

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS**

The Faculty Council on University Relations met on Friday, **December 6, 2002**, at 10:00 a.m. Co-chair Christina Emerick presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Emerick (Chair), Hicks and Robertson;
 Ex officio members Arkans, Doherty, Whang and Whitney.

ABSENT: *Professors* Dziwirek, Fridley, Kozuki, Regnier and Seifer;
 Ex officio members, de Tornayay.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of May 29, 2002, October 4, 2002, and November 1, 2002 were approved as written.

The Rose Report – Christina Emerick

Emerick, by way of an overview, said, “The impetus for the Rose Report was the increasing difficulty in recruiting faculty to serve on faculty councils because of parallel administrative committees, and the growing sense on the part of many faculty councils that they are not taken as seriously by the administration as they ought to be.” Many faculty feel that if the council process is streamlined there will be a better use of faculty time in faculty governance.

Emerick said that, with parallel committees reaching separate conclusions on issues, and then reacting to each other without interacting, unnecessary confusion and misunderstandings occur.

She said that Bradley Holt, 2001-2002 Faculty Senate chair, asked the Rose Committee to look at possible restructuring of the faculty councils. The question for FCUR members, now that the proposed restructuring has been delineated, is whether or not it represents an improved structure.

Emerick said another question to ponder is whether both faculty and administration would feel easy about speaking out in the proposed University Councils.

“How would we define the University Councils?” asked Emerick. “And how would we determine if the University Councils are working?” She said it was decided in the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) that two or three of the current faculty councils would participate in University Councils in pilot cases, and that the results of those experiments would help determine further implementation of, or a drawing back from, the proposed restructuring.

Emerick asked the council, “What would the FCUR University Council purview be? Is this restructuring a good idea for FCUR? And what would be included under the proposed University Council on External Relations? The ‘Current Administration Committees’ on the graph are merely suggestions for possible inclusion in the University Council on External Relations.”

Robertson said, “The new name, ‘External Relations,’ is a much better name than ‘University Relations.’ It’s a much more accurate description of the council’s real purview.”

Emerick asked, “Is it a good idea to set up a joint structure, with equal representation? With the same number of appointees from the Faculty Senate and from administration? Proposals would be brought from either the president or the Faculty Senate leadership. There would be joint chair leadership, with one chair appointed by the Faculty Senate and the other appointed by the president.”

Emerick pointed out that University Councils would not always be in agreement internally; that faculty council members and administrative members may have discrete responses to specific issues before the council.

Emerick said meetings of the University Councils would be set up on a regular basis, though they councils would not necessarily meet on all scheduled dates. Their meetings would largely be determined by the presence of issues requiring a specific council's attention.

Hicks said, "The restructuring is a good idea. There is certainly some redundancy now in the council structure. There are some cross-purposes, in part because of the budget process. The restructuring would hopefully improve communication between administration and faculty."

Robertson said, "This council couldn't function without its ex officio members. I know that from long experience on the council. The University Council would work well for FCUR, I think."

Emerick said, "Yes, this council would be a model for the proposed change in structure." Arkans said, "There's one particular benefit that comes to mind: It would bring more people together. We – in the administration – would benefit from having enhanced faculty representation. And, for the faculty, there would be a broadening perspective. You'd have faculty speaking from the point of view of the University as a whole, which would be good. And a certain degree of redundancy would be avoided. Here, in University Relations, we don't have an analogous committee, as other faculty councils do. There are task groups, but no duplicative committee. We still have to get better at taking advantage of faculty input. This change would be good. The faculty perspective could more concertedly be brought to bear on issues important to the University's external affairs."

Emerick said, "The greatest rationale for the change would be: getting faculty to think in terms of the University as a whole; broadening the faculty's perspective." Emerick noted, however, that "some faculty feel that faculty autonomy would be seriously diluted by the proposed councils." Arkans said, "Now, the path toward legislative changes to the Faculty Code originates in the faculty councils. Where would such changes originate in the restructured councils?" Emerick said, "That's not been worked out yet." Arkans asked, "Would the Senate Executive Committee still be there?" Emerick said, "I should think so."

Robertson asked, "Will there need to be a majority vote on any issue in the proposed University Councils?" Emerick reiterated that "sometimes the faculty and administration might have different conclusions, and will need to caucus separately."

Arkans said, "This will work only if people really embrace it." Hicks said, "If there's disagreement, and that disagreement is made apparent, and it is then worked through, in the University Councils, and there is thus more exchange between faculty and administration, that's good!" Arkans said, "We need to look at the new structure from the perspective of the origination of legislation. Remember, the endgame is that the president and the administration have to approve any proposed legislation."

Whang asked, "What would FCUR look like in the restructured system?" Emerick said, "One of the faculty councils would be linked to administrative committees. The University Council will be the umbrella, with standing committees. Let's look at the list of 'current administration committees' that would be under the umbrella of the University Council on External Relations, and ask: What do they do?"

Arkans noted that CUCAC (the City/University Community Advisory Committee) cannot be "subsumed under External Relations, but the council should know about it." Arkans said Public Exercises is getting larger; there are more students (at least five) and others as well. "It would have to exist as a separate committee, but with a representative from the council." The Jessie and John Danz Lectureship Committee and the Walker-Ames Lectureship Committee should not be on the list; they are stand-alone committees.

Arkans said the University Names Committee could be a subcommittee of the University Council. He said the University of Washington Business Leaders Group does not exist. The University of Washington Communications Steering Committee would be an "appropriate" committee to be subsumed under External Relations.

Emerick said subcommittees of the University Council would include the Outstanding Public Service Award Committee, the Honorary Degrees Committee, and the University Names Committee. And representatives from the University Council should serve on CUCAC and on the Public Exercises Committee, but not be “folded in” on those committees.

In a vote, the council approved unanimously the above suggestions regarding FCUR’s participation in the restructured University Councils, the committees that should be subsumed under the University Council of External Relations, and the committees on which External Relations should have representatives, who would not, however, be “folded in” on those committees.

Arkans said, “If the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is related to one of the University Councils, it would be the University Council on Undergraduate Education.”

Emerick asked, “Should we be an early council to try the new structure?” The council responded affirmatively, but Emerick noted that FCUR is not “on the top of the list” being considered for early pilot testing of the new structure by SEC. Robertson said, “As to FCUR’s *raison d’être*, a group can do a better job than individuals can.”

Emerick said, with respect to projects undertaken by University Relations that Arkans has sought the council’s advice on, “We’ve had input to the campaigns that have been vetted here in the council.”

Arkans said, “I’m very positive about this council’s input. We need input from the faculty. We’re strengthened by having this council as a sounding board. It is a great benefit for us to have the faculty’s voice. We are still trying to find the best way to use faculty input.”

Expanding FCUR membership – Christina Emerick

Emerick said, “We need faculty from Communications (people with expertise in this area) on the council.” Arkans said, “You need faculty from the Business School too, because of the importance of marketing, and their expertise in that area. You need to get people who are interested in what the University is doing.”

Arkans suggested the council also seek membership from faculty who have participated in the University’s Bus Tours throughout the state. Others in the council concurred with Arkans, and said they were impressed with faculty they know, or have met, who have participated in the Bus Tours.

Faculty Advocacy for the University – Norm Arkans

Arkans said, “We do not take full advantage of the expertise of our faculty. We need to do so. We need to empower faculty to be advocates of the University’s objectives, both in education and elsewhere. We need to get better information into faculty’s hands, as they interact with community groups. They could incorporate in their discussions what’s going on with the University’s current objectives and difficulties, such as state appropriations.”

“We need to equip faculty to become better advocates,” said Arkans. “We could have a faculty Road Show around the state. It doesn’t have to be an administrative Road Show. This would allow people throughout the state’s communities to *hear* the effects of the under-funding of the University.”

Next meeting

The next FCUR meeting is set for Wednesday, January 22, 2003, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder