

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

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on January 8, 2003, at 11:00 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill presided.

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

Synopsis

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. Code housekeeping items:
 - a) Emeritus title clarification
 - b) Research faculty voting rights on Principal Lecturers
4. Eliminating hard-copy requirements for Faculty Senate business (Vaughn)
5. Brief updates from subcommittees:
 1. A/B salary subcommittee
 2. Unit adjustment subcommittee
 3. Tuition waiver subcommittee
 4. Winn settlement subcommittee

O'Neill called the meeting to order at 11:02.

Approval of minutes

The November 27 minutes were approved.

Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

Code Housekeeping – Emeritus title

As decided 2002, the code that governs the Emeritus title should be revised to allow faculty members who retire before age 62 to be eligible for the Emeritus title. Some who retire early are not now eligible for the title, and this affects the 40% re-employment benefit, ability to obtain grants, and some other benefits. The proposed code language, as revised after brief discussion, is as follows:

Section 24-34 B.10 The *emeritus* appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, clinical, or research 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.

Steven Olswang supported the change, because it addresses the benefits issue without contravening the state law's definition of a retiree. A faculty member can retire at age 55 and get benefits, but is not by law a retiree

until age 62. Lea Vaughn suggested that the words "regular, WOT, clinical, or research faculty be added for clarity.

FCRIB has endorsed this change in principle, and it should be submitted by FCFA as Class A legislation. It was moved, seconded and passed to accept the revised code language and submit it as Class A legislation to the Senate Executive Council.

Research Faculty Voting Rights on Principal Lecturers

Section 21-32 C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the *Faculty Code* except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks:

- Senior Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Associate Professor WOT
- Professor WOT

When the Lecturer legislation was passed last year, the title "Principal Lecturer" was inadvertently left out of the list of faculty upon whose personnel matters Research Faculty may NOT vote. This oversight in the code language appears to allow research faculty to vote on Principal Lecturers, which is contrary to the intent of the legislation. This is an obvious omission that can be corrected by Vaughn under an agreement that allows her, as Secretary of the Faculty, to correct obvious typos or omissions. Vaughn will make this change.

Eliminating Hard-Copy Requirements for Faculty Senate Business (Vaughn)

In her capacity as Secretary of the Faculty, Vaughn proposed to eliminate from the Code the language that specifies the medium that the Office of the Faculty Senate must use in communicating with the Faculty. This change would allow the Faculty Senate to conduct the required notifications and elections via email or Web technology, thereby saving the University approximately \$3,500 for each mailing. As the number of faculty members rises, the cost of paper mailings continues to rise as well. Mailings are currently required by the Code for each piece of Class A legislation and for Senate elections.

Vaughn would like to make these provisions technology-neutral to allow the Faculty Senate Office to fall into line with the rest of the University, which has moved to electronic format (Web or email) for its Operations Manual, University handbook, and many other forms of communication. This would be a great advantage, especially in budget-conscious times.

Vaughn said that some have asked whether there will be a provision for opt-outs, for those who do not use email. Others have expressed concern about confidentiality and anonymity. Vaughn has met with the Catalyst organization on campus (who now run the ASUW elections electronically) and found that they can guarantee confidentiality, but cannot guarantee anonymity. However, there is no guarantee of anonymity with the paper ballots, since most people return them with their mailing label still attached. The staff members who count ballots in the Faculty Senate Office understand elections are a confidential process whether the medium is paper or electronic.

FCFA members were supportive of the proposal, but also expressed concern that no one is left out or disenfranchised by the change. Olswang supported the change, commenting that every faculty member has an email address. He has no data to show that there are any faculty members who do not have email, though some may use it more often or more effectively than others. Some email gets ignored, Olswang said, but so does some paper mail. As an institutional policy, basic communication at the UW is done via email. He added that there might be a problem with balloting being in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, and that the Attorney General's office is now reviewing this. Moving forward gives some new options but raises some new issues.

Alan Kirtley said that there's a distinct difference between votes that occur during the course of a meeting of an assembled body, versus votes where a measure is submitted to a large group and individuals in the privacy of their offices and send (or do not send) their votes back to the requesting party. They are two entirely different cases, said Kirtley. In the first case he sees a problem, in the second he does not.

O'Neill asked the Council for its will regarding this legislation – shall we authorize the amendments in principle and forward to the Code Cops?

After discussion, it was decided that making the legislation neutral would give Vaughn leeway to design a voting and notification system that would meet the needs and requirements of the Senate.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed that:

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs approves the principle of draft legislation to allow more flexibility in the medium in which votes are taken at the University of Washington, and directs that draft legislation be forwarded to the Code Cops for language review and to the Attorney General's office for review of compliance with the Open Meetings Act.

Vaughn will submit the draft legislation as noted above, with a cover letter describing the change that is contemplated and that gives rise to the proposed language changes.

Brief Updates from Subcommittees

A/B Salary: Carol Green reported that both the subcommittee and Olswang are gathering data on A/B salary plan, which allows some faculty to resign a portion of their tenure and be paid partially from grant monies. She will attend a January 16 Faculty Council on Research meeting, where Olswang will discuss the plan in depth.

Unit Adjustments: Leah Ceccarelli reported that this subcommittee has not yet met. The group will examine the unit adjustment policy to determine whether there is – or should be - any formal connection between the 10-year review and a given unit's eligibility for a unit salary adjustment, and whether there is a positive correlation between the results of a unit's 10-year review and their eligibility to be in queue for a salary adjustment. This is seen as a daylight issue that may or may not give rise to Code changes.

Tuition Waivers: O'Neill reported that this subcommittee, which is looking into the idea of "banking" tuition waiver benefits for the use of children and spouses, has met and has determined that the issue is not appropriate for speedy efforts. There is much enthusiasm for the idea, but more information needs to be gathered and the timing for such a proposal needs to be right. The subcommittee will continue its work.

Winn Settlement Review: O'Neill reported that this subcommittee needs members. The Faculty Senate has adopted Prof. Warren Gunterroth's resolution directing FCFA to look into the financial settlement between the University and Dr. Richard Winn, in order to determine the source of the funds and ascertain whether Winn was paid out of monies that would otherwise have been used for faculty salaries. It is not anticipated that the subcommittee will find this to have been the case. This is not a review of the settlement itself, but a review of the fiscal controls on the units involved. O'Neill will obtain a copy of the language of the Senate resolution and circulate it to the membership, and will also ask Gunterroth for a description of what happened.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*