

Gail Stygall, Chair
University of Washington Faculty Senate
Remarks at May 24, 2007 Faculty Senate

"Welcome to the final meeting of the Faculty Senate for this academic year. Although one might think that things were winding down at the end of the year, we do have our usual full agenda. We are fortunate today to have a guest speaker, Representative Fred Jarrett, from the 41st Legislative District, a legislator who has spent a great deal of energy coming to know higher education in Washington. After he speaks, we'll have an opportunity to ask questions. We will then turn to our own budget with a report from the Provost on this year's budget. Under requests for information, we will hear from Elizabeth Warrick on the progress of the Leadership and Community Values Initiative. We will also consider Class B legislation today, amending the Student Conduct Code, as well as two Class C resolutions related to benefits. These Class C resolutions, if passed, will provide the administration with a guideline for future faculty benefits and changes in benefits.

"But before we turn to the rest of the agenda, I want to close my year as Chair with both thanks to those who have made special contributions to the work of the Senate and Councils and observations on the work of the Senate. I begin my thanks to my colleagues who complete the elected Senate leadership, Dan Luchtel, Senate Vice Chair and Ashley Emery, Immediate Past Chair, and Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Both have been generous in their support of Faculty Senate goals for the year. Nancy Bradshaw, Assistant to the Chair, as well as the Vice Chair and the Immediate Past Chair, is simply outstanding in her support of the Senate. In large part, the Senate works because Nancy does. Our two faculty representatives in Olympia, Legislative Representative David Lovell and Deputy Legislative Representative JW Harrington were effective advocates for the concerns of faculty. Their efforts go beyond simply being present in Olympia but also include participation in groups like the business-oriented Seattle area Prosperity Partnership and tracking and attending meetings of the HEC Board. Thanks to David and JW, we had a presence in Olympia and beyond. I would also like to thank Gerry Philipsen for his superb performance as Secretary of the Faculty, stepping into the position of Secretary, and returning the Office of University Committees to a much appreciated level of support for the Faculty Councils. In doing so, Gerry made two excellent hires, Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary

of the Faculty, and Melissa Kane, recorder for Faculty Councils. I deeply appreciate their support of Gerry, of the Faculty Councils, and of the Senate.

“In turning to the work of the Faculty Councils, I want to thank four chairs, each of whom brought legislation forward during the year. Jan Sjøvik and the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs brought you legislation on the selection process for the Secretary of the Faculty. That Council also worked with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to study faculty salary policy in some detail. Marsha Killien and the TriCampus Council brought you legislation on recognizing the changes and development of our campuses at Bothell and Tacoma. Kathy Gill and the Faculty Council on University Relations brought us a Class C resolution on the planned SR 520 Bridge replacement, which, I believe, helped make mediation an important part of the discussion about the bridge. Brian Fabien and the Faculty Council on Student Affairs brought to the SEC today’s legislation on the Student Conduct Code and Bob Bowen of Retirement and Benefits brought to the SEC today’s Class C resolutions. And these are simply the Faculty Councils that brought legislation forward. All the other councils worked hard all year long, providing much needed faculty input on issues ranging from academic program approvals to space usage in the former Safeco, now UW Tower. We also had an engaged set of group representatives this year, and they brought forward concerns, including those related to the Faculty Effort Certification, joining with the Faculty Council on Research to make faculty perspectives well known. These are all ways through which shared governance works on the faculty end of things and my thanks to all who have participated. All of this is hard work, too often unrecognized. I’d also like to close this segment with my thanks to Mark, Phyllis and Ana Mari for keeping the lines of communication open throughout the year. And a final thanks to Regent Sally Jewell for working to understand the salary issues that faculty at the University of Washington face.

“The major observation that I would like to share is that unexpected events may drive a Senate Chair as much as a planned agenda for the year. As I remember, my planned agenda had to do with better connections for south campus with the Senate and the *Faculty Code* and with budget transparency.

“But instead I found myself dealing with events as well as an agenda. Perhaps the most important way in which I experienced these agenda-changing events relates to salary policy. Last spring, after the last Senate meeting of the year, Ashley and I became aware that, post-Storti settlement, there was some number of the Regents who wanted the President to vacate Executive Order 64, especially the 2% policy for ordinary merit. Thanks to Regent Sally Jewell, who counseled study and patience to the other Regents, the move to vacate the order was removed from agenda and deferred until there could be a consideration of the more general faculty salary policies. The President asked us to consider what changes, if any, would the faculty want to make in Executive Order 64. This request meant that I and members of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting spent months examining the history of salary policy at the UW, what changes in the *Faculty Code* might allay concerns about changes in the Executive Order, and possible language changes for the Executive Order. We learned that the so-called financial crisis in the 2002-03 academic year was not as critical as we had been asked to believe. We learned that we still had a significant compression problem. We learned that it was difficult to address the lecturers’ concerns about salary and compression because it was difficult to even get data that disaggregated the ranks within the lecturer category. We learned that although a California style step system would address some of our problems that such a system would bring a new set of complex problems to the salary system. When we finished our study, we proposed some modest changes to the code and to Executive Order 64. In bringing that proposed change to the code to the SEC, I and the others from the salary committee learned just how concerned faculty were about any change to the current policy. As I reported at the last Senate meeting, after a serious and lengthy discussion between members of the SEC and the President, the legislation was tabled and the President agreed to make the case to the Regents on leaving the Executive Order in place for the present. And he did so. But as I learned at the last Regents’ meeting, there are still some Regents who believe that the policy should be abandoned. So while Executive Order 64 was not on my agenda for my term as Senate Chair, it became firmly implanted on the list, welcome or not. And, apparently, after the last Regents’ meeting, it may turn out to be on Dan’s list as well.

“My second observation is that shared governance for faculty depends on our willingness to do our homework, our ability to persuade the administration that our views matter. That ability to persuade requires that we be able to see the functioning of the university in complex ways. Shared governance also requires timely and full disclosure of important information by the administration. Included in our part of shared governance should be our vigilance and concerns over the operation of the university at large. Unlike our colleagues at the state’s regional universities, we are not unionized and so more definitive means to change positions are not currently available to us. Let me return to salaries for a moment. You are going to hear a presentation on the proposed budget a bit later on the agenda. That budget and salary proposal is a disappointment to some faculty. And part of that disappointment, I believe, stems from announcements from the administration that “this is the best budget in 20 years.” My own sense is that it is an adequate budget, not a catch-up budget. Although larger, this budget requires the university to spend money on a number of specific items, including \$6.3 million on the new Department of Global Health, \$9 million dollars to high demand enrollments which requires reporting to the state on increased enrollment, and \$4.5 million on WWAMI, for medical and dental education, in Spokane. These are not trivial amounts and the collection of other required expenditures leaves me without the lift of “the best budget in 20 years.” The comparison I might use is that the budget is a regular meal after years of partial meals and that it isn’t even necessarily a healthy meal much less a feast. So that is the complexity that we need to understand. Many of us wanted more in salary than we will be getting. Some of us wanted more money to appear in ordinary merit. Others of us wanted more money devoted to compression and other salary inequities. Some of us felt that student issues should result in more commitments in the budget. Did the administration hear us? Certainly, they haven’t changed the original proposal. Were we persuasive? For this next year’s budget, no. But perhaps they did hear us on making longer term commitments to faculty salaries and other items related to the central educational mission. I am hoping that you will hear the Provost make a commitment, barring financial disasters, to the same salary program in the second year of the biennium as the first. I am also hoping that we will begin long-term planning for maintenance of faculty salaries as well as salaries being budgeted early in the process and will make those items my goals next year in the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Doing our homework, understanding complexity and being persuasion must all be operating for shared governance

to succeed. And so, too, must the administration provide information, listen, and be willing to be persuaded.

“So there you have it. Although there were many other events during this academic year, many other issues on which we were successful, addressing salary issues remained central all year long and these are my lessons learned.

“Let me close on a somber note. We have, since the last Senate meeting, lost another former Senate Chair, David Fowler, from my home department of English. He served as chair of the Senate in the mid-1960s, retiring from English in the late 1980s. Amazingly, David remained a practicing scholar right up to the end, still visible in the department over those years since retirement. May we be as graceful in the later years as David was.

“And that’s my report. I will turn the microphone over to David Lovell, our faculty legislative representative, who will introduce our guest speaker, Representative Fred Jarrett.”