

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on March 8, 2004, at 9:30 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m..

Synopsis:

1. A/B Salary Report/Discussion and next steps
2. RCEP Draft
3. Promotion and tenure – revision to Code Chapter 24.54
4. Winn Settlement/Appropriate Dispute Resolution subcommittees

Approval of agenda and minutes

The agenda was approved. The February 9 minutes were approved, as corrected.

Announcements

Steven Olswang is assuming the post of interim chancellor at UW Tacoma effective April 15. He thanked the Council for many years of interesting and productive collaboration; he has enjoyed working with everyone very much. Cheryl Cameron will attend FCFA in Olswang's stead.

Kate O'Neill's term as FCFA Chair ends this quarter. She asked for volunteers for next year's chair. Anyone who wants to serve should contact Lea Vaughn or let Kate know.

AB Salary Discussion

The A/B salary plan allows some tenured faculty to resign a portion of their tenure and be paid partially from grant monies, thus increasing their salaries. An FCFA subcommittee was appointed in October 2002 to interview selected administrators and faculty and gather preliminary information regarding the use of A/B type salary plans on campus. In their Spring Quarter 2003 draft, the subcommittee reported that A/B was a positive plan that had allowed the University to retain some faculty members who would otherwise have gone elsewhere, and that the plan should be made more visible. They recommended that FCFA draft a report on A/B salary and communicate it to the faculty at large, but no further action has been taken.

O'Neill asked the Council to decide whether to finalize the report and, if so, to decide how the report should be communicated to the faculty. Should additions or changes be made to the report? Should it be posted to the Faculty Senate Website as an information item?

In a technical discussion of how this benefit works, there was a question about how much money the salary supplement adds; i.e., the percentage of tenure that is resigned and the additional money that is realized. Barbara Krieger-Brockett will follow up with Ronda Lahey of Academic Personnel to confirm what is actually done, and will adjust the examples in the report accordingly.

Lea Vaughn asked whether it might be possible to use private foundation funds for AB salary supplements, rather than grants, to address perceived inequities between those who receive grants and those who are not. Foundation monies are more stable than grant monies.

O'Neill posed the question of how these kinds of shifts in public funding might affect the University's budget in the long term. It might be difficult to come up with a statement of the long-term consequences.

Krieger-Brockett said the faculty have been asking about this report, and she would like to see it published in some way. There may be considerations about how this would be perceived in the legislature. It would be important that any information that goes up on the Website not be mis-perceived as a reduction in teaching.

Vaughn is concerned that the more faculty that are paid through grants, the more this leads to the "entrepreneurial university" – i.e., the university as a "business with a product," as opposed to a university that fulfills its mission of education. There has never been a fully engaged faculty discussion about whether this is an appropriate path to take, and what the consequences may be. Kirtley said that the long-term consequences

portion of the draft report do not adequately capture this issue, and should be expanded upon.

In O'Neill's view, there are two interests working at cross-purposes here – information needs (faculty want to know what the AB salary option is all about) and philosophical concerns (need to explore the assumptions, premises, and consequences of widespread use of this alternative funding model). Perhaps a Website posting, followed by a Walker-Ames lecture and discussion of the larger issues, would work.

Vaughn recommended that the AB salary report be submitted to the Faculty Senate Chair and the President – it has been seven years since there was serious consideration of the salary plan. Given the number of units that are behind in salaries, it may be time for a committee on salaries to be appointed.

Next steps: The subcommittee will polish the information, and submit it to the Council at the next meeting for an up or down vote. Further action, which may include submitting the report to the Faculty Senate Chair and President, will be decided at that time.

RCEP (Reorganization, Elimination and Consolidation of Programs)

Vaughn reported that the Senate leadership has been working for 1.5 years on the RCEP procedures in the faculty code to make them work better. The existing process is cumbersome, lengthy, and unpredictable.

Vaughn presented Council members with a draft of the proposed procedures, which focus on using the RCEP procedures as a planning device, rather than as a reaction to an emergency. There is an emphasis on using a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" process to effect change, in which the faculty take the lead in any changes. The draft specifies levels of change that range from minor, limited change to a major elimination of programs. Where the change is small, there is less review needed, rather than a full-blown, lengthy review for everything. Timelines are changed to more accurately reflect the realities of University life, and there is a definition section in the draft.

Because this is a complete reorientation of the philosophy and a complete rewrite of the procedures, it will take a lot of explaining to the Senate. Vaughn is shopping the draft to Councils – the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) is the lead in the process. The Provost will review the draft with Vaughn. Vaughn would like comments from FCFA before the first SEC meeting of Spring Quarter, so the draft can be submitted as legislation next fall.

Promotion and Tenure Review

R.D. Wilson raised the issue of promotion and tenure reviews for the Council to consider. The existing process is weak at the Dean's level, Wilson said, because it lacks openness. Deans are not required to explain their decisions on promotion and tenure. Wilson believes the Code, Section 24.54, should be clarified. He is willing to write up a clarification and send it to O'Neill, for presentation at the next meeting.

Appropriate Dispute Resolution/Winn Settlement Subcommittees

Alan Kirtley and O'Neill expressed regret that they have not been able to meet with their subcommittees in these matters, and promised progress during Spring Quarter.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Present: *Regular:* Ceccarelli, Graubard, Hadjimichalakis, Hildebrandt, Kirtley, Luchtel, O'Neill, Wilson
Ex-officio Krieger-Brockett, Walker, Vaughn, Olswang
Absent: *Regular:* Demorest, Dzwirek, Janes, Lydon-Rochelle
Ex-officio: Blumenthal, Johnson, Stygall