

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
7 May 2001
Gerberding Hall, Room 142, 2:30 p.m.

Present: Senate Chair Coney and President McCormick; Vice Chair Holt, Group Representatives Storti (VI), O'Neill (V), Roberts (VII), Martin (III), Pace (II), Cirtautas (I); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjøvik; Faculty Council Chairs Bothwell (FCR), Emerick (FCUR), Wadden (FCAS), Chalker-Scott (FCIQ), Simpson (FCEO), Kielbowicz (FCUL); UW Tacoma Representative Crawford, ASUW Representative Weaver, GPSS Representative Kuterdem; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW) Government Relations Representative Taricani, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

Absent: Group Representatives Carr (VII), Salas (IV), Killien* (VIII); Faculty Council Chairs Murphy (FCSA), Martin (FCRIB), Zoller (FCET), Holzworth* (FCFA), Schaufelberger* (FCUFS); UW Bothell Representative Jack Meszaros*, and Special Committee Chair Fabien (SCMFA), Provost Huntsman.

* = Excused Absence

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

There was one change to the agenda: consideration of the distance learning legislation was changed from an action item to a discussion item. With that change, the agenda was approved.

Announcements

The SEC dinner will be held at the President's home on Wednesday, 9 May 2001. Members of the Committee are urged to attend this enjoyable evening.

Report of the President

The President, after encouraging everyone to attend the dinner, covered three topics: the budget, the UIF Review Report, and the UW Diversity Compact. First, the President characterized the budget situation as a struggle, and a process that must be viewed in the long-term context, especially as it pertains to developing revenue sources. Any choices we make, he added, should be consistent with our overall goal of excellence.

The UIF Review Report has been finalized and will be sent to a variety of constituencies. The President hopes to have reactions to the report recommendations by 18 May 2001. Given the suggestions made in the report, both short and long term decisions regarding the UIF program will have to be made.

Finally, the President's office is preparing a report on the compliance and progress under the UW Diversity Compact that was signed in October 2000. He felt confident that most of the pledges for progress have been fulfilled.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting -Bradley Holt, Chair

At this point, Holt began, all three budgets (House, Senate, Governor) have been presented and significant differences exist among the three. This will be a very challenging situation for the University, especially given the escalating energy crisis which is estimated to cost up to \$23 million. There will be things that we would like to do, but cannot. Also, the SCPB has completed the budget exercise which was useful in identifying priorities and possible places to cut the budget.

Holt also made a few short announcements. First, the merger of Speech Communications and the School of Communications has been approved. Second, the Committee is exploring new ideas for how to develop revenues. For example, the committee has considered how restricted costs get charged and inquired as to whether they could be charged back to gifts and grants.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig's first words were that the end of the session "is still a long way off; there may be a need for a second session." Referring to budget summaries prepared by JoAnn Taricani, Ludwig highlighted the differences between the House and Senate budgets.

The second item that Ludwig discussed was House Bill 2244 which involves retirement benefits. Briefly, this regards the state funded supplementation of retiree income under certain conditions, and a proposal that this supplementation be dropped in exchange for another approach. McCormick stated that what the University would gain is much better than what would be lost. Olswang added that this also had to do with over funding of pensions. After several questions about the proposal, this discussion segued into a conversation about legislative salary increase proposals and what we might expect this year.

Report from Faculty Council on Research – Mark Bothwell, Chair

Bothwell began by describing a nation-wide, grass roots initiative to curb the rising cost of library serials and the difficulty faculty face, increasingly, in having to pay to get published. Similarly, there are initiatives asking faculty to pledge not to be involved with journals that charge high subscription fees or article use fees. Given these, Bothwell suggests that we need a public discussion on whether the Faculty should sign on to these efforts, and asked whether the Senate should fund a fall forum on the library. The group agreed with Bothwell's proposal to go forward in the fall with some type of forum or discussion.

Nominations and Appointments

Approved as listed.

Review of 2001-2002 Meeting Calendar

The SEC was asked to approve the proposed calendar of meeting times for the Senate for the next academic year. Before approving the calendar, Holt explained that the May meeting was moved to an earlier time so that there would be adequate time to vote on any legislation presented at the May meeting.

Class B Proposal on Distance Learning: Discussion – Doug Wadden, Chair, FCAS and Roger Simpson, Chair, FCEO

Simpson explained that he and Doug Wadden are trying to conduct some additional outreach around campus before submitting a final draft of distance learning legislation to the SEC. Opening the discussion, Wadden stated that they had tried to make the proposal as concise as possible, but that this was difficult because not all of the terms are defined in the *Code* or *Handbook*.

McCormick asked how a department, under the proposal, would proceed to seek approval for a distance learning major. Wadden responded that the proponents of a DL major would follow the usual FCAS process for approval of majors. While there has been some talk of a special subcommittee on distance learning, the process would still be the regular faculty process. After this comment, Lea Vaughn (Secretary of the Faculty) stressed that this legislation will need to have an "effective date" or implementation date. Given the Senate office experience with phasing in the recent proposals regarding research faculty and tri-campus legislation, an effective date is needed so that various offices and units of the University can plan to be ready to meet the requirements of new legislation. McCormick and Olswang agreed that this would be appropriate.

Holt described his experience of going on-line and trying to identify DL courses. He found that of the 72 courses listed, people with a UW affiliation taught about 34% of the courses, and that another 61% had no apparent ties to the University. He identified this as an important concern. Second, he noticed that there were two types of starting times; some courses could be started at anytime while others had group starts, which was the more common pattern. Finally, it appeared that about 92% of current DL listings are actually correspondence courses. Moreover, he suspects that the majority of the DL "correspondence" courses would not receive FCAS approval. That having been said, however, he opined that there should be a place for classic correspondence classes. Olswang inserted a historical note, stating that this was the way that previously we had offered courses to people off site. This proposal, in his mind, would treat all off campus courses as DL regardless of the teaching method used in delivering the instruction. He believes that the course teaching method should be a local decision, and therefore he sees the equal treatment approach as the right one. Wadden added that his understanding is that we are moving away from correspondence courses and that his goal, in drafting the proposal, was to avoid erecting a hierarchy of courses. Holt agreed with this statement, but pointed out that the Code reserves to faculty decision what is appropriate for course offerings. He believes that faculty would agree that if it is "just correspondence," it will not be approved, but that there should still be a home for this type of offering. Simpson said that each unit will need to address criteria for evaluating courses, and he personally had not assumed that the proposal and individual units would outlaw correspondence-type courses. Olswang interjected that if the "correspondence course" is not the equivalent of a regular course, it should not receive University sanction.

Wadden brought this part of the discussion to a close by stating that while he was not sure that agrees with Holt's poll, the ultimate issue facing faculty is that they will have to review exactly what is going on in this area. He views the proposal as trying to identify courses and modes of instruction that are currently escaping faculty review. This proposal will allow the faculty, overall and within units, to get a handle on these issues. Holt then asked SEC members to read the DL proposal and send reactions, ideas and questions to Wadden and Simpson. Olswang, on behalf of Huntsman, expressed the Provost's appreciation of the Councils' work with the Administration on this effort.

Class C Resolution on Rewarding Teaching – Linda Chalker-Scott, Chair, FCIQ

Chalker-Scott presented the Council's resolution and explained that it had been refined in light of the suggestions made at the last meeting. It was moved that the resolution be forwarded to the Senate. Duane Storti (Group VI) called the question, and it was approved.

Class C Resolution on Temporary Facilities – Duane Storti, Group VI Representative

After Storti explained the genesis of his proposal, Vaughn inquired whether there was another way to resolve this problem short of a resolution that, additionally, might be more effective. Olswang, responding to a question, explained that there is a siting policy for new or permanent structures. As to temporary facilities, an effort is made to contact everyone affected but that in this case, "there was a slip up." He also endorsed Vaughn's suggestion that the best resolution to this might be to talk to Facilities or FCUFS and have them draft a "temporary siting" policy. Storti interjected that the building that led to this resolution was not temporary and raised serious safety and disability access issues.

After also acknowledging that a mistake had been made, McCormick endorsed Vaughn's suggestion. He noted that this had caused both immediate problems as well as a governance issue, but said there was not money in the budget to provide an immediate fix to the presenting problem. After a short exchange with Storti, he opined that a conversation to prevent this kind of situation from re-occurring would be useful. Clark Pace (Group II) moved that a list of specific concerns be given to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and that the council report to the Senate on 24 May 2001. After this motion was seconded, Storti withdrew his resolution. The Chair agreed to refer this matter to the appropriate council.

Class C Resolution on the UIF Program – Seelye Martin, Group III Representative

Martin explained that his resolution has two parts: part one seeks to exempt the library from the program "tax" and part two addresses the phase-out of the UIF "tax." He added that the inspiration for his resolution came from Lee Huntsman's presentation on the need for good infrastructure. Information obtained from Betty Wilson, Director of the Library, revealed that there has been a 10-13% reduction in non-health sciences materials and an 11% reduction in health science materials, for a combined cut of \$2 million. The UIF cut was another \$500 thousand, and none of the library's UIF proposals have received funding. Concluding, he stated that it is against the spirit of the UIF to cut library funding.

During discussion, Richard Kielbowicz (Chair, Faculty Council on Libraries) mentioned that while his council had not discussed this per se, that the previous chair had sent a letter to this effect and that the council would probably be behind it. McCormick asked for non-support of the resolution. While he agrees with many of Martin's concerns, he feels that increased serial costs can be addressed in other ways. Stating that "special dispensation" is not the way, he observed that there is no unit for whom the UIF budget cuts are easy. Additionally, given the recommendation of the UIF taskforce that the UIF tax be phased out until eliminated, this problem will take care of itself. In closing, he asked the group not to endorse selective exemptions, noting that the Administration has a good record of responding to the special needs of the library.

Vote on Part I of the Resolution regarding Libraries: Yes – 5; No – 2

Moving to part two of the resolution, both McCormick and Martin agreed that the resolution needed some minor re-wording before it would go to the Senate. Coney confirmed with Martin that the effect of his proposal would be to speed up the phase out of the UIF tax in UIF 3 rather than UIF 5. Holt noted that this suggestion would be consistent with language in the task force report that said the tax should not be imposed during biennia with serious budgetary problems

President McCormick suggested that the wording of part two be corrected, so that it would read: "That given the pressures on the budget, *the UIF3 levy should be 0.4% . . .*" This would clarify that 100% of the funding for the UIF would come from the unit levy, but that the amount collected would be less. Storti suggested that the difference could be made up from the unit-specific awards that were made in UIF2. Martin objected, saying that the money has been allocated and there are not realistic retroactive sources of money. Storti proposed an amendment for part two that stated that the 0.4% be collected not by levy but by recapture of UIF unit-specific money. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Martin explained that this resolution followed the UIF Review Committee's idea of a gradual reduction in the UIF levy, but it begins in UIF3 rather than UIF5. Holt pointed out that both the founding group and the review group of the UIF recommended that the levies not be done in bad budgetary times. For interdisciplinary awards perhaps it should be only 0.4%, not 0.6%, since there will most likely be additional budget cuts. Acceleration of the reduction of the UIF levy is simply recognition that this is a bad legislative budget year.

Vote on Part II of the Resolution: Yes – 5; No – 1; Abstain - 1

Discussion: House Bill 2244 – Diane Martin, Chair, FCRIB

Martin brought the committee up to date on FCRIB discussions about this bill, thus complementing Ludwig's earlier discussion of the legislation. Given the earlier discussion, she kept her remarks brief and there was no further discussion.

Information

Marilyn Gray asked for a count of those who would be attending the SEC dinner hosted by the President on Wednesday, May 9.

New Business

a. The draft Senate Agenda was approved with the following changes:

Remove the Distance Learning item

Agenda Item No. 13: UIF Resolution is two resolutions, not one.

b. Linda Chalker-Scott (Chair, FCIQ) brought up the issue of calculation and use of Student Credit Hours per Faculty Member. She explained that if faculty teach in another college or if they teach an interdisciplinary course, the hours are not counted in his or her student credit hours. This is a problem because these numbers are used by the Provost's office to make decisions regarding unit productivity and if they are inaccurate it puts certain units at a disadvantage. In addition, it acts as a disincentive to teach interdisciplinary or cross-unit courses. There should be a more accurate way to

determine these numbers. She pointed out that the highest Student Credit Hour numbers are in Undergraduate Education, which is not even a college. She indicated that the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality is concerned and will look into it.

McCormick and Olswang indicated that they did not believe the numbers were significant in decision-making. McCormick expressed interest in finding out how these numbers are used. Coney and several other members pointed out that in the past these numbers have been important in decision-making and that units have complained. In earlier years these numbers were used in determining budget allocations, new positions, cuts, etc. Wadden mentioned that during their interviews with various University members about distance learning they learned that one unit was developing a new program specifically to increase their student credit hour numbers and therefore to improve the unit standing with the administration.

Olswang suggested that Chalker-Scott ask Phil Hoffman from Institutional Studies to visit her council and explain how the numbers are collected and how they are used, and work with him towards making changes. If that does not prove satisfactory, come back.

- c. Robert Crawford acknowledged that this is the last SEC meeting of the year, praised the capable leadership of Mary Coney, and thanked the other members of the SEC for a good year.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate