

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Wednesday, April 30, 2008
36 Gerberding Hall

Council Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

Meeting synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and the minutes of the previous meeting.
2. Conciliation (concluding discussion).
3. RCEP (continued discussion).

1. Approval of agenda and minutes, and announcements.

The agenda and the minutes of the April 9, 2008, meeting were approved as corrected.

Sjøvik noted that the Council may soon be receiving two more issues for deliberation from Senate leadership. One involves faculty participation in the approval of new administrative appointments and the other is consideration of the current proposal to restructure the Faculty Senate.

2. Conciliation.

Sjøvik distributed the latest version of changes the Council had proposed in previous meetings, imposed as a tracking changes document onto the existing *Code* entry for Conciliation Procedures.

The Council proposed the following changes:

First, introductory paragraph, second sentence:

The proceedings set forth in this chapter are forms of mediation/**conciliation** that are permissive, not mandatory. (adding the word “conciliation” to the existing addition to the original text)

Section 27-31:

The faculty member ~~may first, where applicable, is encouraged first~~ to discuss the issue about which he or she is concerned with the appropriate department chair ~~person or equivalent~~ and, if the faculty member so wishes, ~~the academic dean~~ then an appropriate academic administrator. The matter may be concluded by mutual consent at ~~this~~ any point.

Section 41.A.1, first sentence:

Conciliation officers shall be ~~tenured~~ voting members of the faculty; ~~associate and full professors without tenure for reason of funding,~~ or emeritus faculty, who are familiar with... (deleting the first comma that appears in the sentence)

Discussion leading to these changes in Conciliation Procedures raised questions that emphasize the importance of this legislation being carefully reviewed by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, the Ombudsman, and the Secretary of the Faculty.

A motion was made to approve all changes to the legislation and forward it to the Chair of the Faculty Senate for further appropriate consideration. The motion was approved by a vote of the faculty members present.

Sjåvik will transmit the proposed, amended document to Faculty Senate Chair Dan Luchtel with the strong recommendation that he refer the legislation to the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, the Ombudsman, and the Secretary of the Faculty – before referring the document to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration as Class A legislation.

The Council then turned its attention to Sjåvik’s draft “explanation” of Chapter 27. Council members suggested that Sjåvik include a review of Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen’s recommendations for the proposed revision and a note regarding the propitious timing of this proposal in view of the current transition in the Ombudsman’s Office.

3. RCEP – continued discussion.

Sjåvik initiated this conversation by asking for help in defining next steps for this process. He had understood that the Board of Deans and Chancellors had significant concerns about the proposed revisions to RCEP, but after a request for written feedback from the Board of Deans and Chancellors some time ago, he has received none so far. In fact the only feedback he has received is from a member of the faculty from UW Bothell.

Vice Provost Cameron said that she had contacted the chair of the Board of Deans and Chancellors, Dean Archibald to inquire about the status of its review and comments. The Dean said that she had been told that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting would be taking up this issue at the beginning of the next academic year, and so had assumed that the “pressure was off” as far as the deans’ feedback was concerned. The Dean reiterated, however, that the comments and concerns raised at the recent RCEP presentation at the Board of Deans and Chancellors meeting are core concerns for the deans and should be considered carefully in any further drafts going forward.

Cameron then outlined the issues she had noted during the presentation at the Board of Deans and Chancellors meeting:

- differentiation of procedures for dean-led versus director-led schools and colleges
- issues related to the graduate school and graduate school council
- interdisciplinary program issues
- providing clear definitions of *reorganization*, *consolidation* and *elimination of programs*
- some clarification about how these procedures relate to UWB and UWT
- what is meant by an “external” faculty committee for UWB and UWT
- how “student body” relates to the three campuses
- direction to review the Graduate Program review of conflict of interest guidelines
- when and how HECB approval required
- should a different name for the chapter be considered

Concerns from the UWB representative, Michael Stiber, addressed the fact that the UWT and UWB campuses are looking toward departmentalizing their campuses and they don’t see how these procedures will apply to their particular situations. The process may be appropriate for the Seattle campus, but not for Bothell and Tacoma.

Councilmember Vaughan suggested the Council focus on the principles addressed in the proposed revisions and rely on the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy to work out the details of how those principles relate to Tacoma and Bothell campuses.

Moving forward, Sjøvik suggested that the Council begin by looking at the words we've been asked to define and explain how one relates to the other – and then assemble a compilation of issues raised by feedback from all sources – addressing those systematically.

Vaughan suggested that the Council had done its job and cautioned that the “perfect” might be the enemy of the “good” in this case. Perhaps this draft is ready for the “fresh” eyes of the Senate Executive Committee.

The Council considered splitting the proposal into two legislative packages that might be sent forward one at a time – preparing 26-41 for the SEC by the end of this academic year and 26-42 as soon as possible after the beginning of the next. They are separate, quasi-autonomous operations and are not too interwoven. Questions were raised, however, on just how interwoven they might be after all.

Sjøvik reminded the Council that there are only two more meetings scheduled for this academic year - next week and the week following. Given the very best scenario, the new procedures could not be in place earlier than mid-Winter Quarter. It looks very likely that implementation of RCEP procedures during the establishment of a College of the Environment will be accomplished under the old procedures. If the Council could polish 27-41 within the next two weeks, that would be a major accomplishment.

Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron volunteered to create a summary of issues raised at Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and Board of Deans meetings related to the draft, as well as those raised in her recent conversation with Dean Archibald. She encouraged other Council members who had attended those meetings to do the same.

Council members should come to the next meeting prepared to consider the most recent version of the draft revisions alongside the issues summary that Cameron and perhaps others may bring.

###

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk
Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty
slfolk@u.washington.edu

Present:

Regular: Callis, Christie, Di Stefano, Hildebrandt, Phillips, Ricker, Scheuer, Sjøvik, Vaughan
President's Designee: Cameron

Absent:

Regular: Bryant-Bertail, Carline, Gill (all excused)
Ex Officio: Bazarnic (excused), Hahn, Cook