

**The University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

*The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met Thursday, April 12, 2001 at 8:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair Robert Holzworth presided.*

**PRESENT: Professors** Carr, Haley, Holzworth, Hunn, O'Brien, Roberts *Ex officio* Adman, Fabien, Krieger-Brockett, Olswang, Rose, Sjøvik. *Special Guest:* Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.  
**ABSENT: Professors** Luchtel, Poznański, Riley *Ex officio* Bentsen, Ludwig, Rickerson.

---

Minutes from March 29, 2001 were approved as written.

**Instructional Responsibility Policy (IRP)**

As Olswang reported at the last FCFA meeting, he circulated the IRP Subcommittee's draft resolution to the Deans, Provost, Vice President and President for comments with the explanation that it was a potential Class C legislative issue. He also posed a general list of questions to them, e.g. how do they perceive the current policy to be working?, are they in favor or against the proposed changes?, should this be debated on the Senate floor?, should the policy be amended to reduce the level at which approval is sought from Provost's to Deans' level?, etc. The response, Olswang reported, was almost uniform: if the President were to sign an amendment giving the Deans the right to grant or deny IRP waivers, the majority of the Deans would approve of such a policy change. The President also said that he would seriously consider this possibility if the FCFA requested it.

One belief that the Deans uniformly hold is that the current policy is working and is in no need of amendment. They also unanimously agree, as does the President, that if the issue were to be brought before the Senate at this time, the public would view the issue negatively. The President said that his concern for this potential political fall-out would cause him to oppose the draft IRP resolution at the SEC level; however, if the SEC were to fully support the resolution, then he said that he probably would not oppose it. Substantively, he appreciated the faculty's concerns raised by the resolution, but he felt that this is not a good time to raise the issue politically. The Council responded by asking if there would ever be a "good time", implying that there never would be one. Olswang admitted that there probably is not going to be a good time, but with current legislative battles on salary and benefits issues and a potential statewide strike looming, this time is especially bad.

Holzworth began the Council's discussion by reiterating one of the original issues that led to the draft resolution, which is that even though the Deans may not perceive a problem, the Council is concerned that faculty might perceive a problem and be hesitant to ask for IRP waivers. A faculty survey of some kind might be the only way to know if this concern is justified. No such data currently exists on grievances or discouragement felt as a result of the current IRP. Hunn also reiterated another original issue: the current policy is seen as a violation of shared governance having been put into effect without faculty input. Hunn believes that the faculty should take the initiative to make the policy a true product of shared governance and that the resolution should be revised and pursued as Class-A legislation to be included in the Faculty Code.

Vaughn said that she would be willing to assist with the revision of the resolution should the Council wish to propose Class-A legislation. She noted that even though Class-C legislation is not part of the University Handbook, she is currently working on a way to show a permanent record of it online. Vaughn also raised the issue of the semester system, asking if the subcommittee had considered arguing for this as a way to restructure faculty time.

The issue of the Political Science department's official IRP exemption was brought up once again. Olswang pointed out that the official policy for the Political Science department states that the Dean be involved in the department's decision to approve or deny IPR waivers. Olswang reminded the Council that the President would be willing to consider making the Deans officially responsible campus-wide. Olswang added that as the policy currently stands, he is the position of approving or denying waivers, a decision that he makes after consulting with the Deans. In effect, the Deans are already making the decisions.

Regardless of the way the IRP is carried out, Rose pointed out that one issue remains: the faculty feel, according to Hunn, that the IRP has caused them some harm and the administration has not acknowledged that perception. The question according to Rose would then be, has there really been harm? Holzworth suggested that the answer to this question could be found by conducting either a survey or by pushing for a massive faculty education campaign to inform them of the possibilities of waivers and provide some examples of appropriate justifications for waivers.

Hunn said that the IRP Subcommittee will meet again and consider the Council's discussion today.

### **Subcommittee on Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**

Holzworth announced that the meetings of the Subcommittee on Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are underway. The Subcommittee will work to generate a written report of their findings by the end of the academic year with the understanding that work will probably need to continue on this matter next year.

### **Request for Nominations for FCFA Chair for Next Year**

Holzworth reminded the members to forward their FCFA Chair nominations to Vaughn. Vaughn added that she would very much like to see a current FCFA member, who is accustomed to Holzworth's style, step forward to serve as chair next year. She commended Holzworth's work and described him as an exemplary Chair.

*Meeting adjourned at 8:45 a.m. Minutes by Katherine Wimble, Recorder.*