

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**12 February 2001**  
**Gerberding Hall, Room 142, 2:30 p.m.**

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. Coney (Chair) began the meeting by introducing new members and visitors.

**Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as written.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes were approved as written.

**Announcements**

1. The UIF survey will be launched tomorrow. It will be available on e-mail or the WEB, although Coney recommended use of the web and urged everyone to complete the survey. She noted that it is important to hear the comments of all faculty.
2. The UIF Open Meeting will take place on 22 February 2001 in Kane Hall. It will start with short comments from several participants in the process. Then, the meeting will be open for public comments. The comments from this meeting as well as the survey results will be compiled and given to the UIF oversight committee.

**Report of the President**

In the absence of the President to attend capital budget hearings in Olympia, Provost Huntsman made brief remarks. The Governor has released a bill pertaining to tuition policies. Huntsman noted, wryly, that up until now, the state has really not had a tuition policy; rather, it was decided as part of budget negotiations. The other important news is that the revenue forecast is going down while the expected expenditures are going up. The session is still in its early stages, and it is hard to determine exactly what will happen. It is a bleak climate although the University's legislative team is trying to maintain a positive outlook.

**Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**

Holt (Vice-Chair) reported the developments since the last meeting. There have been discussions on tuition policies, most of it focused on graduate and professional school differential tuition proposals. This has been spurred by a Business School request for a \$6000 increase for the MBA degree.

There has also been a discussion on short and long term financing of the University. These discussions have been preliminary, and have focused on what should be a priority for funding.

Today, the Committee discussed developing and implementing a policy that would address the specifics of unit adjustments. A second discussion item involved how faculty salaries might be adjusted in order to make-up the cuts in health care benefits. The committee is exploring whether the cuts in health care benefits can be made up in salary disbursements.

In response to a question about new funding ideas, Huntsman observed that every idea is still on the table and that they are seeking new funding ideas. He also responded to concerns about "privatizing" certain parts of the University. There will be series of discussion about the long-term future of the University as well as more targeted discussions about particular budgetary initiatives. Holt observed that the proposed increased health care cuts might amount to \$500 per person over two years. Storti (Group VI) characterized this as an on-going degradation of faculty salaries. Holzworth (Chair, FCFA) asked if there had been any discussion about giving the University more autonomy in setting both the number of students and tuition setting. For example, he asked what if the University set a price for education and then asked the state how many students they would be willing to fund at a given level given that basic set of costs. Huntsman responded that the University is looking at this as an opportunity to raise policy questions about the basic funding of higher education. Ludwig (Leg. Rep.) added that part of the problem is that this legislature wants to pay for education on the "cheap" and that is how many legislators view higher education.

### **Report on Legislative Affairs**

Ludwig pointed out that there is not much more to add to the previous reports. The big discussion item is tuition policy, and there has been a hearing almost every day on this issue. He pointed out that the Governor's budget has both attractive features, e.g. more autonomy and less attractive ones, e.g. we would be required to fund higher financial aid. With respect to the capital budget, he characterized this as a very serious problem because we have not done well, although no one has. We have deferred major improvements and need funding for these needs. Ludwig also distributed two CFR handouts on the budget (attached to the official copy).

Ludwig also updated the Committee on the status of the enabling legislation. The Senate leadership plans to start working on this actively in the spring. Work on the TA bill also goes forward. The plan is to go together with a joint bill, assuming that the TA bill passes this year, during the next legislative session. Ludwig regards this as a good outcome in this process.

His last remarks were about the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR). Given the harsh budget climate this year, the Council has been much more active and the membership has been more willing to work together for common budget objectives. They have named as their goals for this session quality (salaries), accessibility and diversity. CFR has also produced a CD that they are giving to each legislator. It has "hot-links" to different programs at the varying institutions around the state that highlight their legislative goals. This has been useful for both individual and group presentations. This has also demonstrated to legislators that faculty are making good use of educational technology. They have made 150 copies, and each institution contributed \$25 towards the cost of distributing these CDs.

Coney reiterated Ludwig's statement about the faculty enabling legislation. She and others have worked closely with the administration to arrive at an agreement for drafting and supporting the bill.

Martin (Group III) asked whether the UIF tax will be assessed given the predicted budget cuts. Huntsman replied that he is willing to engage in a discussion about this, but that he would be loath to give up this program. He pointed out that the fundamental premise of the program, which at times gets lost, is that there has to be a way for the institution to respond to new initiatives and ideas. This is a way to maintain the flexibility of the

institution. Coney pointed out that the survey provides faculty with a way of registering their feelings about this program as well as an opportunity to suggest alternative ways of achieving institutional goals.

Ludwig concluded by describing one silver lining in this budget. While there will not be more money coming, he stated that most of the legislators have been very unhappy with the outcome of the K-12 initiative which will create a two-track system for public employee salaries.

### **Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Rewarding Teaching**

This is a preliminary discussion about ideas that might lead to legislation. The FCIQ began discussing this idea last year and was trying to develop ways to reward good teaching and increase the prestige of excellent teaching. Jan Carline (Prof., Medical Education) has prepared a report that would describe how this *ad hoc* group got started and the issues that they have been discussing (copy attached to official copy). For the distinguished teaching award winners, the group has proposed that the winners have a title attached to their current titles. Similarly, they suggest that the award funds become a permanent part of the faculty member's salary. Another set of recommendations addresses the ways in which distinguished teaching could be supported with outside funds. The group developed seven recommendations overall (see report attached to official copy).

Holzworth asked whether it was true that lecturers are excluded from participation in this program, and asked what the rationale for this exclusion might be. He said that this question came up as part of a more generalized discussion about lecturers that is now taking place in FCFA. Carline said that while they discussed this issue, they felt that the status of lecturers should be addressed by FCFA before it is folded into the award program. All agreed that there is very little information about lecturers in the handbook, and that the topic deserves more attention.

Holt asked why the group was refraining from suggesting that this be the topic of legislation. Carline replied that they had discussed this issue with the Secretary of the Faculty last fall, and that she had recommended against putting this in the Code at this time. Coney suggested that this could be debated at a later time. Carline also pointed out that several of the recommendations do not involve the Code. Chalker-Scott (Chair, FCIQ) asked what the body wanted to do about taking these proposals to the next level. Holzworth said that anything that should become part of the Code would need to be done against the backdrop of the "big picture." He could not quite see a fair way to put these proposals into the Code, and recommended that this be kept out. Carline agreed, pointing out that this could lead to a string of special faculty titles. Holt disagreed, suggesting that a simple statement could be included at Sec. 24-70. Holzworth conceded that point but felt that there would still be a problem about a plethora of titles and sections that would be affected. Huntsman also added a cautionary note and said that the process by which these types of decisions get made is quite important. He stated that if the award were to be made a permanent increase, that it will raise a number of issues about current practices in merit reviews. This, in turn, would raise a number of issues of substance that would need to be vetted through other groups on campus.

### **Report on *Ad Hoc* Committee on Distance Learning**

The FCAS and FCEO have been working together on this report, and had a very successful meeting last Friday. Simpson (Chair, FCEO) said that the public hearing made it clear that

there is a lot of interest in this topic, and that it is likely that these discussions will lead to some type of legislation. It will build on the "ill-fated" proposal of last year but be responsive to criticisms that were raised at that time, and thus he sees it as moving in a very healthy direction. Wadden (Chair, FCAS) added that in addition to input at the meeting, they have also received a high volume of e-mail on this issue. It has been difficult, however, to gauge student opinion on this issue. They have set a process to gather more input, but at the same time, they are trying to narrow the inquiry as they come up with discrete proposals. Additionally, they are surveying other institutions. Out of this, they are hoping to come to a consensus proposal. Also, they may have additional forums or meetings to focus faculty attention on this development. In discussion, Storti (Group VI) stated that he attended the meeting and found it useful. He also noted that the AAUP has material about this topic on its website. In passing, he noted that this building (Mary Gates Hall) devoted to undergraduate education was all "locked up" which he found to be ironic given its purpose. It should be available, he claimed. \* Crawford pointed out that this issue needs to go to the Tri-campus Council assuming that the tri-campus legislation passes. This will be an issue that affects all three campuses, and in the interim, asked that information be sent to faculty leadership at each campus. Cirtautas (Group I) asked why it was that intellectual property issues were not discussed. She was told that FCR and FCFA have been considering these issues. They also wanted to get a handle on exactly what distance learning should be on this campus before they reached the very complicated issues of the copyright and patent issues.

**Class A Legislation: Tri-campus Legislation. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Sections 22-37, 22-41, 22-47, 22-48, 22-52, 22-62, and 22-74; and Part IV, Chapter 42, Sections 42-31, 42-32 and 42-46.**

Vaughn (Sec. of the Faculty) explained that President McCormick had approved the legislation and that the Code Committee had made three minor, technical suggestions (copy attached). She also explained that the interlined comments would be deleted from the final copy of the legislation before it goes to the Senate. Coney then outlined the process that the Committee must follow at this point.

The group agreed to vote on the Code Committee amendments and then move to the main motion. Holt moved that we adopt the recommendations of the Code Committee. Recommendation one would insert the word "either" to make it clear that either campus could object. This passed. Discussion moved to point number two. Both Crawford and Meszaros suggested that the ex officio section be "without vote" only. A discussion ensued as to where the other references to the legislative representatives appear. Storti moved that at 42-32B to remove the final period and replace it with a semi-colon, and include "ex officio without vote: faculty legislative representative and deputy legislative representative." Approved. The third change, from will to shall, was accepted. The last suggested change regarding "and campus" and "the chair" was accepted. Storti moved that we accept the last sentence suggested in item three. Crawford thought that the suggestion unnecessarily restricts the jurisdiction of this council. He was afraid that "inter-campus" relations would be construed more narrowly. Crawford made a friendly amendment that the words "affecting inter-campus relations" be omitted from the proposed change. Holt made this a motion when Storti declined to accept it. This was accepted and was approved.

At this point, when all of the Code Committee suggestions had been considered, discussion turned to the main motion. The legislation, as amended, was approved and will go to the Senate for a second reading.

**Nominations and Appointments**

Vaughn pointed out that she will be sending out nominations and interest surveys for Faculty Councils. She will also need to know which chairs plan to continue, and names for council chairs and members. Holt pointed out that he will also need names for people on the SCPB.

**New Business**

Coney asked the group to review the Senate agenda. It was approved. Holzworth asked people to urge their colleagues to vote on the Faculty Research Voting issue.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty  
APPROVED BY: Mary B. Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate