The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on October 30, 2002, at 11:30 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill presided.

Present:  
Regular: Ceccarelli, Dzwirek, Graubard, Hildebrandt, Kirtley, Kolko, O'Neill  
Ex-officio: Colonnese, Krieger-Brockett, Green, Sjavik, Croft  

Absent:  
Regular: Graubard, Landis, Lydon-Rochelle, Luchtel, O'Brien, Poznanski  
Ex-officio: Olswang, Johnson, Vaughn  

Guest: Steve Demarest, Music Education

Synopsis  
1. Approve agenda  
2. Approve minutes  
3. "B" salary plan  
4. Tuition waiver benefit (Demarest)  
5. Electronic voting (Vaughn memo)  
6. Provost's Classroom Assignment Policy

The meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m.

Approve Agenda  
The agenda was approved.

Approve Minutes  
The minutes of the October 16 meeting were approved.

"B" Salary plan  
The "B" Salary plan is a mechanism for tenured faculty to relinquish a portion of their tenure and have that portion replaced with money from research grants. This can be done for up to 125% of the faculty member's 100% tenure salary. Once relinquished, that portion of tenure cannot be regained. This is only done for faculty who have a solid history of grant monies for the preceding five years, and bears a salary cap of 125% of the original 100% FTE.

Pending further information from the Vice Provost, it is the understanding of the Council that a faculty member earning $80,000 at 100% tenured FTE could, for example, reduce tenure to 80% FTE and receive the same $80,000. The remaining 20% FTE could then be paid for via grant monies, effectively giving the faculty member a raise without requiring additional monies from the State.

Senate Chair Sandra Silberstein has asked FCFA to investigate the "B" plan and evaluate whether it's a good thing for the faculty as a whole (retention, morale, any detriments). In general, FCFA has been asked to shed more light on the plan and report on it, for everyone's enlightenment. A report could be posted on the Faculty Senate Website.

Tom Colonnese said this kind of funding is fairly common at other universities, but he isn't clear about why – when there's already a procedure in place to raise salaries – you'd want to give up part of your tenure. Beth Kolko commented she is distressed by the fact that a position that is deemed to take 100% effort can suddenly be termed 75% with no change in the content of the position. Carol Green said this
can benefit the productivity ratings of the school or college, because it balances out the ratios of student credit hours versus faculty FTE.

O'Neill surmised that part of this may tie in with the administration's goal of an increase in private support, and may be a whole new way to organize faculty salaries. Colonnese sees this as feeding the idea of moving toward a business model for universities. It creates a split faculty, and puts the emphasis on research and grant activity over teaching. What are the implications of that? On the other side, Colonnese added, it makes some sense that people bringing in grants for the university should be rewarded with some portion of that money.

Alan Kirtley commented that there absolutely needs to be more daylight on this issue. Twenty years ago he was told that no matter how much grant money he brought in, his salary could go no higher. He is surprised to learn how the policy has flipped, he said. If the "business" model is played out to the extreme, Kirtley could imagine a department head saying "The only way you're ever going to get a raise from the University is if you do grant funding – that's just our policy." And that kind of policy may or may not be in the best interests of people's careers, or in the best interests of the University, Kirtley added.

That kind of policy, observed Sjavik, greatly favors grants and contracts and keeps the research engine running. In another "no raise" year, if one could tap into another 20% of salary, the loss of a 2% raise would surely sting a lot less.

Leah Ceccarelli commented that there is a big salary discrepancy between faculty in fields that get grants and contracts, and faculty in (for example) the Humanities. In the long run, would a policy like this decrease that difference?

Colonnese pointed out that there is a potential for funding in any discipline, depending upon how actively you get involved in pursuing grants. O'Neill wondered how the "B' plan might skew across-the-board raises. It is not possible to deny an across-the-board raise to grant-funded faculty members, even if they have just given themselves an additional 20% raise by going on the "B" salary plan.

The consensus after general discussion was that much more light needs to be shed on the "B" salary plan and its implications. Beth Kolko, Katharine Graubard, Mona Lydon-Rochelle, and Barbara Krieger-Brockett have volunteered to work on this subcommittee, and will try to round out the subcommittee by recruiting someone from Humanities and someone who is presently on the "B" salary plan. Steven Olswang has promised more information on the subject.

**Tuition Waiver Benefit**

O'Neill introduced Steve Demarest (Music Education), whose proposal on revising the tuition waiver benefit favorably impressed the Council at its last meeting.

As currently structured, the tuition waiver benefit allows faculty and staff to take a total of six credits per quarter free of charge. The benefit, said Demarest, is not necessarily useful for those with "terminal" degrees and a full teaching load. He would like to see this benefit become bankable, and would like to see its use extended to members of the immediate family (spouse and children). Demarest sees this as an aid to faculty and staff retention that would not require the University to spend more money. Students admitted under this program should not count against the enrollment cap. In essence, faculty would agree to "teach each other's families" on an overload basis.

Conditions that would make this program more appealing might include:
1. Tuition would become bankable after three years continuous service. After three full years of continuous service, the benefit would vest as one year of coursework (18 credits per year for 3 years = 54 credits or roughly one year of coursework for the beneficiary).

2. After three years, the benefit would always vest a quarter at a time, so the benefit is always "paid out" after it is earned.

3. To ensure continuity, the benefit would be lost if the faculty or staff member left even temporarily.

4. Benefit would not be banked during any quarter the faculty or staff member is on leave or personally using the benefit.

5. If both parents work at the UW, both can accrue the benefit.

6. The beneficiary would have to meet all admission standards, but would be treated like any other student with regard to registration priority (at present, tuition waiver students register last on the list).

7. To begin the program, anyone who has served three years would automatically receive a year of banked tuition. In this way, the system would not be overwhelmed.

8. The tuition benefit would be used until it runs out, then the student/parents would make up the rest of the tuition.

O'Neill reminded the Council that this benefit would require a bill to amend the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). According to Vice Provost Olswang, the tuition waiver as presently mandated applies to all state employees who work 50% time or more – could an expanded version be applied only to the family members of higher education employees? Would this be reciprocal at other Washington State universities? Could it be made voluntary for the various State universities? How does this affect the UW's position that we will not accept more students absent funding? If we bring in students with average family salaries of $70,000, what happens to those who don't get access? Many other universities, including at least one state university Council members know of, offer full tuition benefits to family members of faculty and staff. Would this change make UW employment more attractive?

Given that we are in a year of no raises, Sjavik said, this may a good benefit to lobby for. It might have very good effects in retaining faculty who might otherwise leave. Using the language of the UIF, Demarest pointed out, we would in effect be taxing ourselves to pay for this benefit.

Kate O'Neill and Steve Demarest will serve on the Tuition Waiver Benefit subcommittee, and will seek more members from the Council as a whole. They will also seek the support of the administration, the Regents, and – in order to meet the legislative calendar in Olympia - will try to get the proposal on the Nov. 7 SEC agenda so there will be greater awareness of it.

**Electronic Voting**

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, has forwarded a memo requesting FCFA to amend the Faculty Code to allow electronic voting, and electronic communication with faculty. The issues are convenience, productivity, and cost savings (mail balloting costs about $3,000 per mailing, for example). There may or may not be issues with the Open Meetings Act.

**Provost's Classroom Assignment Policy**

Some concern about the new Classroom Assignment Policy comes out of SEC, who would like Faculty Affairs to find out who is being affected by this, and in what respect. Bottleneck courses and required courses are getting priority for classroom assignments – this pleases some faculty and displeases others. A subcommittee may be needed to look into this.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:32. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*