

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on November 27, 2002, at 11:30 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill presided.

Present: *Regular:* Ceccarelli, Dzwirek, Graubard, Hildebrandt, Johnson, Kirtley, Landis, Luchtel, Lydon-Rochelle, O'Neill
Ex-officio Colonnese, Krieger-Brockett, Sjavik, Croft
Absent: *Regular:* Landis, Lydon-Rochelle, O'Brien, Poznanski
Ex-officio: Olswang, Johnson, Green, Vaughn

Synopsis

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. Announcements
 - The Rose Report re organization of faculty & administrative councils for shared governance;
 - Update on A/B salary plan information
 - Housekeeping issues in faculty code
 - ** Emeritus designation for faculty retiring before 62.
 - ** deadlines for faculty reappointment
 - ** voting rights of research faculty on principal lecturers
 - ** Research associate rank & "principal investigator" status
4. Tuition Waiver Benefit
5. Pending Action Items:
 - Proposed legislation to eliminate faculty code requirement that Senate provide notices/ballots, etc. in print. .)
 - Letter to the President re amendments to Executive Orders governing criteria used in Unit Adjustments.
6. Discussion of and assignment to subcommittees of pending matters:
 - ** Dr. Winn settlement
 - ** Promotion/Tenure standards & collegiality
 - ** Chapter 28 amendments/dispute resolution
 - ** Provost's classroom policy

O'Neill called the meeting to order at 11:32.

Approval of minutes

The October 30 minutes were approved.

Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

Announcements

O'Neill announced that the Rose Committee, which has recommended that faculty councils and committees be reorganized as joint faculty/administration committees with voting rights for all, has designated Faculty Affairs as a council whose voting members and authority should remain "faculty only" because of the special quality of its work on behalf of faculty. Faculty Affairs would still include administrators in a non-voting capacity.

A/B Salary Issue

Faculty Senate Chair Sandra Silberstein has asked Faculty Affairs to step up efforts to study the A/B salary plan, which has become of great interest to many faculty members as a way to increase salaries by resigning up to 25% of tenure and substituting grant monies for the additional FTE.

Subcommittee members for this issue are Mona Lydon-Rochelle, Barbara Krieger-Brockett, Katharine Graubard and Beth Kolko. It is recommended that a faculty member who is on the A/B salary plan and someone who is in Humanities be recruited for this subcommittee.

Some questions to be answered include which faculty members, and how many, are on this plan as well as whether the plan can be initiated by a faculty member or only by the administration. At present, it appears that Deans and Chairs are initiating the plan as a way of fighting for salary increases. Can this be done at anyone's option?

It would be important to see how this distorts salaries in departments, which may be to a considerable extent. In addition, how would this affect department FTE counts? If you resign a quarter of your tenure but do the same amount of work, how does this affect productivity figures?

Carol Landis said that in her department, she can presently "buy out" of teaching, using grant monies, but this means she does more research and less teaching work. If she resigns some of her tenure but is expected to do the same amount of teaching work, doesn't that mean she's doing more for the same amount of salary?

Graubard suggested the discussion be tabled until the subcommittee can get its facts straight - who's on the plan, how is it being used, how does it affect the teaching load, is it working smoothly? Apparently the A/B plan is being used in Engineering and Pharmacy, but its use is not widespread. Jan Sjavik wondered if this does not enlarge the gulf between Humanities and the fields that routinely garner more grants and contracts. It appears that the policy would help retain star faculty in the grant and contract fields, but there's no comparable way to retain faculty in the Humanities.

O'Neill would like the A/B subcommittee to meet by quarter end, appoint a chair, and work on this issue in January.

Housekeeping Issues in Faculty Code (for Winter Quarter)

There are four Class A "housekeeping" issues which should be cleaned up in the Code this year:

1. Emeritus Faculty: A technical correction to the Code may be needed. Code presently states that Emeritus faculty can't be appointed under age 62. This is deemed not to be fair to faculty who would otherwise qualify for the title, but who take early retirement. FCRIB will formulate this legislation.
2. Deadlines for Reappointment of Faculty: Jan Spyridakis and others have asked about this. The code is not clear as to when reappointments need to be made for assistant professors, and this has a bearing on how much time an assistant professor has to prove him/herself, and how much lead time he/she has to look for a new position should a denial of renewal occur. This is sure to be more of an issue in budget crisis years such as the present one. Deans and Department Chairs receive a notification schedule from Human Resources, but it would be preferable to have the Code clarify this. Perhaps Spyridakis could write the changes - she is in Technical Communications. O'Neill will look into this.
3. Voting Rights vis-à-vis Principal Lecturers: To keep the ranks parallel, should "Principal Lecturer" be added to the Code as a title upon which Research Faculty cannot vote? Ia Dubois should probably follow this, since it's a detail that should have been addressed in the Lecturer legislation passed last year.
4. Research Associates Prohibited as Principal Investigators on Grants: Is there a need for a Junior Research rank that would allow these post-docs to be Principal Investigators on grants? Graubard said that the original Research Associates could write grants, because there was no limit to the number of years one could be a Research Associate/Senior Research Associate. When there came to be too many post-doctoral

fellows, the Research Associate designation was limited to three years and the right to write grants was rescinded. Those post-doctoral fellows now have to become either a staff Research Scientist (with grant-writing authority) or go into the Research Faculty track and become a Research Assistant Professor (also with grant-writing authority). But Research Associates are not considered to have the experience to be P.I.s. There is now a lifetime limit of six years as a Research Assistant. The bottom line is that University policy does not allow post-docs to write grants – the faculty member they're working with has to be the Principal Investigator. If a department has a star post-doc who wants to write a grant, said Luchtel, that person's mentor should go to the Chair and ask to have him/her appointed a Research Associate Professor. O'Neill will refer this back to the faculty member who inquired, as it appears that creating a "Junior Research rank" so post-docs can be P.I.s is a non-issue.

Report from Subcommittee on Tuition Waivers

As currently structured, the tuition waiver benefit allows faculty and staff to enroll for a total of six credits per quarter free of charge. A faculty member has suggested that this benefit be allowed to accumulate, or be made "bankable," and its use extended to members of the immediate family (spouse and children), as an aid to faculty and staff retention that would not require the University to spend more money.

A Council subcommittee has made preliminary exploration of this idea, and has concluded that this is not the best time to pursue it. O'Neill described this as a legislative issue that involves not just the Faculty Senate, but also the State legislature. There is not enough time to craft a bill in time for this legislative session, and the political climate may not be right to introduce the idea. Conflicting issues include the stance that there should be no over-enrollments without salary increases – enrolling family members without tuition could be seen as over-enrollment. Ceccarelli and Luchtel disagreed with the view that this is a radical or unusual idea – many other universities routinely offer such an educational benefit to the families of faculty and staff members, and use it as an aid to recruitment and retention. Luchtel added that this benefit would go a long way toward making faculty members feel valued, even in the face of no salary increases and very few perks. O'Neill agreed, but said the subcommittee didn't feel it could adequately prepare a bill without more time to gather data and do some consciousness-raising with legislators. This does not mean the idea is dead – just that it will take more work and preparation than there is time for this year. Graubard suggested that this might also be a benefits choice, instead of a perk. Sjavik suggested this might also be a quid pro quo in case the legislature tries to rescind its 10% contribution to the retirement plan.

Faculty Code Requirements for Notices/Balloting

This cost-saving issue would remove the present Code stipulation that the Faculty Senate provide mailings such as notices and ballots in print (each mailing costs approximately \$3,000). So that Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, can present this issue, it will be taken up as the first agenda item at the January meeting.

In essence, this change would remove from Code any reference to paper notices and ballots, allowing the Faculty Senate the option of using other media - including email and the Web - for its notices and ballots.

Questions remain as to whether a switch to non-paper media would disenfranchise those who have not adopted (or are not adept at) email and the Web, and exactly how ballots and notices would be handled for retirees who may not have email or Web access. Council members are requested to read Vaughn's 11/27 memo in preparation for the January meeting. Vaughn is also requested to specify alternatives the Faculty Senate would use if the changes to the Code are made.

Unit Adjustment Policy

This is another "daylight" issue - the policy was adopted by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, but does not appear in the Code and is nowhere part of the Handbook. It is concomitant with the 10-year Review, but is not an explicit part of the Review and is not necessarily an outcome of the Review. Now that we are to have a new President, will we even have an Academic Program Review as presently constituted, since it is

mandated by Executive Order? If it's not in the Code, it's not required. The budget won't always be negative; at some time there will be resources to bump up those units whose salaries are seriously underfunded.

Sjavik said Unit Adjustments have been used for high-performing departments, but also for merging departments (to adjust inequities). This motivates departments to merge, to take advantage of the higher salary scale. If Unit Adjustment is stipulated in the Code, Lea Ceccarelli asked, could it still be tied to merger situations?

O'Neill would like to see the Unit Salary Adjustment defined, would like to see some criteria for who (including faculty), can initiate a Unit Adjustment, and some statement as to whether it should be coupled with the Administrative Program Review or whether there are other times when the Unit Adjustment can be made. O'Neill mentioned that Debra Friedman said last year that she would make 10-year Review results available on the Web, but O'Neill does not know if this has actually happened. Council members should look to see if this information is now available.

This issue will also be a focus of the January meetings. (Please see appendix for an excerpt from the 02/02 meeting with Debra Friedman on this issue)

Class C Resolution on Winn Settlement

FCFA has been directed by Senate Class C resolution to look into the sources of funding and the criteria for the exit settlement to Dr. Winn. The negotiations and the settlement were properly an administration responsibility, but the faculty would like to be assured that the money, which could amount to as much as three million dollars, did not come from monies earmarked for the salaries of other faculty. It's an issue about the administration's use of its discretion, said O'Neill. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Appendix to Minutes

From the February 7, 2002 FCFA meeting:

Unit Adjustment Policy and Strategic Planning

Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, visited the Faculty Affairs Council to provide some background on the Unit Salary Adjustment Policy and strategic planning.

Unit salary adjustments, said Friedman, are part of a set of current objectives of the Office of Academic Planning - these include Unit Strategic Planning, recognition of unit contributions to the University, and Academic Program Reviews.

The Academic Program Review - also known as the ten-year review - is at the heart of Academic Planning. Components of this review include rigorous, thoughtful, in-depth assessment of a given unit by colleagues from inside and outside the University, by the Provost's Office, the Graduate School, the Undergraduate Dean, and by the unit itself. Friedman cited the University's Landscape Architecture program - "a gem that was undervalued" - as a unit that has benefited substantially from their Academic Program Review, as has the Classics department, where the review found a serious commitment to scholarship and teaching that placed it far above its peers despite a salary profile much lower than local and national averages.

The Academic Program Review creates an important portfolio of quantitative and qualitative information about a given department, and is a good basis for unit salary reviews. Its major drawback is that it occurs only once every ten years. Brad Holt, said Friedman, has raised an issue of fairness where the trigger for unit salary adjustment is the Academic Program Review. Is it fair to ask departments to wait ten years to be evaluated, if there is no other pathway to the adjustment process?

Where conditions warrant, said Steve Olswang, some units have been reviewed out of their ten-year cycle. The School of Nursing, which has been ranked first in the nation for years despite substantially lower salaries than its peers, was reviewed and awarded a unit salary adjustment before their review would normally have been done. This, however, is extremely rare.

In response to Marilyn Roberts' question about the weight of national rankings, Friedman said that considering national rankings alone would be a violation of the kind of conversation that occurs in the Academic Program Review, where many

measures of quality are used. Roberts asked what other criteria might be considered outside the ten-year cycle to bring to light undervalued units. Friedman responded that the Academic Program Review isn't just about undervalued units, but is more about high-level review of units and their strategic direction.

Olswang said one of the important ways the Academic Review ties into unit salary adjustment issues - whether or not there should be an expectation that everyone has a fair shot at a salary adjustment - is that it's built into the system. However, not every unit is extraordinarily qualified compared to its peers, or has an extremely disparate salary compared to both its local and national peers - the two features that would combine to warrant a unit adjustment.

Friedman said that the Academic Program Review reveals the help a unit most needs to achieve excellence; there is an exceptionally high bar for unit salary adjustments.

Haley said he had concerns about timing issues for unit salary adjustments - what triggers an adjustment, how does it occur, and if a particular unit is awarded an adjustment in a year when there is no money, what happens?

Friedman responded that the decision should be made regardless of money, and that is true not just for salary adjustments but for all things having to do with help for a unit. Many units need more "X" - graduate fellowships, operating money, salary money, etc. If there is no money available when a need is identified, the unit goes on a queue. Everyone in the Provost's office, said Friedman, is alert to opportunities that arise to help units get what they need; the Academic Program Review identifies those priorities. "Units should not in any way consider themselves harmed by lack of money," said Friedman.

Olswang added that the Code was changed to take away the funding element when it comes to individual promotions - you shall receive - and this has been the President's commitment for 7.5% for promotion. Unit adjustments are a "may" receive.

In general discussion, Kirtley wondered what happens when the unfunded unit salary adjustments go into a queue. "It seems that there's a problem of an ever-lengthening queue," he commented. Katherine Graubard observed that a tremendous amount of work goes into these reviews and that the information should be used as a tool for the development office. In her view, the review should always be coordinated with the development office, so worthy units get a development person to help them get things the University doesn't have the resources to provide, but which could conceivably come from outside donors.

Olswang noted that, between the Academic Program Reviews and the accreditation process, the administration reviews 25 UW segments annually. In each review, issues of support and salary support come up. In the last three years, only three or four units (of approximately 75 reviewed), have received a unit salary adjustment, said Olswang, so these adjustments are truly extraordinary.

The Academic Program Review, said Friedman, looks at faculty participation and particularly the state of mentoring of junior faculty. Problems here reveal problems with unit faculty in general, which must be corrected within 60 days.

Haley asked to what extent reviewers at the University level are looking at existing overall programs to determine whether we are doing, and doing well, everything we should be doing. In addition, does anyone review University programs to make sure we're not doing things we shouldn't be doing?

The first is important, said Friedman, and the second is difficult. The reviews give us time to think about what and how well we're doing. And there are good reasons to be cautious about "taking away" too quickly. The more things get busy, Friedman observed, the more we worry about whether we're doing the right things. And particularly with the new development plans, it's important that we do the right things. Even if we can't answer the question perfectly, it's a question we continue to ask.

Barbara Krieger-Brockett asked how and when faculty epiphanies and ideas are taken into account. Friedman cited the Tools for Transformation program as important in this process: <http://www.washington.edu/change/index.html#tft>

When reviews are done, Friedman said, faculty and senior observers bring forth an array of ideas modest to large - Tools for Transformation provides a mechanism for implementation. Impacts to the budget tend not to be great, but the evidence over the three years of the program shows the ideas that are implemented do make a difference.

Carol Green asked whether it is really practical to have another trigger for unit salary reviews besides the ten-year review. Friedman responded that the Academic Program Review (ten-year review) is tremendously important and should be protected -

she worries about adding other triggers, fearing they would have to closely duplicate the Academic Program Review in order to convince the Committee on Planning and Budgeting of their importance. If a department is in distress, she said, there are ways for deans to bring this to the attention of the Provost. Units can also ask to have their review accelerated, or postponed, by a year.

Olswang said he did not see the need for a Code provision stating that a unit salary review shall be done, since there are already several ways to accomplish this. In addition to being part of Academic Program Reviews, unit adjustment reviews can be done in extraordinary situations (such as Nursing), as part of mergers, by request of a department chair who asks for a unit adjustment on behalf of his or her faculty. Requests from a chair are routinely routed back to deans for assessment and a statement of support - in the two instances where this was done, the requests were not supported by the dean.

Olswang asked the Council to consider, as part of its deliberations on this issue, whether there is an indication that units have not had a fair shot at a unit salary adjustment. Friedman concurred that an additional trigger needs to be looked at only if a fairness issue is involved.

Dan Luchtel commented that the issue is not whether the reviews are fair - the issue is who gets reviewed, how they get reviewed, and when they get reviewed. Luchtel asked how accessible the results of Academic Program Reviews are - Friedman responded that the reports are not online, but are public records and can be put online. Roberts said both the results and the schedule for future reviews should be online.

General discussion centered on pros and cons of codifying a trigger for unit salary reviews, in addition to the Academic Program Review (which is itself not codified). Roberts said she can't see the Council writing another trigger that would make administrators even more unhappy; James Riley said he wants to codify the process. Krieger-Brockett wanted to see more information on the Web about completed reviews and reviews that are scheduled. Haley viewed the fairness issue with the ten-year review as more of a five-year problem - it would be at about the middle of the cycle, or five years, that salary adjustment problems might tend to surface. At five years, waiting for an additional five years to be reviewed (in the absence of some other trigger) might be perceived as unfair. Luchtel commented that the current trigger - the Academic Program Review - is completely dependent upon the current Provost. If another provost comes in, doesn't think the reviews are important, and drops them, what happens then? Luchtel said that lots of importance is currently attached to the Academic Program review - he would like to see it codified.

Haley summed up the divergent viewpoints by noting that the Unit Adjustment Policy is still a live issue for the Council, and one that will require more discussion. Now that the Council has learned more about the Academic Program Review as it relates to Unit Salary Adjustment Policy, Haley will ask Brad Holt to speak to the Council again on the subject.