Council Chair Rich Christie called the meeting to order at 8:59 a.m.

Meeting synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Speaker protection
4. Voting faculty - emeritus and on leave
5. Adjournment

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. Approval of the agenda, minutes, and notes

The minutes for April 20th and the notes for April 13th were approved.

2. Speaker Protection - Christoph Giebel

Professor Christoph Giebel presented concerns he had about threats preventing speaking events at the University. He shared a story in which he invited a speaker that had to cancel because of fears for his safety. The speaker was going to speak on Vietnam and received a threat from a person that claimed to be a former sniper that claimed to have 21 kills and told the speaker that he would be number 22. Upon receiving this threat Giebel contacted the UWPD and was told that he would have to pay for additional security at the event. Giebel had already used all of the funds allocated for the event, so the event ended up being canceled.

The Council then discussed what should be considered common goods and whether or not security for a special event was such a common good. Rich Christie pointed out section 24-33 of the Faculty code says “Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but given an opportunity to be heard.” The Council went on to discuss places that Giebel may have been able to go to for additional funding to cover the security such as the Dean’s or Chair’s office. Giebel said he had not requested funding from those places. Cameron explained that any special event that requires additional security must pay for the additional security. Examples include athletic events and the Dalai Lama’s visit. Giebel explained that even if that were the case, he felt that it would create a chilling effect. Giebel would like to see a fund set aside for such instances. The Council discussed the idea. Some doubt the necessity for such a fund. The consensus was that for this case, funding should have been requested from the immediate administrators, and no general policy change was needed.

3. Definition of Voting Faculty

Before beginning the discussion of voting faculty, the Council congratulated Susan Astley for her election as the Faculty Senate Vice-Chair. Secretary of the Faculty Killien then shared the background on what groups are considered voting faculty, and conversely those who are not. Two instances in which this creates logistical issues for the Office of Faculty Governance are Emeritus and retired Faculty and Faculty on Leave. While faculty with professorial ranks must be 50% or greater to have voting rights, retired and emeritus faculty can vote during the quarter(s) they are serving “part time” with no percentage of
appointment specified. Retired faculty are limited to 40% service during the year, although they may greater than that percentage for a given quarter. The Office of Faculty Governance does not have easily obtainable data on the percentage of service for individual retired and Emeritus faculty at any given point in time during the quarter, thus creating logistical difficulties in applying these voting eligibility rules. The Council then discussed the difference between Emeritus vs. retired faculty. It was explained that in the Faculty Code, Section 21-32. Voting Membership in the Faculty, the two are treated the same.

Secretary Killien then explained the logistical difficulties of not allowing faculty on leave the right to vote and provided a reason as to why they should be able to vote; namely that they are expected to return so still have a vested interested in the University, school, and department. Cameron explained that part of the logistical difficulties is due to the fact that the University has a payroll system, but not a Human Resource system which would better facilitate such work. The Council went on to discuss the theoretical reasons to change or not change the voting status of these two groups. The Council expressed reluctance to take voting rights away from a group that currently has them and expressed further concerns about the need to implement a code change to give faculty on leave the right to vote. The consensus of the group was to leave the current voting rights in place.

4. Faculty Council Diversity

Alan Kirtley explained that he would like to urge the Council to create a statement showing a commitment to diversity in the Faculty Code. Kirtley suggested using the same wording as is used in other University documents. It was believed that there was such a statement in the University’s Vision Statement that the group could adopt.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 a.m.

* * * *

Minutes by Alex Bolton bolt@uw.edu

Present:

Faculty: Christie (Chair) Astley, Bryant-Bertail, Kirtley, Phillips, Ricker, Sjåvik
President’s Designee: Cameron
Ex Officio: Corbett
Guests: Killien, Balick, Harrington, Christoph Giebel

Absent:

Faculty: Carline, Di Stefano, O’Brien, Scheuer, Wilcock
Ex Officio: Padvorac, Vallier