

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
TUESDAY MARCH 30, 2010 9:00 AM
142 GERBERDING

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Faculty Council membership guidance
2. College-level RCEP

The meeting was not called to order because of a lack of a quorum. Those present began to discuss the issues on the agenda at 9:05.

Items Discussed

1. Faculty Council membership guidance

The Council discussed feedback from the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) about how to update their membership requirements with the likely approval of Senate restructure and abolishing of groups. Secretary Killien shared her experience at the latest FCUL meeting in which the issue was discussed. As FCUL discussed the membership requirement in the code and how to replace it, their list of required members became longer and longer. FCUL did not make a formal recommendation. Dean Wilson, the Presidential Designee of FCUL, indicated that if FCUL lacked diversity, she might need to create a new faculty advisory group for the libraries.

The Council discussed the many ways diversity can be construed. A dichotomy was presented in which one form could be thought of as academic diversity based on ranking, discipline, campus and other similar factors. Another type would be consisting of ethnicity, gender and other similar factors. Secretary Killien reinforced that the only type her office has information on is academic. Chair Christie mentioned the current FCUL membership requirements are based on academic diversity. Sjøvik brought up the fact that there are no sticks and very small carrots to motivate faculty to join Faculty Councils, and wondered how there can be a mandate without a way to enforce it. Astley asked if diversity on Councils has been an issue without a statement, and members agreed that it hasn't been. Christie pointed out that members are confirmed by the Senate and that the sensibilities of the Faculty Senate are what protect the Councils. Killien pointed out that a working guideline for the Councils could be created which would not have to go through the difficult process of approving a code change. She also pointed out that there are a number of practices that are not in the code, but are in a written form as a supplement. Killien later pointed out that the Tacoma and Bothell campuses have asked not to serve on some Councils, which would be in conflict of fulfilling a campus diversity requirement.

2. College-level RCEP

Chair Christie presented his proposal on changing the RCEP process and asked if the Council wanted to pursue his proposal. Sjøvik stated that the Council should focus on the interest of the faculty, and if the Provost started an RCEP, the Provost should be the one that makes the case for it. Cameron asked the Council to take a broader look at the RCEP process and not focus on issues of the most recent RCEP. Last time RCEP changes were made, it was in response to the Pathobiology experience, and this time it is Fisheries. The administration wants faculty input, but would like it quicker. She also urged the Council to look at the whole process and how it works. Sjøvik again pointed to the interest of the faculty, and that the supreme interest of the faculty is the well being of the University, and in practice as a counterweight

to the administration. As for RCEP, he said it is a lengthy process and it is intended to be so. He also said that it is not appropriate for financial emergencies and that if there are true financial emergencies, then they should go through another process. Sjøvik stated that the RCEP process is a process to deal with changes of the academy, not a financial process to deal with a financial problem.

Balick believed that this problem shows the lack of strategic planning taking place when times are good. Christie stated that the administration is trying to have the cake and eat it too by trying to restructure based on finances without declaring a financial emergency. He also adds that expedited processes can be abused and have been in the past. He thought the process implicitly said that the process would take place in departments and then as a school, not as a department and then skip the school. Later, Christie took issue with the belief among many that the RCEP process is unwieldy. He pointed out that the times mentioned in the RCEP are not required, but maximum amounts of time allowed. He also said that he saw process as providing time as a necessary minimum.

Sjøvik stated that he believes that the history for having the RCEP process is for two reasons: 1) to protect tenure and 2) to stop departments from being eliminated. Christie shared his problem with the college and program relationship in the RCEP process. Killien pointed out two problems that she observed. The first being that faculty had the opportunity to vote twice: once at the departmental level, and then at the college level. The second being that several faculty were in the middle of tenure and promotion process. The issue was averted, but it took time and care to do so. Killien also wondered what would happen if subunits go to different colleges. Cameron pointed out that the University has never eliminated tenure granted to a professor. Departments have been eliminated, but the faculty were reassigned. The Council also discussed cost savings in such a move. Harrington asked if the process is intended to show motivation and then how the end would be met. If so, shouldn't there be evaluation later to see if the goal was achieved? The Council then discussed what options they would like to consider in making RCEP changes and whether or not the Council wanted to look at the general RCEP.

The discussion ended at 10:30.

Notes by Alex Bolton
Council Support Analyst
bolt@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Astley, Ricker, Scheuer, Sjøvik
President's Designee: Cameron
Ex-Officio Reps: Vallier, Corbett
Guests: Killien, Balick, Harrington

Absent: **Faculty:** Bryant-Bertail, Carline, Di Stefano, Kirtley, O'Brien, Phillips, Wilcock
Ex Officio Rep: Padvorac