

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Research**

The Faculty Council on Research met on Thursday, January 30, 2003, at 8:00 a.m. in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Asuman Kiyak presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Booth, Heath, Kartsonis, Kiyak, Stewart, Tolnay
 Ex-Officio Blake, Kahl, Hogan, Zuiches

ABSENT: *Professors* Gordon, Ruzicka, Troll, Vance, Vitaliano, Vogt
 Ex-Officio Sjavik, Stygall, Dworkin, Ghosh, Camber, Parks

Guests: Steven Olswang (Vice Provost), Carol Green (FCFA), Tami Sadosky (GCA)

Synopsis:

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. A/B Salary Plan (Olswang)
4. Executive Revisions to Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct Allegation Guidelines (discussion of 12/10 Vaughn memo)
5. New Joint Research Committee (discussion re: Rose Committee recommendations)

Kiyak called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

Approve agenda

The agenda was approved.

Approve minutes

The January 16 minutes were approved, with one revision.

A/B Salary Plan (Olswang)

Vice Provost Steven Olswang presented information on the A/B salary plan now being used to compensate some tenured faculty. The plan, said Olswang, is one way to provide greater salary support to eligible faculty members in times of extreme budget constraints.

In some departments, e.g., the Medical School, there is more than one source of funds used to pay tenured faculty. This has been called the XY salary policy, where X represents state funding and Y represents monies generated by clinical services.

Those faculty members who are active in research and are successful in obtaining grants and contracts can also "buy out" their teaching time with grant and contract monies.

The A/B salary plan is modeled on a combination of these two approaches. Under certain circumstances, tenured faculty may use grant and contract monies not to supplant but to enhance their state-funded salaries. Faculty members who have a history of generating grant monies equal to at least 20% of their salaries, over a period of five years, may be eligible to participate in this program.

To participate, a tenured faculty member must resign a portion of tenure, but keeps both the salary and the workload associated with full tenure. If a faculty member resigns, for example,

80% of tenure, s/he would retain the full dollar amount of state funding and be able to add an additional 20% from grant/contract monies. The University would expect the same amount of service for the 80% tenure as for the 100% tenure. In addition, the decision is irrevocable. The percentage of tenure lost can never be regained.

For example, a faculty member making \$10,000/month could resign 20% of tenure and replace it with \$2,000 in grant monies, resulting in a salary of \$12,000 or a \$2,000/month raise. The faculty member would be obligated to provide the same level of institutional service for the 80% tenure as for the 100% tenure.

If the faculty member were to become research-inactive, that position would be considered 80% tenured and 20% without tenure. However, said Olswang, the State's dollar commitment to the faculty member would remain the same, as would benefits and retirement.

This plan would not apply to WOT (Without Tenure) faculty, since their positions are 100% funded by grant and contract income and their salary levels are solely dependent upon the research income they generate. While WOT faculty cannot raise their incomes by using the A/B strategy, said Olswang, they are eligible for salary adjustments from Retention monies if they are unfairly compensated relative to their peers – this provides much more flexibility to adjust WOT faculty salaries.

Cathryn Booth raised the issue of "buyout time," where tenured research faculty generate grant monies that support their own salaries, thereby freeing state monies to pay junior faculty for teaching undergraduate courses. The "buyout time" is recaptured by departments for replacement purposes. Under the A/B plan, this recapture does not apply.

At present, 91 of 1,534 tenured faculty members are on the A/B plan – this is a very small percentage, Olswang noted. Kiyak speculated that many more faculty members would want to take advantage of the plan if they knew more about it.

Olswang responded that all such salary arrangements arise from individual negotiations between faculty members and their deans in response to retention issues, and adjustments must be certified as a retention issue by the dean. Retention is interpreted broadly, said Olswang, and includes situations where a valued faculty member is grossly underpaid and unhappy about it, whether or not that person is being actively courted by another institution.

The A/B salary plan is not automatic, Olswang said. The questions that must be answered in assessing the appropriateness of the plan for any tenured faculty member are:

- Is the person really underpaid?
- Does the person consistently generate sufficient grant/contract monies to support the increase?
- Can the department afford to do this?
- What is more important to the department and the dean – the recapture or the salary adjustment?

Olswang stressed that this plan does not work everywhere, but is one tool of many being used by departments to assist highly productive research faculty in obtaining higher salary rates. The plan is in use in Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Education, and Social Work. Deans set up their own restrictions for using the plan, and chairs have to sign off on its use. Hogan added that the plan

does not work with many National Science Foundation (NSF) grants, which are structured quite differently.

Kiyak noted that the plan is positive for schools and departments because it motivates more faculty to obtain grants, but there can be inequities for those whose deans do not want to use the plan.

Olswang noted that unit-specific salary decisions by deans take many factors into account, e.g.:

- The faculty member's value to a given department
- Peer average salaries
- Collegial decisions and policy issues

Some faculty members have been offered the A/B solution and have refused it, because they were concerned about partial tenure. The dollars and benefits are the same, said Olswang, but some people don't like the idea of being designated less than 100% tenure.

Departments that are behind their peers in salaries but cannot make use of the A/B plan, such as the Humanities, are being asked to develop salary plans so that any available or reallocated funds can be used to make specific unit adjustments for those whose salaries are 20% or more behind their peers.

State support pays salaries for only about 1600 tenured faculty and an additional 800 faculty have some state support. However, the entire cohort of UW faculty is about 4800 faculty – meaning that at least half the faculty at the UW are supported by grant and contract monies or clinical recapture funds and have no state funding. The A/B plan only works for tenured faculty who have both state support and substantial grant/contract awards that allow salary support.

Revisions to Executive Order 61, Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct Allegation Guidelines

The Office of Scholarly Integrity (OSI), which assumes responsibility for investigating and resolving allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct by faculty, students, and staff, is now supervised by Cheryl Cameron, who reports directly to the Provost. The Office was previously part of the Graduate School.

The Executive Revisions to Executive Order 61, dated December 10, 2002, have been proposed by the Secretary of the Faculty, Lea Vaughn, under an agreement with the Faculty Senate that allows the Secretary to make technical changes to the policy. The current changes referenced in Vaughn's December memo include:

- Changes in Federal definitions with which the University must comply.
- The transfer of the Office of Scholarly Integrity from the Graduate School to the Provost's Office

Olswang explained that the transfer of OSI has occurred as a result of resource reallocations in the Graduate School and in the Provost's Office. Vaughn has asked for comments from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and from the Faculty Council on Research on these executive changes.

Kiyak questioned whether it might be better to have OSI report to Craig Hogan/Office of Research, who would know the research processes better. Olswang and Hogan both responded that it is better that OSI does not report to the Office of Research, so that OSI can maintain

independence in its investigations. OSI does, however, work closely with the Office of Research in investigating allegations of misconduct.

The Federal Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has reviewed and vetted the changes proposed by Vaughn's memo, Olswang added, so that the changes are in compliance with Federal guidelines. The Provost's Office has asked the Faculty Senate for a response within 45 days, but will not implement the changes until they get a green light from Vaughn.

Kiyak will respond to Vaughn's memo, on behalf of the Faculty Council on Research.

Motion re: Research Royalty Fund Review Committee

Further to the January 30, 2003, FCR discussion about publishing the membership of the Royalty Research Fund Review Committee, Anna Kartsonis introduced a motion to do so.

Discussion included reference to the fact that Mac Parks said there was no reason to publish the names, but no reason not to publish them. It was noted that many granting organizations either do not publish the names of their reviewers, or publish them only after the reviews have been completed, to avoid any lobbying.

It was moved, seconded and passed that the names of the appointed Royalty Research Fund Review Committee members be made public after each cycle of reviews has been completed.

Joint Research Committee (discussion re: Rose Committee recommendations)

Furthering the work of the Research Council in creating a prototype Joint Research Council modeled on the recommendations of the Rose Report, Council members discussed a draft list of possible faculty and administration representatives who are potential members of the new Joint Council.

Ross Heath reminded Council members that the intent of the new Joint Council is to have a large, high-level body that will meet once or twice a year to hear reports and craft policy, with its work done by subcommittees and ad hoc committees. All members will have voting rights, and there will be one co-chair each from the faculty and the administration. Members will be appointed equally from the faculty and the administration.

During the discussion, various bodies and groups were recommended. Kiyak will gather the suggestions into a draft to be forwarded to the membership and discussed further (see appendix).

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton.*

Appendix

Potential Structure of Shared Governance in Research: "University Council on Research" (DRAFT)

Representation by diverse UW constituencies should be sought; suggestions by FCR members are listed below. One way of reducing the possibility of a large, unwieldy council is to establish the Council as a larger "umbrella organization" with multiple subcommittees that meet more often, and the Council meets once a year to obtain reports

*from all subcommittees. In addition, some of the representatives below are proposed as ad hoc, non-voting members or observers. **Co-chairs should be appointed by the Faculty Senate and Vice Provost for Research.***

Voting Members:

Faculty Senate

Association of UW Librarians (ALUW)

UW Retirement Association

Professional Staff Association (especially representing research staff)

Classified Staff Association

GPSS president

ASUW president

Office of Research (Vice Provost, Associate Vice Provost)

G&C Services

Human Subjects

Board of Deans

Graduate School Dean

Executive Vice President

Purchasing & Stores

Capital Projects

Human Resources

Publications

Risk Management

Office of Intellectual Property & Technology Transfer (OIPTT)

Grant & Contract Accounting

Environmental Health & Safety

Undergrad Research Program

Observers:

Federal Relations

Government Relations

Development & Alumni Relations

IACUC (Animal Care Committee)