

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**301 Gowen Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 3 March 2005**

The meeting began at 2:34 p.m.

**Introductory Remarks – G. Ross Heath, Chair**

Heath's remarks were accompanied by the following overhead titled "Components of UW Faculty Salaries":

Policies Clear

1. Cost of living adjustments
2. Continuing Merit (2% p.a. in Code)
3. Individual merit (including equity?)
4. Promotion increases (7.5%)

Policies Unclear

5. Unit adjustments
6. A/B plans
7. Recruitment and retention fund
8. Re-investment of differential tuition
9. Use of retirement/resignation salaries
10. Linkage to tuition increases?

Remarks/

I am NOT going to talk about bioterrorism, other than to observe that the articles in yesterday's NY Times and Washington Post have added a new wrinkle to the conversation.

Rather, today, I am going to focus on a perennial topic that is again rising to the top of our agenda – faculty salaries. There are several reasons for the current heightened interest.

Firstly, the Locke 2005-07 budget actually includes funding for faculty salary increases equivalent to the percentages negotiated by collective bargaining units last year.

Secondly, if performance contract negotiations are even partially successful, there will be significant new resources to focus on this problem.

And, finally, a number of salary-related policy questions and discussions have arisen on campus in recent months.

One of the outcomes of these discussions is a recognition that there is no coherent policy for many aspects of the current faculty salary system at the UW.

The issue is multi-faceted (see overhead). It has evolved substantially in recent years. The SCPB is currently working to get its arms around the problem.

Today, I'll just list some of the pieces of the puzzle to create a context for future discussions. In rough order of increasing complexity, the pieces are:

1. Cost-of-living-adjustments. Such adjustments are supposed to maintain the purchasing power of current salaries in the face of inflation. Because the State has a policy not to recognize inflationary increases in our carry-forward budget, there have been no COLAs to salaries for more than a decade. The long-term consequence of this policy - over an academic career - is that fixed salaries lose 50 to 75 percent of their purchasing power, even under low to moderate inflation. Obviously, if we **were** to get such a COLA, it would be easy to implement.
2. Continuing merit. This 2% annual adjustment for meritorious faculty was negotiated several years ago and is now incorporated in the Faculty Code. The number - 2% - was a compromise, but actually makes some sense. If one looks at a large population of faculty across many institutions, real salaries (that is corrected for inflation) slightly more than double during an academic career. This corresponds to about 2% p.a. above inflation. This suggests that we should press on with continuing merit increases even when we get COLAs. Again, the procedures to implement this salary component are well established.
3. Individual or exceptional merit. This component, intended to recognize exceptional performance has only been funded intermittently in recent years. According to faculty and chairs from a number of departments who have commented recently on the salary "gap," the absence of merit funding is one of the most damaging aspects of our current salary situation. Salary compression and inversion are supposed to be addressed under this item, but resources have been far too small to have much impact on these problems. Again, procedures to distribute such funds are well established.
4. Promotions. This centrally-supported salary increase pool is being fully funded

Now for the more difficult areas:

5. Unit adjustments. This is the focus of current SCPB discussions. A consensus seems to be developing that if we care enough about a program to have it on campus at all, we should not allow its salaries to fall more than 20% below the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the HECB peer group. This was the basis for the 2004 unit adjustments, for example. Beyond that, there are many open questions. What is the peer group and target salary level for each unit? How are quality and aspirations-to-quality established and factored into the target level? How should unit adjustments be allocated within a unit (across the board, pre-emptive retention, merit, equity ...)? Current policy provides only minimal guidance on such questions.
6. So called A/B plans, where research and clinical funds are used to augment state salaries. Under these plans, some faculty members have negotiated reductions in the levels of their appointments derived from general operating funds (including a partial release of tenure), with a lesser or no reduction in State salary or obligations. The remainder of the appointment is made up with non-state funds. This is often a retention strategy (either in response to an outside offer or pre-emptive). Use of this option varies widely across campus and reflects both opportunity and philosophical perspectives that vary from unit to unit. Again, there is no University-wide policy or guidance on the issue, but the Provost, Board of Deans and Senate are putting together a study group to take a hard look at it.

7. Recruitment and retention. These funds are a stopgap response to our overall weak salary position relative to our peers. Recruitment issues are pretty obvious – we have to compete at market and use whatever resources we can lay our hands on to do this. Requirements are very unit and discipline specific. Retention is more complex. Some units respond only to written offers, others do not respond to any external offers, and still others engage in pre-emptive increases to try to keep key faculty from even applying elsewhere. This topic presents ethical challenges: some faculty are comfortable playing the “outside offer” game even though they have no intention of leaving; others are not. Current policy is very *ad hoc*.
8. Re-investment of differential tuition. This is a special case of unit adjustments that, because of market conditions or peer behavior, allows some units access to funding beyond that available to the rest of the University. In addition to the questions associated with all unit adjustments, this item raises the additional question of how to divide the extra income from differential tuition between the originating unit and the rest of the university, particularly given the high degree of interdependence of all our programs. Current policy is opaque.
9. Use of funds from retirements and resignations. Current policy and practice seem to fall into four categories: a) Support for up to 5 years re-employment at 40%; b) Creation of new positions (which may or may not be in the unit where the vacancy appears); c) Use of unfilled vacancies to provide operating funds (but such vacancies tend not to get increases); and d) Elimination of positions and use of the funds to support individual merit salary increases (which increases the workload on remaining faculty in the unit).
10. The final issue that has arisen in the context of faculty salary policy is the extent to which tuition increases should be linked to increases in the faculty salary budget. Both students and faculty have raised this question as a response to concerns that tuition increases are simply compensating for reductions in State general fund support.

There is no simple recipe to mix and match all these issues in an optimum way or even in multiple optimum ways. I do hope however, that discussions during the coming months will explore all these issues comprehensively and openly and determine where current policy need clarification or augmentation.

**Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) – Douglas Wadden, Chair and Former Chair, Faculty Senate**

Continuing with the salary discussion, Wadden noted that a small subcommittee has examined the unit adjustment policy and submitted a proposed draft policy. Wadden noted that if we discuss unit adjustment in the abstract, it becomes a proxy for all salary increase issues rather than a discrete part of total salary policy. Because of this, the unit adjustment policy is susceptible to a number of interpretations and uses that mirror the compensation options listed by Heath in his remarks. The subcommittee will prepare a final report for discussion in the committee and with the Board of Deans.

Since the last senate meeting, the committee has discussed the Regional Biocontainment Laboratory (RBL) issue. The Provost has appointed a working group, chaired by Professor Walter Stamm, (Head, Division of Allergy & Infectious Disease, Medicine) and Wadden. It

will include jointly appointed faculty and staff, and will begin meeting next week. The committee will consider three options:

1. Continue our current policy for siting hazardous labs
2. Develop and site the RBL on campus
3. Develop and site the RBL off campus.

Wadden hopes that the committee's work will be completed in five or six meetings, or by mid-May.

In the meantime, the SCPB is working to gather final information prior to discussing the budget. For example, the committee will look at tuition revenues, the effect of waivers, faculty salaries, and differential tuition. Finally, there will be another RBL presentation and discussion to follow up on additional questions.

### **Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative**

"It's reading the tea leaves time," began Stygall. Cut-offs are approaching for policy bills and other legislative issues. March 16<sup>th</sup> will be another revenue forecast, and on March 23<sup>rd</sup>, Gov. Gregoire will present her budget proposals. In theory, April 24<sup>th</sup> is the last day of the session, but with the pending deficit, it is likely that the session will go into overtime.

A bill to study education funding is still alive, and it sets up three advisory groups (Preschool, K-12, and higher education) and a large steering committee. Second, there is a performance audit bill that would require annual performance audits of state agencies. Much to its dismay, the higher education community is included in this bill. The community's preference is that our accrediting agencies and reports would have fulfilled the audit function. In response to a question, Stygall explained that the audits are to be conducted under contract by people outside of the state agency, and that they are to consider existing materials such as accreditation reports. The bill to permit consideration of race in admissions is dead in house but survives in senate as an initiative. Three bills related to research, sponsored by Gov. Gregoire, are moving along in the process. Access bills are also being studied. The UW neighborhood bill is dead, but the University has been warned that the sponsor would like to see progress in the next year.

There have been conversations about salary increases but the legislature talks about this as a COLA issue. Many legislators still do not understand that faculty do not get steps and increments, unlike K-12 and community college teachers. This is an argument for faculty receiving a COLA, and faculty may want to communicate with their representatives about this (although not using University time, supplies, or equipment).

### **Report of the President and Opportunity for Questions – Mark Emmert**

The president has been spending a great deal of his time in Olympia, and what has been most interesting to him is the mood of the legislature. Many of the bills described by Stygall were filed without regard to current fiscal realities, but this is now becoming a factor. Currently, it would appear that the deficit will be at least \$1.9 billion and there is very little talk of revenue enhancements. Use of the tobacco funds would be a short-term fix and would make it impossible to fund the lifetime science discovery fund, which would benefit UW and WSU. We will continue to work with the legislature on revenue and expenditure bills. At the same time, there is a great deal of recognition of and conversation about the

serious issues that confront higher education in this state: access, competitive financing of salaries, capital budget, etc. We also have support in the business community for our point of view. But, we will have to wait and see if these views become a part of the budget picture. Pres. Emmert has met with Stygall to ensure that the communication between the University's lobbyist, Randy Hodgins, and Stygall, is coordinated and good. Additionally, we will have to work with our colleagues at other institutions to coordinate our requests.

This spring, Emmert noted that the retirement of Ernest Morris, Vice President for Students Affairs, and the departure of George Bridges, Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, for the presidency of Whitman College present a unique opportunity to rethink the structure of undergraduate education and services. To this end, he will assemble a small working group to look at these areas and to make sure that we are configured in the best way possible to fulfill these functions. Therefore, these two positions will not be filled until the conversation is completed, most likely over the next two quarters.

Emmert announced that he will be meeting with Brian Fabien, chair, SCMFA, and others about the open letter to the President regarding diversity issues. He will be meeting with them to begin a conversation, and to plan a town meeting to identify things that need to be done so that we can move forward.

Leadership searches continue. There is a finalist for Dean of Graduate School; an offer is out and negotiations underway. We are moving forward on the provost search – there have been some conversations with candidates, but the committee is also developing the pool. He has been pleased with caliber of pool. Other dean searches continue. The Business School decanal search committee had interviewed some candidates but decided to look further and continue the process. His preference is to make sure we get the right person rather than to move rapidly.

Finally, he stated that the RBL is an open question in his mind. There have been two open forums on campus; there will be a third. We will gather as much information as possible and he awaits the recommendations of the advisory committee, and move forward from there.

In response to a question about access, Emmert noted that this is probably the most divisive issue with our other state institutional colleagues. Locke proposed adding 7000 slots across the state, although none of these would be at UW or WSU. If there are funds available to increase funded undergraduate positions, we will get our fair share. Another factor that contributes to divisiveness is the effect of lower division enrollment at the branch campuses and the emerging issue of applied baccalaureate degrees at the community colleges. Regarding the latter, he is not sure what this would mean beyond two more years of an AA degree. There are two pieces of legislation that authorize pilot projects but are unfunded. There has been an extended debate on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses about these issues, and agreement with surrounding community colleges that Tacoma could have lower division students as long as two-thirds of the Tacoma enrollment comes from community colleges. There is no similar agreement at Bothell although they are working on that. Concluding, he observed that these are divisive issues that raise sensitive turf issues

### **Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. and the agenda was **approved**.

### **Summary of Executive Committee Actions – Upcoming Issues and Actions**

a. Minutes of the January 10, 2005 Senate Executive Committee meeting and January 27, 2005 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. b. The SEC approved the following three candidates for the Secretary of the Faculty position; Donna Kerr, Professor, Education; Sandra Silberstein, Professor, English; Jan Sjøvik, Associate Professor, Scandinavian Studies. The names will be forwarded to the President who will appoint one person to fill the five-year term. c. Reports from Councils and Committees: Don Janssen, Chair, Council on Academic Standards, presented an update on the policy regarding the acceptance of transfer credits approved on January 24. The Council is beginning the process of creating guidelines to implement the policy. Brian Fabien, Chair, Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs, reported on a letter the group presented to President Emmert addressing the university's lack of progress towards hiring and retaining minority faculty; entire letter can be found at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/councils/scmfa/scmfa.html>. d. Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative, presented an update on the university's NCAA recertification.

### **Announcements**

The Committee on the Annual Faculty Lectureship invites nominations for the 2005-2006 University of Washington Faculty Lectureship Award. This year we are seeking nominations within the natural and health sciences and engineering. This reflects the recommendation of previous committees (formally adopted this year) to alternate nominations between two broad interdisciplinary categories: arts/humanities/social sciences and natural sciences/engineering/health sciences.

Nominations are due no later than Friday, April 1, 2005. The nomination letter should include a supporting statement summarizing the nominee's accomplishments and impact, speaking ability, ability to adapt his/her academic interest to a broad audience, and a list of important publications. Please send nominations to Ashley Emery, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate, 36 Gerberding Hall, Box 351271.

### **Requests for Information**

David Thorud, Acting Provost, responded to a request for information regarding the RBL. A recent newspaper report misrepresented the space usage for these labs on campus. The Times report said that this project would consolidate the laboratories, and Thorud commented that if RBL is built, it would not result in much decommissioning of Level 2 and 3 labs because our need for lab space exceeds capacity. Thus, no significant decommissioning of current lab space would occur.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Nominated for Senate appointment, effective immediately, Johnella Butler, Associate Dean and Associate Vice Provost, Graduate School and Rusty Barcelo, Vice President for Minority Affairs, to replace Gabriel Gallardo on the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs, representatives of the administration, without vote, for a term ending September 15, 2005.  
**Approved.**

### **Memorial Resolution**

Be it resolved that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of this friend and colleague: Professor Emeritus Geraldine Brain Siks of

Drama who died on 28 January 2005 after having served the University since 1950, and be it further resolved, that the senate chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

**New Business**

None.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: G. Ross Heath, Chair, Faculty Senate