

**Gail Stygall, Chair
University of Washington Faculty Senate
Remarks at March 1, 2007 Faculty Senate**

Good afternoon. Welcome to the second Faculty Senate meeting of the winter quarter. Today, after we hear our regular reports as well as a report from our Executive Vice President, Weldon Ihrig telling us why the trees over the Triangle Garage are coming down, really a report on Sound Transit construction, we will continue with our legislative work. Last time we had a first reading on legislation related to TriCampus. After a first reading, legislation goes to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations. As you may note under Item 6 on the agenda, the “code cops” brought a substantive substitute amendment, making the legislation consistent with the rest of the chapter. Consequently, because comparisons between the two proposals are still under way, we have delayed the second reading of the Tri-campus legislation until the next Senate meeting in April. Our Class A legislation for today comes to us from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and this legislation changes the system for selecting a Secretary of the Faculty. The particular proposal brought by Faculty Affairs is quite similar to the selection process in the Cal system. Jan Sjøvik will present information on this legislation. Our Class B legislation for the day comes to us from the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach and this legislation removes the distance learning marker on student transcripts for students who are enrolled in courses in which 50% or more of the instruction takes place on line. Bill Erdly will present information on this legislation.

Before we turn to our reports and our business, I want to make a few remarks on the issue of faculty salaries. As you know, I have sent out two messages to the voting faculty, one outlining the current budget proposal from the Governor, the other outlining different components of our long-term salary problems. The responses, as you might imagine, have been something like turning over a rock. We have heard from faculty who worry that the A/B salary plan confirms and makes permanent the inadequate state support for departments and programs who are able to secure grants and contracts. We have heard from lecturers who believe that some effort should be made for equitable salary treatment for long term lecturers. We have heard from research faculty who want to continue teaching in their programs and working with graduate students in spite of the recent federal efforts to bar all activity for

research faculty but work on their federal grants and contracts. We have even heard from chairs who bemoan the fact that the chair's stipend in at least one college hasn't increased in more than a decade. But the primary concerns of faculty involve compression, units, and merit. One of my surprises in these responses was that south campus was also experiencing below market pay, even when faculty were recruited in, and compression after they arrive. The morale problems associated with all three of these factors—compression, units and market, and merit—are considerable. Most of these problems can be said to have been created by prior administrations that simply declined to pursue long-term planning to correct the salary inequities, worsening the overall problems. One year, we would address merit, the next unit adjustments, the next across-the-board, none connected with the other or with a long term plan. Currently, we have a salary policy in Executive Order 64 in the Faculty Code that sets the order and process by which salary is distributed, starting with ordinary merit and promotions, salary floors, additional merit, unit adjustments, recruitment and retention and system wide adjustments. The ordering is sensible, but once past the first three—ordinary merit, promotions, and salary floors—it has been difficult to actually fund the others, leaving us with continuing problems in significant parts of the university. In order to assess the faculty's concerns about salary issues, we continue to invite your responses to the original emails. We are also planning an open meeting on faculty salaries on April 3, 2007, at 3:30 pm in Johnson 102 and we invite you and your colleagues to attend and engage in this discussion.

Past administrations seem to have taken their cue from the Washington state legislature's insistence that they cannot commit a future legislature to funding obligations made by the prior legislatures and simply not planned out beyond a single biennium. But the university is not the legislature and is capable of planning better than the legislature. With this administration, this president and this provost, and this Board of Regents, it may be possible to plan beyond the moment. We invite you to participate in setting the issues, encouraging your colleagues to participate, through email or through attending the planned meeting on April 3rd.

At the Faculty Senate's next meeting, we will discuss the salary issues and we will also consider legislation that will substantially amend the Student Code of Conduct.

That concludes my remarks—on to today's business, starting with the Report of the President.