

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
Tuesday, March 2, 2010, 9:00 a.m.  
142 Gerberding Hall

Council Chair Rich Christie called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

**Meeting synopsis:**

1. Approval of the agenda and minutes
  2. Senate restructure - update
  3. Representation on Faculty Councils - update
  4. Consideration of college-level RCEP revisions
  5. Possible cancellation of March 16 meeting
  6. Adjournment
- 

**1. Approval of the agenda and minutes**

The agenda and minutes were approved as drafted.

**2. Senate restructure - update**

Christie reported that the Secretary of the Faculty and he had met with the elected faculty councils (EFCs) of several of the schools, colleges and campuses, including the two largest Councils (Medicine and Arts & Sciences) to discuss the logistics of elections and other transitions if the Senate restructure proposal is approved. Most of these meetings are going well, including the Medical School. They encountered some challenges, however, with the meeting of the EFC for Arts & Sciences. One member of that Council suggested that asking the EFCs to take on the responsibility for elections was an unfunded mandate. Another suggested that this would constitute an instance of "passing on" a budget cut. In retrospect, Christie determined that in fact the diminishing of the numbers of Senators from Arts & Sciences will amount to an enormous savings to the College as a whole – and that the result will actually be a net benefit to colleges, schools and campuses. He will convey this to those concerned in Arts & Sciences, and will find ways to include that aspect of the change when asked to talk about the proposal in future meetings. Presidential Designee Cheryl Cameron suggested that although there will be a savings with regard to faculty time, there may well be a concern about the impact on support staff resources.

In response to a question about how elections will be conducted, Christie responded that the EFC must supply a list of nominees to the Secretary of the Faculty. Nominees will be chosen from a list of those eligible to run for election, compiled by the Secretary of the Faculty, and provided to the EFCs. The Secretary of the Faculty will then, at least initially, conduct the elections from her office. Ultimately the burden of the elections will be transferred to the EFCs, but not before the system has been tested by the Secretary of the Faculty and is deemed ready for use by EFCs.

**3. Representation on Faculty Councils - update**

Christie reviewed the issue of the impact that the prospective change in Faculty Senate structure will have on representation requirements on both the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) and the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). Although the Office of University Committee considers broad representation on Councils a priority in the recruitment of new members, the membership of both FCUL and FCTCP is Code-mandated. Requirements for FCTCP seem well justified, but requirements for FCUL may be less necessary if care is taken in ensuring reasonable representation from across all three campuses of the University.

Discussion ensued about the effects of legislating rules for membership on Faculty Councils. Some would like to see provisions supporting current practice. Some are concerned that rules would increase the burden of recruitment efforts by Office of University Committee staff.

There was a general consensus that rules governing FCTCP should stay in place, but that FCUL should be asked to consider loosening their regulations for membership – perhaps using language similar to that for Senate Executive Committee membership (“best efforts to diversify”) in the Restructure proposal. Discussion shifted to providing for racial and gender diversity in addition to broad representation across the campuses.

Some FCFA members favored not having any statement about representation and relying on the good faith of the Council Chairs and the Office of University Committees in making best efforts to provide for diversity and broad representation on the Councils. Others favored including some statement as a reminder to help avoid the possibility of having self-perpetuating Councils. A question was raised about whether the Code should reiterate what is already UW policy and practice.

Council member Alan Kirtley volunteered to draft language change that would suggest general principles regarding diversity and broad representation. Christie will send a message to the Chair of FCUL, with a copy to Kirtley, informing her that FCFA is at work on a draft proposal for representation on Faculty Councils, including FCUL, which will be forthcoming.

#### **4. Consideration of college-level RCEP revisions**

Christie reviewed the origins of the concerns raised about the recently revised RCEP procedures. These came to light when the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences (COFS) was moved, program by program, into the College of the Environment (COE). Each program had a separate RCEP procedure, which was followed by a final RCEP procedure that eliminated the (now empty) College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences. Some feel that under the new procedures, COFS could have been moved as a single unit into COE. Others are concerned that without individual RCEP procedures at the department level, faculty in the smaller departments will be subject to the will of the faculty in the larger departments. But some colleges have significantly more departments than COFS had – and moving large numbers of departments, one by one, to another college might be prohibitively expensive in terms of the staff time required to conduct the procedures.

Christie reviewed the options he proposed at the last Council meeting, including pros and cons. He then put forward a proposal to add a program-level process to the existing College-level RCEP process. The steps in the process would be very similar to those in the existing program level process, e.g. appointment of an External Faculty Committee (EFC), formation of an augmented College Council, and reporting requirements on the administrator (the Dean, in the existing program level process) with a few additional considerations.

First, there would be one EFC for the entire process, covering all affected programs and colleges. It would meet with the augmented faculty councils of each affected college, either separately or together. An open issue here is whether a program could request its own separate process.

Second, in the existing program level process, a Dean is the initiating administrator. In a College-level RCEP, the Provost is the initiating officer and the Dean of an affected College may be opposed to the process. Therefore, in the College level process, the Provost, or designee, should be tasked with the responsibilities and authority that the Dean enjoys in the program level process.

Christie further stated that from a legislative point of view, this could be accomplished with minimal language changes by reference to the program level process from the college level process, and offered example language.

Faculty Senate Chair Bruce Balick expressed appreciation for Christie's efforts. He noted that with the budget situation what it is and will be over the next several years, the Senate Office may well be facing

large-scale needs for implementing RCEP procedures. He suggested the Council construct some large and complex “what if” situations and then apply current procedures and envision how it might work – where the pitfalls lie and what should be changed before the time comes to face these large-scale needs.

In response to a question of what went wrong with the COFS RCEP, Christie replied that, from a faculty code point of view, nothing went wrong. In addition to the college-level RCEP, the program-level RCEPs were also required and fulfilled by those procedures. Cameron, on the other hand, felt that was not the intent of the new procedures – and that the program-level RCEPs did not need to be done. The concerns, then, were that the linkage between program and college level RCEP is not explicit in the faculty code, so that the program level process might not be carried out, and that having a separate program-level process for each affected program in a multi-college restructure would be infeasible.

Another concern about the COFS RCEPs involved timing. Discussion of the changes was begun so early that by the time formal RCEP procedures were underway, all the decisions had been made and everyone involved was fatigued by the process. An alternative view is that achieving consensus on the changes before starting the formal process is desirable.

Discussion then turned to the question of how RCEP interacted with financial emergencies. Christie related that President Emmert, in a Senate Executive Committee meeting, had described RCEP as too time consuming to use in a financial crisis. Yet the University is reluctant to declare a financial emergency due to its effects on, among other things, interest rates on university bonds. Even in a financial emergency the faculty code requires that the structure, but not the time line, of RCEP be followed. Christie suggested that rather than changing RCEP, attention to relaxing the constraints on restructuring operations in a financial emergency might be more appropriate.

Christie’s rough notes on the proposed college level process were to be distributed to the Council.

## **5. Possible cancellation of March 16 meeting**

The March 16 meeting was canceled. The next meeting of FCFA will be March 30, 9 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

## **6. Adjournment**

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

\* \* \* \*

*Minutes by Susan Folk [sfolk@u.washington.edu](mailto:sfolk@u.washington.edu)*

### **Present:**

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Regular:              | Astley, Christie, Kirtley, Ricker, Sjøvik, Wilcock   |
| President's Designee: | Cameron  |
| Ex Officio:           | Corbett  |
| Guests:               | Alex Bolton, Council Support Analyst<br>Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate<br>JW Harrington, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate |

### **Absent:**

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Regular:    | Bryant-Bertail, Carline, Di Stefano, O'Brien, Phillips, Scheuer |
| Ex Officio: | Padvorac, Vallier   |