

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Monday, October 20, 2008
9:00-10:30 a.m.
36 Gerberding Hall

Council Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Meeting synopsis:

1. Approve the agenda of this meeting; review minutes of the last meeting
2. RCEP (continued discussion).
3. Conciliation (update).
4. Senate restructuring proposal (as time allows).

1. Approval of agenda and review of minutes from the October 6, 2008, FCFA meeting.

Both were approved.

3. Conciliation (update)

The update on Conciliation Procedure was taken out of order. Alan Kirtley distributed a copy of a proposal he brought to the Council from a recent meeting of the Board of Conciliators. The Board is hoping that the Council will agree to draft legislation that would increase the number of Conciliators allowed on the Board from six to twenty-four – apart from the more major revisions planned for Chapter 27. He made a motion to send forward to the SEC legislation changing Chapter 27, Section 27-41.A.2 as follows:

2. There shall be no more than ~~six~~ twenty-four conciliation officers who shall serve three-year ~~staggered~~ terms ~~commencing on September 16~~.

After hearing a second, Kirtley went on to explain that there is significant urgency in making this one particular change now – despite the fact that a more thorough revision of Chapter 27 is on the agenda for the fall quarter. In part, the request to increase the number of conciliators from six to twenty-four, addresses the enlargement of the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to include Tacoma and Bothell. Currently, four cases are being conciliated and the Ombudsman has been made aware of eight other possible conciliations. Growth in the conciliation caseload is a positive development that should be encouraged, for conciliation offers the possibility of reaching a mutually satisfactory resolution and avoids adjudication. Several factors limit the Board's capacity to provide conciliation services. The Ombudsman's general practice is to assign two conciliators to each case. The conciliation process routinely lasts more than one quarter. Typically, a conciliator is assigned to one, possibly two cases per year. Conciliators can only handle cases arising outside their own school or college. In this regard, Arts and Sciences cases present challenges in finding neutral conciliators, since the college and its faculty are so large. If the current year caseload in fact reaches 12 cases, the board of conciliators will be severely challenged to meet that level of demand and to provide services without delays.

For these reasons, the Board requests that the maximum Board size be set at 24. A Board of 24 will address current needs and allow for future growth if warranted. Setting an outer limit of 24 also avoids the need for future class A legislation each time an increase is desirable.

Finally, the Board agrees with FCFA that staggered terms and a specific start date (September 16) should not be codified. This will give the Ombudsman flexibility to fill vacancies and add new Board members as necessary to carry on the current practice of staggered terms without being mandated to do so.

The Council approved the motion to send the Class A legislation as outlined above, to the SEC for consideration at its next meeting.

2. RCEP (continued discussion).

Vice Provost Cameron distributed a flow chart which provided the Council a graphic representation of the draft revision of RCEP procedures. She mentioned that in the process of creating the flow chart, she was aware of many ways that the procedures were made more clear – but also that the process was made substantially longer in the revised procedures. Given the times listed in the Council’s revision, Cameron estimated that a typical case would take 7-7.5 months to complete. After considerable discussion about the relative merits of using calendar days instead of instructional days, the Council decided to stay with instructional days. Many deadlines in the draft revisions were shortened, with the (draft) proviso that the Secretary of the Faculty would be empowered to grant extensions of deadlines when needed.

The following five changes in timing were made to the January 18, 2008, revision of the procedures:

Section 26-41.B.2.a

The dean or chancellor shall notify the Secretary of the Faculty of his or her intention to initiate a review under this section of the Faculty Code. The Secretary of the Faculty shall, after consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, appoint within ~~seven~~ ten calendar days an External Faculty Committee composed of five faculty members (including one designated as the committee’s Chair) from outside the school or college in which the review is to take place.

Section 26-41.B.3 (two changes)

The dean’s or chancellor’s intention to reorganize, consolidate or eliminate the identified program(s) shall be announced within a period of ~~sixty~~ forty-five instructional days from the appointment of the External Faculty Committee (2.b. above). This announcement shall be made in the form of a detailed and specific report accompanied by a separate, independent statement from the External Faculty Committee. Both of these documents shall be submitted by the dean or chancellor to the Provost and the chair(s) of the affected unit(s), to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and to the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall publish them in a Class C Bulletin within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.

Section 26-41.B.5

This committee’s primary goal is to review the dean’s or chancellor’s recommendation from the perspective of the University and the public and, to this end, shall conduct an open review of the dean’s or chancellor’s proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered. The Review Committee may receive or request additional materials or arguments from the dean or chancellor, from the External Faculty Committee, from the faculty, students and staff of the identified program(s), and from other constituencies in the University or the public at large. Meetings to invite public comment shall be scheduled at times that permit participation by the public. Within ~~sixty~~ thirty instructional days of its appointment, the Review Committee shall deliver its written recommendation to the President and Provost. The recommendation shall be transmitted at the same time to the dean or chancellor and to the chair(s) of the affected program(s).

Section 26-41.B.7

After the President (or the President’s delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a decision on the matter and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents; to the dean(s) or chancellor(s), and the chair(s) of the affected program(s); and to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty, within ~~thirty~~ twenty instructional days of receiving the Review Committee’s recommendations. The President’s decision shall take careful account of the impact of the reorganization(s), consolidation(s) or elimination(s) on the University’s ability to perform its educational role and mission, and on the diversity of the University community.

By the conclusion of the discussion, four out of five the voting members still present at the meeting felt that Sections 26-41.A. and B. were finished. Sjøvik expressed his hope that this legislation could be approved to send to the SEC for their, and ultimately for the Senate’s, consideration during the first half of the next FCFA meeting. During the second half of the meeting, he would like the Council to take a serious look at the Faculty Senate restructure proposal.

4. Faculty Senate Restructuring Proposal (as time allows).

Before adjourning the meeting, Sjøvik asked Council members to consider the following questions as they prepare for the next Council meeting:

- Do we really want a smaller Senate? If so, by how much?
- Do we really want to make the SEC smaller?
- Should the inclusion of ties to the elected college, school and campus councils be mandatory or optional to the colleges, schools and campuses?
- Would the college/school/campus representatives need to be the Chairs of the Councils or another designated member of the Council?
- Should the Office of University Committees continue conducting elections for Senators or should that responsibility be transferred to the departments?
- Should we get rid of the faculty “groups” as they now exist, or is there a role for the groups in a restructured Senate?

One member suggested she would like to hear and participate in a discussion of the assumption that a smaller Senate would necessarily provide for a more engaged and active Senate.

Gerry Philipsen (a proponent of the restructure) and Kevin O’Brien (an FCFA member and a proponent of preserving the Senate as is) will be asked to participate in the discussion at the next meeting. At the suggestion of Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien, a staff member will also be asked to discuss the impacts of the proposed revisions on staff in the Faculty Senate office.

#

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

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

Present:

Regular: Astley, Bryant-Bertail, Carline, Christie, DiStefano, Kirtley, Philips, Scheuer, Sjøvik
 President’s Designee: Cameron
 Ex Officio: Corbett, Nguyen, Killien, Balick

Absent:

Regular: Carline, O’Brien, Ricker, Wilcock
 Ex Officio: Vallier