

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

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on February 5, 2003, at 11:00 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill presided.

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

**Synopsis**

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. Announcements
4. A/B Salary subcommittee report (discussion)
5. Winn Settlement subcommittee update

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

**Approval of minutes**

The January 8 minutes were approved.

**Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**Announcements**

Legislative Rep. Jan Sjavik reported that the Tuition Waivers Bill 5357 for children of faculty was read in the Washington State Senate for the first time on January 23, 2003, and was referred to the Committee on Higher Education. The bill (see Appendix for text of bill) sounds better than it is, Sjavik reported, since it mandates attendance on a space available basis and may conflict with staff benefits. It may also be possible to do this without legislation, under the West Waiver bill, which authorizes Washington institutions of higher education to waive all or a portion of tuition for specific types of students, up to a limit specified in statute.

The Senate Executive Committee has been looking at salary issues to determine how the UW might catch up with peer institutions, who have been receiving 3% raises consistently.

**A/B Salary Plan**

O'Neill summarized an emailed report by Carol Green, who attended a meeting at which Dr. Sid Nelson, Dean of the School of Pharmacy, presented a report originally prepared for the Board of Deans by the Board of Deans Subcommittee on Compensation. The first part of the report discussed the A/B salary plan (A=state funded salary; B=research funding) that is in effect for the School of Pharmacy.

The A/B plan developed as a retention device when it became apparent that faculty in the school were at risk for leaving the UW due to salary inequities in the School of Pharmacy, where salaries were determined to be 9% below peers for assistant professors and 20% below peers for associate and full professors.

- The School of Pharmacy includes 34 FTE faculty, with 1/4 of faculty participating in the A/B plan.
- Participating faculty must have at least 25% of their salary offset from grant and contract funds.
- Faculty member agrees to reduce FTE tenure by up to 20%, and receives 100% of state salary plus up to

20% from research funds, plus a 15% recapture for the department.

- Faculty member agree to retain full teaching and research responsibilities.
- Plan must be approved by Office of Provost.
- Plan is reviewed annually.
- Once on the A/B plan, the faculty member cannot return to 100% FTE.
- Offset salary is dependent on grant and contract funding. (May be lost if no research funds available.)
- Plans and amount returned to department are developed by each department depending on what they think they need to keep department functional.
- Other schools use similar plans - Michigan and University of Cal system were mentioned.
- Many departments have split appointments (less than 100% FTE).
- There are no University-wide guidelines for the A/B plan; each department develops a plan that has to be approved by the Provost.

Lea Vaughn commented that departments are required to have a plan as to whether or not the department will carry WOT faculty if research funding is lost. This requirement might be applicable to the A/B plans as well.

- NOTE: Also see the Appendix for a report on A/B salary from the minutes of the Faculty Council on research, January 30, 2003, also attended by Carol Green on behalf of FCFA.

### **Discussion**

O'Neill noted that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting has referred the A/B salary plan to Faculty Affairs for study, to see whether it could be widely used to positively affect faculty retention and morale. What would the Council like to do with the A/B plan information?

In discussion, there was an FCFA consensus that the A/B salary committee should press forward with respect to three issues:

- Who is eligible for the A/B plan and how do they find out about it?
- What are the other tools being used by main campus to retain and recruit faculty?
- What is the effect on teaching and morale, both within a given department and across campus, in departments where A/B is not a realistic scenario?

FCFA members would like to know more about the potential effects on departments University-wide, and to be sensitive to how the plan might "read" to both internal and external constituencies.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 n. *Meeting minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder, from notes by Lea Vaughn, with supplementary materials from the Washington State Legislature Website, Washington State University Website, and minutes from the January 30, 2003, meeting of the Faculty Council on Research.* .

### **Appendix**

#### **A/B Salary Plan Report from Faculty Council on Research Meeting (from FCR Minutes)**

The Faculty Council on Research met on January 30 to hear Vice Provost Steven Olswang present information on the A/B salary plan now being used to compensate some tenured faculty. The plan, said Olswang, is one way to provide greater salary support to eligible faculty members in times of extreme budget constraints.

In some departments, e.g., the Medical School, there is more than one source of funds used to pay tenured faculty. This has been called the XY salary policy, where X represents state funding and Y represents monies generated by clinical services. Those faculty members who are active in research and are successful in obtaining grants and contracts can also "buy out" their teaching time with grant and contract monies.

The A/B salary plan is modeled on a combination of these two approaches. Under certain circumstances, tenured faculty may use grant and contract monies not to supplant but to enhance their state-funded salaries. Faculty members who have a history of generating grant monies equal to at least 20% of their salaries, over a period of five years, may be eligible to participate in this program.

To participate, a tenured faculty member must resign a portion of tenure, but keeps both the salary and the workload associated with full tenure. If a faculty member resigns, for example, 80% of tenure, s/he would retain the full dollar amount of state funding and be able to add an additional 20% from grant/contract monies. The University would expect the same amount of service for the 80% tenure as for the 100% tenure. In addition, the decision is irrevocable. The percentage of tenure lost can never be regained.

For example, a faculty member making \$10,000/month could resign 20% of tenure and replace it with \$2,000 in grant monies, resulting in a salary of \$12,000 or a \$2,000/month raise. The faculty member would be obligated to provide the same level of institutional service for the 80% tenure as for the 100% tenure.

If the faculty member were to become research-inactive, that position would be considered 80% tenured and 20% without tenure. However, said Olswang, the State's dollar commitment to the faculty member would remain the same, as would benefits and retirement.

This plan would not apply to WOT (Without Tenure) faculty, since their positions are 100% funded by grant and contract income and their salary levels are solely dependent upon the research income they generate. While WOT faculty cannot raise their incomes by using the A/B strategy, said Olswang, they are eligible for salary adjustments from Retention monies if they are unfairly compensated relative to their peers – this provides much more flexibility to adjust WOT faculty salaries.

Faculty can also "buyout" their time. In this case, tenured research faculty generate grant monies that support their own salaries, thereby freeing state monies to pay junior faculty for teaching undergraduate courses. The "buyout time" is recaptured by departments for replacement purposes. Under the A/B plan, this recapture does not apply.

At present, 91 of 1,534 tenured faculty members are on the A/B plan – this is a very small percentage, Olswang noted. All such salary arrangements arise from individual negotiations between faculty members and their deans in response to retention issues, and adjustments must be certified as a retention issue by the dean. Retention is interpreted broadly, said Olswang, and includes situations where a valued faculty member is grossly underpaid and unhappy about it, whether or not that person is being actively courted by another institution.

The A/B salary plan is not automatic, Olswang said. The questions that must be answered in assessing the appropriateness of the plan for any tenured faculty member are:

- Is the person really underpaid?
- Does the person consistently generate sufficient grant/contract monies to support the increase?
- Can the department afford to do this?
- What is more important to the department and the dean – the recapture or the salary adjustment?

Olswang stressed that this plan does not work everywhere, but is one tool of many being used by departments to assist highly productive research faculty in obtaining higher salary rates. The plan is in use in Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Education, and Social Work. Deans set up their own restrictions for using the plan, and chairs have to sign off on its use. Hogan added that the plan does not work with many National Science Foundation (NSF) grants, which are structured quite differently.

Unit-specific salary decisions by deans take many factors into account, e.g.:

- The faculty member's value to a given department
- Peer average salaries
- Collegial decisions and policy issues

Some faculty members have been offered the A/B solution and have refused it, because they were concerned about partial tenure. The dollars and benefits are the same, said Olswang, but some people don't like the idea of being designated less than 100% tenure.

Departments that are behind their peers in salaries but cannot make use of the A/B plan, such as the Humanities, are being asked to develop salary plans so that any available or reallocated funds can be used to make specific unit adjustments for those whose salaries are 20% or more behind their peers.

State support pays salaries for only about 1600 tenured faculty and an additional 800 faculty have some state support. However, the entire cohort of UW faculty is about 4800 faculty – meaning that at least half the faculty at the UW are supported by grant and contract monies or clinical recapture funds and have no state funding. The A/B plan only works for tenured faculty who have both state support and substantial grant/contract awards that allow salary support.

**Washington State Senate Bill 5357**

S-0664.1

---

SENATE BILL 5357

---

State of Washington    58th Legislature    2003 Regular Session

By Senators West, Sheahan, Kohl-Welles, Hale, Honeyford, Winsley, Mulliken, Rasmussen and Shin

Read first time 01/23/2003. Referred to Committee on Higher Education.

AN ACT Relating to tuition waivers for children of faculty at institutions of higher education; and adding a new section to chapter 28B.15 RCW.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

{+ NEW SECTION. +} Sec. 1. A new section is added to chapter 28B.15 RCW to read as follows:

(1) The governing boards of the state universities, the regional universities, The Evergreen State College, and the community and technical colleges may waive all or a portion of the tuition and services and activities fees for children of tenured faculty and children of full-time faculty with ten or more years of service at an institution of higher education as defined in RCW 28B.10.016. The enrollment of these persons is subject to the following conditions:

(a) Such persons shall register for and be enrolled in courses on a space-available basis and no new course sections shall be created as a result of the registration;

(b) Enrollment information on persons registered under this section shall be maintained separately from other enrollment information and shall not be included in official enrollment reports, nor shall such persons be considered in any enrollment statistics that would affect budgetary determinations; and

(c) Persons registering on a space-available basis shall be charged a registration fee of not less than five dollars.

(2) For the purposes of this section, "tenured faculty" means persons employed at an institution of higher education, as defined in RCW 28B.10.016, as an associate professor or professor, who holds his or her position without discriminatory reduction of salary or loss of position.

(3) In awarding waivers, an institution of higher education may award waivers to eligible persons who are children of persons employed by the institution before considering waivers for eligible persons who are not children of persons employed by the institution.

--- END ---