

**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)**  
**2009-2010 Annual Report**  
**Submitted by Richard D. Christie, Chair**

During the 2009-2010 academic year, FCFA dealt with the following issues:

**Senate Restructuring:** Fall quarter was spent completing the restructuring of the Faculty Senate begun the previous year under Jan Sjøvik's chairmanship. That prior work had resolved the conflict between the principles of proportional representation of faculty and departmental representation with a compromise brought forward by the Secretary of the Faculty featuring School and College representation. The Council now hammered out a series of agreements on

- Seating of Faculty Council Chairs and College Council Chairs in the Senate
- Guidance to College Councils on apportioning Senate seats within colleges
- Senatorial term limit changes
- Allowing designees for College Council Chairs
- Senate Executive Committee (SEC) membership, including number, composition and breadth
- Nomination and election to the Senate Executive Committee
- Transition process

The Chair presented the completed legislation, revising significant portions of Chapter 22 of the Faculty Code, to the SEC at the start of Winter quarter. The SEC made minor changes to SEC representation of the branch campuses. The Chair presented the revised legislation to the Senate, which approved it. The Chair and Senate leadership held two rather poorly attended public meetings on the restructuring. The Chair assisted the Secretary of the Faculty in meetings with College Councils to facilitate the implementation of restructuring. The faculty approved the change by vote, and the Secretary of the Faculty has ably implemented the transition process. A restructured Senate will meet in Fall 2010.

**Librarian Suffrage:** At the start of fall quarter the Chair's attention was called to a memo issued by the outgoing chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) in Spring 2008. The memo noted the unanimous support of the FCUL for giving librarians a vote in the Faculty Senate, the issue to be considered by FCFA during Senate restructuring. Initial discussion in FCFA raised the question of whether this meant that librarians should be considered to be faculty, or just have a vote in the Senate. FCFA asked John Vallier, President of the Associated Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) to ascertain the views of the librarians.

John reported that the existing librarian career path has a tenure process and research and publication expectations similar to those of research faculty. FCFA noted that other universities consider librarians to be faculty. After consider the role of the Faculty Senate in advising on faculty salary policy, FCFA reached a consensus that librarians should change their status to faculty in order to vote in the Faculty Senate, and that they would

be welcome to do so. John Vallier reported that the librarians are undecided among pursuing faculty status, forming a librarian's union, or maintaining their current status. At the end of the academic year the librarians remained undecided.

**Faculty Council Member Selection Guidance:** The Senate restructuring eliminated Faculty Groups. Groups were previously used to ensure a range of representation on Faculty Councils. FCFA was asked to consider whether substitute guidance was needed for Faculty Council member selection. Reviewing the Faculty Code, FCFA determined that there were only two Faculty Councils with explicit guidance for membership. The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) has guidance related to membership from the various campuses. The Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) had explicit guidance requiring one member from each faculty group. After discussion between the chairs of FCFA and FCUL, the group-related guidance in section 42-32 of the Code was deleted as a housekeeping change. FCUL was encouraged to draft local rules of procedure (§41-32) to govern the breadth of its membership.

**Diversity Principles in the Faculty Code:** The discussion of breadth of membership on Faculty Councils gave rise to a discussion of the diversity of membership on faculty councils. "Breadth" refers to breadth across the academic units of the University while "diversity" refers to racial, gender and other diversity categories. There was general agreement on FCFA that diversity should be considered in selecting members of Faculty Councils. It was suggested that a statement could allude to the University's diversity principles. Concern was expressed that the Secretary of the Faculty does not have diversity information such as gender and race for individual faculty members, making implementation difficult. A review of the Faculty Code for references to "diversity," "gender" and "race" turned up only isolated instances. At the last meeting of the year FCFA broadened the issue to the idea of a general statement of diversity principles for the Faculty Code. Consultation with the University's diversity officers is planned for Autumn quarter.

**Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP):** Recent implementations of the RCEP process (§26-41), notably the creation of the College of the Environment from several other colleges, have generated concerns about the legislation, which FCFA revised only last year. FCFA heard from the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and from the Secretary of the Faculty concerning these problems, and conducted extensive discussion. The problems identified were

- The absence of an explicit linkage between College RCEP and program RCEP resulted in implementers not performing program RCEPs for all programs when colleges were reorganized and consolidated. Some of the FCFA members present at the previous RCEP discussions did not recall that this linkage was intended.
- Finding External Faculty Committees and Review Committees for each program in a college RCEP would in any event not be feasible.
- Appealing a limited RCEP uses a voting process that may allow a large program to suppress an appeal from a smaller program.

- The wording of the RCEP process is too complex, creating confusion about what to do and creating incentives to avoid the RCEP process.

Further discussion turned up the problem case of a program being transferred from one college to another. In this case the identities of the responsible Dean and Augmented Faculty Council are ambiguous.

FCFA agreed that any program affected by a college or program limited RCEP process should have the ability to appeal for a full RCEP process. FCFA further agreed that there should be a step similar to the first part of the program RCEP process during a college RCEP process, with one External Faculty Committee for the entire college RCEP process. FCFA requested that the chair redraft the RCEP language over the summer to implement these decisions, simplify the language while retaining the steps of the existing process, and deal with the two-college RCEP issues.

**Faculty Full Time Equivalent (FTEs):** Senate leadership expressed concern that a number of faculty from Health Sciences had very low FTE values (in the teens) but were nevertheless voting faculty. On investigation the problem proved to be that there are two definitions of FTE in use when dealing with faculty. The first is the percentage *appointment* and the second is the percentage of *salary* paid from GOF and DOF (basically, paid from state funds). Documents giving FTE numbers do not always clearly distinguish between these two definitions, leaving the FTE in use to be inferred from context.

Voting rights are allocated based on the *appointment* FTE. Health Sciences faculty are almost all 100% appointment FTE, but have low average *pay* FTEs due to research funding and clinical income. FCFA noted that research faculty throughout the University are often 100% appointment FTE and 0% pay FTE. FCFA determined that voting rights are being properly allocated in Health Sciences.

**FCFA Quorum:** After suffering through two meetings without a quorum, FCFA adopted a rule of procedure for quorum similar to the Faculty Senate quorum rule, that a member reporting an excused absence prior to an FCFA meeting would not count against quorum.

**Freedom of Speech Protection in the Faculty Code:** Senate leadership advised FCFA that there was no free speech protection in the Faculty Code, and pointed to suggested language from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). However, there is an Academic Freedom statement in the Code (§24.33) which appears to contain freedom of speech protection equivalent to the AAUP language. FCFA did not discuss the issue extensively.

**Speaker Protection:** A Senate Executive Committee member raised the issue of speaker protection. A speaker was invited to give a presentation on campus. When the presentation was publicized, the speaker received a death threat considered to be credible. The host called the University Police to request protection for the speaker. The police

offered to provide the protection for a fee. The host did not have funds for the fee, and felt that the University should have a policy to provide protection in such cases.

FCFA determined that the Academic Freedom section of the Faculty Code (§24.33) guarantees speakers protection from violence, but does not address the associated fiscal issues. FCFA agreed that if a speaker is known to be controversial, the host should find funds for protection prior to issuing an invitation. The example of protection for the visit of the Dalai Lama was discussed. No one doubted that the University Police would respond to any reports of violence arising at a speaking event on campus. That left the special case at hand.

FCFA determined that the appropriate source of funding for this sort of case should be the related academic program or department, and then the college or school, because these were the entities likely to have the financial reserves to cover such an eventuality. FCFA determined that the host had not consulted with department or college, and advised doing so in the future.

**Voting Status of Emeritus and On-leave Faculty:** The Secretary of the Faculty raised an issue about the voting status of Emeritus and On-leave Faculty. The problem is that voting status for these faculty can change on quarter boundaries, or in the case of faculty on leave, at arbitrary times. Thus an emeritus faculty with a 40% annual appointment may be 100% active during one quarter while teaching courses, and 0% active the rest of the year. Notably, the recent vote on Senate restructuring spanned the end of a quarter, so some emeritus faculty were eligible to vote for the first few days and not for the last few! A faculty member going on sick leave may be on sick leave one week and off the next. It is impractical for the Secretary of the Faculty's office to determine faculty appointment status each time there is a faculty vote, and in any event this would not solve the problem of eligibility changing while the vote is open. The Secretary of the Faculty reported that presently a ballot is sent to all emeritus faculty, and voting eligibility depends on the honor system.

FCFA was reluctant to solve the problem by prohibiting active emeritus faculty from voting, and in any event saw no solution to the faculty leave problem. After discussion FCFA agreed on retaining the present system.

### **Pending and Future Issues**

Next year FCFA will likely address the following issues:

**Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP):** As discussed above, RCEP will be rewritten over the summer to address various issues and simplify the language. The revision will then be considered by the full Council.

**Diversity Statement:** As discussed above, FCFA is considering addition of a general statement of diversity principles to the Faculty Code. Consultation with the University diversity officers is the next planned step.

**Senate Restructuring Cleanup:** Implementation of the Senate restructuring legislation has revealed a few holes. The most obvious is that there is no provision for electing the Faculty Council chairs nominated to the SEC! They of course should be elected by the Senate like the other SEC members, and that was done this year. There is also a question about allowing self-nominated candidates on Senate election ballots. FCFA plans to consult the Senate leadership and College Councils for any other clean up issues, and address them all in a minor revision.

**Promotion and Tenure:** FCFA has been advised of continuing concerns about the confidentiality provisions of the Promotion and Tenure process in the Faculty Code and plans to obtain more information and consider whether revision of the Code is warranted.

### **FCFA Membership 2009-2010**

**Faculty:** Susan Astley, Sarah Bryant-Bertail, Jan Carline, Christine Di Stefano, Alan Kirtley, Kevin O'Brien, Sandra Phillips, Larry Ricker, Todd Scheuer, Jan Sjøvik, William Wilcock, Richard D. Christie (Chair)

**President's Designee (without vote):** Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

**Members of Representative Groups (without vote):** John Vallier (ALUW), Jason Padvorac (ASUW), Robert Corbett (PSO), Don Berg (PSO)

**Faculty Senate Staff:** Susan L. Folk, Alex Bolton