

**Dan Luchtel, Chair**  
**University of Washington Faculty Senate**  
**Remarks at March 13, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

Good afternoon. Today's Senate meeting represents the beginning of the second half of my term as Senate Chair and in thinking about that, I wonder if this is what being a lame duck feels like. I decided to go back to the minutes of the first Senate meeting to determine if any progress has been made on issues that I had then identified as my priorities. There were 5 such issues.

Priority # 1 was to restructure the faculty salary policy. We—that is, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB)—have worked hard on this. As Gail Stygall has reported at each Senate meeting this year, we have not only reviewed our faculty salary policy, but also have tried to understand the overall UW budget. It is stunningly complex. It is a \$3 billion dollar annual operation. We would also like to understand how the budget is constructed and how priorities are established. The SCPB has benefited from a helpful interaction with the Provost as her office has provided us with much information about the budget.

The SCPB has been accused of focusing only on faculty salaries. I think there is some truth to that and the SCPB is developing a more comprehensive overview of the budget. But it is distressing to hear that last year “everything was put into faculty salaries” and that this year more discretion is needed in order to fund other things. A problem with this viewpoint is that it singles out the category of faculty salaries as a discretionary account and its funding takes away from other things. This begs the question as to why other parts of the budget aren't viewed in the same light. What we need to do is to ask questions about priorities in the entire UW budget and how these priorities are decided on.

One thing that is not generally appreciated by the faculty is how early in the game priorities are decided. I'm sure Gail will have more to say about this but if faculty are to have any meaningful input deciding on budgetary priorities for the 2009-11 biennium, now is the time in March and April of 2008 to do so. Once the Provost sends a budget to the Board of Regents in June, budgetary priorities have been determined.

Priority #2 was to improve childcare facilities at the University of Washington. Childcare needs were addressed in the UW Supplemental Budget Request during this year's short legislative session. There was an operational request for \$250,000 and a capital request for \$1 million to expand access to childcare. Unfortunately, there was not support for these two requests in the Governor's budget or the House budget or the Senate budget. While not requested by the UW, \$500,000 was funded for HECB Childcare Institutional Grants.

Priority #3 was to review the Faculty Grievance procedures and to prepare a Best Practices or a Frequently Asked Questions document that would be available online on the Faculty Senate and Secretary of the Faculty websites to help faculty understand grievance procedures, who to talk to, and the pros and cons of pursuing a grievance process. The Secretary of the Faculty, Gerry Philipsen, carried this effort forward. I am happy to report that after reworking 2 or 3 drafts of an older document, we are now editing a final draft that we hope to put online next week. It will consist of two documents: 1) *A Faculty Guide to Dispute Resolution* and 2) *Summary Table of Options Available for Faculty Dispute Resolution*.

Priority #4 was the appointment of a faculty member to the Board of Regents. J.W. Harrington, the Faculty Legislative Representative, did the heavy lifting on this one. The level of support for this in the legislature increased significantly this year. Bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate, sponsored by the Chairs of the Higher Education Committees in both chambers and supported by both Democrats and Republicans. Unfortunately, the bills did not make it out the Higher Education Committees. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate leadership is committed to trying again next year.

Priority #5 was to begin a discussion about the structure of the Senate and the SEC, and possible ways to restructure these bodies to stimulate more engaged input and debate. Discussions were held during meetings of the SEC and Senate and the merit of an initial restructuring proposal was debated. Based on

this input, a second restructuring proposal is being written and this will be presented in future meetings of the SEC and Senate. I think it is fair to say that there are at least two areas of agreement; that is, that the Senate should consist of a smaller number of Senators and that the chairs of the College Councils or some designated representative from each of these Councils should be included as members of a restructured Senate.

Additional issues are perking along in the various Faculty Councils, let alone other initiatives such as the proposed College of the Environment. I expect we will have a chance to hear about some of these in the remaining Senate meetings.

So, overall, some progress, some setbacks. I worry about productivity as it seems really hard to get anything done or changed around here but I feel encouraged by what I believe are good working relationships between the Senate leadership and the offices of the President and Provost, and between the Senate leadership and the Board of Regents. I will leave it to our next speaker to comment on this if he wishes to. This ends my remarks. Thank you.