

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
January 19th, 2016
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from January 5th, 2016
 3. Announcements
 4. Discuss of Librarians as Faculty
 5. Review comments from Code Cops
 6. Lecturers – continued discussion
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

Watts called the meeting order at 11:04 a.m.; he chaired the meeting via video conferencing as he was out-of-country.

2) Review of the minutes from January 5th, 2016

The minutes from January 5th, 2016 were approved with one abstention.

3) Announcements

Watts explained his internet connection is unpredictable, and asked member Buck to serve as proxy council chair if the connection fails, which was agreed to.

Watts noted he has been invited to numerous UW departmental meetings to discuss the faculty salary policy (FSP), which is currently awaiting its second consideration by the faculty senate (approved in first consideration). He asked if any FCFA members were available/willing to join the Department of Geography to discuss the FSP with that group, and to answer questions. He noted the code language is complicated, and many faculty members are having trouble grasping its main concepts, or possess questions if they do. Watts noted the date and time of the meeting in question, after which Buck explained he is able to meet with the department. Watts thanked him and explained if any other member is interested in meeting with UW departments to discuss/explain elements of the FSP, they may contact him via email. He noted he has met with a few departments and made presentations recently, and those faculty were very appreciative.

Watts explained a new “teaching evaluation guide” has been completed by Beth Kalikoff (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning) and others within the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). He noted this document is now being presented to faculty councils for feedback, and the FCFA is among the groups asked to review. He explained the best way to proceed would be for the document to be

distributed over email, comments gleaned electronically from members, and discussion will be held in the next meeting. He noted the document includes 9 pages of text.

Watts explained the conflict of interest legislation (approved by the FCFA in their last meeting and forwarded to the SEC) will be presented at the next faculty senate meeting on January 28th. He noted he will be out-of-country on this date, and asked if any other FCFA representative would be present to introduce the legislation. After some discussion, Buck explained he would be present and is able to introduce the legislation at the meeting. Killien explained she would help Buck explain elements of the legislation if questions arise.

4) Discuss of Librarians as Faculty

Henchy introduced a few guests to the council present on behalf of the Association of Librarians of the University of Librarians (ALUW). The guests included ALUW vice-President Robin Chin Roemer, and ALUW President, Deborah Raftus.

Raftus explained the ALUW represents all librarians working for UW libraries, as all librarians are automatically enrolled as members of the organization. She explained she is here to present a proposal changing the academic personnel status of UW librarians from “academic staff,” to “faculty.” She used a PowerPoint as part of her presentation (Exhibit 1).

Since 2010, the ALUW has been working to understand the UW campus environment as well as its peer institutions nationwide, including the academic personnel status of their librarians. Raftus explained the academically-based responsibilities of librarians in higher education institutions are numerous, many running parallel to those of faculty, and include (Exhibit 1):

- ❖ Intellectual freedom; trustees of knowledge through acquiring and sharing knowledge no matter how controversial
- ❖ Teaching credit courses
- ❖ Professional judgment within the library
- ❖ Conduct research in professional interest and contributes to scholarly knowledge to the discipline and the institution
- ❖ Impart knowledge and skills to students and faculty
- ❖ Advise faculty members in their faculty pursuits

In addition, Raftus noted the changing nature of publishing in a digital environment, and explained many see the library at the core of this shift. She noted the libraries do not simply serve as a “warehouse for books” as some believe, but contain key players working towards the well-being of the university, including a copyright officer, digital scholarship librarian, and data management consult. She explained the university libraries are also centralized, and work with virtually every agency on campus, making them “key connectors.”

Raftus explained there will be several benefits to the university if faculty status is granted to librarians and made a few examples. She explained this shift would create an alignment of policy with the five other Washington public baccalaureate institutions, and strengthen recruitment/retention of highly-qualified international and domestic librarians. She clarified that currently, the UW is the only public baccalaureate institution in the state of Washington without librarians with faculty status.

Council feedback

After the presentation, Watts explained there are two categories of questions for the council to consider: philosophical (i.e. "is this the right thing to do"), and procedural (i.e. "how will it work"). He noted the focus of today's discussion should be based in the philosophical questions, as procedural considerations would follow a philosophical decision.

Vaughn explained she is in support of the ALUW proposal. She explained the UW School of Law has its own campus library, and explained only recently, faculty status had been removed from the position of Library Director. She explained this shift had made recruitment very difficult; the position is not advertised as "faculty." Vaughn noted the librarian status shift would also make the UW more competitive in regards to retention/recruitment, and in other ways.

Buck noted that there is already tremendous diversity of faculty roles and titles at the UW. He explained there is a large amount of overlap of faculty roles with other campus community members such as professional staff. He noted librarians fit into this interplay, but asked what is it about librarians specifically that distinguish them from other members on campus such as professional staff? Roemer explained librarians already have ranks similar to professorial ranks, for one thing. She noted librarians are also placed in a position that is academic in nature. She explained for these reasons, the scale and organizational structure is already in place for a shift to occur. Buck explained when looking at research staff - they have ranks as well, and they interact with students and faculty in many ways that can be argued are at least similar to librarians. He asked if there another distinguishing factor from these sorts of staff? Henchy iterated librarians are a part of an academic discipline in their own right, and are very much at the forefront of the "academic world." She explained students should view them as holding academic status.

Katz questioned if the UW faculty code would cover librarians, and also asked what faculty titles librarians might have if granted faculty status. Raftus explained many of the associated questions are up for negotiation. She explained the ranks of librarians, and noted "associate" is when librarians reach tenure levels. It was noted most librarians are on 12-month contracts. Cameron (president's designee) clarified librarians have "continuous appointments" not tenure under current university policy.

Buck asked about the pedagogical relationship between the UW Information School (I-School) and the UW libraries and how the two might integrate their roles and administrative structures. Roemer explained many librarians with faculty status will offer courses to students on information literacy not taught in the I-School. She made an example, stating that the I-School does not currently offer a course in "metrics," though the libraries would likely offer this. Raftus clarified for the council that librarians currently teach courses on a regular basis. There were more areas of pedagogy pointed out of which the I-School is not instructing on currently. Raftus explained that librarians may only teach one course per year under current policy.

Watts asked the guests the difference between the Assistant Librarian rank and the Senior Assistant librarian rank. It was noted Assistant Librarians require two years of service and the completion of other steps before continuous appointment may be granted. Watts asked when it comes to teaching courses: if librarians were to become faculty, what organization/agency would handle the logistics of administering and managing their courses? Would there be an organization in the library with responsibility over this? Answers to those questions were not directly known, but the guests noted

there is a teaching and learning organization within the UW libraries currently, which may be charged with new responsibilities.

Watts noted if the FCFA believes granting faculty status to librarians is the right thing to do, the council will attempt to work with the administration and faculty senate leadership to implement a plan to do so. He noted Interim Provost Baldasty had stated that the university is currently in the middle of a faculty union drive, rendering the initiative for librarian faculty status unclear and untimely. Watts explained the FCFA needs to decide if they will accept the proposal, and if so, initiate a conversation with faculty senate leadership to progress an effort. He noted further council deliberation will occur in the next meeting.

5) Review comments from Code Cops

Watts noted the “Code Cops” have returned a document to the council highlighting some questions they have over the proposed faculty salary policy, as that body is charged with evaluating compliance of the proposed code with formatting and language inside other sections of the faculty code as well as compliance with alternative university regulations (Exhibit 2). Watts proposed the council go through the listed questions in the document and answer them, and if members wish it, more time with the document will be granted than the single meeting.

There was some discussion over the FCFA’s ability to offer additional or replacement code language at this point in the legislative process, being as the legislation is already under consideration by the faculty senate. Killien explained that at this point in the process for approval of Class A legislation, changes to legislation may come from the President’s Office and/or the code cops. After discussion, it was agreed there is nothing in the legislative process that precludes the council giving advice to the code cops on the original “intent” of its legislation. The council then began providing answers to the questions listed in the document (Exhibit 2).

1. After discussion between Killien, Watts, and other members, it was noted the question is not one of intent, but an issue in formatting. The council decided to overlook question #1 for this reason.
2. The council decided to overlook question #2.
3. It was noted the proper introductory sentence of the section is “buried” by the first sentence of the section, which references another section of the code wherein collegial reviews take place. Watts noted he agrees with the feedback from code cops chair Rich Christie in that the reference sentence obfuscates the introduction. Ultimately, the council decided to take no action on question #3.
4. It was noted it was the intent of the salary policy legislation that “faculty members may not review themselves,” and this is already included in the conflict of interest portion of the faculty code. After discussion, it was found it is not necessary that the FSP incorporate language stating this.
5. It was noted it was the intent of the FCFA that the president consult with faculty before setting default formulas. Cameron explained it is assumed these formulas will be established by Executive Order, and Executive Orders provide for comment and review by the faculty senate.

6. It was noted in the proposed FSP, permission is not expressly given to the President's Office to override all formulas (as formulas may be adjusted), but only the overarching formulas. The council clarified it was their intent that the President be able to override all formulas in times of financial hardship.

Watts explained he would pass on the advice of the council to the code cops. He noted if any member feels uncomfortable approving the advice to be given, he is happy to wait and conduct an electronic vote for approval at a later time. It was noted all members are comfortable.

6) Lecturers – continued discussion

Watts noted he had sent around another version of the council's lecturer discussion summary document with the added issue: "make hiring more predictable." He noted the reason for adding this item is that a lecturer needs to know if he/she will be rehired as soon as possible in order to allow that individual to plan for their future. Katz noted he is strongly in favor of the added item. Watts noted the council may use this document to run the discussion in the next meeting in an attempt to work towards a set of principles for the council to vote on and approve.

Katz noted there is a fundamental concern in this effort. He explained units across the three UW campuses use lecture positions differently, they hire for different reasons, they use lecturer titles differently. He noted he would like the lecturer titles to accurately reflect the work of that position. Watts agreed this to be an important consideration.

Killien noted there is data relating to this topic published in some of the lecturer taskforce reports the council had reviewed in previous meetings. After discussion, she explained she would extract this data, and also provide her summaries of some of those reports (drafted in 2014) for the next FCFA meeting. Watts explained this data would be useful, and thanked her for her work.

Killien explained she has heard the Provost is putting together another body to revisit lecturer issues, which may link in to deans, chairs, and chancellors at the UW. She asked if Watts has been contacted about this effort. Watts explained he may have been contacted very recently, yes. It was noted the initiative may have been initiated by current Faculty Senate chair Norm Beauchamp, after holding related conversations with the Provost. Watts noted he will try to coordinate with this other group and report back to the council.

7) Good of the order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

8) Adjourn

Adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Carol Landis, Lea Vaughn, Gordon Watts
(chair), Aaron Katz
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Deborah Raftus, Robin Chin Roemer

Absent: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Chandan
Reddy
Ex-officio reps: Julian Rees, Freddy Mora

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - FCFA Presentation January 19 2016.pptx

Exhibit 2 – codecops_substantiveissuessummary_salarypolicy_winter2016

Faculty Salary Policy (No. 136) Substantive Issues

Jan 6, 2016
Rich Christie
Chair, ACFCR

1. Major: Section numbering is inconsistent with 13-31 and Introduction-4 and not easily fixed.
My suggested fix: Add a footnote acknowledging that section numbering deviates from 13-31 and that the deviation is specifically authorized by adoption of the legislation.

2. RESOLVED: Section 24-23 Footnote and Section 24-25. Conflict of interest language in these sections has not been carried forward because a change to the language was expected prior to this legislation. That change has not happened.
Solution: SecFac agrees that the existing conflict of interest language will be carried forward.

3. Minor: 24-61 Introduction does not match range of contents of the section.
My suggested fix: Strike the first sentence and revise the second. Minor issue.

4. Major: 24-62 B: There appears to be no provision that faculty cannot review themselves.
My suggested fix: Add a no-self-review paragraph. Major issue, would prefer FCFA draft language.

5. Major: 24-72A: The President is authorized to establish formulas for salary increases without consultation.
My suggested fix: Add 'after consultation with SCPB'. Major issue, would prefer that FCFA draft language, if in fact they think the President should consult.

6. Major: 24-72C: The President is not authorized to change unit-specific formulas developed in 24-72B, but is permitted to change the basic formulas from in 24-72A.
My suggested fix: Add 'and B'. Would prefer FCFA input.