

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2007
36 GERBERDING HALL**

Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the May 3, 2007, meeting.
2. RCEP and Section 26-41 of the *Faculty Code* (Professor Jan Carline).
3. UW Educational Outreach Contracts (Vice Provost David Szatmary).
4. Additional Business.

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the May 3, 2007, meeting.

Agenda for the meeting and the minutes of for the May 3, 2007, meeting were approved.

2. RCEP and Section 26-41 of the *Faculty Code* (Professor Jan Carline).

Jan Carline began his presentation with a brief review of the process leading up to and including the RCEP process conducted so far with regard to the Pathobiology Department. Concerns about the department date back to 1999 when a number of problems were documented. In 2004, the review of the Department Chair raised a number of issues as well, leading to the resignation of the Chair. At that point Dean Wahl (School of Public Health and Community Medicine, SPHCM) began talking about the possibility of eliminating the Pathobiology program and began the process of changing the graduate program to an interdisciplinary program within the Graduate School. Unfortunately, due to the fact that the Dean and Provost were new – and that Faculty Senate leadership was in transition – no one identified this process as something that should have been done within the context of RCEP (Re-organization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs) procedures. Once RCEP procedures were invoked, the process stumbled through the appointment of two PIC (Program Identification Committee) committees, with the second committee coming to an inconclusive end. The PIC felt that given the information available, and especially the complexity of the finances involved, it could not make an informed recommendation. Soon after the Review Committee was appointed, Carline discovered that there were no minutes of the PIC meetings nor of the SPHCM Faculty Council meeting that PIC members had attended. This left the Review Committee with quite a lot of information-gathering to do in very little time. One of the Review Committee's first recommendations was to allow for a time extension in the *Code* procedures in order to allow (under difficult circumstances) the PIC to complete the work they are asked to do.

Carline reported that the Review Committee was a good one – and benefited greatly from the GPSS representative's input. Despite a very tight timeline and the extent of their charge, the Committee pulled together, held a public meeting, received e-mail and written testimonies, and collectively wrote the report (which had been distributed to FCFA members before the meeting).

The Committee concluded that the process had been fumbled – from the fact that the RCEP process was not invoked much earlier than it was, through the problems encountered in appointing a PIC that was in fact able to effectively accomplish its mandate. The Review Committee recommended that the *Code* include the possibility of time extensions for both the PIC and Review Committee if needed. It would also recommend that the PIC be *required* to complete the required recommendation. Finally, Deans, administrators and faculty leadership need to be made aware that these procedures exist and are in fact required, beginning with the first time questions are raised about the viability of an existing program.

The following issues were raised during the course of the discussion that followed:

- The Graduate School would benefit greatly from an introduction to and training on RCEP procedures.
- The *Code* definition of a “program” should be made clearer.
- The title “Program Identification Committee” is misleading. Once a PIC is appointed, the program has already been identified.
- The particular financial problems faced by Pathobiology are not unusual for programs in the Health Sciences. There should be a way to monitor similar programs in order to resolve problems before (if possible) questions about disbanding the program arise.

The status of WOT faculty whose funding comes entirely from outside the University is a tangential issue to the RCEP process, but it one that should be considered on the FCFA next year.

Dean Wahl will be able to attend the next FCFA meeting to give her perspective on how the RCEP process worked.

3. UW Educational Outreach Contracts (Vice Provost David Szatmary).

Sjåvik introduced David Szatmary and outlined the background for this issue. Those who prepared the memo entitled “Position on Proposed Contract” (distributed at the meeting) are all fulltime instructors with appropriate terminal degrees. The matter came to FCFA through Senate Chair Gail Stygall, who had been approached by EO colleagues. These individuals were concerned about their status because of a change in the process of their yearly appointments – from a relatively collegial appointment *letter*, to more formalistic *contracts* with restrictions reflecting unflattering assumptions about these individuals. Sjåvik asked the Council to consider both sides of the issue: 1) the definition and status of these individuals, and 2) the immediate matter of the contracts.

Szatmary explained that the shift from the appointment letters to the contracts was initiated by a request from the Attorney Generals office. Apparently an EO instructor had been caught identifying himself as a UW faculty member on-line in order to promote a program for personal gain. The Attorney General asked Szatmary to include a clause prohibiting such behavior in contracts for all EO instructors.

Faculty Legislative Representative David Lovell asked if there were any reason that some such clause might be included in the appointment letter, rather than converting the appointment procedures to a more formalistic contract. Szatmary replied that the contracts distributed are very preliminary drafts – created to cover a variety of different kinds of personnel – none of whom can be considered UW faculty in the usual sense of the word since he has no authority to appoint UW faculty.

Míceál Vaughan pointed out that FCFA is not empowered to adjudicate on this issue. These are concerns to be addressed by the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach. Related issues that FCFA should address would include the possibility of extending UW faculty status for EO instructors – and the terms of contracts for any UW faculty.

Sjåvik responded that Stygall had asked that FCFA specifically to address the possibility of extending UW faculty status to EO instructors, and that he would include that on the agenda of items for the Council to consider during academic year 07-08.

Visitors from the International Educational Outreach and English Language Programs were invited to speak. One representative pointed out that the clause that prohibits misrepresentation

and promotion for personal interest is not included in UW faculty contracts and appointment letters. Why should one instance of a violation provoke assumptions about an entire class of instructors who have worked effectively without such a prohibition for dozens of years?

Another representative pointed out that the former appointment letter always included a paragraph spelling out benefits included in the employment package. That paragraph had been dropped from the draft contracts.

Szatmary said the exclusion of a section on benefits in the draft contracts was an oversight. They would be included in all future drafts. He also reiterated his previous statement that these contracts are preliminary drafts, and that he has taken instructors' comments, issues raised in the memo, and issues raised in FCFA discussion to heart and will consider them carefully in the next drafts.

The EO visitors stated that they would like to be included in the review of all future draft contracts – even if that slows the process to the extent that administration must revert to using the old appointment letter format while the review is taking place.

Szatmary concluded by acknowledging the importance of communication among all interested parties and a thorough review of all drafts by those affected, the Attorney General, Cheryl Cameron, and the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach.

4. Additional Business.

There was no further additional business.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-543-2637.

Present:

Regular: Callis, Christie, Graubard, Hildebrandt, Scheuer, Sjøvik, Vaughan

President's Designee: Cameron

Members of Representative Groups: Patterson, Doyle, Lovell

Guests: Jan Carline, Chair, Review Committee, Pathobiology RCEP; David Szatmary, Vice Provost, UW Educational Outreach; Clark Westmoreland, Executive Director of Operations, UWEO, Martha Dietz, Assistant Vice President, Corporate/Foundation Relations; and Mary Kay Seales, Mary Nell Sorensen, Lynne Walker, and Marshall Palmer (International Educational Outreach and English Language Programs Faculty)

Absent:

Regular: Gill, Kirtley (excused)

Members of Representative Groups: Cook and Shields (excused)

