

12/2/2014

Faculty Meeting Minutes – December 2, 2014

Present:

Dan Abramson, Marina Alberti, Christopher Campbell, Andy Dannenberg, Sofia Dermisi, Carrie Dossick, Kelly Hostetler, Don Miller, Anne Moudon, Mark Purcell, Qing Shen, Diana Siembor, Fritz Wagner

Arrived Late: Chris Bitter, Branden Born, Phil Hurvitz, Bob Mugerauer, Jan Whittington, Rachel Ward – *arrived late and did not vote on measures*

Approval of November 18th meeting minutes

- Don motions to approve; Qing seconds. Minutes are approved.
- Anne requests that minutes be spell-checked.

Vote on Concurrent MUP/MPH Degree: clarification by Andy Danneberg

- Last meeting there was a question about the MPH science-based pre-requisites, and if those pre-requisites would preclude potential MUP students from being eligible for the concurrent MPH degree because many of them do not have science backgrounds.
- Andy Dannenberg explained that the proposal is for 3 separate concurrent degrees: MPH Environmental Health, MPH Health Services, & MPH Community Oriented Public Health Practice. The science pre-requisites are only required for Environmental Health degree – not for the others.
- Dan moves to vote, Qing seconds – all present voting faculty approve (9). No abstentions, no declines

Vote on Visiting Fulbright Scholar Professor Morten Nicolaisen (Blum)

- Nicolaisen knows the criteria and has agreed to them
- Anne move to vote, Don seconds – all present voting faculty approve (9), no abstentions, no declines

UW Faculty Salary Proposal (Carrie Dossick) – see attachment

- Carrie Dossick is a BE faculty senate representative (in addition to Thaisa Way). The purpose of her discussion was to explain the proposal to the UDP faculty and answer their general questions, but not to engage in a deeper discussion about the issues. She brought a 1-page hand-out and asked all faculty to review it. She explained that there will be a vote on this proposal in spring in the Faculty Senate
- The proposal introduces 14 salary tiers & changes the way faculty are evaluated for raises
- The current salary model was enacted in 2000. Since the recession, this model has shown its weaknesses. In 2012, President Young established a work group to develop a proposal for a new model for faculty raises. This proposal is a product of that work-group.
- The main thrust of the new proposal is to:

12/2/2014

- Modify the mission statement of purpose for faculty recruitment and retention. The new language includes “to motivate and reward” faculty
- There are Four Pillars (see handout):
 - A change in raise rates
 - Tiers within ranks: ranks remain the same, new tiers added to them
 - Market adjustments
 - Variable adjustments
- There is an active discussion board where faculty from across campus can ask questions. These questions will be answered by the work-group.
- In addition, UDP faculty can send questions to the BE faculty senate representative e-mail: be-faculty-senate@uw.edu
- Carrie asks UDP faculty to consider 3 questions:
 - 1) Opinions about problem statement and aspirations: Do you agree with the problem?
 - 2) Do you agree with the solution?
 - 3) If it does happen, how will we react? This ties into the budget: what in the budget will be compromised if this is approved and faculty get raises?
- Christopher Campbell explains further: Each tier step carries with it an 8% raise. In principal, faculty get a 4% total raise each year if we’re not in a budget crisis. In the proposed model, every 3-5 years (average of every 4 years), faculty would have an 8% raise based on their salary level and productivity. The raises wouldn’t be as frequent as they are now, but they would be greater than the 4% yearly raise over time. Unproductive faculty will be reviewed less frequently. Productive faculty will be reviewed more frequently thus having more opportunities for raises. However, every four years, faculty would go through a full review for this raise – this could be a huge administrative load on all faculty – both those being reviewed and those doing the reviewing.
- Christopher Campbell asks UDP faculty to consider: If the proposal passes, where does the money come from? This is an unfunded proposal. Faculty need to determine where the cuts come from.
- Carrie asks us to reflect, think of questions and she and/or Thaisa will return to our faculty meeting for further discussion.
- Anne Moudon and Rachel had a discussion about number of paychecks. Carrie will bring Anne’s question to the faculty senate.

Budget Overview and Discussion (Campbell) – see attachment

- Christopher Campbell gave a thorough overview of ABB budgeting and the Department’s current and projected budget for the next year (see attachment). Rachel Ward was on-hand to answer additional questions. Christopher’s main points:
 - 1) We are responsible for our own budget. This differs from the past, when Provost controlled the budget. Now Dept/Programs are responsible for everything

12/2/2014

- 2) Budgeting 101 basics: Budget needs to be balanced. Spend about as much as you bring in – cannot do this with ABB. Basically, with ABB it is very hard for Departments to predict their revenue
- 3) Department revenue – discussed 5 kinds, our departments primary concern is GOF.

Reminder

- UDP Strategic Planning Meeting occurs on Friday, Dec 5, in Odegaard from 12:00 – 4:00pm