

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY**

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, **February 10, 2003**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Primomo and Stein;
 Ex officio members D’Costa, Olswang, and Swinney (ASUW);
 Guests Jon Brock, Evans School of Public Affairs; Ia Dubois, Scandinavian Studies;
 Robert Holzworth, Geophysics; all with the Committee on Collective Bargaining.

ABSENT: **Professor** Leppa and Schaufelberger;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Decker, Fugate, Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Sjavik, Stygall,
 Wadden and Whitney.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the January 13, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

Meeting of FCTCP members with the Senate’s special Collective Bargaining committee – Guests: Jon Brock, Evans School of Public Affairs; Ia Dubois, Scandinavian Studies; Robert Holzworth, Geophysics; all with the Committee on Collective Bargaining

Holzworth said Faculty Senate Chair Sandra Silberstein asked the Committee on Collective Bargaining to consider how faculty might be affected by possible legislation on collective bargaining.

“We’re currently in the fact-finding phase,” said Holzworth. “We’re trying to identify what could affect faculty at the University of Washington in the event of unionization. Obviously, salary would be affected, and much else.”

Holzworth emphasized that there are currently “no models to use as paradigms. None of our peer institutions are unionized. So we’re in the dark on this.” He added, “We won’t *advise* the Faculty Senate. Our purpose is one of fact-finding. Given the tri-campus nature of the University, we want to know what might happen with such issues as salary and collegiality at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.”

Olswang said, “The law states that all faculty are under one unit. We can’t have separate bargaining units at each campus.”

Meszaros said, “At UW Bothell we invited comment from all faculty. They have identified two fundamental categories. One is shared governance. We’re at a different point in our life cycle than UW Seattle. We’re apprehensive that unionizing at this point might *undo* what we’d like to see evolve at our campus. We have more fragile mechanisms at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. Second, it might make it harder for us to recruit good people. We are already a bit of a tough sell with high teaching loads, fuzzy status and identity, high service demands, resource and salary challenges. If we add a union, some of our faculty worry that this will further discourage good applicants because many academics do not like the idea of unions in universities.

Meszaros stressed that it is “more challenging for faculty coming to our campuses [than it is at UW Seattle]. There is a higher work load; most of us teach six courses per year.” Told by Holzman that this work load is not stipulated in the Faculty Code, she replied, “Though this is not stipulated in the Faculty Code, it nevertheless is the work load we must assume if we are to achieve our program objectives.”

D’Costa said, “I have a different take on unionization. I believe people might feel more protected if UW Bothell and UW Tacoma did have unions.” Meszaros said, “Good point. I’m only saying that I did not receive any response to that effect from the faculty who notified me where they stood on this issue.” Asked

if she had heard from non-tenured faculty, Meszaros said, “I heard from one lecturer; all others who responded are tenure track faculty.”

Killien said, “The issues of importance across the three campuses may not be the same. There could be an even greater and more intricate process at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. The process of collective bargaining could be really difficult.”

Holzworth said, “*But*, the *only* voice for faculty now is the Faculty Senate. With a union, we would have a signed contract.”

Killien said, “Getting faculty to *agree*; that’s the challenge. That’s my point.”

Olswang said to the Collective Bargaining Committee members, “What they’re saying [those representing the other campuses] is that the issues at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are *different* from those at UW Seattle.”

Collective Bargaining Committee member Ia Dubois asked, “Do we have to have only *one* union [for all three campuses]?” Holzworth replied, “Yes. We [the faculty at UW Seattle] said we wouldn’t have collective bargaining unless we were one union. There *are* different ways that different unions have of doing things. But yes, there *are* a lot of unknowns about this entire process. Do you faculty members at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma feel you’d get *more* under unionization than you do under shared governance?”

Primomo said, “This would be *additional* to shared governance.” “That’s correct,” said Holzworth. Primomo continued: “There are concerns about whether we as *professionals* want to be in a union. The issue of salary, for instance, would be crucial: the effect of unionization on faculty salaries. And there would be major questions concerning the co-existence of shared governance and unionization. Just how would that dual process work?”

Stein said, “We want to work it out so that there *is* some comparability with UW Seattle [on the part of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma]. We *do* think we need to be at the table.” Meszaros said, “If you address both shared governance and the issue of salaries in your report, that would be most helpful to our faculty.”

Primomo said, “Regarding the issue of work load, we’re mostly talking about the *teaching load*. Service and research are less significant with respect to the issue of collective bargaining than is teaching.” Holzworth said, “Work load and salary are the two overriding issues involved in this discussion.”

D’Costa said, “We teach six courses a year, as has been mentioned. After doing this for six years or so, people are exhausted. This is in addition to the work of institution building in which we are engaged continuously. I find it a very exhausting process, with the add-ons and everything else. There is a *cumulative* effect of exhaustion.”

Killien asked Holzworth, Dubois and Brock, “Has there been any discussion, in the Collective Bargaining Committee meetings, about the distribution of benefits, or about retirement, or medical leave?” Holzworth replied, “No. Only salary has been discussed thus far, among the issues you mention. But benefits are tied to that.” Olswang said, “Benefits are controlled by the state.”

Holzworth said, “There’s a variety of topics we’ve had on the table in our meetings. A significant one is that of lobbying. It’s clear that, with unionization, the union could hire lobbyists to go live in Olympia and knock on doors every day. How do you feel about that?” Meszaros said, “That goes with comment one of our faculty offered: This might give us more bargaining power with the state legislature.” Holzworth said, “The lobbyist would be lobbying for the faculty: what the faculty set as their chief priorities.”

Meszaros said, “So it would be important for faculty to have good communication across the campuses in order to agree on what the chief priorities are. If Seattle had different priorities, would the union be responsive to concerns from our minority faculty?” Meszaros said, “I learned something interesting in my

last job, at Temple University. The presence of a union did not stop the administration from disregarding agreements or faculty policies. The union was introduced because of a rift between faculty and administration. That rift grew under unionization. I'm told that in their last search, the Trustees sought out and hired a president in part because he had been tough on unions."

Stein said, "Shared governance has been difficult to 'grow' at UW Tacoma, with its top-down management, though it's changing somewhat."

Asked about the role of department chairs in collective bargaining, Holzworth said, "Department chairs are part of the bargaining unit." But Olswang offered a correction: "We believe chairs would *not* be part of the bargaining unit. It would be most unlikely on this campus. They're also not a part of collective bargaining at Temple."

Meszaros said, "The difference that leadership can make on our newer campuses is enormous. Individuals can make a huge difference. Unionization might affect who we attract as leaders as well."

Dubois said, "Is there any other aspect you think would be affected?" Meszaros said, "We're looking forward to your report [the report from the Collective Bargaining Committee] to see what the categories are we should consider."

Brock said, "Your comment about leadership seems especially relevant. With unionization, you'd have to develop a very effective infrastructure."

Killien said, "The presence of a union may affect who *becomes* administrators and leaders. It's already difficult to find leaders in the Faculty Senate; so finding leaders for *two* bodies [the Faculty Senate and the union] would be doubly difficult."

Stein said, "It goes back to leadership: the importance of effective leadership."

Brock said, "*That*, and structure. Are we more likely to get what we want with a new structure or with the current structure? That's the question we want to ask."

Meszaros said, "We haven't been talking about salary here. When salaries are low, the probability of a successful organizing drive is higher. Salaries might override other concerns if the faculty face a vote." Holzworth and Dubois both agreed with that assessment.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, March 10, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder