The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met Thursday, March 8, 2001 at 9:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair Robert Holzworth presided.

PRESENT: Professors Haley, Holzworth, Luchtel, Riley. Ex officio Fabien, Krieger-Brockett, Ludwig, Rose, Sjåvik. Special Guest Bradley Holt, Vice-Chair of Faculty Senate

ABSENT: Professors Carr (excused), Hunn, O'Brien, Poznański, Roberts (excused). Ex officio Adman, Bentsen, Olswang (excused), Rickerson.

Announcements from Chair

Chair Holzworth announced that the legislation giving voting rights to Research Faculty was recently approved. 72% of voting faculty who returned ballots on the legislation approved of the measure.

Continued Discussion on the Status of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

Holzworth informed the Council of another issue pertaining to the rights of their colleagues which he believes should be addressed by the Council as soon as possible, which is the status of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. He told the Council that he was himself surprised to learn recently that the Faculty Code grants Lecturers and Senior Lecturers voting privileges but no rights to be elected to the Faculty Senate. Holzworth expressed his feeling that the FCFA should develop legislation to adjust the wording of the code to grant senatorial privileges. Under the same legislation, he suggested they address other issues of actual and/or perceived injustices to Lecturers and Senior Lecturers by providing clear guidelines on the promotion path from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and by granting faculty members of this group eligibility for the Distinguished Teaching Award.

To consider these issues, Holzworth established an FCFA Subcommittee on Lecturers, with members: Riley (Chair), Adman, Krieger-Brockett, Haley, and Holzworth. Holzworth will also appoint one or two Senior Lecturers to serve on the Subcommittee. He charged the Subcommittee with the task of examining all aspects of the treatment of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the Faculty Code and in practice on campus. He asked that they bring forward to the FCFA any proposal for legislation or any resolution they deem necessary to improve the situation for their Lecturer and Senior Lecturer colleagues.

Report from Joint Subcommittee on Proposed Changes to Copyright Policy

Fabien reported that the Joint Subcommittee on Proposed Changes to UW Copyright Policy, comprised of members of the FCFA and the Faculty Council on Research (FCR), met to discuss the proposed changes and their implications for Faculty. The Subcommittee decided that the terms of certain proposed changes were not clearly defined (especially definitions of 'usual and customary work' under the 'Works for Hire' portion) and therefore that the changes, if approved, may negatively impact faculty. The Subcommittee decided to draft a resolution to the Provost suggesting that the Copyright Policy changes be redrawn. Fabien presented the draft resolution to the FCFA; it was then discussed and edited. The resolution follows.

A Joint Subcommittee of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) and the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) has reviewed the attached proposed changes in the University of Washington's Copyright Policy.
While the FCFA and FCR understand that the proposed changes are meant to address problematic issues that arise from ambiguities in the existing UW Copyright Policy, it is nevertheless our opinion that these proposed changes, as they are currently worded, would be a serious threat to academic freedom.

As a result, the FCFA and FCR strongly recommend that the UW Copyright Policy be redrawn. The faculty will help in development of a policy that adequately takes into account the concerns of the faculty community for preserving the most basic of academic rights: the unimpeded search for knowledge and the free exposition of that knowledge.

The FCFA and FCR formally offer to actively participate in the re-drafting of the UW Copyright Policy to both address the concerns of the Administration and preserve the principles of academic freedom and shared governance that are clearly essential to the mission of the University.

Note: Although there was not a quorum at today's meeting, the changes made to the memo by members present were approved unanimously. Full approval will be determined via email correspondence with all the FCFA and FCR members.

Summary of Possible Future FCFA Issues, presented by Brad Holt

Brad Holt presented several issues to the FCFA that the FCFA may wish to consider and subsequently, possibly propose legislation to the Faculty Senate during Autumn Quarter, 2001. Specific issues include:

1. **Revisiting Chapter 24 Legislation.** Holt suggested that some revisions to existing legislation might be warranted, e.g. establishment of timelines for chairs to provide written versions of faculty conferences.

2. **Unit Adjustment Policy.** The current policy allows the Provost to examine academic units to determine if a unit-wide salary adjustment is justified. Holt proposed that a specific procedure be developed to evaluate a particular unit's quality. He suggested that the findings of 10-year reviews (carried out in most departments) be considered in the evaluation process, as well as fluctuating market price salary statistics.

Other issues he felt FCFA may choose to deal with are more immediate:

3. **The Budget.**
   
   a) **Faculty Raises:** Holt described the state of the University's budget as "not in good shape." He reported that the Provost believes that the current budgetary strains are not likely unique to just this year's budget negotiations and are not necessarily tied to the general state of the economy (i.e. the State is currently fiscally healthy and only a 'paltry' raise (1.8%) is being considered). In light of this dismal prediction, Holt asked FCFA to consider what type of general faculty salary increase they would like to propose and whether maintenance of salaries to keep in-step with peers at other institutions should come at the expense of other campus programs.

   b) **Proposed Changes to Medical Benefits for Faculty Relative to the 2% Merit Raise.** Holt explained that this year the Governor's budget proposes that faculty pay an increased portion of the cost of their medical benefits. The proposed change would increase the current portion of 6% to 8% and then later to 10%, and would be uniformly applied to all Faculty regardless of salary. In effect,
increased medical costs would subtract from any approved meritorious raise. Also, because a meritorious raise would be a percentage of salary and the medical benefit cut would be uniform, the raise would be felt differently among different faculty. Holt asked FCFA to consider what action, if any, they would like to take on this issue. He explained that the current salary policy allots a pool of money for faculty salary raises, of which part is available for non-uniform distribution. The question that FCFA might wish to consider is how to divide that pool: should it be distributed evenly or non-uniformly to account for different felt increases in medical costs? Another point of consideration is how this might be perceived by classified staff who have a completely different salary system and do not have any flexibility in how pay is distributed. Classified staff all receive across the board raises set by the State, independent of merit, and annual raises based on seniority (until they reach the top of the pay schedule). It may increase the feeling of being "second class" among the classified staff if the faculty distribute funds from their salary pool to account for the benefit cuts in this fashion since they are unable to do the same with their salary pool.

Report from Subcommittee on Proposed Changes to Instructional Responsibility Policy

Luchtel reported on the meeting of the Subcommittee on Proposed Changes to Instructional Responsibility Policy (IRP) and presented a draft of the proposed changes to the FCFA. The policy changes are designed to give faculty and their Departmental Chairs (or Deans if part of such a unit that does not include a Departmental Chair) autonomy in determining appropriate teaching loads per quarter in their own departments. For example, they propose that faculty be able to negotiate in their departments to spread out their academic year teaching loads over two quarters and use the third quarter to fulfill other academic responsibilities. Currently, the Provost requires that faculty teach courses during every quarter that they receive State funds. The Subcommittee feels that this 'edict from above' is unnecessary.

There was some discussion in this meeting and in previous meetings (see January 11, 2001 FCFA Minutes) about the fact that exceptions to the current policy are often made and that in Olswang's recollection he has never turned down a request from a faculty member for an exception. Rose argued emphatically that faculty rights should not be contingent on the privilege of knowing how to get around the rules. Fabien also pointed out that if the administration changes, there is no guarantee that the current policy of routinely approving exceptions will remain intact.

Ludwig predicted opposition from some members of the legislature on this issue based on the fact that he believes this move would be perceived as 'faculty trying to get out of doing their jobs.' He also indicated that he would not feel comfortable arguing this case in Olympia and that there may be negative political ramifications for faculty, which made Holzworth reluctant to push for IRP changes. Sjåvik registered some reluctance to push for legislation based on his own experience. He recalled a time before the administration's 'edict' came when a certain colleague in his department took some quarters off from teaching, causing, in Sjåvik's opinion, great strain on the department as well as a negative consequences for this individual's career.

Holzworth suggested that the FCFA hold this issue to be discussed further at the next meeting (March 29, 2001) when the Council could hear from other members who were not present today.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m. Minutes by Katherine Wimble, Recorder.