

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 2007
36 GERBERDING HALL**

Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the March 12, 2007, meeting.
2. Report on the work of the joint FCFA/SCPB salary policy committee.
3. Update on the Secretary of the Faculty legislation.
4. Procedures for removal of faculty leaders.
5. Additional business.

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the March 12, 2007, meeting.

The meeting agenda was approved. The minutes of the March 12, 2007, meeting were approved with one exception: The final minutes will display only the final proposal for procedures for removal of Faculty Leaders and not the “tracking changes” exhibited in the draft minutes.

**2. Report on the work of the joint FCFA/SCPB salary policy committee.
Senate Chair Gail Stygall**

Senate Chair Gail Stygall asked the Council to review information she distributed in support of the joint FCFA/SCPB salary policy committee’s proposed Class A legislation and proposed changes of a related Executive Order to be forwarded to the President (also distributed). Part of the impetus for this proposal came from the Administration and the Board of Regents who asked Faculty Senate leadership to consider an addition to the Faculty Salary Policy’s “Funding Caution.” This change (to an Executive Order) was drafted and will be submitted for Administration’s consideration in a process that, if approved, will parallel the process that will change the Faculty Code’s correlative sections concerning the Faculty Salary Policy.

Information distributed included figures relating state general funding support and tuition to the change in overall funding between 1991 and 2007. This information supports the Committee’s proposal suggesting a 3% decrease in the combined state appropriations plus tuition would be a reasonable benchmark for an occasion when this policy might be suspended for a year.

The Council suggested changing the word “revisited” at the bottom of the second page of the Executive Order to “reevaluated” to strengthen the language.

Chair Stygall explained that the Committee's primary intent was to add a provision for high merit and a provision. Apparently 20% of faculty members have experiences some form of salary compression or inversion.

After some discussion about the definition of "high merit" as opposed to "merit" it seemed clear that Section 24-55 of the Code (Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit) be re-examined to see if it provides sufficient guidance to Chairs and Deans on how to make those determinations among faculty. The Council was reminded that if the legislation were to progress, it would go to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulation whose job it is to determine whether new legislation makes sense within the context of all portions of the Code.

The issue is complicated when applied to non-tenure track faculty. Apparently there is some benefit to receiving a smaller amount of state funds if a faculty member is paid primarily by grant money.

A motion was made and seconded to send the proposed Class A legislation changing Sections 24-70 and 24-71 of the Faculty Code to the Senate Executive Committee for review.

During discussion, the following changes to the proposed legislation were suggested:

Section 24-70.B.3 should read:

shall be awarded to recognize high merit (following review procedures of Section 24-55).

Section 24-70.B.5 should read:

may be awarded to all meritorious faculty as an additional merit salary increase beyond that available under 24-70.B.1 and 24-70.B.3 (following review procedures of Section 24-55)

One Council member reported feeling uncomfortable that the Council was being asked to approve this legislation, having seen it only this morning for the first time. Could a vote be deferred to the next meeting?

Chair Stygall reported that Administrative representatives on the Committee made it clear that they would not accept a change from the 2% raise for merit and the 1% raise for high merit – with a provision of a 3% raise for meritorious faculty overall.

After some discussion, the Council decided that without correlative changes in the Executive Order on Faculty Salary Policy, these Class A changes should not be approved. However, timing of both processes would make it clear in plenty of time if there were to be a change of heart about the Executive Order.

After a call for a vote, the motion was approved with the two modifications noted above by the voting members present.

3. Update on the Secretary of the Faculty legislation.

Not addressed because of lack of time.

4. Procedures for removal of faculty leaders.

Chair Sjøvik asked Council members to review material he had brought for their consideration – including the text of the procedures for removal of faculty leaders that the Council had drafted at the last meeting, comments from David Lovell, a re-drafting of the procedures by Alan Kirtley, and another by Sjøvik. The subject will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

5. Additional business.

Not addressed because of lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

*Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty,
sfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-543-2637.*

Present:

Regular: Callis, Christie, Graubard, Hildebrandt, Kirtley, Scheuer, Sjøvik, Vaughan

President's Designee: Cameron

Members of Representative Groups: Cook

Guest: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate and Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty

Absent:

Regular: Gill (excused)

Members of Representative Groups: Patterson, Doyle, Shields, Lovell

