Faculty Senate Notes

December 4, 2014

2:30 p.m. Savery 260 (UWS)

Two big items were discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting in December: (1) Report on activity based budgeting (ABB) and (2) the proposed faculty salary policy.

**Activity Based Budgeting Implementation**

A task force has been created to look at issues with the implementation of ABB in Seattle. While I believe that the Tacoma campus is still considered one unit for the purposes of ABB, and that therefore the inter-program issues mentioned may not directly apply within our own campus, I believe that some of these issues will affect cross-campus degrees current and future. Some of the problems mentioned include the following:

a. Cross-listed courses create problems for assigning student FTE to the correct unit.

b. Some TA’s are funded by one unit while the FTE generated by the courses they teach are being credited to another unit.

c. There is an issue with how ABB affects the allocation of funds from summer teaching.

d. They have already seen ABB as a disincentive to cross-unit curricular collaboration.

I would propose that the UWT Faculty Assembly investigate how this may affect the Tacoma campus and submit comments to the task force if warranted.

**Faculty Salary Policy**

Most of the meeting was set aside for open discussion and reporting of issues raised in regard to the proposed faculty salary policy. Here are some of the comments:

a. There may be a significant workload addition for senior faculty who have to carry out more substantial review of more junior colleagues every 4 years, although it was also suggested that real merit evaluation is not currently done every year and that this is just making merit review a real practice.

b. One suggested that more money from the salary pool be set aside to address retaining existing faculty to safeguard diversity and equity of current faculty.

c. It is important that each unit model the effects of this salary policy on their own budget using the spreadsheet provided to the Senate.

d. The discrepancy between lecturer contracts (3 years) and recommended merit review (4 years) would create problems for lecturers.

e. How would this affect non-mandatory promotion cases?

f. The Business School in Seattle was concerned that the pay increases for faculty with high salaries would be less as a percentage since tied to average faculty salary, and that this might make it difficult to recruit “highly-paid, highly-productive senior faculty.”

The Senate leadership has scheduled an information session at UWT on January 23, 2015, 1-3pm, in WPH. It is highly recommended that UWT faculty familiarize themselves with the specific impact of the proposed policy on their own unit and their own salary before that time. I was able to garner very few responses to a request for questions or comments before the December faculty meeting. The Senate leadership has provided a model survey to try to promote greater consideration by the faculty, and your
representatives have been asked to administer this survey to their constituents. This would be best done by the Faculty Assembly at the campus level I believe. Also, to my knowledge no unit at UWT has yet to model the policy’s effect of their own budgets and I would encourage each program/school to do so before the January information session.

More information on Senate can be found at [UW.edu/faculty/facsen/](http://UW.edu/faculty/facsen/).


This report was prepared by Jim Gawel.