

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on April 12, 2004, at 10:15 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 10:19 a.m..

Present: *Regular:* Graubard, Hadjimichalakis, Hildebrandt, Kirtley, Luchtel, O'Neill, Wilson
 Ex-officio Krieger-Brockett, Cameron, Walker, Vaughn
Absent: *Regular:* Ceccarelli, Demorest, Dzwirek, Janes, Lydon-Rochelle
 Ex-officio: Blumenthal, Johnson, Stygall

Synopsis:

1. Winn Settlement report
2. Perceived problems with promotion rules Chapter 24.54
3. RCEP revisions

Approval of agenda and minutes

The agenda was approved. The March and December minutes were approved.

Announcements

O'Neill welcomed Cheryl Cameron, Associate Vice Provost, who replaces Steven Olswang as an ex officio representative of the Provost's office.

Winn Settlement report

In answer to a Class C resolution passed by the Faculty Senate, O'Neill presented a draft of the subcommittee report in the matter of \$3.7 million settled on Dr. Richard Winn, former member of the UW Medical School. She asked for comments on a first reading of the draft.

Katherine Graubard recommended that the final report to the Faculty Senate should be forward-looking, focusing on how UWP ought to run, rather than on what was done in Dr. Winn's case. Further, FCFA should consider a wider review of campus organizations similar to UWP, to see whether they comply with new laws. The UWP appears to be badly designed both as a non-profit organization and for transparency. This should be looked at, and the report will get a better response if it is more analytical than punitive. As a housekeeping matter, meeting attendees' titles should be included in the report. Bill Wilson would like to see a more detailed explanation of the reasons behind the firing and the settlement. Should Winn have been fired for cause?

Michael Hadjimichalakis does not perceive the report as punitive and said it does not go far enough – it should say "don't do this in the future," or history will repeat itself. Dan Luchtel said there are structural problems with the power of the Dean, particularly with the transparency of the decisions that are made by the Dean, and these should be fully addressed.

Lea Vaughn suggested that the report could specify that the Chair of the Senate write a letter to the Dean of the Medical School seeking a concrete response, and asking the Dean to explain the situation and the decisions that were made.

O'Neill said there is one group of faculty who think the Winn money is the most important issue, and one who believe the structural problems are more important. The subcommittee is trying to address both. The Dean of the Medical School did have the power to make the \$3.7 million payment, but were these public monies and, if so, was it a proper use of public monies? The subcommittee cannot determine this without a legal opinion from the Attorney General's office. Luchtel said that the faculty of the Medical School are outraged that \$3.7 million of the monies their work generated was used for this settlement. – this large payment may have resulted in cutbacks in health insurance for the med school faculty.

Wilson objected to recommendation #8, which would set up a new council for administrative matters. Wilson feels this would be a parallel council to FCFA, and would be counter-productive – how would faculty matters be distinguished from administrative matters? Who would decide this?

Vaughn would like to give the Winn report to Doug Wadden and Ross Heath for their comments. The council agreed.

O'Neill asked that the council read the draft closely and send further comments to her via email, with copies to Linda Fullerton, Recorder.

Reorganization, Consolidation, Elimination of Programs (RCEP)

Lea Vaughn has provided electronic copies of the proposed revision to the Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs portion of the Code, and asked that council members review it and email individual comments to her at secfac@u. The revision has been reviewed by Denice Denton, Cheryl Cameron, Susan Jeffords and Bruce Bare, and this has lengthened the time it will take to get the legislation to the Senate. Vaughn and the Faculty Senate leadership will continue to work on RCEP through May and will present the revision as Class A legislation in Fall Quarter.

Problems with Promotion Procedures in Code

Wilson questioned some of the Faculty Code procedures for promotion that he believes are impractical; e.g., the requirement for annual consideration of all assistant or associate professors for promotion, and the lack of a requirement for feedback when promotion is not granted. Wilson said there should be a provision for faculty members to opt out of the promotion process, and a better process for feedback. In addition, the procedure for faculty members to recuse themselves for conflict of interest is unclear and could be problematic. Wilson submitted a few changes in wording that he believes could resolve these problems.

It was pointed out that the personnel sections of the Code have been written with some flexibility to allow for differences in local custom. In addition, it has been extremely difficult to revise promotion and tenure procedures because Deans believe this is their arena and are reluctant to make changes to existing procedures and customs. It generally takes two to three years to make these kinds of revisions to the Code.

After discussion of the concerns put forth in the Wilson document, it was decided to put this item on the FCFA agenda and see if it needs a subcommittee to address the issue. Wilson volunteered to chair the subcommittee, if one is formed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*