

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

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met Thursday, **November 2, 2000** at 9:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair Robert Holzworth presided.

PRESENT: *Faculty* Holzworth, Hunn, Luchtel, O'Brien, Riley and Roberts. *Ex officio* Ludwig and Sjøvik. *Regular guest* Mary Coney.

ABSENT: *Faculty* Carr, Haley, and Poznanski. *Ex officio* *Adman, Fabien, Olswang, *Rickerson and Rose. (*with vote). *Regular guest* Lea Vaughn.

Minutes from October 19, 2000 were not approved. They will be reviewed at the November 30, 2000 meeting.

Action Items:

1. A motion was made to advise the Faculty Senate that FCFA believes that if RF are to be given the vote they should be allowed to vote on all issues. Motion passed unanimously.
2. The council moved to form an IRP Subcommittee composed of Hunn, Holzworth, Sjøvik, Luchtel, and Olswang.

Discussion of Status of Existing Legislative Action

Chair Holzworth communicated that FCFA currently has no draft legislation on its agenda. The Research Faculty Vote legislation was tabled at the October 26 Senate meeting and will need to be reviewed by the "Code Cops"; the Enabling Legislation resolution was on the 10/26 Senate agenda as a discussion item and will appear as a voting item on the November 30 Senate agenda; and the Tri-Campus legislation is on hold for the time being while UW Bothell reviews some of the provisions it contains: Bothell is concerned that Seattle will have too much control over UWB programs, e.g., will all new course approvals have to come through UW Seattle? Holzworth said he thought FCFA would get the legislation back from UWB relatively soon.

Luchtel asked if Tacoma was happy with the legislation. Holzworth replied that, yes, Rob Crawford (Chair of the UWT Faculty Assembly) had been involved in drafting the Tri Campus legislation and that Tacoma was "fully on board." Coney noted, however, that after the 10/26 Senate meeting, Crawford and Jack Mazeris (from UWB) were concerned that any Class C legislation that passes in the UW Senate would affect all three campuses. Coney added that she had asked UW administration to clarify this issue for UWB and UWT. Olswang submitted that there has been a consensus among the three campuses that there will only be one *Faculty Code*--not three--even though there may still be some backsliding on certain issues like course approval. He noted that the paradigm for Tri Campus governance has been the relationship of individual Schools or Colleges within the University of Washington: the *Code* allows colleges to have their own rules as long as they are consistent with the *Code*.

Ludwig advised that the issue may be deeper than just the "one *Code*" issue--President McCormick needs to make it clear to UWB and UWT that all three campuses are part of the "University of Washington." Olswang agreed that there has been some argument around the curriculum issue, i.e., new program approvals having to go through UWS; these questions have not been answered yet. He also advised that he, Coney, Vaughn and Holt were going to Tacoma today to discuss these and other issues. Roberts wanted to know if there were going to be different admissions requirements for the three campuses. Olswang responded that each campus would have its own admissions standards. The Chair added that there is already a wide array of

student qualifications on the UWS campus. Olswang added that UWS now takes more Community College transfer students than freshmen. Ludwig submitted that there is also the *perception* of different standards at the three campuses--UWB and UWT have to meet FTE quotas to avoid having to return funds to the state.

The Chair advised that the Faculty Senate did not get a chance to discuss Enabling Legislation at the 10/26 meeting. Coney submitted that the Senate office will reduce speakers' time during the next Senate meeting to allow for ample discussion of Enabling Legislation.

Research Faculty Vote Legislation

Chair Holzworth advised the council that the RF Vote legislation had been amended at the 10/26 Senate meeting to include Assistant RF Professors. He noted that last year FCFA wanted to keep Asst. RF Profs. in the legislation but the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) took them out, then the Senate amendment put them back in. Holzworth reminded the council that FCFA thought leaving Asst. RF Profs. in would kill the bill. Some Senate members also took issue with allowing RF to vote on tenure and promotion since RF are not tenure-track faculty; therefore, on 10/26 the Senate also amended the legislation to exclude RF from voting on tenure-related items. Olswang wondered if the intent of the amendment was to exclude RF from voting on RF promotion issues as well--the amendment was not clear on this point. Coney and Holzworth agreed that the amendment was ambiguous on this point but that they thought the amendment had only intended to prevent RF from voting on issues involving tenure-track faculty.

Olswang advised the council that there was already a provision in the *Code* (25.41.C) which does not allow non-tenure-track faculty to move into tenure-track positions without going through the complete tenure process. He understands that much of the objection to having RF vote on tenure issues is that RF might somehow sabotage a tenure-track faculty member's bid for promotion. Holzworth remarked that he has felt all along that the new openness in promotion legislation would prevent this type of "sabotage" by removing the secrecy from the promotion and tenure voting process. O'brien said he agreed with Olswang and Holzworth, but about 95% of the faculty in the School of Medicine are WOT (without tenure for reasons of funding) so this "sabotage" issue is of little concern to him and his colleagues. O'brien added that the same logic being used to preclude RF from voting on tenure issues could be used to preclude non-clinical faculty from voting on the clinical track process: one could argue that tenure-track faculty don't understand the clinical track process and, therefore, should not vote on it.

Olswang remarked that perhaps the RF voting issue is one of personal integrity: if faculty don't understand an issue that is up for vote perhaps they should abstain from voting on that issue. Chair Holzworth asked each council member to go back to his or her department and invite RF to attend the next Senate meeting (November 30, 2000 at 2:30 in 301 Gowen). Olswang reminded the council that the Faculty Senate had been mandated to return to the next Senate meeting with draft language for the RF Vote legislation. Holzworth asked if anyone on the council was in favor of excluding RF from voting on tenure issues. *A motion was made to advise the Faculty Senate that FCFA believes that if RF are to be given the vote they should be allowed to vote on all issues. Motion passed unanimously.*

Instructional Responsibility Policy (IRP)

Eugene Hunn advised the council about the University's policy on instructional responsibility, which was implemented by outgoing President William Gerberding in 1994. Hunn said he does not believe faculty were given sufficient voice in this matter and protested that the policy interferes with faculty research projects. He stressed that he does not have an issue with the course requirements mandated by the IRP, only that faculty in his and other departments are not

given the opportunity to teach two courses for two quarters and no courses for the final quarter (so-called "collapsed teaching loads") without receiving special permission from the Provost's office. Faculty are no longer allowed to have "research quarters" as they did in the past and Hunn recalled a time when faculty were able to schedule these "research quarters" while still maintaining a presence on campus by continuing to hold office hours, supervise graduate students, attend departmental meetings, etc. He believes he can be a more effective researcher if he is allowed to fulfill his teaching requirements in a 2-2-0 arrangement.

Olswang advised that in 1994, President Gerberding implemented the IRP as a result of some problems with faculty misusing their "research quarters." Gerberding decided that faculty who are on 100% support from state funds must teach during each academic quarter but that there would be instances when faculty may "collapse" teaching loads, e.g., 2-2-0 by permission of the Provost only. Olswang added that the Faculty Senate did discuss the IRP issue and even asked President McCormick to rescind the IRP four years ago--he refused. The administration does a statistical review to see which units offer fewer courses when faculty are teaching collapsed loads. Students often complain that they cannot get certain classes because they are not offered frequently enough. Olswang stated that he sees all requests for collapsed teaching loads and that he and the Provost make the decisions regarding whose requests are granted.

Riley asked about an option to "buyout" teaching time and Olswang replied that buyouts are local--they take place at the departmental level, whereas collapsed teaching loads are approved by the Provost's office. For example, a buyout could take place if a faculty member has a one-course obligation and has a grant to buy his or her state-supported time down to 50%--the faculty member could teach the course during one quarter, then buy out the other quarter with grant money. Riley wondered how the IRP could assume that a faculty member's salary was coming from 100% state funds. Olswang replied that this was a fair question but did not know the answer.

Chair Holzworth proposed that FCFA draft a class C resolution objecting to the notion that instruction only pertains to didactic classroom responsibilities and noting that, at a research institution like the University of Washington, research is integral to the teaching environment as well. Roberts wondered if the "bad press" this statement would generate was worth the effort. The Chair replied that one has to separate political issues from how policies like the IRC affect research quality. Hunn imparted that he doesn't think the faculty object to the teaching load policy but he doesn't believe faculty were sufficiently involved in the decision-making process. He also pointed to the decision to allow the Political Science department to make its own decisions regarding teaching collapse as, perhaps, opening the door to allow other departments to do the same. Hunn emphasized that it was time to change the IRP from a Presidential mandate to a faculty-implemented policy based on departmental need.

O'brien suggested that each department set up a required minimum percentage of courses that must be taught each year. Riley added that the University needs to better define what constitutes "teaching": does teaching include distance learning, for instance? Luchtel agreed and added that the UW also needs to better define what constitutes a "course": are the special seminar courses that are implemented in the Medical School considered "courses?" Olswang asked the council to imagine having this type of conversation with the Legislature--the legislators simply would not understand this type of discussion. Hunn remarked that it was the faculty's job, then, to impart to the Legislature that the UW is a **research** institution and that faculty are vetted for tenure and promotion based on their **research**. Ludwig remarked that the legislators *do* understand Hunn's point, they just don't care about it; the Legislature already perceives that UW faculty get three months' "free ride" in the summer and they certainly aren't going to be receptive to allowing faculty who are supported by state funds to "take a quarter off" to do research.

Sjåvik reported that he is the only FCFA member from the Humanities department (Scandinavian Studies) and that their faculty are mandated to teach five, five-credit courses per year. Faculty sometimes have to teach 15 credit hours per quarter which is extremely taxing and most certainly has an adverse effect on teaching quality. Sjåvik wondered if the council would be able to draft a policy that could fit the entire University community. Olswang questioned whether the IRP impedes research--he said he has not heard this argument before and added that the Provost's Office has statistics to show that research has improved every year at the UW.

The council moved to form an IRP Subcommittee composed of Hunn, Holzworth, Sjåvik, Luchtel, and Olswang.

Olswang offered to get copies of the IRP and distribute them to the council. Sjåvik, as Deputy Legislative Rep., asserted that this might be a politically difficult stance to defend to the State Legislature. Holzworth asked if he were arguing that FCFA should not consider this agenda item, or if the council just shouldn't advertise it. Sjåvik clarified that, if the council wants to examine how the current IRP policy works and whether or not it needs to be improved, then he sees no problem with pursuing it as an agenda item; he was simply trying to point out how the State Legislators would react to an attempt by UW faculty to justify these "research quarters." Ludwig said he would not have a problem defending this re-examination of the efficacy of the IRP to the Legislature. Luchtel suggested that the IRP subcommittee investigate how the Administration let the Political Science department, a department that by the Administration's own admission has had problems with collapsed teaching loads, set its own policy.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25. Minutes by Todd Reid, Recorder.