

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

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on January 10, 2002 at 9:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Charles Haley presided.

PRESENT: *Professors:* Dzwirek, Haley, Kirtley, Kolko, Luchtel, O'Neill, Roberts
 Other members: Krieger-Brockett, Green, Sjøvik

ABSENT: *Professors:* Graubard, Jacobs-Young, Landis, O'Brien, Poznański, Riley
 Other members: Ludwig, Olswang, Rose

The meeting was called to order at 9:05.

Approve Agenda

With the addition of one item, the agenda was approved.

Approve Minutes

The December 6, 2001, minutes were approved as submitted.

Results of Email Vote on Code Changes

To expedite Class A legislation on three separate issues (competitive offers default policy, WOT faculty, and voting eligibility), the Council was polled for their votes via password-protected email on December 14. The results of the email vote are as follows:

Competitive Offers	Yes=12	No=1
WOT faculty	Yes=12	No=1
Voting eligibility	Yes=11	Needs More Discussion=2

Having passed by majority vote, the legislation will be presented at the Senate Executive Committee Meeting on Monday, January 14. A copy of the legislation is appended to the minutes as an addendum.

Update on Lecturer Subcommittee

The Subcommittee on Lecturers is drafting a Statement of Principles with regard to the status and privileges of Lecturers at the University. When the Council is satisfied with the statement, it will be referred to someone with expertise in drafting Code language before it is submitted as Class A legislation.

Ia Dubois has raised the question of whether the Faculty Code allows Lecturers to be Graduate School faculty. Haley has not found anything in the Faculty Code prohibiting this, and believes that faculty members must apply to the Graduate School in order to be members. The Council concurred - Marilyn Roberts did not think there was such a prohibition but that many Lecturers, because they don't realize they can be Graduate School faculty, have simply not applied. Jan Sjøvik observed that some Lecturers may not be Graduate School faculty because they do not teach upper division courses.

Alan Kirtley asked whether the status of Artists and Artists-In-Residence is being considered along with Lecturers. At present, the Subcommittee is just concentrating on Lecturers, because there are so many of them and they are so widely employed. There are few Artists or Artists-In-Residence, so they have not had a champion. The Subcommittee will continue its work and prepare a package for the Council to consider.

Update on Chapter 24 Subcommittee

Kate O'Neill, Dan Luchtel, and Beth Kolko met as a subcommittee and agreed that they need to survey the faculty to discover how the regular conferences between Deans and faculty (mandated by Chapter 24) are working. Are the conferences actually helping faculty to plan their academic futures? There is a perception that these intended planning conferences have been collapsed into the merit evaluation process, which undermines the planning process. The Subcommittee is studying benign ways to ask a survey question on this topic.

The Subcommittee will also recommend some language changes to the Code, to clarify the original intent of the conferences. In addition, there may be a need to educate Deans and Chairs about the planning conference as it relates to, and is independent from, merit.

Haley commented that the classic business definition of "planning" is to assess the present situation, establish goals, and identify strategies to achieve the goals. Perhaps this would be a good model for the planning conferences, as opposed to a merit review that focuses on history and performance. There is a great deal of business literature on the distinctions between planning and evaluation.

General discussion centered on timely reporting of the faculty member's review by the Dean or Chair, a dispute resolution process, and the issue of keeping the planning conference and the merit conference separate. The Subcommittee will address these concerns in their recommended changes to Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code.

Unit Salary Adjustment Policy

The Unit Salary Adjustment Policy contained in the Faculty Code aims to raise salaries for high-quality departments that are paid substantially less than their peers. The Code as written may need to be fleshed out so that departments are reviewed on some specific schedule and so that guidelines for increases are clear. There is a debate about how to do this - Faculty Code changes to the process could be made and these would be permanent changes. If incorporated into an Executive Order, however, the process changes could be rescinded at any time.

The goal for the Unit Adjustment Policy, said Kate O'Neill, should be transparency in the process, and input from the faculty. At present, the Faculty Code is clear on the process for individual adjustments. It is vague, however, on unit adjustments. Carol Green suggested that a small subcommittee should draft any code changes deemed necessary, for review by the whole Council. Kirtley felt that the work on Unit Salary Policy should go forward despite the poor economic climate. It's unlikely, he said, that unit adjustments will be forthcoming in the near future, but the groundwork for future adjustments can be put in place.

At present, there are three pieces of Class A legislation pending in FCFA:

- Lecturer Status
- Chapter 24 Legislation
- Unit Salary Adjustment Policy

Haley will continue to try to get Debra Friedman to come and talk to the Council on Strategic Planning and the Unit Adjustment Policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Addendum

Class A Legislation proposed January 14, 2002

1. Competitive Offers:

Retention Adjustments. With approval from the Provost, college-administered or University funds may be used to adjust faculty salaries as a means to retain faculty members at the University of Washington either at the time of merit reviews or at other times as necessary throughout the academic year. Assessments of a faculty member's quality and unit contribution are essential elements in decisions to make retention adjustments. Consultative processes to recommend retention adjustments shall be established at the unit level following the procedures set forth in [Section 24-71](#) of the Faculty Code.

From Section 24-71

B. The Provost may distribute, in the course of a biennium, funds allocated by the President:

1. to provide additional merit salary increases (beyond those awarded under [24-71.A.1](#)). This allocation shall be distributed as equal-percentage increases to all units to fund merit increases for faculty (in accord with Section [24-55](#)).
2. to address the market "gap" of an individual unit. Allocation of such funds to units shall follow close consideration of individual units and consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. The Provost shall periodically gather updates on salary information from appropriate sources, including unit heads, and shall make those findings available to the faculty. The department chair (or dean in an un-departmentalized school/college) shall consult with the unit's voting faculty who are senior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank--or the unit's designated faculty committee(s)--about the appropriate distribution of these funds; and
3. to retain a current faculty member, based on the recommendation of the dean. Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. ~~The faculty of each academic unit shall document biennially, consistent with the procedures of Section [23-45](#), the level of consultation, if any, they deem necessary before competitive salary offers may be made.~~

The faculty of each academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to vote on the appropriate response; alternatively, the faculty may establish, consistent with the procedures of Section 23-45, a different policy regarding the level of consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This policy shall be recorded with the Secretary of the Faculty and be re-affirmed biennially.