

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs Annual Report 2005-2006
Dan Luchtel, Chair

In contrast to last year, when the FCFA dealt with a major problem—the Medicare over billing case in UW Medicine—the FCFA this year worked on a number of smaller problems, such as issues to do with the more or less “forgotten members” of our faculty—the lecturers, research faculty, and educational outreach faculty.

1. Luchtel presented an update on the FCFA report about the Medicare over billing issue at the initial meetings of the academic year for the SEC and Faculty Senate. The FCFA report recommended changes regarding issues of administrative transparency, structure and finances. Luchtel had met recently with Dean Paul Ramsey concerning follow-up of the Council’s recommendations. Luchtel expressed optimism that the recommendations of the FCFA report were being addressed but noted that while progress has been made, much remains to be done.
2. In recent years, the FCFA has recommended changes in the Faculty Code in order to give voting rights to full-time lecturers and research faculty. Concerns have been expressed to the FCFA about how effectively these policy changes were being implemented across campus. For lecturers, the FCFA had been told that a cohort of lecturers had been appointed with 90-95% FTE, thus effectively denying them a vote since only full-time faculty can vote. University personnel records showed that there were no lecturers appointed with 90-95% FTE. Another concern was that there was a cohort of full-time lecturers but with part-time appointments in two different departments or units. Personnel records revealed only three lecturers who each held two part-time lecturer appointments in separate departments. This number is very small, indicating there is not a significant problem.
3. An issue about voting rights for the research faculty was claimed in departments with large numbers of research faculty and thus research faculty could control the results of departmental votes. The distribution of research by department showed that there are 472 Research Faculty in the professorial ranks. The majority, 335 (71%), are in the Health Sciences—with 222 in the School of Medicine—69 (14.6% are in the College of Arts and Sciences; 68 (14.4%) are in other Colleges and Schools. This compares with approximately 1,500 WOT and 1,500 WT faculty. The issue of research faculty in particular departments skewing departmental votes was not supported by this data.
4. Input was requested from the Council about the criteria for promotion to the rank of Principle Lecturer. Such promotions have been little used since the rank was established in 2002. The Faculty Code description is: Principle Lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized by appropriate awards, distinctions, or other major contributions to their field.

The FCFA recommended that, while promotion to Principal Lecturer is made in recognition of exceptional contributions and distinctions, it should not be viewed as an elitist title that is awarded to only a select few. Rather, the intent was that this title allows 3 levels in the Lecturer track—Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer— comparable to the 3 levels in the professorial track (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor). The FCFA recommended the following housekeeping change to Section 24-34 (B)(3) of the Faculty Code: “Principal Lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in

instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.”

5. Review of the lecturer appointments in UW Educational Outreach (UWEO) showed there were 16 part-time, 44 full-time and 344 hourly lecturer appointments. While there does not seem to be a need to pursue faculty appointment issues at the present time, some concern was expressed about the high proportion of part-time lecturer appointments paid on an hourly basis. Also, the UWEO program seems remarkably independent of central administrative oversight, raising a concern about quality control of the courses offered through UWEO.

6. A long-standing issue, the A/B Salary Plan was acted on by the FCFA. Last year, the FCFA had prepared an informational document that was forwarded to an Administrative Committee. That committee modified the document and returned it this year as a “Draft A/B Salary Plan”.

As defined by the Administrative Committee, the fundamental purpose of the A/B Salary Plan is to insure that sufficient mechanisms exist to support the retention of University of Washington tenured and tenure-track faculty consistent with the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy. The A component of an A/B salary is the state-committed salary support associated with an amount equal to the value of a state position (tenure) commitment that is matched with an institutional expectation of teaching, research, and service contribution. The B component of an A/B salary is the balance of the base salary funded from non-state appropriated sources (e.g., grants, contract, and self-sustaining).

The FCFA questioned several elements of the draft plan. Was its fundamental purpose for faculty retention? Rather, it seems primarily to support the well being of the faculty by providing salaries that are commensurate with their market value. Another concern is that the A/B plan is only available to those who engage in activities that can generate the required external funding. This was viewed as discriminatory against those that are dedicated to instruction or non-fashionable research. Finally, changes in salary vs. effort distributions become very difficult to track in parallel when an A/B salary plan is instituted for an individual faculty member. Although not described in the draft, an inevitable effect is to decrease the effort distribution devoted to teaching and service activities. The FCFA voted to approve the A/B Salary Policy (but with an attachment of related policy issues and other considerations) and submitted it to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

7. Possible changes in the faculty Grievance Procedures were discussed without resolution during several FCFA meetings. There seems to be a cynical, negative attitude by many of the faculty as to how grievances are handled. A basic problem seems to be that a faculty member with a potential grievance issue doesn't know who to go to for advice, and then don't trust whomever they went to.