

The proposed default policy on competitive offers - which states that all faculty will have a vote on the offer - will come into play when a department faced with a competitive offer does not have its own policy. Departments that want to avoid using the default policy, said Holt, may create an alternative policy and must register it with the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

Steve Olswang agreed with Holt that faculty should be allowed to vote on competitive offers, and further described the funding process for these offers. In a typical year, the UW's central resource budget includes money for retention of faculty; in special circumstances, some additional funds can be found from internal reallocations of the central budget. Deans are usually expected to fund a portion of the competitive offers from their own budgets - historically this has been 50%, which can come from line items such as vacant positions or from merit money. Since pre-committing merit money reduces the amount of merit money available to other faculty, Olswang said, faculty members should be allowed to share in decisions on competitive offers.

Holt added that the proposed Code revision requires departments to file their policies biennially. This should raise awareness that both the competitive offers policy and the default policy exist.

After general discussion, Haley noted that there is consensus among FCFA members to go forward with this revision. Haley will firm up the proposed language and submit it for an email vote to meet the January 4 deadline for agenda items for the next SEC meeting.

Unit Salary Adjustment Policy

Holt began the discussion on Unit Salary Adjustment policy by revisiting the salary adjustment policies set forth in the Faculty Code.

Per the Code, resources shall be allocated so that:

1. Meritorious faculty SHALL receive salary adjustments.
2. Faculty who are promoted SHALL receive salary adjustments.
3. Faculty whose salaries are below the departmental "floor" SHALL receive salary adjustments.
4. Faculty MAY receive adjustments for extra merit.
5. Faculty MAY receive adjustments in response to competitive offers.

The percentages that govern the amounts of these individual increases, added Olswang, are set forth in a Presidential Order that is a footnote to the Code section on salary increases. Those percentages are 2% for merit, 7.5% for promotion, and unspecified amounts for the other categories. The Order contains a caveat that, in times of budget emergencies, there may be no increases.

The President can rescind the salary increase order at any time. "The Code does not have a guaranteed dollar amount or percentage increase," said Olswang. "That is a commitment from the President that has held for three years and we expect it to hold a lot longer."

The Unit Adjustment increase, however, differs from the individual adjustments governed by the Presidential Order. The Unit Adjustment Policy aims to correct salary inequities for entire departments that are outstanding in quality but are paid less than their peers. The policy may also be used to align salaries in departments that are merging.

The trouble, said Holt, is that the current process for reviewing departments for unit adjustments is not systematic. There are no guarantees that a given department will be reviewed, and no timetable for doing so. Holt would like to see a policy in place for regular reviews of all departments, and quality standards

for evaluating a department's merit. This might coincide with a department's ten-year review, or there may be other ways to accomplish this.

Unfortunately, said Holt, state money fluctuates. If a policy relies on the ten-year review, what happens if there's no money available in that year? A department could be found worthy of a salary increase, but funding might not be available.

The question, said Olswang, is whether unit adjustments should be written into the Code or whether they should be part of a policy implementation such as the Presidential Order that governs individual increases. Further, what should trigger a unit salary review - a department merger, review, accreditation, threats to departmental quality? Are there other considerations?

Holt reiterated his belief that a policy for regular, systematic unit reviews should be included in the Code and that departments reviewed would be considered for, though not guaranteed, a salary adjustment.

Barbara Krieger-Brockett wondered what would happen if a unit went through a ten-year review and was found to be both meritorious and below market peers, in a year when there was no funding available for raises. Holt said faculty must decide how important that issue is. "Are we willing to say that we consider this important enough that there'll be cuts or tuition raises someplace?" Holt said.

Reviewing each department on a cycle would mean about 15 departments would be reviewed each year. Olswang said he is not certain the President would be willing to guarantee unit adjustments in the same way he has guaranteed 2% and 7.5% guarantees for individual merit and promotions. "Since 1999," Olswang said, "every faculty member who's been promoted has received a 9.5% salary increase."

Alan Kirtley disagreed, commenting that some units have "taken the position that a 7.5 is a 7.5 regardless of whether, unit-wide, there's a 2% increase across the board." As a conciliation officer, Kirtley said he has dealt with some complaints of this kind. Olswang reiterated that, in cases of promotion, the 2% increase should be in addition to the 7.5%.

Haley raised the question of whether unit adjustment policy should be clarified and imbedded in the Faculty Code, or whether the Council could work out a clear statement of policy implementation so the rules are clear.

Olswang said the Faculty Senate might recommend that the president amend the Executive Order on salary allocations to define when a unit adjustment would be considered. Holt differed with this view - he prefers that the changes be made via Code revision instead of Executive Order.

Holt and Olswang agreed that there should be a triggering event for unit adjustments, and that this should be spelled out in the Faculty Code. How unit adjustments are to be funded is a separate and difficult issue.

Chavonda Jacobs-Young suggested that departments who feel they deserve a unit adjustment submit proposals and ask to be reviewed. Holt replied that quality is a big issue in these adjustments, not just whether a department is paid less than its peers - the ten-year review is the best assessment of quality available. Katherine Graubard said the underlying issue is fairness - that everyone is considered.

Beth Kolko characterized the issue as two-fold: First, what should trigger a unit salary review for a department; second, what to do if the review shows that salary adjustments should be made. Holt

concurring in principle, but cautioned against splitting the question into two issues. All policies for all aspects of this issue should be spelled out in the Faculty Code.

Alan Kirtley said there is a third part to this issue - standards. How do you define exceptional? How do you define the salary gap - do we quantify it? To be fair, and to avoid the appearance of politics in these reviews, departments should know what hurdles they have to cross.

Under current policy, said Holt, having a ten-year review does not trigger a review for a unit adjustment in salary. A clear process might be to choose three of the fifteen or so programs that are up for review in any given year, and submit them to the Provost for unit adjustments review as well.

Kirtley would like to see a code section that clearly defines target dates for unit reviews. This would free Deans from having to worry about reviewing every department every year. This would create a process where twelve or fifteen units would receive serious consideration every year, and would be guaranteed a substantive hearing.

Holt acknowledged it would be easier to work with the Provost to develop an Executive Order on unit salary adjustments than to change the Code, but reminded the Council that Executive Orders can be changed without faculty input. The Faculty Handbook cannot be changed without faculty concurrence. There was general consensus in the Council that Code changes, while perhaps more difficult to achieve, are preferable.

On a slightly different matter, Haley said there should be a legitimate role for faculty in the process of strategic development for the University. At present, it is possible for some departments deemed "strategic" to receive the lion's share of resources with little input from anyone other than the Dean.

Holt said the Faculty Senate is starting a big push for more faculty involvement at the college level. There is already a specific requirement that all colleges elect faculty councils to advise the Dean on policies - at some colleges, that's in place and working; at some colleges, it's not. These advisory councils will become very important this year, and in the next biennium, because of the budget implications.

Under the procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP), if the Dean wants to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate programs in a given college, there is a procedure to follow. The faculty advisory council works with the Dean to look at alternatives and give their recommendations before the Dean writes a plan.

The Secretary of the Faculty appoints five additional members to sit on the college council; these five write a separate report that agrees or disagrees with the Dean's recommendations. More important, they also report on the quality of the process - was it fair, were the participants knowledgeable and involved?

Faculty members need to know that this requirement exists, and to make sure there's a faculty advisory council working with their Deans. Haley said mechanisms are in place to see that faculty members are involved in these strategic decisions - we need to see that they're being used. Holt suggested Debra Friedman might come and talk with FCFA about strategic planning issues. Haley will contact her for the January 10 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder*