

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

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on January 11, 2005, at 1:00 p.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Dan Luchtel called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.

Synopsis:

Agenda:

1. Discuss revised A/B Salary report
2. Discuss revised list of questions for Dean Ramsey
3. Regional Bio-Containment Lab issues

Revised A/B Salary Report

Council members reviewed the A/B salary report preparatory to posting it as an informational document. Some members were not comfortable with the description of the rationale and process for using A/B salary, and wanted to re-work the text for greater clarity.

It was agreed to revise the document, with the understanding that there is a need to publish the A/B salary document to tell what A/B salary is, how it's used on campus, who's eligible to participate, and how many faculty members are on this salary plan. It may also be wise to link FCFA's document to an explanation on the School of Medicine Human Resources Website, since the plan in the Medical School is somewhat different and there may be some confusion with UWP incentives.

Discussion:

A/B salary is a way to retain sought-after individuals who have the credentials the institution needs and to use part of the grant monies their credentials bring in as the additional dollars needed to keep them at the University. This recognizes that these individuals work much more than the 40-hour work week for which their state tenure money pays them, and allows exceptional effort to be rewarded with monies from their own grants. This also allows the University to be more flexible with its limited retention monies and reward more of those exceptional faculty members whose disciplines do not allow them to obtain grants.

Cheryl Cameron observed that this is about the faculty member's dollar value to the University. Faculty members who have four courses will still have the same four courses and do the same amount of work. Their workload remains the same, but is now 80% of their dollar value. In that way, the University can more adequately fund the research portion of their salaries.

Reducing tenure is not a reduction in load. If a faculty member's tenure guarantees a salary of \$100,000, now 80% of tenure guarantees the \$100,000 salary and the grant does the rest. The portion that was once 100% of salary is now 80% of it. The faculty member will always receive that 80%, that \$100,000, and will always have to do all the same work. But the faculty member will only receive the 20% portion if they continue to bring in grant money to support it.

A subcommittee will meet, revise the draft wording, and bring it back to the full council for a vote.

Regional Bio-Containment Lab Issues

Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath has referred to three councils the issue of a Level 3 Bio-Containment Lab proposed for construction on South Campus next to Portage Bay.

Issues include the appropriateness and safety of the site as well as community relations. However, there is also an overarching concern about the manner in which the proposal was made without involving faculty governance

bodies. A project of this magnitude should have been referred to the Faculty Senate for input before the grant proposal was made. Acting Provost David Thorud has assured the faculty that the project will be thoroughly vetted with the faculty and the community, but these assurances were given after the proposal was submitted.

The UW is an emerging center of excellence for the study of infectious diseases and there is a perceived need for the extra security and consolidation such a building would allow. If awarded the grant to build this project, the UW would be the only Level 3 bio-containment facility west of the Mississippi.

If built, the lab would be a facility appropriate for the study of HIV, influenza and the like, and would not house research on Ebola or other diseases that might make the building a target for terrorists. Only a Level 4 facility with a completely different configuration could contain Ebola and or other similarly-deadly diseases.

Heath would like FCFA to discuss the matter of the breach in the faculty governance process and advise him. He will then designate one council to be the lead on this issue.

Revised list of questions for Dean Ramsey

The council continued discussion on a list of questions to ask Dean Ramsey when he meets with the council to discuss the Winn/Couser affair, the Winn settlement, and the subsequent effect on the School of Medicine. The list of questions will be prioritized and sent to Dean Ramsey before the meeting.

Council members are striving for questions that are both specific and "answerable." There may be some questions Dean Ramsey cannot answer.

It would be important to know whether Ramsey agreed with the substance of the original report sent to him by Kate O'Neill, and whether he has any major comments on that report. There were serious concerns raised in the initial draft report, and FCFA wants to work with Dean Ramsey in a positive, supportive way to make life in the Medical School better for everyone.

After discussion, it was decided that Dan Luchtel will revise the set of questions, regroup them per the discussion, write a preamble, and send to everyone before the document goes out to Ramsey.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:27. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

Present: Ceccarelli, Hildebrandt, Janes, Luchtel, Scheuer, Sjavik, Walker, Murray, Cameron, Blumenthal, Vaughn,
Absent: Demorest, Graubard, Hadjimichalikis, Kirtley, Lydon-Rochelle, Fabien, Roy, Johnson, Stygall

Additional documents made available at today's meeting:

- Kate O'Neill/Dean Ramsey cover letter re Winn Settlement draft report 4/27/04
- FCFA draft report on Winn Settlement 4/27/04
- FCFA draft recommendations re Winn Settlement draft
- Dean Paul Ramsey's response to FCFA draft report on Winn Settlement 5/25/04
- Kate O'Neill's reply to Ramsey's response 10/31/04