

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY
FRIDAY, March 6, 2009, 2:00-4:00 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Chair Janet Primomo called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of Minutes from February 13, 2009 (see attached)
2. Discussion with Dan Jaffe, UWB GFO Chair and member of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
 - a. Temporary Executive Order on salary policy
 - b. Should we consider Class A Legislation to ‘codify’ UWB and UWT membership on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting?
3. FCTCP Work Group on Tri-Campus Relations update (Alan Wood; Doug Wadden)
4. Promotion and tenure issues at UWB/UWT: Communication of Provost’s decisions to the campus
5. Update on Faculty Senate Class A Legislation coming before the Senate on March 12. A.
 - a. Proposed Changes to Chapter 26, Section 26-41: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination Procedures (attached)
 - b. Changes to Conciliatory Proceedings, Chapter 27, Section 27-41 (attached)
6. Future agenda items for the 2008-09 academic year:
Follow-up regarding issues of mutual concern with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach

1. Approval of Minutes from February 13, 2009

Chair Primomo asked to amend the agenda by adding a brief discussion about an Educational Outreach (EO) pilot program. The agenda was approved as amended.

Primomo asked for any corrections or additions to the minutes of February 13, 2009. A request was made to separate and clarify statements attributed to Julia Petersen. The minutes were approved as amended.

Primomo congratulated JW Harrington who was recently elected as Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Primomo announced that Educational Outreach will test some online fee-based courses in the time schedule. Students would pay for the courses as part of their tuition base, rather than as an extra outreach fee. Chris Paredes had asked Primomo whether UW Bothell and Tacoma students would be eligible to sign up for the pilot courses. She reported that David Szatmary, Vice Provost for Educational Outreach, told her he thought that there was no reason that UW-B and UW-T students couldn’t take the pilot courses. Primomo noted that UW cross-campus requirements would apply for those UW-B and UW-T students interested in signing up for the EO courses. Paredes clarified that the EO is not offering a new program, but is taking seven

regular Seattle campus courses and offering students an in-class or online option. He noted that there were some fees associated with it for software maintenance.

Bruce Balick raised an issue concerning the lack of extra compensation for faculty members who teach online courses which they feel demand more time than regular courses. A discussion began about the faculty perspective on online courses and the rationale for their structure. Primomo noted that she had the document on the new online course option pilot and would forward the email to council members who were interested. She said she contacted Leslie Breitner, chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, about the issue and it is one that this council will track. Primomo thanked Paredes for bringing it to her attention.

2. Discussion with Dan Jaffe, UWB GFO Chair and member of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

a. Temporary Executive Order on salary policy

This agenda item was discussed briefly by Bruce Balick.

b. Should we consider Class A Legislation to ‘codify’ UWB and UWT membership on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting?

Primomo introduced Dan Jaffe, UW-B General Faculty Organization (GFO) Chair, and member of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (SCPB). She noted that last year the council had considered whether they should pursue class A legislation to formalize UW-B and UW-T membership on SCPB. Primomo said she felt it was premature to pursue that, and invited Jaffe to speak about his experience on SCPB, what he sees as his role, and whether it’s a valuable use of his time.

Jaffe described the changes the committee has undergone this year with the budget crisis taking on the primary focus of discussion. He felt that UW-T and UW-B should be represented on SCPB, particularly on issues related to the biennium budget as they relate to the UW-B and UW-T campuses. Jaffe noted that there are few votes taken on the committee, with the exception of the vote on the Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) for the new College of the Environment. He found that SCPB gets the same budget documents as the Board of Deans, which he has presented at GFO meetings as useful “unfiltered” information. Jaffe suggested that SCPB could possibly help push for a more open process with the administrations at all UW campuses.

A discussion began about getting information from the administration. Balick spoke about the frustration associated with not knowing what information they need to make intelligent decisions. He noted that faculty don’t fully understand the context of the budget figures they receive. Zoe Barsness asked whether there were any institutionalized mechanisms in place to help set guidelines for what is needed. JW Harrington noted how complex the university budget is and how SCPB’s function is not clear to the faculty members on the committee. He felt that it takes a lot of time to understand both the university structure and the budget. Harrington said that being on SCPB was very valuable, especially for learning about the university, and for the two

smaller campuses, because they interact separately with the administrative structure which has a lot of flexibility. Harrington said he felt strongly that each outgoing Faculty Senate Chair should spend a couple hour-long meetings during the summer with the Provost and Executive Vice-Provost to outline a plan of action for the year, for the purpose of finding what would be helpful to both the Provost and the faculty in the decision making process for the budget.

Jaffe described his view of shared governance as one in which the administration is willing to give them what they request but that it is not their role to help them figure it out. Alan Wood offered an historical context to the dilemma, noting that UW governance is top down. He felt that administrators have a sense that faculty come into leadership positions for a period of one or two years, and rotate out. Wood explained that because that is not long enough to build the basis of knowledge needed to make decisions, administrators basically have to manage the faculty in leadership positions. Wood suggested a plan in which the Secretary of the Faculty would take a more prominent role in faculty governance. He envisions bringing faculty leadership into the decision making process at a much earlier stage to consult with administrators, especially given the difficult budget decisions that will be made within the next month.

Balick reported that a discussion arose at the last SCPB meeting about the committee's process. He said that some faculty felt their role was to observe the process and report back on it to faculty. Balick felt that the only way faculty could influence the decision making process was if they took a role in setting the criteria for the budget cuts to be made, a decision the committee could not agree to do. Barsness noted that group research argues that just the presence of faculty in discussion meetings is powerful because it brings forth accountability. Jaffe pointed out that the real budget decisions are made at the school and college level, because the administration has assigned fixed percentages to each school and college. He asserted that one would need to know their budgets well to be able to have an influence. Balick gave an overview of the budget cutting plans sent to the Provost and how they will be reviewed and decided upon.

Barsness suggested that perhaps both UW-B and UW-T should be represented on SCPB, since Tacoma is not gaining from the benefits outlined by Jaffe. She also asked why UW-T's and UW-B's budget plans are not being reviewed at Seattle. Last, Barsness noted the lack of substantive content in the budget meetings at her campus. Jaffe responded by noting that Bothell faculty are experiencing committee overload and they are unable to staff important committees. He noted that FCTCP council members should be pressuring him for information and figuring out a mechanism where SCPB documents can reach them. Jaffe also acknowledged that he should be taking notes from the SCPB meetings, a simple task that would eliminate the need for separate UW-T and UW-B representation on the committee. Chuck Jackels noted that if they formally codified representation for UW-B and UW-T, the SCPB representative would be a liaison between the two campuses with the responsibility for communicating with the chairs of the General Faculty Organization and the Faculty Assembly. Chair Primomo commented that FCTCP has not discussed enlarging SCPB with the committee, and stressed that they try to move forward immediately by getting handouts sent to Tacoma's Faculty Assembly chair, and having Jaffe do a brief update.

Primomo asked Johann Reusch to comment on Tacoma's executive council involvement in the budget discussions. Reusch addressed Tacoma's lack of a budget committee, noting that his

council has spoken to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor about it. He said they would insist on electing their own faculty representative for the budget committee from the Faculty Assembly. Barsness offered some institutional history for the situation at Tacoma. Steve Collins spoke about the changes at UW-Bothell concerning shared governance. He called for parallel budget committees at UW-T and UW-B that would share notes.

Barsness emphasized the importance of SCPB as the one area to have a greater number of people invest the time and energy to understand the budget process. Primomo suggested they phrase something to send to UW-B and UW-T administrations to show that they support faculty-elected representatives to advise on budget decisions. She suggested that they update next quarter on the progress that UW-T has made towards formalizing faculty representation.

3. FCTCP Work Group on Tri-Campus Relations update (Alan Wood; Doug Wadden)

Alan Wood reported to the council on his efforts to get a graduate student to assist them on their tri-campus relations project. He was told the student wants a research assistant position which would cost them about \$3,600 more than they have budgeted for. Wood said he will still pursue finding a graduate student interested in an independent study project as an alternative. He noted the value in building a base of knowledge. Julia Petersen offered to send an email out to a student listserv in the Graduate School for prospective students looking for an independent study project. Wood agreed to send Petersen the list of questions the council raised concerning tri-campus relations. Paredes asked Wood how many students he wanted and whether he would consider students from UW-T and UW-B. Wood thanked him for the idea.

Primomo noted that she has added all council members to the Catalyst Go-Post list so they can access the documents on tri-campus relations and the work of the Provost's task force. She reported that Beth Rushing sent her an update on the latest meeting with the Provost's work group. It seems that the Provost will not accept the creation of schools and colleges at UW-T and UW-B until they have separate accreditations, but said if they move toward that she would support the creation of "divisions." Primomo noted that they could have divisional deans. A discussion began about what that title would mean. Barsness noted that it is essentially what they have in the Milgard School of Business. Rushing also reported that the task force is making good progress on identifying for the campuses those functions that are common to them and those that require autonomy. Primomo noted that this will likely be a long term project. She pointed out that they should spend the project money to pay someone to do synthesis of data, for example. Paredes reported that the ASUW's tri-campus committee would be visiting Vancouver, WA, and asked council members to send him any questions they might want him to ask. Primomo gave him a list of the council's questions.

4. Promotion and tenure issues at UWB/UWT: Communication of Provost's decisions to the campus.

Barsness said she asked Primomo to put this item on the agenda on behalf of the Council for Tenure and Promotion at UW-T, which she has only become a member of this year. She described two faculty review cases that had come before the council, both of which had been sent up to Seattle and then returned for re-review this year. One candidate received some

guidance on what to do and the other received no information. Barsness noted that the council wanted to know the appropriate process that would ensure that faculty under review are informed. She thought it was a coordination problem between the two campuses and asked for help in understanding whether this was an anomaly or not. Wood described the typical review process for a simple case and one that is more complex. Barsness felt that faculty under review should have due process and that the process should maximize their potential for success, with consistent criteria. Jackels shared his experience as a former program director, noting that he would have contacted a candidate directly if something more was expected, and that he would expect to hear from the Provost's office about a candidate's shortcomings. Reusch suggested that it is the charge of the Tenure and Promotion committee to recommend a policy that would require a standard across campuses and recourse for redress. Barsness summarized her understanding that if a candidate's promotion and tenure review has gone up to the Provost and back to the Vice-Chancellor, that the information should be available to the candidate. Balick recommended that faculty members seek redress through the Secretary of the Faculty. Primomo suggested that they work into the review process the idea of getting all available information to the candidate.

5. Update on Faculty Senate Class A Legislation coming before the Senate on March 12.

a. Proposed Changes to Chapter 26, Section 26-41: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination Procedures (RCEP)

Primomo noted that there was a big discussion in SEC about the length of time an RCEP takes. She also pointed to a major change in the process which no longer appoints an external review committee. She noted that Bothell and Tacoma are rolled into the document and she sees it as a document to support. Balick offered an historical perspective to the RCEP process and explained the current changes made to the document. Primomo encouraged members who are in the Senate to take a close look at the RCEP document.

b. Changes to Conciliatory Proceedings, Chapter 27, Section 27-41

Primomo summarized recent legislation presented to the Senate Executive Committee that will allow for a minimum of 6 conciliatory officers for faculty grievance. Collins raised a concern that the document might assume faculty are available to work in the summer. It was pointed out that the change made to the document was intended to make it possible to add more members at any point in the year.

6. Future agenda items for the 2008-09 academic year: Follow-up regarding issues of mutual concern with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach

There was no time to address this item.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu

Present: Faculty: Barsness, Collins, Endicott-Popovsky, Harrington, Primomo (Chair),
Wood

***Ex Officio* Reps:** Balick, Jackels, Lord (by phone), Paredes, Petersen,
Reusch, West

Absent: Faculty: Feroz

President's Designee: Jeffords, Rushing, Wadden

***Ex Officio* Reps:** Fridley, Weitkamp