

Approval of Minutes

Haley asked for any revisions to the October 10 minutes. He reminded the Council that meeting minutes of all Senate Councils are public records and are posted to the Faculty Senate Website, so approving the minutes is a non-trivial exercise.

Beth Kolko observed that the October minutes list her as both present and absent. She was present.

Richard Ludwig recommended alternative language for the paragraph on Enabling Legislation (page 4), deleting the sentence "The UW could not support the bill for several reasons" and incorporating the clause "In order for the UW faculty to support the bill" as part of the next sentence. The revised sentence now reads: "In order for the UW faculty to support the bill, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution that specified certain provisions be included in any state enabling legislation."

It was also pointed out that the verb "included" should be added to the fourth line of the paragraph on Enabling Legislation (page 4).

It was moved and seconded that the October minutes be approved as corrected. Motion carried.

Announcements - Actions taken at Special SEC Meeting Nov 5

Haley reported on the special meeting of the Senate Executive Committee, which was held Monday, November 5 to hear the reports of the Special Fact Finding Committee and the Special Committee on Institutional Responsibilities in Courses with Teaching Assistants. Both these committees have been dealing with issues related to a possible job action by the GSEAC/UAW.

The Special Fact Finding Committee, chaired by Karen Boxx, attempted to discover, and to provide the faculty with, factual information on the positions of both the UW Administration and the GSEAC/UAW. While the committee did compile a report, Haley said, they were less than successful in determining the positions of the GSEAC/UAW. Boxx felt the report was one-sided and did not want to publish it at this time. She will contact the GSEAC/UAW again, to give them another opportunity to respond to the fact-finding committee.

Haley reported that the Special Committee on Institutional Responsibilities in Courses with Teaching Assistants, chaired by John Junker, found that many faculty members would face an impossible workload in the event of a job action by the Teaching Assistants. The Committee reported that the situation should be dealt with at the department level, devolving upward as appropriate. They also believed the University should provide extra resources to fulfill its obligations to students in the event of a job action.

Haley said he was impressed by the comment of a professor who said that there are 2200 students in her department taught by TAs, so a job action is not something individual departments could deal with. He reported that the SEC directed the Committee to draft a Class C Resolution on the matter.

Chapter 24 Legislation: Charge to subcommittee

Haley broached the idea of adding members to the Chapter 24 subcommittee. Chair Kate O'Neill responded that the group's small size (three members) enabled the subcommittee to do more and faster work, but that she was not opposed to adding members if there was good reason to do so.

After brief discussion, consensus emerged that Arts and Sciences and Humanities were under-represented on the subcommittee. Jan Sjøvik proposed adding Katarzyna (Kat) Dzwirek to the group. O'Neill agreed that broader representation was important, and will call Dzwirek to invite her to serve.

Unit Salary Adjustment Policy

"The charge from Brad was detailed." Chair Haley opened the discussion on Unit Salary Adjustment by describing an October 30, 2001 memo from Brad Holt, Chair of the Faculty Senate, in which Holt urged the FCFA to "develop a more systematic policy that would allow all faculty units to be regularly considered for a unit adjustment." Holt's memo, which asks for an FCFA recommendation by February 15, 2002, cites issues of eligibility, mechanism, criteria, and funding.

Haley proposed that FCFA devote a substantial portion of its December 6 meeting to the Unit Salary Policy rather than form a subcommittee. He noted that the date of the Unit Adjustment Policy was February 25, 2000, and wondered what had happened to it.

Richard Ludwig responded that the likelihood was small there would be a unit adjustment, because there is no funding. Ludwig said he has asked the Provost to add a budget line item for "Recruiting, Retention, and Unit Salary Adjustments" so that funding for Unit Adjustments would at least be identified. But the entire line item is a very small amount.

Chavonda Jacobs-Young asked if there is any possibility people will get these adjustments. What is the procedure? Are there guidelines or is it subjective, which can lead to unfairness? What do you do when someone is 15-20% under the rest of the department? Haley said individual adjustments are part of the review process at merit raise time. If a faculty member feels he or she has been treated unfairly, there is an adjudication process to address the grievance - faculty regularly avail themselves of this process.

Ludwig explained that the Unit Salary Adjustment pays special attention to compression issues. Jacobs-Young asked what constitutes compression. Ludwig described compression as a situation where faculty in the higher ranks of a department have received no raises, while those in the lower ranks have been given higher salaries to attract and retain them. Haley stated that, in some of these cases, he has seen not just compression but inversion.

Ludwig added that there have been unit adjustments where all the salaries in a department have been raised. "Brad [Holt] says the 10-year review program would help, but there may be other ways to do it."

After general discussion, the Council agreed to devote a substantial portion of the December 6 meeting to further exploration of the Unit Salary Adjustment Policy.

Preliminary Report of Subcommittee on Lecturer Status

The Faculty Council Subcommittee on Lecturers was formed under the 2000/2001 FCFA to consider all aspects of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer treatment in the Faculty Code, and in practice on campus, particularly with respect to promotion, equal treatment, and full participation in governance.

Before the subcommittee spends much time getting into the Code, Haley said he wanted the Council's feedback on the subcommittee's ideas about procedures for promotion, eligibility for awards, terms for contracts, ranking, and voting rights. A lively discussion followed, in which Council members from a

broad spectrum of departments commented on the issues, compared differences in the way Instructors and Lecturers are treated across campus, and commented on the subcommittee's ideas.

For example, Jan Sjøvik stated that Instructors are on a tenure track, while Lecturers are not. Dick Ludwig said that Instructor used to be a "holding position" for PH.D candidates, or until a specific professorship opened up. He added this is not true in the Med School, however, where Instructors cannot move to the professorial ranks. Barbara Krieger-Brockett pointed out that, under the present system, a newly-hired Assistant Professor votes on a Senior Lecturer's pay raise. She added that these issues affect women disproportionately, since the majority of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are women. A variety of questions and comments from other FCFA members underscored the perceived need for Code changes.

After general discussion of the preliminary document, areas of agreement and potential "hot spots" in the subcommittee's ideas were identified.

There was agreement that Lecturers and Senior Lecturers should be eligible for teaching awards. Prof. Rose summed up the general feeling when he said "We hire Lecturers for their teaching expertise - but we bar them from getting teaching awards? What's that about?"

There was general agreement that procedures for promotion and terms of contracts should be more clearly defined in the Code.

There was some feeling that, to benefit the life of the University, full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers should be eligible to serve as Faculty Senators and chairs of Faculty Councils. (They are currently excluded under section 22-43 in the University Handbook.) As Carol Green observed, "Lecturers do a lot of University-building and have valuable experience. The University says 'pay attention to your teaching,' so it seems that Lecturers voices are important." Riley said some feel only tenure track professors should be allowed to make decisions on the Faculty Senate. Ludwig added that there are hardened views on both sides of the [voting and ranking] issues and this causes divisions. In addition, views are colored by local situations.

Haley speculated that issues of ranking and voting rights were likely to be the "hot spots" in any draft legislation. Ludwig asked why the Lecturer track shouldn't be the same as the professorial ranks - Asst. Lecturer, Full Lecturer, Senior Lecturer. A third Lecturer category could be added to match the three steps in the tenure and research tracks. Haley felt that voting rights for Lecturers should be granted at 60% time, instead of the present 100% time or the proposed 50% time (which might unfairly tie the granting of benefits to the granting of voting rights). Jan Sjøvik commented he is very much in favor of a third rank for Lecturers, for economic reasons - Lecturers are very poorly paid, he said.

Krieger-Brockett asked whether Lecturers should be allowed to vote on curriculum but not on promotions, and agreed that the debate might be so rancorous that it would kill the legislation. Alan Kirtley suggested FCFA might float two bills, to separate the more divisive issues. The subcommittee will consider this approach, the possibility of three steps for Lecturers, and the rest of the input of the Council, as it continues its work.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, December 6, 9:00-10:30 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m. -- Linda Fullerton, Recorder