

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
November 12, 2013, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Approval of the Minutes from October 29, 2013
 3. Announcements
 4. Report from the President's Designee
 5. Minor Changes to the Faculty Code
 6. Professor of Practice
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Watts at 9:30 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from October 29, 2013

Minutes from October 29, 2013 were approved as written.

3) Announcements

Watts reported that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) is meeting next week and will address the Class A legislation on academic freedom. This is the second reading and once approved will be sent to the Faculty Senate for an up-or-down vote. Buck has volunteered to represent Watts at the upcoming SEC meeting.

Faculty salary policy is still being developed. The task force is currently addressing concerns raised by the professional schools. Jack Lee, chair of the faculty, is still pushing ahead with drafting code language even if other schools are not on board with the proposal.

Watts notified the council that he will be meeting with Rebecca Deardorff and Marcia Killien about finalizing the housekeeping changes to the faculty code.

Watts mentioned that Jim Fridley (faculty legislative representative) asked him to identify issues that people in Olympia may bring up. At this time academic freedom and faculty salary policy are the main issues from this council that people in Olympia are likely to know about. Watts asked the council if there are any additional issues Fridley should be aware of. It was suggested to inform lawmakers about UW's attempt at reforming the RCEP process to become more streamlined. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that legislators care about this.

4) Report from the President's Designee

Cameron had the opportunity to meet with the Provost regarding her communication with faculty through the AAUP list serve. The Provost appreciated the feedback and is willing to speak with the

council to address this issue at an upcoming meeting. A comment was raised that there are two issues to address: communication with AAUP and communication with faculty as a whole. Discussion ensued. Council members agreed to invite the Provost to an upcoming meeting.

5) Minor Changes to the Faculty Code

Vaughn researched the term “brief application panel” in the Washington State Administrative Procedures Act but was not able to find it. It appears that this term found in the Faculty Code could be changed to “brief adjudication panel”.

Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty, presented proposed minor changes to the Faculty Code. Killien clarified that the discussion today is not to draft language but to discuss in principle the suggested changes.

Section 21.32.B – Allow Voting Rights for Faculty on Leave

The Faculty Code currently states that faculty on leave do not have voting privileges. This has been an issue with voting on Catalyst because the Secretary’s Office does not have access to data about when a faculty member is on leave. The Secretary’s Office is getting this information in a timely manner, but still does not have the ability to determine who is on leave on a daily basis.

A question was raised asking why faculty members on leave are not allowed to vote. Historically, the intent was to ensure that members are present for debate and vote on issues. However, in the digital age it is much easier to access information and be engaged with faculty governance. Discussion ensued. Council members debated whether faculty members should have voting privileges if they are on sabbatical versus other forms of leave, such as medical leave. In the past, faculty members on medical leave are not supposed to be working. A comment was made that it would be nice to have individuals on leave, who are actively involved with the university, continue participating.

It was asked if it is easy to receive accurate leave information from units. There is a new HR system in the works and once it is up and running Killien’s office will be able to obtain better data. However, that will not happen for quite a while.

A question was raised asking how large an increase in eligible votes would result from allowing everyone on leave to vote. There is little data to understand the impact. A question was raised asking if this would apply to individual units changes or if their unit bylaws could differ from the Faculty Code voting rules. Discussion ensued. Killien asked the council if, for example, they believe a faculty member on a year-long sabbatical should have the right to vote on policy changes in their unit regarding promotion and tenure. Discussion ensued.

It is hard to draw the line between different types of leave (family, medical, maternity, research, etc.). A comment was raised that if a faculty member is on leave, then they are on leave from the university no matter the reasoning. It may also raise the concern of encroachment on their leave time. If they have the right to vote, then they also have the responsibility to vote and be in discussions. If somebody is on leave from the university, the status of “on leave” should have value. Killien stated that the faculty salary policy will affect every faculty member at the university. Killien asked council members if they believe that faculty who are on leave for one quarter should be disenfranchised from voting on a matter like this. A comment was made that going on leave is a faculty member’s decision and they must weigh

the costs and benefits. Discussion ensued. Concern was raised that faculty members cannot determine when an important issue will arise, such as salary policy.

A comment was raised that if a small number of individuals will receive voting privileges as a result of this change then it is likely a good decision. However, if this just affects a large number of people it may create some problems. The main concern should be defining the term “on leave” because it has implications on whether an individual is still actively involved with faculty governance. Cameron stressed that any time the Faculty Code is revised it will affect the administration and implementation of the policy, so it is important for the council to fully understand the implications of this decision.

Watts asked council members if they believe that all faculty members on leave should be allowed to vote as currently defined in the Faculty Code. The council took a straw poll and all members agreed that faculty on leave should not be allowed to vote. Watts stated that the council would like to stick with the current language in the code until the council has a better understanding about the types of leave and average number of people on leave at any time. Currently, when sending out ballots to faculty, those who are on leave are asked to not vote. A comment was raised that there should be some way to verify “on leave” status when ballots are returned. Killien explained that there is not. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that this appears to be only a temporary problem. Killien pointed out that by not allowing this change it is difficult to strictly implement the voting rules of the Faculty Code.

A question was raised asking what happens if the council does not address this issue today. A hypothetical scenario could be the upcoming changes to the faculty salary policy. Since this change is so complex with different levels of information it is bound to create issues. In the past the assumption was that the number of faculty on leave was small and not influential in the outcome of faculty votes. If the vote becomes close then it is the responsibility of the Senate chair and secretary to certify the election results. Killien expressed her discomfort that she knows there are current flaws in the system, which is why she believes the change should be considered. Discussion ensued. As long as faculty are being advised in the voting procedures to not vote if ineligible then the onus is on the faculty member to comply with the Faculty Code.

A comment was raised that the only simple way to be accurate is not allowing faculty members on leave to vote. Watts stated that his preference is to keep the code how it is currently written and make sure ballots explain to faculty that they cannot vote if they are ineligible. Discussion ensued. It is important to make it clear to the voter that they are consciously making the decision to vote if they are not supposed to vote. A question was raised if the Faculty Senate office has the resources to do make this a question on the ballot and filter the results by this question. Killien explained that the question could be asked and results filtered, but it would result in other problems.

6) Professor of Practice

Watts collected the issues and concerns surrounding the proposal into several main topics:

- Similarity to existing positions across campus
- Issues regarding tenure
- How current UW faculty members fit into this new classification
- Voting status for members of this classification
- Confusion over the title “Professor of Practice”

One concern that has been raised is whether there is another position that already accomplishes the goal of this proposal. For example, lecturer titles include have the title “Principle Lecturer. Killien clarified that individuals cannot be hired directly as a Principle Lecturer; it is a promotional title only. Discussion ensued. The Professor of Practice classification would apply to someone in the professional field who is brought in to teach based on their expertise in a subject. This would also be appropriate for those who have had a long and distinguished academic career and have retired from one institution, while continuing to be involved with the academic community. The position would denote the respect for what they have accomplished and add prestige of the unit. A comment was raised that tenure would not apply to this title.

Discussion ensued. It appears there may be confusion with existing clinical professorial titles used within the School of Medicine and other units engaged in clinical practice. A comment was raised stating that from a grammatical point of view this classification could be problematic because faculty may be disturbed to have lecturers at the same level. Discussion ensued.

Council members discussed the term “artist in-residence” which appears to be similar to this proposed classification. Discussion ensued. A question was raised asking if the term “Practitioner in Residence” could be used which may reduce the confusion between units. The council discussed the importance of titles and whether “Practitioner in Residence” infers a distinguished title. It does not, but the term “in residence” is appealing because it is consistent with a classification that already exists. A comment was raised that the term “in residence” was not career ending, but rather career building within is not consistent with the intent of this proposal.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Watts at 11:00 a.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst. gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Watts (Chair), Adam, Buck, Janes, Johnson, Landis, Vaughn
President’s Designee: Cameron
Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy
Guests: Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent: **Faculty:** Stygall (on leave), O’Brien
Ex-Officio Reps: Zanutto, Rees