

**Gail Stygall, Chair  
University of Washington Faculty Senate  
Remarks at October 26, 2006 Faculty Senate**

Good afternoon and welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2006-07 year. Our agenda today is full and it includes our deliberation on a Class C resolution related to the proposals for the replacement of the State Road 520 Evergreen Point Bridge, so I'll be relatively brief, but indulge me for a few moments. I reviewed my statement as a Vice Chair candidate in preparing these remarks. I made two strong claims in that statement: first, that the university functions best when it makes use of the expertise of its faculty as expressed by the Faculty Senate and Councils; and second, that transparency, from the administration to the faculty and from the faculty to the administration is the best path to shared governance. I continue to advocate both of those claims in my new role as your Chair. Last year, Ashley and I were agreed that it was a year in which we needed to learn, to watch, and to wait to see the direction of the new administration. I think we can both say that we are encouraged by the actions of the president and the provost. This year, then, we can get started on a number of issues that have awaited a better understanding of our circumstances and in just a moment I'll turn to some of the issues we can expect to see emerging from the Faculty Councils this year.

But first, I want to say something about the Senate itself. In my vice chair statement, I also observed that there was often a substantial disconnect between the work of the Councils and the work of the Senate itself. By reviewing the upcoming issues of the councils for you today, I hope to begin to forge a better relation between those two arms of shared governance. I also want to make better use of the knowledge of the group representatives who are members of the Senate Executive Committee. I have set aside time in each SEC meeting for group representatives to bring the concerns of faculty and especially Senators in their group to the attention of the Executive Committee so that those concerns are heard by the councils. [Would the group representatives who are here today please stand up?]

So let me tell you a little about the Faculty Council agendas for the year so that you will be able to anticipate the work of the Senate this year. If we expect to pass Class A legislation in this academic year, we will need to consider any changes to the Faculty Code, by the second meeting of the winter quarter, March 1. I am not going to cover all of them this time; instead, I will spread the discussions over to the

next meeting as well. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has the heaviest agenda for the year. One of their tasks will be to review the operation so far of the Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs section of Chapter 26 of the Faculty Code. A second task for this Council will be to appoint a subcommittee to work with a subcommittee from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting on options for salary plans. There has been considerable discussion about the 2% policy in the past several years, and although it is clear that we need at least a baseline for ordinary merit, we still lack recognition of growth and excellence over time. A step system, as we used to have, or a system resembling the California system's steps within ranks are among the options this joint subcommittee will consider. A third task for FCFA will be to reconsider the position of Secretary of the Faculty. Over the years, the duties of the Secretary have inadvertently expanded as our legislation has assigned new tasks to that office. Our current secretary of the faculty, Donna Kerr, has been increasingly concerned about "mission creep" in that office. Additionally, as the president and I have been discussing, the current process of appointing a secretary is considerably unlike the process at our peer universities, where the secretary is often elected by the faculty, as Dan Luchtel suggested in his vice chair statement last year. The administrative appointment within the Faculty Senate can sometimes be awkward for all concerned. So the Faculty Council will review the duties assigned to the secretary, think about how reasonable those duties might be, consider other possible configurations, and suggest the best procedure for selecting the secretary. That is an enormous load for this Council and we may need to recruit help to make sure that all this gets done.

In other Faculty Councils, some of the issues we may expect to see include the work of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services on the faculty's role in placements into the soon to be named University Tower (formerly the Safeco Tower) and an assessment of the impact on the physical campus of the actual plans put forward on the State Road 520 bridge. The Tri-campus Council will continue working through issues that affect all three campuses and that effort has been enhanced by the presence of administrators from each of the three campuses, Ana Man Cauce from Seattle, Tom Bellamy from Bothell, and Alan Woods from Tacoma. This council will also consider how the Bothell and Tacoma campuses are treated in the Faculty Code, currently as schools and colleges rather than as campuses. Finally, the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality will continue to examine the use of various

assessment instruments, including the National Survey on Student Engagement and several instruments suggested by the recent report on the Future of Higher Education from the US Department of Education.

[Would the Council chairs who are present today please come down here so that I may introduce you?]

That's more than enough talk for today. I look forward to working with all of you this year—may we all have a good one!