds, departmental, clinical and service funds. As defined in Section 24-61, faculty member's WOT shall have a written understanding with the chair describing their duties to be performed to meet the department's missions. This understanding will specify the sources, distributions and levels of funds supporting their salaries for these purposes. Salary funding shall be related to the faculty member's involvement in these departmental activities. Classroom instructional duties shall be supported from departmentally administered funds.
E. WOT Faculty-Identifying and Evaluating Alternative Salary Sources

To maintain the integration of WOT faculty members in the ongoing activities of the appointing unit during a temporary lapse in funding sources, appointing departments, schools, or colleges shall develop a process to identify and evaluate the availability of alternative salary sources. This process shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and the dean's office shall forward the policy to the Secretary of the Faculty. Should alternative resources be made available, a new version of the understanding specified in Subsection D shall be required.

## Section 24-34 24-36 Qualifications for Extension Appointments

Persons giving instruction in extension classes offered for academic credit shall have scholarly and professional qualifications equivalent to those required for the teaching of regular University classes.

## Section 24-35 Tiers and Tier Advancement

A. Tiers Generally

Tiers are levels within ranks and titles that reflect continuing achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and service, commensurate with the expectations for faculty members with a given rank and title in the appointing unit, as more fully described below.
B. Professorial Tiers

Within the professorial ranks the following tiers are established:

- Assistant Professor 1,2
- Associate Professor 1,2,3
- Professor 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9
C. Lecturer Tiers

Within the Lecturer titles the following tiers are established:

- Full-time Lecturer 1,2
- Full-time Senior Lecturer 1,2,3
- Principal Lecturer 1,2,3,4,5,6
D. Artist in Residence Tiers

Within the Artist in Residence titles the following tiers are established:

- Artist in Residence 1,2
- Senior Artist in Residence $1,2,3$
E. Eligibility for Tier Advancement

To be eligible for tier advancements, a faculty member must be appointed in the tenure, without tenure by reason of funding, or research professorial tracks, or appointed to a rank or title listed in Subsections B, C, or D above that is eligible for multi-year appointments (whether or not the individual's current appointment is multi-year).
F. Initial Appointment Tier

An initial appointment for a tier-eligible faculty member is ordinarily to Tier 1 within the given rank or title. A promotion for a tier-eligible faculty member is to Tier 1 within the given rank or title. However, an individual with significant prior experience who is initially appointed to a rank of Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Artist in Residence, or higher should be assigned an initial tier that is commensurate with his or her career stage and salary compared to market conditions and to the other members of the academic appointing unit at the same rank or title. The initial tier shall be assigned by the chair (or, in an undepartmentalized college, the dean), subject to approval by the dean in consultation with the elected faculty council.
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G. Advancement of a Tier-Eligible Assistant Professor

A tier-eligible Assistant Professor who is reappointed for a second three-year term (as described in Section 24-44, Subsection A) shall be advanced to Tier 2, effective at the start of the second threeyear term.

## H. Advancement of All Other Tier-Eligible Faculty

For all tier-eligible faculty members other than Assistant Professors, to receive an advancement from one tier to a higher tier (with the exception of advancement to Professor Tiers 7 and higher, described in subsection I below) depends on a finding that the individual faculty member's recent record of performance reflects continued achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and service at a level that is commensurate with the high expectations of the university and of the faculty member's academic appointing unit for a faculty member at a similar stage of his or her university career. The relative weights of these criteria for each individual faculty member may be adjusted from time to time as described in Section 24-22. A tier advancement should be awarded when a faculty member's accomplishments since the most recent previous appointment, promotion, or tier advancement are commensurate with that of a typical UW faculty member in the field over the course of about four years. Because this is a performance-based system, the rate of tier advancement will differ from one individual to the next, with some being advanced more frequently than the average and some less, when compared with the achievement of the appropriate comparators over the course of about four years. For the same reason, individuals may experience different frequencies of tier advancement at different times during their career.
I. Advancement to Professor Tier 7 or Higher

Advancement to Professor Tier 7 is based on an evaluation of the faculty member's cumulative record of performance, and depends on evidence of exceptional distinction in scholarship, teaching, and service as attested by the judgment of the individual's departmental colleagues at the rank of Professor and by external letters of review. Advancement to Professor Tier 8 or higher depends on evidence of continuing exceptional distinction, as attested by the judgment of the individual's departmental colleagues at the rank of Professor. (External letters of review are not required for tiers higher than 7.) A Professor who has advanced to Tier 7 or higher shall be entitled to the designation "Eminent Professor."
J. Tier Advancement-Unusual Circumstances

In unusual circumstances, a department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may recommend that an individual be advanced to a tier higher than those listed in subsections $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, and D above. Such an advancement requires explicit permission of the Provost.
K. Administrator Exemption from the Tier System

A faculty member serving in an administrative position, including chairs and deans, with responsibilities that include authority over non-administrative faculty members' salary adjustments, tier advancements, promotions or reappointments shall be exempt from the tier system. For compelling reasons, a faculty member serving in an administrative position that does not include authority over non-administrative faculty members' salary adjustments, tier advancements, promotions, or reappointments may request from the dean and Provost an exemption from the tier system; and one serving in an administrative position that does include such authority may request from the dean and Provost permission to remain in the tier system. When the faculty member's administrator exemption ends the faculty member shall be assigned a tier that is commensurate with his or her career stage and salary compared to market conditions and to the other members of the academic appointing unit at the same rank. The tier shall be assigned by the Provost, in consultation with the faculty member's chair, dean or chancellor, and elected faculty council.

## Commented [NLB4]

The original intention was to provide a way for someone to equest an administrator exemption if they are not exempted by default, or to request that an administrator exemption should not be applied if they would have been exempted by default. The original language was not clear on intent and the president's suggested changes limited the ability to opt out of an administrative exemption. This change also reflects the president's request to have the provost involved in all such decisions (not just the dean).
L. College, School, or Campus Exemption from the Tier System

Any college, school, or campus may choose to exempt its faculty from the tier system, or to reverse a previous decision to exempt its faculty from the tier system. This is done using the following procedure.

1. The dean or chancellor, in consultation with the elected faculty council, develops a proposal for tier exemption, or a proposal to reverse a previous tier exemption, together with a detailed justification. The proposal shall include a transition plan to minimize inequities that might otherwise result from the change.
2. The proposal and its justification shall then be made available to the faculty of the school, college, or campus for comment for a period no less than 30 days, after which the voting faculty of the school, college, or campus shall vote to approve or deny the proposed exemption according to the procedures described in Chapter 23, Section 23-46. All voting must be completed at least three months prior to the proposed effective date of the change.
3. If the result of the faculty vote is to approve the proposal, it is sent to the provost and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, together with the justification and the result of the faculty vote.
4. After consulting with the SCPB, and dean or chancellor when appropriate, the provost may, within 45 days after receiving the proposal, veto the proposed change for reasons of financial or operational feasibility or equity, and shall provide in writing the explanation for the veto.
5. If the provost does not veto the proposed change, then all faculty members in the affected college, school, or campus will be considered non-tier-eligible.

Commented [JL5]:
This is the "opt-out" provision for tiers. The procedure to opt out of the tier system. By default, faculty throughout the University who are defined as "tier eligible" will be in the tier system. At any time after this legislation has passed, a school, college, or campus may opt out by a majority vote of all the affected faculty. Once opted out, it is also possible to opt back in by the same procedure. As written, opting out (or back in) can't happen at the department level - school, college, or campus is the smallest unit of granularity. For the purposes of the code, faculty are considered as non-tier-eligible if their school, campus, or college has opted out of the tier system.

## Part 24-40 Appointment Policies and Procedures

## Section 24-41 24-51 Responsibility for Appointments

A. Recommendation of Faculty Appointments

The President and the appropriate college or school faculty share responsibility for recommending faculty appointments to the Regents. Full and discriminating consideration by that faculty of the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a proposed appointee is essential in an effective appointment procedure.
B. Assessment of Suitability of Prospective Appointees

The appropriate faculty, therefore, shall carefully judge the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a prospective appointee, shall determine from all available evidence his or her suitability for employment, and shall provide the Regents, through the President, with the information needed for a wise decision.

## Section 24-42 24-52-Procedure for New Appointments

A. Committee Role in Appointment Recommendations

Faculty recommendations of appointments are ordinarily rendered through committees, and the procedure depends upon the level of appointment.

1. For recommendation of a departmental appointment other than that of chair, the department members act as an advisory appointment committee. A department may delegate this responsibility to a departmental committee.
2. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a department chair should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean of the appropriate college, or if the President so desires, by the President.
3. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a dean should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the President.
B. Duty of Appointment Committee

The duty of an appointment committee is to search for suitable candidates, to study and determine their qualifications (Sections 24-22, 24-23, 24-31, 24-32 and 24-34), and to obtain and evaluate all data related to the problem of appointment. When, after such a study, the committee finds a candidate or candidates who appear to be qualified it shall transmit its information and recommendation to:

1. The department chair, if the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, or
2. The appropriate dean, if the appointment is to be one of a department chair, or
3. The President, if the appointment is to be one of a dean.
C. Administrator Role in Appointment Recommendations

In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all
available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Recommendations in favor of appointment, based on a majority vote of the voting members of the faculty or of the elected committee with delegated authority, shall be sent with pertinent information to the appropriate dean. If the chair concurs in the department recommendation, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if it is favorable, shall transmit it together with the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President. In the unusual case where the chair does not concur in the department recommendation, he or she may communicate objections to the dean and may also submit a separate recommendation to the dean from among the candidates who have been considered by the department. If the dean concurs in the chair's recommendation, or has additional information which raises doubts concerning the department's recommendation, or finds that the President has such information, the dean shall refer the matter again to the department along with an explanation and comments. After considering the evidence, the department may then either reaffirm its original recommendation, or transmit a new one. After the department's final recommendation has been sent to the dean, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if an appointment is to be recommended, shall transmit it together with the final recommendation of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President.
2. If the appointment is to be one of a department chair, the dean shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision. The department concerned shall be consulted in making the appointment, but a formal vote is not required.
3. If the appointment is to be one of a dean, the President shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision.

## Section 24-43 24-53-Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-44 whether tier-eligible or not, the procedure described below shall be followed.

## A. Faculty Recommendation

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-31, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

## Commented [NLB6]:

The president's office requested that the final decision for renewal of appointments, actions on a collegial review, be made by the full faculty in the appointing unit rather than by a delegated committee (if there was one formed in the first place). The delegated committee can still do all the work, come up with the recommendation, and present a simple list to the full unit to be quickly voted on.
B. The Chair's Recommendation to the Dean
If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does
not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.
C. The Dean's Decision
The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24-44 and inform the faculty
member concerned of the decision.
D. Written Statement of Reasons for Non-Renewal
If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non-renewal of his or her
appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

## Section 24-44 24-41-Duration of Nontenure Appointments

A. Assistant Professor

The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in Subsection D. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.
2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or
b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.
3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.
B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence
4. Appointment as a full-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.
2. Appointment as a full-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.
3. Except as provided in Subsection B. 4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer. artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-43, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.
4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B. 3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.
5. Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24-43 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.
66. A full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

## D.C. Assistant Professors on Other than State-Appropriated Funds

Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

## E.D. Less than $50 \%$ of Full-Time Status

The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than $50 \%$ of full-time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than $50 \%$ of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

## F.E. Research Assistant Professor

The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.
2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or
b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.
3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure;
b. The appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases $b$ and c the appointment is extended by one year.
4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or
b. The appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.
5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.
G.F. Research Associate Professor, Research Professor or Professor of Practice

At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, or Professor of Practice, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-43, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of a Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, or Professor of Practice is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

## H.G. Research Assistant Professor-Reasons for Removal

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Section 24-82), for termination of funding. or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 24-83.)
H.H. Research Professor and Research Associate Professor-Reasons for Removal

Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Section 24-82), for termination of funding as defined in Subsection I, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 24-83.)

## d.l Termination of Funding

Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least $50 \%$ of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.

## K.J. Research Assistant Professor-Unusual Cases

In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Subsection G.

## L.K. Procedures for Renewal and Promotion

The procedures prescribed in Section 24-43 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24-55 for Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.

## Section 24-45 Appointment of Part-Time Professors

A. Documentation of Part-Time Professorial Appointments

The University may appoint faculty to professorial or research professorial ranks (see Section 24-31, Subsections A. 1 through A. 3 and Subsection B.) on less than a full-time basis. The percentage of appointment at the time of hire shall be documented by the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) and clearly communicated in writing to the faculty member.
B. Part-Time Assistant Professor-First Appointment Period

The first appointment of a part-time assistant professor at 50\% or greater of full-time shall be for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. In Spring Quarter of the second year of appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed;
2. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the three-year period, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the third year; or
3. The decision concerning reappointment is postponed to the following year, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the three-year appointment is extended to include a fourth year.
C. Part-Time Assistant Professor-Reappointment Postponement

Should the decision in Subsection B above result in a postponement, during Spring Quarter of the third year the dean shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed for a further period consistent with Subsection $D$ below; or

Commented [RGD7]:
Note that although Section 24-45 has not been renumbered in this proposed revision, it appears without the double underline to indicate movement from another location.
2. The appointment is not to be renewed, in which case the assistant professor shall be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the fourth year.
D. Part-Time Assistant Professor-Second Appointment Period

Should the initial appointment of a part-time assistant professor be renewed pursuant to Subsection $B$ or $C$ above, the following renewal periods pertain to the second appointment:

1. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments of $90 \%$ time and above, the second appointment period shall be for three years.
2. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between $70 \%$ and $89 \%$, the second appointment shall be for four years.
3. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between $60 \%$ and $69 \%$, the second appointment shall be for five years.
4. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between $50 \%$ and $59 \%$, the second appointment shall be for six years.

In all cases, a mandatory review for promotion and tenure (or in the case of WOT faculty, for promotion and continuous appointment) must occur no later than the end of the last year of appointment as specified in Subsections D. 1 through D. 4 above.
E. Change in Part-Time Appointment Percentage

At any time during the appointment, the faculty member may change his or her percentage of appointment with the written agreement of the dean. In the event of a change, the time for mandatory review shall be stated in the agreement consistent with Subsection D above.

## Part 24-50 Promotion and Tenure

## Section 24-51 25-31 Definition of Tenure

Tenure is the right of a faculty member to hold his or her position without discriminatory reduction of salary, and not to suffer loss of such position, or discriminatory reduction of salary, except for the reasons and in the manner provided in the Faculty Code.

## Section 24-52 25-32-Criteria for Tenure

A. Tenured Appointment

Unless he or she is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:

1. He or she is a professor or associate professor; or
2. He or she has held full-time rank as assistant professor in the University for seven or more years and has not had his or her term of appointment extended by the Provost or received notice terminating his or her appointment.
B. Recommendation for Tenure Concurrent with Promotion to Associate Professor

Generally, recommendation for tenure (Section 24-54) is made concurrently with recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor (except in the circumstances listed in the subsequent paragraphs of this section.)
C. Appointments that Do Not Acquire Tenure

A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:

1. An acting appointment, or
2. A visiting appointment, or
3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, principal lecturer, or
4. An appointment as teaching associate, or
5. An appointment as professor of practice, or
6. Any appointment specified to be without tenure, or
7. An adjunct appointment, or
8. A research appointment, or
9. A clinical appointment, or
10. An affiliate appointment, or
11. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment.
```
D. Appointments to Associate Professor or Professor "Without Tenure"
    Appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor "without tenure," as specified in Subsection C. 6 above, are limited to not more than two consecutive appointments, each of three years' duration. The first appointment is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. During the second year of the initial appointment, the appointment will be considered for renewal consistent with the provisions of Section 24-44, Subsection A for assistant professors. If the associate professor or professor is reappointed, the three-year period of reappointment must include a tenure decision and terminal year in the event that tenure is not granted. To meet this expectation, the tenure review must be conducted no later than the second year of the second three-year appointment; during this second term of appointment, postponement of the tenure decision is not an option. In the case where tenure is not granted in the mandatory fifth year, the sixth year will be the terminal year of appointment. The part-time renewal periods provided for assistant professors in Section 24-45, Subsection D do not apply to associate professors and professors without tenure.
Appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor "without tenure by reason of funding," as specified in Subsection C. 11 above, are continuing appointments governed by Section 24-33.
E. Retaining Tenure When Resigning a Portion of Appointment
A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of his or her appointment with the agreement of his or her department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in his or her part-time appointment.
F. Part-Time Assistant Professor-Eligibility for Tenure
A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Section 24-45 accumulates eligibility for tenure under Subsection A of this section.
G. Leaves of Absence
Time spent on leaves of absence from the University does not count in the accumulation of time toward tenure.
```


## Section 24-53 25-33-Tenure of Faculty Members in Administrative Positions

The tenure of a faculty member who holds an administrative position, such as that of dean or department chair, extends only to the faculty position which she or he holds conjointly with such administrative position.

## Section 24-54 25-41 Granting of Tenure: Policy and Procedure

For "Documentation of Qualifications and Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases," see Executive Order No. 45].
A. Careful Consideration of Qualifications

Tenure should be granted to faculty members of such scholarly and professional character and qualifications that the University, so far as its resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a policy requires that the granting of tenure be considered carefully. It should be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, which is exercised only after careful consideration of the candidate's scholarly and professional character and qualifications.

| B. Recommendation Process |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Consistent with the timelines set in Section 24-52, Subsection A. 2 for full-time assistant professors |  |
|  |  |
| professors or professors "without tenure," a decision shall be made in the following manner: |  |
| A recommendation that the faculty member be granted or denied tenure shall be se |  |
| the school or college. This recommendation shall be based upon a majority vote of the eligible |  |
| professors and associate professors of the department, or of the school or college if it is not |  |
| departmentalized. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation she or he may also submit his or her own recommendation. |  |
|  |  |
| The dean, advised as prescribed in Section 24-55, Subsection C shall then make his or her recommendation to the Provost, and if tenure is to be granted it shall be conferred by the President acting for the Board of Regents. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| denied, the dean shall notify the individual in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the succeeding academic year. |  |
|  |  |
| A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory |  |
| proceedings described in Chapter 27, and may file a petition for review as provided in Section 24-87. |  |
| If a tenure decision is postponed for reconsideration, the assistant professor's dean shall cause him or her to be notified in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the second succeedin |  |
|  |  |
| academic year unless reconsideration in the meantime shall have resulted in the granting of tenure. |  |
| C. Tenure Review Separate from Promotion |  |
| If it is desired to appoint to a position with tenure other faculty members referred to in Section 24-52, |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Section 24-55 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A faculty member eligible for promotion (whether tier eligible or not) shall receive a promotion review if recommended by a collegial performance review (Section 24-62), or at the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory. The promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

## A. Consideration for Promotion

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion. Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-31,
Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or
undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an
instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-21, 24-22, 24-23, 24-31, and 24-32 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-22.
B. Promotion Record

The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The voting faculty of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.
C. Advisory Group to the Dean

The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

## D. The Dean's Decision or Recommendation

After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.
E. Written Statement of Decision

After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

## Part 24-60 Evaluation of Faculty Members

## 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/eolloge, University, and appropriate regional, national, and international communitios.

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;
2. Documentation of the review conference required by Section-24-57, Subsection- D; and
3. 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 lovel 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.
6. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized schoo//college, shall consider the morit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his or hor 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 roviow 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 ovent of two conseoutive annual fatings 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 momber, appoint an ad hoc committeo of department (or school/collego) facultysuperior (or, in the case of full profecorors, 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, upen completion of its review, repert in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the eommittes shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to onhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify oxisting misjudgments of his or her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculy member may respond in witing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committeo (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is oxtended by the chair or dean). The committee's repor and advice, the faculty momber's writen 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 24-61 24-57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Tenure, Tier Advancement and Collegial Performance Review Merit-Based, and Tenture Consideration

All procedures regarding promotion, merit-based-salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. This section describes procedures for gathering information to be used in collegial performance reviews (Section 24-62), and in promotion, tenure and tier advancement decisions, and for safeguarding the rights of faculty members and the welfare of the university. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University's obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards-processes shall be adopted-implemented in each department, school, or college.

## A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

Each faculty member with teaching responsibilities shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24-22, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member with teaching responsibilities also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college, and collegial teaching evaluations shall be considered when any decision is made regarding renewal of appointment, promotion, tenure, or tier advancement of a faculty member.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, Ffor faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under Section 24-52, Subsection D, or professor "without tenure" under the same subsection, or with the instructional title of lecturer, the collegial teaching evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the fank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or professor of practice, tThe collegial teaching evaluation shall be conducted at least every three-two years for associate professors and senior lecturers, and at least every four years for professors and
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principal lecturers. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained by the appointing unit and shared with the faculty member.
B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of satisfactory performance, promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendation of promotion, merit salary, or tenure-, reappointment, or tier advancement. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.
C. Regular Planning Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean or his-the chair's or her dean's designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors "without tenure" appointed under_Chapter 25, Section 25-32Section 24-52, Subsection D.

The chair must ensure that this conference occurs early enough that a collegial review can occur if a reappointment is required.

The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors, and principal lecturers, and professors of practice at least every three four years, the conference shall occur sooner than the required time if requested by the individual faculty member. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals-; and to assess when it is appropriate to initiate a collegial review of their performance. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit-collegial performance reviews, the gular planning conference should be distinct from the morit collegial performance review pursuant to Section 24-55-Section 24-62.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss:

1. The department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments;
2. Shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and
3. A shared strategy for achieving those goals-; and
4. The chair, dean, or designee's career advice and the possible timing of collegial performance reviews, based on the faculty member's recent performance and accomplishments, the department's needs and goals, and the faculty member's responsibilities.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32. The chair, dean or his or her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member's work.
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D. Outcome of Planning Conference

After the conference, a collegial performance review pursuant to Section 24-62 shall be initiated if requested by the chair, dean, or his or her designee or the faculty member; or if it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment; or if it has been five years since the last previous collegial performance review. A collegial review should occur about once every four years for most tier-eligible faculty not up for reappointment or a tenure decision (see Section 24-35, Subsection H).

## D.E.Documentation

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, shall, in a timely manner, document in writing, with a copy to the faculty member, that such conferences occurred, and shall list the subject matter discussed.

This conference document shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and responsibilities of the faculty member for the coming year(s) and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in this chapter.

Should the faculty member not agree with the summary or statements in this conference document, he or she shall indicate so in writing. The failure of a faculty member to object in writing to the chair's (or dean's) conference document within ten days of receiving it (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the period is extended by the chair or dean) shall constitute his or her official acceptance of its terms and conditions.

If the faculty member disagrees with the conference document, the chair (or dean) shall either withdraw it and issue a revised one to which both parties can agree, or reaffirm the accuracy of the original conference document.

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference document, the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior (or in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member, or faculty members from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner. The faculty member and the chair, or dean, shall each select one member of the ad hoc committee and those two members shall select the third member. At its earliest convenience, the ad hoc committee shall review fully the records relating to the conference, meet with the faculty member, and meet with the chair, dean, or his or her designee.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty member shall then meet with the ad hoc committee to discuss the issues, with the purpose of achieving a resolution. In the event resolution is not achieved, the committee shall, in a timely manner, report in writing the results of its review to the faculty member, to his or her department chair or dean, and to the designee, if any. The committee's report and advice, if any; the faculty member's written response, if any; the response by the chair, dean, or his or her designee, if any; and any agreement between the faculty member and chair, dean. or his or her designee shall be incorporated into a written report that shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and shall be considered during the subsequent collegial performance review.

A faculty member's record upon the stated duties and responsibilities in the conference document will be assessed in accordance with Section 24-55-62 Nothing in this section is intended to alter the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.
[The University Handbook included Board of Regents Governance, Regent Policy No. 8, and Executive Orders No. 29, No. 45, and No. 64 as footnotes to this section.]
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## Section 24-62 Collegial Performance Review

All faculty at the University of Washington (whether tier eligible or not)shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this section, to evaluate their merit performance and Fo arrive at a recommendations for an appropriate merit salary increase reappointment and the timing of promotions and tier advancements. 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. In all these, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included. Collegial performance reviews are initiated as described in Section 24-61, Subsection D.

The purpose of a collegial performance review is:

- To determine whether the performance of a faculty member is satisfactory or unsatisfactory;
- To consider a faculty member for a possible tier advancement;
- To consider reappointment of faculty members;
- To consider recommending a faculty member for a possible promotion in rank.
- To provide information for the distribution of variable adjustments as described in Section 24-72 Il.

A collegial performance review shall be conducted following the procedure below.
A. Reviewers' Voting Status

Reviewers must be voting members of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) of the individual being reviewed.
B. Reviewers' Academic Rank or Title

Reviewers must be superior in academic rank or title to the individual being reviewed, except that professors and principal lecturers shall be reviewed by members of equal or greater rank and title.
C. Optional Delegation to a Performance Review Committee

The voting faculty of a unit may, by majority vote, delegate the authority to carry out collegial performance reviews of all or some faculty to one or more committees of three or more faculty members. This delegation is subject to the following rules:

1. The vote must stipulate which ranks and titles the committee being formed will review.

The faculty vote must stipulate that the committee is empowered to carry out an initial review and make recommendations which are then voted upon by the eligible faculty of the unit as described in Section G below.
2. This delegation does not alter the faculty rank or title requirements for collegial performance evaluations described in Section B above.
3. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this delegation biennially.
D. Unit Guidelines

The unit shall develop guidelines for the collegial performance review. The guidelines shall specify responsibilities for assembly of the record, including a self-assessment.
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E. Performance Assessment

In evaluating the quality of an individual's performance and in assessing whether that performance is satisfactory, reviewers shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-22, 24-23, 24-31, and 24-32, and Executive Order 45 for the various academic ranks and titles. Performance shall be measured upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service and shall consider the whole record of the individual's qualifications described in Section 24-22, including:

1. The most recent assessment of teaching effectiveness, as provided in Section 24-61, Subsection A;
2. The individual's most recent activity report, as described in Section 24-61, Subsection B;
3. Documentation of the planning conference, as provided in Section 24-61, Subsection D;
4. The individual's self-assessment.
F. Initial Committee Report

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report is produced by a committee, the department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee), shall provide the individual being reviewed with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the summary given to the individual being reviewed. The individual being reviewed may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The head of the unit shall forward any such response, together with the committee's report, to all qualified reviewers.
G. Consideration of Record and Possible Actions

The faculty members who are eligible to review the individual under consideration shall then consider the individual's record and/or the recommendation of a review committee. Following the consideration, there shall be a vote by all eligible voting faculty members of the department or school/college on whether the individual's performance is satisfactory and on whether one or more of the following actions should be taken.

1. The faculty member should be given one or more tier advancements based on the criteria of this section;
2. The faculty member should be considered for a possible promotion in rank and title, following the procedures of Section 24-55;
3. The faculty member should be reappointed, following the procedures of Section 24-43.
H. Written Summary

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee, or chair of the delegated committee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.
I. Recommendation for Tier Advancement
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These lines make it clear that not only should the review make a determination of satisfactory/non-satisfactory, but it should also assess quality of performance. This will be important in schools, colleges, or campuses that have opted out of tiers and thus need a measure of performance to distribute variable adjustments.
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The president's office had requested that deans be able to deny any tier advancement for financial reasons. It has been reworded to limit it to early tier advancements. We fully
expect deans to request a schedule of upcoming tier advancements to plan their budges sufficiently in advance to accommodate the inevitable statistical variations.

1. Enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking collegial performance evaluation of this colleague, or to rectify
2. Rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit performance and make adjustments to correct any associated salary inequity-decision.
E. Written Faculty Member Response

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).
F. Meeting with Faculty Member

Upon receipt of the committee's-report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreoment reachod by (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) shall meet with the faculty member-and. Where the committee report reaffirms the unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member, this meeting shall serve to inform the faculty member of standard conduct violations, including but not limited to incompetence or neglect of duty as appropriate, and fulfill the requirements of Sections 24-26, Subsection B. If a mutually agreed upon plan to address the unsatisfactory performance cannot be finalized, the chair shall be incorporated into a written report refer the matter to the dean for review.
G. Dean's Decision

If the dean determines that the performance concerns are of sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal statement of charges, the provisions of Section 24-26 Subsection D shall next be followed.

## Part 24-70 Faculty Salary Policy and Procedures

## Section 24-71 24-70 Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles

A. Purpose

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be salaried on a merit-based system that reflects the University's standing among its peer institutions. Under this system, all faculty deemed meritorious shall be regularly rowardod for thoir contributions to their departmont, school/college, and university. Resources permitting, the University shall provide its meritorious faculty with salaries commensurate with those of their peers elsewhere.

The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit, retain, motivate, and reward the best faculty. To accomplish these objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Therefore, the University places as one of its highest priorities rewarding faculty who perform to the highest standards and who continue to do so throughout their appointments at the University. This policy is designed to provide for a predictable salary progression for faculty members whose performance continues to reflect achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and/or service, commensurate with the expectation for faculty members with a given rank and title in their appointing unit, as fully described below.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward faculty, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University's Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among units. This provides the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, acknowledges existing and future differentials in unit performance and contribution, and also recognizes that differing funding sources and reward structures exist among schools and colleges. The policy must ensure that equity considerations and compression are also addressed as needed. The University's Salary Policy is founded upon the principle that individual salary decisions must be based on performance reviews conducted by faculty colleagues.
B. Salary Increases

Advancement in salary can be effected in several distinct, but not mutually exclusive, ways. Except as otherwise provided in Section 24-72, a salary increase:

1. Shall attend promotion in rank (approved in accord with Section 24-55);
2. Shall attend each tier advancement (approved in accord with Section 24-62);
3. Shall be provided as part of a market adjustment (in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection H);
4. May be provided as part of a variable adjustment (in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection I);
5. Shall be provided to raise individuals' salaries to the minimum salary for each faculty rank (in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection J);
6. May be offered in response to a potential or actual external offer of appointment (upon review in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection K);
7. May be offered at any time (in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection F) to a faculty member with an administrator exemption (as described in Section 24-35, Subsection K);
8. Shall be considered at the time of reappointment, and may be offered at other times, for non-tiereligible faculty members.

## Section 24-72 24-71 Procedures for Allocating Salary Increases

## A. Default Formulas

The President shall establish by executive order default formulas for the determination of salary increases to accompany promotions in rank and title; salary increases to accompany tier advancements; and market adjustments. These formulas shall remain in effect for all units in the university unless modified as described in Subsection B or C below.

## B. Alternate Formulas

Any college, school, or campus may develop alternate formulas for the determination of salary increases to accompany tier advancements, and market adjustments. This is done using the following procedure.

1. The dean or chancellor, in consultation with the elected faculty council, develops recommended formulas for market adjustments and tier advancement salary increases in the college. These formulas may be the same for all academic appointing units in the college, or they may differ by academic appointing unit. The consultation should include detailed consideration of salaries in each affected unit of the college, school, or campus, as well as information about salaries in appropriate units at peer institutions. The recommendation shall specify to which units the formulas apply, when the formulas are to take effect, whether the formulas are to have an expiration date, and if so when. For any formula that has an expiration date, the formula will revert to the university default in effect at the time of expiration. If the formula does not apply to all units in the school, college, or campus, then the affected unit(s) shall vote and that vote shall be made known to the whole college as part of the material made available in Subsection B. 2 below.
2. The proposed formulas and the financial justification shall then be made available to the faculty of the school, college, or campus for comment for a period no less than 30 days, after which the voting faculty of the school, college, or campus shall vote to approve or deny the proposed change according to the procedures described in Chapter 23, Section 23-46. All voting must be completed at least three months prior to the proposed effective date of the change.
3. If the result of the faculty vote is to approve the proposed formulas, the proposal is sent to the provost and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, together with the justifying financial data and the result of the faculty vote.
4. After consulting with the SCPB, and dean or chancellor when appropriate, the provost may, within 45 days after receiving the proposed formulas, veto the proposed change for reasons of financial or operational feasibility or equity, and shall provide in writing the explanation for the veto.
C. Severe Financial Stress
5. If at any time, distributing salary increases according to the formulas established in accordance with Subsection A or B would, in the judgment of the President, impose severe financial stress on the university, a school, college, campus, or academic appointing unit, and notwithstanding any other provision of the Faculty Code, the President may change one or more of the formulas temporarily to as low as zero, or may temporarily delay tier advancement increases or rank
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The president's office has changed the subsection heading from "Financial Hardship" to "Financial Stress," because the former might have legal ramifications that are too restrictive or the present purposes (for example, if a declaration of inancial hardship is required to deny or reduce raises to faculty, in a situation that fell just short of financial hardship, the university might be forced to lay off professional or classified staff before modifying faculty raises). We agreed that this wording adequately expresses the purpose of the subsection.

The president's office extended somewhat the scope of changes that could be made in time of financial stress.
promotion increases, or may extend a previously established change or delay, by following the procedure below.
a. The Provost presents a recommendation for a change in formula, or for a delay in tier advancement increases or rank promotion increases for a specified time, to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, together with as much budgetary data as then available to support the recommendation. The recommendation shall specify when the change or delay is to take effect and for how long.
b. Within fifteen days the SCPB conducts an advisory vote to endorse, reject, or modify the Provost's recommendation.
c. The Provost's recommendation and the result of the SCPB's advisory vote are then promptly made available to the affected faculty for comment by the Secretary of the Faculty for a period no more than 30 days.
d. The President then decides whether and how much to modify the salary formulas, or whether and how long to delay tier advancement increases or rank promotion increases, and reports the decision and its justification to the Faculty Senate.
2. If tier advancement increases and/or rank promotion increases are delayed, units may proceed to award tier advancements and rank promotions as usual, but any accompanying salary increases shall not be awarded until the delay period expires. At that time, faculty members who received tier advancements or rank promotions during the delay period shall receive non-retroactive salary increases according to the formulas put in effect for the period following the delay period.
D. Promotion Raises

Each faculty member who receives a promotion in rank shall receive a salary increase, to be effective on the same date as the promotion, in an amount determined by the formula in effect on the date the promotion takes effect, except as otherwise provided in Subsections A-C above.
E. Tier Advancement Raises

Each tier-eligible faculty member who receives a tier advancement shall receive a salary increase, to be effective on the same date as the tier advancement, in an amount determined by the formula in effect on the date the advancement takes effect, except as otherwise provided in Subsections A-C above.
F. Salary Adjustments for Faculty with Administrator Exemptions

Salary adjustments may be offered at any time to a faculty member with an administrator exemption as described in Section 24-35, Subsection K.
G. Non-Tier Faculty Salary Adjustments

Non-tier eligible faculty members shall be considered for a salary adjustment at the time of reappointment. In addition they may be considered for a salary adjustment at other times.
H. Market Adjustments

1. A market adjustment is a salary increase to mitigate the effects of general economic and price escalations in the region. A market adjustment formula, reflecting these escalations, shall be established by the President.
2. Except as provided in Subsection $C$ above, each year every faculty member (whether tier eligible
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The president's office wanted 10 days review by the SCPB. The time should be sufficient to allow 2 regular meetings of the SCPB for such an important discussion (plus likely a number of extraordinary meetings), so we are proposing to change the time frame to 15 days. The faculty as a whole still has 30 days to review this (paragraph c.).
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The president's office requested that the wording be clarified to say clearly that the delayed tier raises after a period of financial stress would be given at the rate in effect after the delay. This was always the intention of the working group and FCFA, and we recommend accepting this change of wording.
or not) who has been deemed to be performing satisfactorily in their last collegial performance review shall receive a market adjustment determined by the market adjustment formula.
3. If, in any given year, the market adjustment formula would produce a market adjustment that is zero or negative, no market adjustment shall be given.

## I. Variable Adjustments

1. Variable adjustments are salary increases that can be used for a variety of purposes. Typical uses for variable adjustments include, but are not limited to, the following:
a. To address salary compression or inversion within a unit;
b. To address a "salary gap" between a unit and its academic peers inside or outside the university;
c. To correct inappropriate salary differences among individual faculty members whose accomplishments and career stages are comparable;
d. To provide an additional increase to all satisfactorily performing faculty at a time when the market adjustment is not sufficient to keep pace with average salary advances at peer institutions.
e. To reward performance.
2. In any given year, a variable adjustment may be initiated in the following ways:
a. The provost, after consulting with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, may require one or more colleges, schools, or campuses to allocate certain funds for variable adjustments, and may specify such requirements, conditions, and limitations on their distribution as he or she deems appropriate.
b. A dean or chancellor, after consulting with the elected faculty council and department chairs, may propose the allocation of certain funds for variable adjustments in a college, school, or campus and may specify such requirements, conditions, and limitations on their distribution as he or she deems appropriate. The consultation with the elected faculty council shall include making available to the council detailed information about salaries in each unit of the college, or school, as well as information about salaries in appropriate units at peer institutions as available.
3. The Provost, after consulting with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, may authorize or deny the variable adjustment allocation proposed by a dean or chancellor or may modify it or make it subject to such requirements, conditions, and limitations as he or she deems appropriate.
4. Variable adjustment funds need not be distributed as equal percentages to all units, or to all individuals within a unit.
5. If variable adjustments are authorized in a department or an undepartmentalized school or college, the voting faculty members of the unit shall vote on the procedure and principles to be applied in recommending distribution of the funds consistent with the requirements, conditions, and limitations described in paragraphs 2 and 3 above.
6. A new collegial performance review is not required for the awarding of a variable adjustment. However, a faculty member whose performance was found to be unsatisfactory in his or her last
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Extends the uses of variable raises for performance and other purposes the faculty and university might come up later, with limits described below.

## Commented [NLB23]:

Modified to make it clear the code allows variable adjustments to be initiated by the provost or dean or chancellor. In all cases the final distribution must be approved by the provost, no matter who initiates the process.
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Comment: If a college proposes the same plan year after year, we expect that this provost/SCPB review can be cursory.
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Like all salary decisions, review and approval by the dean and provost are required and this section reflects a realistic expression of their authority
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Accept this change. But move some of the wording to part 9 below.
collegial performance review is not eligible for a variable adjustment.
7. If the rules for allocation of a variable adjustment allow for differential allocations to individuals, then in arriving at their recommendations for allocation to individuals, the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, deans, and chancellors shall each consider the following:
a. the candidate's cumulative record;
b. the candidate's current salary
c. the written summary of the most recent collegial performance review;
d. any relevant documentation produced since that review, such as annual reports, planning conference documentation, and teaching evaluations;
e. any documents produced under Section 24-63.

Differential allocation of variable adjustments to individuals shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of funds available over time, may be considered in making variable adjustment recommendations.
8. If the rules for allocation of a variable adjustment allow for differential allocations to individuals, a recommendation for the variable adjustment for each individual shall be arrived at as follows:
a. The variable adjustment for each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be recommended by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title.
b. The variable adjustment for each full professor shall be recommended by the chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college. 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 the procedure adopted in paragraph 5 above.
9. The distribution recommendation will be forwarded to the dean for review who, if he or she approves, will then forward the recommendation to the Provost for final approval.

## J. Minimum Salaries

Every two years, the Provost shall, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, determine the minimum salary for each faculty rank. This determination shall take account of the recent salaries of beginning assistant professors at the University of W ashington, and shall endeavor to reflect in the floors for other ranks the general expectation of salary advancement for faculty.

## K. Retention Increases

To-A department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized college) may at any time propose a salary increase to retain a current faculty member, based on subject to the recommendation approval of the dean and Provost. Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. The voting faculty of each academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to east an advisory vote on the recommend an appropriate response; alternatively, the voting faculty may establish, consistent with the procedures of Chapter 23, Section 23-45, a different policy regarding the level of consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This policy shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially. Any retention salary increase
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Comment: Note that a department chair can require a performance review at any time, and might wish to do so annually if variable adjustments are routinely based on performance.
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Sections 7 and 8 are adapted from the current code language describing merit salary increases. These paragraphs make sure that when "performance" is a factor in distributing variable adjustments, a fair consideration of the faculty member's full record is performed. These paragraphs are adopted with only minor modifications from the current code language describing merit raises.
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The final distribution of variable adjustments must be signed off on by the dean and provost.
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Accepted president's changes, but moved this sentence down here.
for a tier-eligible faculty member should ordinarily be accompanied by one or more tier advancements commensurate with the tier raise formula then in effect.

## Section 24-73 Transition to the New Salary Policy

New temporary section.
A. Transition Timeline

Once the new faculty salary policy has been approved by the faculty and signed by the President, the President shall establish a Transition Period, to start no later than the beginning of Autumn Quarter of the third academic year after the academic year during which the President signs the enabling legislation. This timeline may be extended for up to one year by the President after consultation with the SCPB. In this section, the following terms are used:

1. The Pre-Transition Period is the period from the time the new salary policy is signed by the President until the start of the Transition Period.
2. The Transition Period begins on a date determined by the president, and ends at the start of the next Autumn Quarter after that.
3. The Implementation Date of the new salary policy is the beginning of the next Autumn Quarter following the start of the Transition Period; and the Implementation Year is the academic year starting on the Implementation Date.
B. Salaries During Transition

The university's faculty salary policy shall be governed as follows:

1. During the Pre-Transition Period, faculty salaries shall be governed by the Pre-Transition Salary Policy, described in Sections 24-74 through 24-76 below. During the Pre-Transition Period, there shall be no Market Adjustments, no Tier Advancements or Tier Raises, and no Variable Adjustments.
2. During the Transition Period, faculty salaries shall be governed by the Transition Salary Policy, described in Section 24-77 below.
3. Starting from the Implementation Date of the new salary policy, Sections 24-73 through 24-77 shall be deleted from the Faculty Code and shall cease to be effective, and the salary policy shall be governed by the remaining provisions of this chapter of the Faculty Code.

## Section 24-74 24-55 Pre-Transition 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
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This clarifies that the expectation that a tier advancement will accompany a retention raise applies only to tier-eligible faculty; it won't apply in colleges that have opted out of the tier system.
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Note: This language was converted back to the previous text at the request of the president's office.

24-75, Subsections B. 1 and B.4; Section 24-76, Subsections A. 1 and B. 1 and for "market gap" salary increases Section 24-71 76, Subsection B.2, the following procedure shall be followed.
A. Considerations for Merit Salary Increases

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 24-22, 24-23, 24-31, and 24-32 for the various academic ranks and titles;
2. The candidate's current salary;
3. Documentation of the review conference required by Section 24-61, Subsection E; 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. Faculty Recommendation

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. Review of Full Professors

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. Chair's Recommendation

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. Dean's Recommendation for Faculty

The dean shall review the department's recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.
F. Dean's Recommendation for Chairs

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, if any, to the President.
G. President's Authorization

The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.
H. Committee Review of No Merit Rating

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 24-75 24-70 Pre-Transition Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles

A. Purpose

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be salaried on a merit-based system that reflects the University's standing among its peer institutions. Under this system, all faculty deemed meritorious shall be regularly rewarded for their contributions to their department, school/college, and university. Resources permitting, the University shall provide its meritorious faculty with salaries commensurate with those of their peers elsewhere.
B. Salary Increases

Advancement in salary can be effected in several distinct, but not mutually exclusive, ways. A salary increase:

1. Shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review conducted in accord with procedures of Section 24-74;
2. Shall attend, in addition to awards under Subsection B. 1 above, promotion in rank approved in accord with Section 24-55;
3. Shall be awarded to raise individuals' salaries to the minimum salary for each faculty rank in accord with Section 24-76, Subsection A.3;
4. May be awarded as an additional merit salary increase beyond that available under Subsection B. 1 following review procedures of Section 24-74;
5. May be awarded as a result of unit-level adjustment in accord with Section 24-76, Subsection B.2;
6. May be offered in response to a potential or actual external offer of appointment upon review in accord with Section 24-76, Subsection B.3; and
7. May be allocated as a University-wide increase in the faculty salary base that shall be distributed in equal dollar amounts or equal percentage salary increases to all meritorious faculty.

## Section 24-76 24-71-Pre-Transition Procedures for Allocating Salary Increases

## A. Provost's Consultation

The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and-shall subsequently recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in Section 24-75, Subsection B. The President shall make the final decision on these allocations and shall report the decision to the Faculty Senate.

1. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide an initial minimum equalpercentage salary increase to all faculty deemed meritorious under Section 24-74.
2. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide salary increases to all faculty awarded promotions approved in accord with Section 24-55.
3. Every two years, the Provost shall, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, determine the minimum salary for each faculty rank. This determination shall take account of the recent salaries of beginning assistant professors at the University of Washington, and shall endeavor to reflect in the floors for other ranks the general expectation of salary advancement for faculty.
B. Provost Distributions and Authorizations

The Provost may distribute, in the course of a biennium, funds allocated by the President:

1. To provide additional merit salary increases beyond those awarded under Subsection A.1. This allocation shall be distributed as equal-percentage increases to all units to fund merit increases for faculty in accord with Section 24-74.
2. To address the market "gap" of an individual unit. Allocation of such funds to units shall follow close consideration of individual units and consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. The Provost shall periodically gather updates on salary information from appropriate sources, including unit heads, and shall make those findings available to the faculty. The department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall consult with the unit's voting faculty who are senior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank-or the unit's designated faculty committee(s)-about the appropriate distribution of these funds; and
3. To retain a current faculty member, based on the recommendation of the dean. Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. The faculty of each academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to cast an advisory vote on the appropriate response; alternatively, the faculty may establish, consistent with the procedures of Chapter 23, Section 2345 , a different policy regarding the level of consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This policy shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially.
C. Dean Distributions

The deans of the schools and colleges shall, after consultation with their elected faculty councils Chapter 23, Section 23-45, allocate to the faculty of the constituent units of their school/college, all funds made available to provide salary increases under Section 24-75, Subsection B. Distribution of
these awards to individual faculty shall be carried out following the requisite procedures of this chapter.

## Section 24-77 Transition Period Salary Policy

New temporary section.
A. During the Transition Period:

1. There will be market adjustments for non-tier-eligible faculty, but not for tier-eligible faculty,
2. There will be no tier advancements,
3. Meritorious faculty may receive Transition Raises as described below,
4. Faculty members promoted to a new rank or title during the transition period will receive their promotion raise upon the effective date of the promotion,
5. Each faculty member shall submit a yearly activity report as described in Section 24-61, Subsection B.
6. A planning conference may be initiated as described in Section 24-61, Subsection C,
7. A collegial performance review following the procedures in described in Section $24-62$ shall be initiated for any individual faculty member if requested by the chair, dean, or his or her designee or the faculty member, or if it is time to decide upon renewal of an appointment, with the caveat that tier advancements are not possible during the transition period,
8. If a collegial review is carried out during the Transition Period, then eligibility for a transition raise is determined by whether the review results in a finding of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance,
9. An appointment renewal may proceed as described in Section 24-43,
10. A variable adjustment may be granted as described in Section 24-72, Subsection I,
11. A retention raise may be granted as described in Section 24-72, Subsection K,
12. And the minimum salary may be determined as described in Section 24-72, Subsection J.
B. Assignment of Initial Tiers

During the Transition Period, each tier-eligible faculty member shall be assigned an initial tier, which will become the person's tier as of the Implementation Date of the new salary policy. The following is designed to assign each individual to an initial tier that is, as far as practicable, commensurate with the individual's career stage, accomplishments, and current salary.

There will be no tier advancements during the Transition Period. The assignment of an initial tier, in itself, has no effect on any individual's salary.

For all tier-eligible continuing faculty members except Lecturers, Artists in Residence, and Assistant Professors, two integer values shall be calculated:

1. Career-based tier, determined by taking the number of years at current rank and title (including
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The original said "no market adjustments." The market
adjustment for tier eligible faculty was already factored into the transition raise; but this is not the case for non-tier tier-eligible faculty, so the latter should get market adjustments. This fixes that oversight in the code.
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This change makes it clear that those who are in college, schools, or campuses that have already opted out of the tier system can receive market adjustments during the transition year.
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The clock should only go back to when the person first was awarded the current rank and title.
the Transition Period) and dividing by four, discarding any fractional remainder, and adding 1. If the faculty member is promoted during the transition period his or her career based tier shall be 1.
2. Salary-based tier, determined by comparing the current salary of each current faculty member to a salary schedule created for the individual's primary appointing unit, and choosing the tier at the individual's current rank and title which has a corresponding salary closest to the individual's actual salary.

When computing the current salary for this purpose all raises awarded during the transition period shall be included except transition raises described in Subsection D (below).

The salary schedules to be used in calculating the salary-based tier will be created by the Office of Planning and Budgeting in consultation with the Provost, SCPB, deans, and chairs.

Once the career-based and salary-based tiers have been calculated, each individual's initial tier shall be assigned as follows (subject to the exceptions noted below):
3. If the two calculated tiers are equal, that becomes the individual's initial tier.
4. If the salary-based tier is higher than the career-based tier, the salary-based tier becomes the individual's initial tier.
5. If the salary-based tier is lower than the career-based tier, the individual may choose any initial tier no lower than the salary-based tier and no higher than the career-based tier.

Exception 1: No Professor shall have an initial tier of 7 or higher. If either the salary-based tier or career-based tier would be 7 or higher according to the above instructions, that calculated tier will be replaced by Tier 6 for the purposes of this assignment.

Exception 2: Except for Assistant Professors, no faculty member shall be required to begin at the highest tier for their rank, or at Professor 6. Thus if an individual's salary-based tier is higher than the appropriate tier in the following list, the individual shall have the option of choosing an initial tier no lower than the tier in this list:

- Associate Professor 2
- Professor 5
- Senior Lecturer 2
- Senior Artist in Residence 2
- Principal Lecturer 5

For tier-eligible Lecturers and Artists in Residence: The initial tier shall be 1.
For tier-eligible Assistant Professors, the initial tiers will be determined by whether they will be in their first or second appointment during the Implementation Year of the new salary policy:

- If the Implementation Year occurs during the initial three-year appointment or a terminal fourth year, the initial tier shall be Assistant Professor 1.
- If the Implementation Year occurs during the second three-year appointment or a terminal seventh year, the initial tier shall be Assistant Professor 2.
- In no event shall the assignment of a tier be construed as the conferral or denial of tenure or promotion.


## Commented [NLB36]:

Rank and title are different aspects (many faculty have both). This makes it clear that when calculating the proper initial tier, both are taken into account. The president's office had suggested "rank or title," which is sufficient in most places in the code, but not here.
C. Assignment of Next Mandatory Collegial Review

All tier-eligible faculty members will be assigned a time for next mandatory collegial review.
For Assistant Professors the next mandatory collegial review year shall be determined based on the dates of mandatory consideration for renewal or promotion.

For everyone other than tenured faculty and WOT faculty (as defined in Section 24-33) the next mandatory collegial review year shall coincide with the next mandatory consideration for reappointment or the 4th year after the transition year, whichever is first.

For tenured and WOT (as defined in Section 24-33) associate and full professors, the next mandatory collegial review year shall be computed as follows: Starting one full year before the first Autumn Quarter during which the individual's last appointment or promotion became effective (including any appointment or promotion awarded during the transition period), determine the least multiple of four years from that date that occurs on or after the implementation date. The individual's next mandatory collegial review shall occur during the academic year starting at that time.
D. Transition Raises

During the Transition Period, there will be no tier raises and no market adjustments for tier-eligible faculty members. Instead, each tier-eligible faculty member who was declared meritorious in his or her last merit evaluation (except for faculty who receive promotions or new appointments that would take effect at the beginning of the implementation year), shall receive a transition raise to take effect no later than the beginning of the implementation year, except as otherwise provided in Subsection E below.

For a faculty member who is eligible for a transition raise, a new collegial review is not required in order to receive a transition raise. However, a collegial performance review following the procedures of Section 24-62 shall be initiated for any individual faculty member if requested by the chair, dean, or his or her designee or the faculty member; or if it is time to decide upon renewal of an appointment. Such a review may be used, for example, to determine satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance, or to consider recommending a faculty member for a possible promotion in rank, or to provide evidence for distribution of Variable Adjustments if they are available. If a collegial review is carried out during the Transition Period, then eligibility for a transition raise is determined by whether the review results in a finding of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance.

For each individual eligible for a transition raise, the amount of the raise shall be determined by his or her next mandatory review year.

Default Plan: For each unit that does not choose to use the Alternative Plan described below, the transition raises shall be as follows:

- For those whose mandatory review year is the Implementation Year, the transition raise is $2 \%$.
- For those whose mandatory review year is one year after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is $4 \%$.
- For those whose mandatory review year is two years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is $6 \%$.
- For those whose mandatory review year is three years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is $8 \%$.


## Commented [NLB37]:

Restrict the determination of next mandatory collegial review to tier-eligible faculty. Non-tier-eligible faculty members who are subject to renewal will have their next mandatory review when they are up to renewal. In colleges that have opted out of the tier system, units will set their own expectations for time of next collegial evaluation.

In each case, the percentage above is a percentage of the individual's salary if that salary is less than or equal to the average UW full professor's salary during the Transition Period; otherwise it is a percentage of that average salary.

Under the Default Plan, there will be Variable Adjustments only if allocated by the college, school, or campus and approved by the provost, in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection I, of the Faculty Code.

Alternative Plan: By vote of a majority of its eligible voting faculty, a department or an undepartmentalized college may choose to use the following Alternative Plan. Such a decision must be reported to the dean.

- For those whose mandatory review year is the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 1.5\%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is one year after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 3\%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is two years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 4.5\%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is three years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 6\%.

In each case, the percentage above is a percentage of the individual's salary if that salary is less than or equal to the average UW full professor's salary during the Transition Period; otherwise it is a percentage of that average salary.

Under the Alternative Plan, $1.25 \%$ of the continuing faculty salary pool shall be available to the unit for Variable Adjustments, in addition to any amount allocated for Variable Adjustments by the college, school, or campus and approved by the provost. All Variable Adjustments shall be distributed, in accord with Section 24-72, Subsection I, of the Faculty Code.
E. Severe Financial Stress

If distributing transition raises pursuant to Subsection $D$ above would, in the judgment of the President, impose severe financial stress on the University, school, college, campus, or academic appointing unit, and notwithstanding any other provision of the Faculty Code, the President may reduce the raises provided in either the Default Plan or Alternative Plan to as low as zero by following the procedure below.

1. The Provost presents a recommendation for a change in the plans to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, together with as much budgetary data as then available to support the recommendation.
2. Within fifteen days the SCPB conducts an advisory vote to endorse, reject, or modify the Provost's recommendation.
3. The Provost's recommendation and the result of the SCPB's advisory vote are then promptly made available to the voting faculty for comment by the Secretary of the Faculty for a period no more than 30 days.

## Commented [JL38]:

Making this consistent with the other provisions pertaining to financial stress.
4. The President then decides whether to change the Plans and reports the decision and his or her justification to the Faculty Senate.

Commented [JL39]: ditto

## Part 24-80 Resignation, Separation, or Change of Appointment

## Section 24-81 24-56 Procedure for Resignations

A. Written Notice of Resignation

A faculty member has a professional obligation to give a written notice of resignation at the earliest possible opportunity. Normally such resignations should be given at least three months prior to the termination date, or within 15 days of notification of terms of a reappointment, whichever occurs later, and should ordinarily become effective at the end of an academic year.
B. Resignation without Written Notice

If the faculty member resigns orally, then the dean shall attempt to obtain a written resignation. If this is not forthcoming sooner, no later than 15 days after the purported oral resignation the dean shall send by certified mail to the faculty member's last known home address, and at the same time send by delivery or campus mail to the faculty member's campus address, a letter stating his or her understanding that the faculty member has resigned. If, within 30 days after the dean mailed and sent this letter, the faculty member notifies the dean in writing that he or she denies a resignation took place, none shall be deemed to have occurred. Otherwise, the faculty member shall be deemed to have resigned.

## Section 24-82 25-51 Grounds for Removal of Persons with Tenure for Cause

A faculty member having tenure under the provisions of this chapter may be removed for cause from his or her position or subjected to reduction of salary only for one or more of the following reasons:

- Incompetence.
- Neglect of duty.
- Physical or mental incapacity to perform academic duties.
- Unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment (see Executive Order No. 31).
- Scientific and scholarly misconduct, consisting of such acts as intentional misrepresentation of credentials, research misconduct (as defined in Executive Order No. 61), abuse of confidentiality, or deliberate violation of regulations applicable to research.
- Conviction of a felony.
- Intentional and malicious interference with the scientific, scholarly, and academic activities of others. To warrant a removal for cause or reduction of salary, conduct falling within these categories must in a substantial way adversely affect the faculty member's or the victim's academic, scholarly, or professional ability to carry out his or her University responsibilities.


## Section 24-83 25-52 Removal of Faculty for Reasons of Program Elimination

A. Program Elimination-Basis for Removal

The removal of tenured faculty, or the removal of non-tenured faculty prior to the end of a specified term of appointment, may be effected upon program elimination within the University. Such removals shall be termed "Removal for Reasons of Program Elimination."
B. Program Elimination Procedures
Removal for reasons of program elimination may be effected only in conformance with procedures set
forth in Chapter 26, Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs, and
the provisions of this section.
C. Notification

1. Each faculty member proposed by the dean for removal for reasons of program elimination shall be so notified in writing by the dean pursuant to Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection C.2.h.
2. When the President's decision to eliminate a program becomes final pursuant to Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection C.7, and the subsequent decision is made as to which faculty members notified under this subsection are to be removed, each faculty member to be removed for reason of program elimination shall be notified in writing by the dean and the effective date of such removal shall be stated. The dean shall deliver a copy of this notification contemporaneously to the chair of the Adjudication Panel (Chapter 28). No faculty member shall be removed for reason of program elimination prior to the end of the academic year following the one in which a final decision is transmitted to the faculty member.
D. Appeal

Each faculty member notified of removal for reason of program elimination may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27. He or she may deliver an appeal to the chair of the Adjudication Panel and to the Secretary of the Faculty as provided in Chapter 28, in which case a Hearing Committee shall determine whether the faculty member was properly identified as a member of the program eliminated; whether the procedures in this section were followed; whether the decision to remove the faculty member was reasonable; and, if the faculty member so alleges, whether he or she was unlawfully discriminated against because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.
E. Placement in Another Unit

The University shall make every reasonable effort to place faculty members notified of removal for reason of program elimination in other University employment for which they are qualified with comparable terms of employment. Priority in such employment shall be given to the faculty member in accordance with University and state employment procedures. In addition to the required notification period, special assignments with pay may be provided to enable the faculty member to prepare for changed employment responsibilities.
F. Reinstatement

In the event that the academic program which has been eliminated is reinstated within a period of five years, new positions shall not be filled through normal appointment search procedures until removed faculty members qualified for the position have been offered reappointment on terms at least comparable to terms which applied to the position previously held. Such removed faculty members shall be given 30 calendar days to accept or decline an offer of reinstatement.

## Section 24-84-25-53 Necessity for Hearings in Tenure Proceedings

No faculty member having tenure as defined in this chapter shall be removed from his or her position or subjected to discriminatory reduction of salary until she or he has been given opportunity for a full review
and hearing as provided in Sections 24-26, 24-85, or Chapter 26, Section 26-31 as applicable to the case, and in Chapter 28.

## Section 24-85-25-62 Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences

The policies and procedures detailed in this chapter and Chapter 26 are intended to ensure academic freedom and to protect the rights of the individual to careful consideration of his or her merits, and also to enhance the ability of the University and its academic units to select and maintain a faculty of the highest quality possible. Occasions may arise in which a faculty member may state that his or her academic freedom or employment rights were or will be impaired if some action or inaction of his or her academic unit or of the University as a whole is permitted, as well as occasions where the University may proceed against a faculty member. A faculty member facing such action or inaction may wish to contest the administrative behavior in question. Such a person is entitled to use the following proceedings: administrative (Chapter 27, Section 27-31), conciliatory (Chapter 27, Section 27-42), and adjudicative (Chapter 28). The University Ombud is available for consultation and advice. Cases subject to these proceedings may include allegations of unlawful discrimination because of race, religion, color, sex. national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran. These proceedings serve to protect the rights both of the individual concerned and the University. In a larger sense they fulfill an important role in protecting the academic profession from infringement of the prerogatives necessary for its proper functioning; and by the same token they protect these rights and the status of the academic profession in our society by assuring that the prerogatives are not demeaned through misuse as a shelter for incompetence or neglect of duty.

## Section 24-86 25-63-Dismissal of a Nontenured Faculty Member

A nontenured faculty member may be dismissed prior to the expiration of the period for which she or he was appointed for the grounds stated in Section 24-82, and in such cases the procedure described in Section 24-26 shall be followed, or for reasons of program elimination, and in such cases the procedure described in Section 24-83 shall be followed; or for reasons of financial emergency, in which cases the procedure described in Chapter 26, Section 26-31 shall be followed.

## Section 24-87 25-64-Discriminatory Reduction in Pay or Improper Non-Reappointment

A. Procedures Available for Review and Resolution

In a case in which a tenured or non-tenured faculty member alleges that he or she has suffered discriminatory reduction in pay, or in which a non-tenured faculty member alleges violation of the Faculty Code in connection with his or her non-reappointment, including denial of tenure, the faculty member making the allegation may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27. He or she may file a petition for review with the Chair of the Adjudication Panel and the Secretary of the Faculty, in which case the procedures set forth in Chapter 28 shall be followed. The petition for review may include allegations of unlawful discrimination because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.
B. Burden of Proof

The procedures set forth in Section 24-85 shall be followed. The burden of proof shall rest with the faculty member making the allegation.

Approved by:


[^0]:    Commented [NLB17]:
    The president's office requested that the final decision for renewal of appointments, actions on a collegial review, be made by the full faculty in the appointing unit rather than by a delegated committee (if there was one formed in the first place). The delegated committee can still do all the work, come up with the recommendation, and present a simple list to the full unit to be quickly voted on.

[^1]:    If the recommendation is for tier advancement, the chair shall transmit it to the dean or chancellor with the candidate's response, if any, and any supporting data the dean or chancellor may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation for tier advancement, he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.
    J. Final Decision on Tier Advancement

    Final decisions on tier advancement that are supported by a favorable vote of the faculty shall be made by the dean, after an advisory review by the elected faculty committee or council. The dean, in making a decision, can consider the individual candidate's performance and record of tier advancements. Also, the dean may limit the number of early tier advancements (tier advancements for faculty other than assistant professors that occur sooner than four years since the last advancement) on the basis of available financial resources. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.
    K. Administrative Position Performance Review

    Notwithstanding the procedures described in this section, faculty members serving part-time or fulltime in administrative positions shall have their administrative performance evaluated by their administrative supervisors.

    ## Section 24-63 24-55.H. Consequences of Unsatisfactory Performance

    In the event of a finding of unsatisfactory performance, the individual shall not be eligible for market adjustments, variable adjustments, or retention increases under Section 24-72, Subsections H, I, or K.
    A. Planning Conference

    The individual shall have a planning conference with his or her chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) every year until the finding has been reversed; and the individual shall receive a collegial performance review every year until the finding has been reversed.
    B. Committee Formed

    At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit determinations of unsatisfactory performance (as a result of reviews under this section Section 24-62), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with-providing the faculty member an opportunity to provide input, appoint an ad hoc committee of at least two department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member.
    C. Committee Review and Evaluation

    This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully and evaluate the record and merit of performance concerns relating to that faculty member.
    D. Written Report from Committee

    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/or college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to ennance:

