Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Review of Minutes from March 11, 2013
3. Update on Childcare Research
4. Request from Provost to Review Policy on Faculty/Student Romantic Relationships
5. Review of New/Revised Contributions to Faculty Matters Memos
6. Old Business
   a. Non-ladder Faculty
   b. Academic HR Data System
7. Items for Senate Executive Committee
8. New Business
9. Adjourn

1) Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Olmstead at 12:30 p.m.

2) Review of Minutes from March 11, 2013
Minutes from the March 11, 2013 meeting were not approved due to lack of quorum.

3) Updated on Childcare Research
Chair Olmstead provided an update on research being conducted by councilmembers to discover how peer institutions are implementing childcare services on campus. Olmstead distributed findings on eight universities to assist with the discussion. Generally, each institution has some form of childcare program as well as having higher enrollment than at the UW. Below are the enrollment numbers from the preliminary research:

- University of Michigan – 400 (numbers for a third center are not available)
- Ohio State University – 411
- UCLA – 337
- Arizona State University – 250
- Washington State University – 150
- University of Illinois – 50 per facility
- University of Wisconsin – 7 centers on campus, enrollment varies center by center
- University of Texas – no published data

Pricing does not change much from institution to institution. Students on Pell grants typically received discounted rates for childcare services. Childcare services across these universities appear to be connected with early childhood programs on campus. Wait list information was not yet obtained, but could be a good indicator of supply and demand for childcare services. Likewise, the ratio of the total number of childcare spots to the total campus population is a relevant benchmark. FCWA can contribute by both clarifying need and highlighting best practices across the county. The
administration’s initial goal was to study what peer institutions are doing, but FCWA should shift the focus to determining best practices.

Additional information was obtained about Ohio State: Ohio State’s tuition fees are on a sliding scale based on gross income of the entire household. The campus population is around 60,000 with an estimated 600 total slots, compared to UW which has around 45,000 (depends on if FCWA counts Bothell/Tacoma campuses and Harborview). Ohio State has a one year wait list and when asked if they are planning on increasing capacity their response was “no”, they are focusing on quality and cannot meet all the demand. At Ohio State service was split evenly between faculty and students. Additionally, Ohio State has an evening program.

It was decided that the next step would be to continue collecting information and call representatives at different institutions. Public institutions may be better examples for UW’s purposes, but FCWA could also follow up with private institutions for comparative analysis. There is a common misconception that childcare services are already provided in the community for an urban site such as UW.

A question was raised about how the proposed new online Early Childhood Education program will impact onsite child-care services. Discussion ensued about the online program. It is believed offsite internship performance would be graded based on video evaluation along with a written assessment.

Another relevant question is whether childcare centers are self-sustaining or subsidized. With planned Sound Transit developments there are discussions of proposed renovations to a nearby building that would include a childcare center, so it would be good to know if there is a self-sustaining model that could be applied to this proposed center. It was pointed out that the Fred Hutchinson child care center is self-sustaining and that the financial model will be useful in promoting and establishing a new childcare center. The vice-president of Human Resources at Fred Hutchinson would be a good person to contact for further information.

4) Request from Provost to Review Policy on Faculty/Student Romantic Relationships

Olmstead explained that she received an email from the provost regarding romantic relationships between faculty and students expressing her concern about the number of “consensual” romantic/sexual relationships that have begun while the student was in the faculty member’s class or research group. Additionally, the provost heard that UW’s policy is substantially weaker and less clear than other peer institutions and asked if FCWA would like to investigate if that is true.

Olmstead explained that the last time UW made changes to its policy regarding faculty/student relationships was back in 1992. Olmstead did some quick research on the topic and found that many universities updated their policies back in 2005. Oregon State posted a list of policies at peer institutions, which would make a good starting point for a committee reviewing this matter. University of Oregon created very useful “what if” scenarios that addressed these types of problems. Washington State has a good policy that identifies all sorts of relationships, not just faculty/student, and is in the executive policy manual, not the faculty or student handbook. Stanford’s policy stands out from other institutions that were looked at in that responsibly falls explicitly on the faculty member, who is the person with greater authority; thereby faculty have the responsibility to report the relationship while students are just encouraged to avoid relationships in the first place.

It is the UW’s policy that there is no penalty if the relationship is self-reported, but if it is not reported then there could be possible sanctions. However, the descriptions of the violations and sanctions are
vague and it is very hard to monitor relationships. It is easy to legislate against actions but not thoughts and feelings. Faculty would be sanctioned based on Section 2571 of the employee code of conduct, but current policy does not clarify what exactly will result from a violation of the code. Currently, faculty/student relationship policy is a footnote within the academic freedom section of the faculty code (section 24-33). Changing this policy requires changing the faculty code.

Discussion ensued about what FCWA’s role should be in this. Other institutions had a task force to look into this issue. The council discussed whether this is something for a senate or provost task force (as an academic freedom issue), for FCWA to use its experience to develop (as a women’s issue), or whether it should go through the ombud’s office (as a sexual harassment issue). The proposal was for the provost to create a task force that will include members from FCWA and representatives from other areas within the university, including the ombud. By creating a task force it makes the point that everyone within the university has a stake in the issue. A question was raised if FCWA wants to clarify recommended sanctions but it was agreed not to address that issue at this time.

Olmstead will draft a response to the provost explaining that FCWA recommends creating a website similar to Ohio State and Oregon State, as well as creating a task force that includes members who represent multiple constituencies across campus. Specifically, FCWA likes WSU’s universal policy that covers all relationships on campus, not just faculty/student relationships.

5) Review of New/Revised Contributions to Faculty Matters Memos
The council discussed findings on flexibility policies focused on faculty needs. These findings will result in a Faculty Matters memo summarizing the opportunities and resources available for faculty that allows for flexibility in balancing professional life with personal and family needs. The council likes what is currently available but desires affirmation from the administration that faculty can ask for these opportunities and resources. It is important to remember that flexibility in the workplace is part of our culture. One of the topics that FCWA inquired about is whether the administration would like to use this forum to define the environment that encourages faculty to take advantage of these policies.

6) Old Business
Neff will follow up with Tacoma for additional input on a review of non-ladder faculty and report back to FCWA.

Updates were provided about progress on a new HR database. There is an agreement that having a process to track longitudinal data would be a good addition. The goal is to have an HR database that could collect data that would then be stored in a data warehouse. Olmstead explained that since the UW is currently interviewing vendors now, she will follow up with a memo to include longitudinal data tracking as important criteria when deciding on a new vendor. Olmstead clarified that the UW will be going with a vendor instead of other alternatives that were discussed. The university will request permission from the regents to purchase the new HR database by the Fall Quarter and should be acted on soon. Olmstead will meet with the chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, Angela Ginorio, to discuss this shortly. When meeting with her Olmstead will provide a list of what to track and explain that this is a document supported by FCWA. Discussion ensued about whom to contact in order to identify different categories and how to track the data.

7) Items For Senate Executive Committee
Olmstead reminded FCWA that the upcoming SEC meeting is later today and will be deciding on Class A and B legislation including openness in promotion and tenure, online early childhood education, and
diversity graduation requirements. Olmstead asked if FCWA has any feedback to present during the meeting. Olmstead read off the most current policy statement on the definition of diversity drafted by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. FCWA supported this proposal, but noted some departments might have difficulties with the language.

Olmstead provided background on the Class A legislation on openness in promotion and tenure and explained what will be presented during the SEC meeting. Discussion ensued about personal experiences in the promotion and tenure process and all agreed that it would have been good to have more transparency. It is important to know why decisions have been made; if the reasoning is significant enough to not promote an individual it should be written down and provided to a candidate. The councilmembers agreed they are strongly in favor of transparency.

8) New Business
Neff announced that she submitted her letter of retirement and a committee has been formed to find a new ombud. The position is being advertised within the university and she is encouraging faculty to apply. Tenured faculty members will not lose tenure if they take on this position, although un-tenured faculty cannot work towards tenure in this position. Neff will distribute the job announcement to FCWA shortly. She explained that the committee will give preference to candidates who apply before April 11, 2013, which does not give much time for candidate to apply. Additionally, she does not know if the committee is actively reaching out to find candidates so she asked FCWA to speak with people who may be interested in the position.

Silberstein asked to formally remember the passing of past-ombud Lois Price-Spratlen, who served the university from 1982 to 2011. Price-Spratlen changed the model and approach to conflict prevention that included education and management, rather than focusing only on problem solving. Silberstein asked if FCWA can make a statement about her contribution since there was not much of an announcement. Additionally, SEC could possibly pass a resolution recognizing her efforts. It is important to recognize Price-Spratlen’s contributions because she had a lot of impact not only on the UW, but at other universities as well. Silberstein asked Olmstead if she can bring this up during the SEC meeting today to determine who will make a tribute to Price-Spratlen.

9) Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Olmstead at 2:15 p.m.
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