Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Review of the Minutes from March 4th
3. Announcements
4. Faculty Salary Policy
5. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Watts at 9:40 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from March 4th

The minutes from March 4th were approved as written.

3) Announcements

Watts announced that he received a revised version of the Professor of Practice (PoP) proposal. Watts explained that he would like feedback from key constituents like the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC) and senate leadership. While this feedback is critical it may create a timing issue which will prevent the proposal from being introduced at the upcoming Senate Executive Council (SEC) meeting in order to receive its first reading at the Faculty Senate. If the final proposal is not ready at the required deadline then the council might wait until next year. Killien noted that the Faculty Senate may also be busy with discussing faculty salary policy which will impact the timing of introducing PoP legislation. Members discussed how much additional work will be required to prepare legislation for PoP and faculty salary policy and the timing of introducing them to SEC. Watts will have the most recent version of the PoP proposal posted on FCFA’s Catalyst page following this meeting.

Watts asked about the result of the Class A legislation on minor changes to the Faculty Code. Killien explained the results will be released on Friday. Watts mentioned that the legislation received no discussion during the second reading at the last Faculty Senate meeting.

4) Faculty Salary Policy

Watts reported that he has reviewed draft code revisions by Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) and Jack Johnson (President’s Chief of Staff). At this time all the modifications are located in Section 24 and include:

- Market adjustments
- Peer reviews based on adjustments
- Assessment process
• Collegial review
• Periodic assessments

Watts mentioned that the proposal is still in draft form and will result in additional changes throughout the rest of the Faculty Code, such as sections dealing with promotion.

Killien reported on recent discussions with faculty leadership and asked members what they expect FCFA’s role to be in developing the salary proposal. Traditionally, legislation dealing with faculty salary has gone through FCFA. However, this proposal is unique because a shared leadership group has crafted and came to agreements on a new salary system. A question was raised asking if there is good faculty representation on the salary working group. Members include faculty in current and past shared-governance leadership positions.

Members discussed how FCFA could be involved in the process. Killien asked if FCFA expects to simply provide feedback for the salary policy group, rewrite the proposal, or not even review the legislation. A comment was raised that FCFA should provide constructive feedback and input in order for the legislation to be ready for a vote. A comment was raised that because this change is so significant it should go through all the appropriate channels, including FCFA, in order to legitimize the process and ensure final approval. A comment was raised sharing the same concerns and stressed the importance of reviewing the policy in its entirety before moving to SEC.

Discussion ensued about how faculty who are not involved with faculty governance would react to this proposal. A comment was made stressing the importance of discussing the underlying principles of the proposal and the likely impact it will have on faculty. Watts stated that FCFA should review and vote on the proposed code changes while at the same time being sensitive to the negotiations that have already occurred. Watts expressed hesitation that FCFA should rewrite the entire proposal if there are outstanding concerns and problems. However, FCFA does have the responsibility to identify problematic issues and ensure the concerns are addressed by the salary work group. Watts suggested that FCFA should spend time reviewing the proposal with the understanding there is urgency for meeting a particular deadline.

Members discussed the need for special work sessions in order to review a final proposal. The need for special sessions depends if there are fundamental problems that require extensive discussion. A comment was raised that if this level of discussion is not done at FCFA it will be done at SEC. A comment was raised noting there are several outstanding issues to be resolved, such as the rollout of a strategic marketing plan in order to generate support from voting faculty members. Discussion ensued about the timeline in which the proposal will be ready for a faculty vote.

A comment was raised that the proposal brings up other concerns not directly related to the legislation, such as financing the new salary system. The fundamental question is to determine if the resulting impacts will be good policy for faculty which is the responsibility of FCFA. Since there is still uncertainty regarding all the implications it appears that FCFA will need a lot of time to review the proposal in its entirety. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that FCFA can play a role by providing oversight of the language which is proposed by the faculty salary working group. Specifically, FCFA could ensure that the specific language is tied to the set of principles that is advancing this proposal.
A comment was raised that FCFA should receive an up-to-date list of principles that is guiding this proposal while it is waiting for the finalized legislation. While FCFA is waiting for the final proposal the council could possibly address other pending issues like changes to the RCEP and adjudication processes.

Members discussed Spring Quarter and their availability to attend meetings. Watts explained that out of all voting members (excluding Vaughn who will be unavailable for the entire quarter) there will be exactly 4 members who can attend due to teaching obligations. As a result this would mean if any remaining member is absent the council would not achieve quorum. Due to the importance of the faculty salary proposal there may be a need to reschedule meeting times to ensure that the majority of members can attend and provide critical input. Although meeting times are normally pre-set for the entire academic year, this is a special situation due to the large impact salary policy will have on UW faculty. Members discussed possible options such as maintaining the current schedule, scheduling long special work sessions as needed, or scheduling new meeting dates. Watts reminded members that the council needs to reach quorum in order to take official actions. Additionally, if FCFA becomes more involved with the in-depth discussions on salary policy then it would be important to have as many members as possible.

Court will send out a survey requesting feedback on members’ availability to meet during Spring Quarter 2014.

5) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Watts at 11:00 a.m.
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