

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting 13 November 2000
Gerberding Hall, Room 301 (Regents Room)

Present: Senate Chair Coney and President McCormick; Vice Chair Holt, Group Representatives O'Neill (V), Martin (III), Salas (IV), Storti (VI), and Cirtautas (I); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughan; Deputy Legislative Representative Sjävik; Faculty Council Chairs Zoller (FCET), Wadden (FCAS), Holzworth (FCFA), Mark Bothwell (FCR), Tina Emerick (FCUR), Richard Kielbowicz (FCUL), John Schaufelberger (FCUFS), and Roger Simpson (FCEO); UW Bothell representative Jack Meszaros, UW Tacoma representative Rob Crawford; ASUW President Weaver, GPSS President Kuterdem, Special Committee Chair Barbara Krieger-Brockett (SCFW); Executive Assistant to the President Niccolls; and Government Relations representative Taricani.

Absent: Group representatives Pace, Carr*, Roberts*, Killien*; Faculty Council Chairs Chalker-Scott*, Martin*, Murphy; Special Committee Chair Fabien; and Provost Huntsman.

**Excused*

Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

The Agenda was approved, as were the following minutes:

Meeting of the Faculty Senate, 26 October 2000

Minutes of the Senate Executive Committee, 9 October 2000

Announcements

Chair Mary Coney announced that a special Faculty Senate meeting will take place tomorrow, 14 November, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in Kane Hall regarding the proposed GSEAC/UAW job action. She stressed that this is a Senate meeting, and is primarily for the Faculty. If there is a quorum, resolutions will be appropriate. While all are invited to speak, preference will be given to Senators and to the Faculty generally.

Report of the President

The President reported that two things have occupied his attention since the last meeting. The first is the outcome of the recent state House and Senate elections. At this point, the composition of the legislature still is not clear. Additionally, the passage of several initiatives will affect our funding picture. It will call for all of us to join together to persuade the Legislature to fund the University adequately.

The other matter that has taken his attention is the proposed graduate student strike. He is concerned that we continue to provide the education for our students, but at the same time he wants to preserve the University community. The administration believes that it should respect the views of the Teaching Assistants (TAs) but that it will also respect the right of undergraduates to complete their fall coursework. Right now, discussions have focused on whether the Administration should join with the TAs and others in seeking enabling legislation. This is an ongoing conversation and he is preparing to do that at the meeting on Tuesday.

Questions

1. Ilse Cirtautas (Group 1) asked what could we learn from other universities with organized TAs. President McCormick commented that the experience of universities varies but that all of them agree that bargaining should not be pursued without enabling legislation, especially as it pertains to the type of the bargaining unit and the subjects that may be bargained. Other universities have had problems with maintenance of collegial relationships and the extent to which academic issues get swept up in bargaining. That said, there are several universities that manage quite well, and he cited the example of the University of Wisconsin.
2. Duane Storti (Group VI) asked if the administration has done anything to follow-up on the role of the Faculty during the strike. Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty commented on labor law regarding conversations between supervisors and employees. President McCormick stated that the TAs have the right to express themselves, and that at the end of the day, class obligations will be met. He is concerned about keeping the community whole, assuming expressive actions, as opposed to draconian punishments for damage to the environment.
3. Vice Chair Bradley Holt asked about enabling legislation on behalf of the faculty. Pointing to the draft of the FCFA Class C resolution, President McCormick said that this is being discussed. If there were something approved along the lines of the current draft of the Class C legislation, there would certainly be room for discussion. At this point, Chair Mary Coney outlined the way in which she will conduct the meeting tomorrow. Both President McCormick and Ted Lang, President of GSEAC, will speak. Additionally, Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, and Tim Washburn, Executive Director of Admissions and Records, will present background information. During the first part, conversation will be more general. In the second part of the meeting, the focus will be on faculty options in the event of a strike.

Report of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Vice Chair Holt reported that for the rest of this biennium, the University would not be meeting retention offers except in exceptional circumstances. Second, the Committee has discussed unit adjustments. The question on which they have focused is the philosophy and procedure that should be used to address these adjustments so that any adjustments will be made fairly and consistently.

Report of Legislative Affairs

Jan Sjøvik, Deputy Legislative Representative, presented the report. He focused on the enabling legislation and on the budget. The Council of Faculty Representatives met last week to discuss the outcome of the election and the upcoming legislative year. One question that came up is how the legislature will approach the I-601 spending limit. Unless the legislature is willing to override it, the funding picture is not good. (The group was also gloomy about funding prospects for the capital budget.)

On the issue of enabling legislation, everyone last year felt that the proposed bill was inadequate. Thus, people have been trying to work with the Washington Federation of Teachers and others to get a good bill. They shared the proposed Class C resolution and explained that unionizing faculty is not like organizing other workers. For example, there are some things about which faculty would not want to bargain or issues that are of special concern to them.

Questions

1. Seelye Martin (Group III) asked if there were legislation, would there be an election. Vaughn explained the two ways in which unions can be recognized: cards and election (but only after a showing of interest). But an election would not be automatic; the Faculty would have to organize the sufficient numbers first.

Nominations and Appointments

1. Nominations for Vice Chair

Chair Mary Coney pointed out that the Code requires that a nomination be presented at the first meeting of winter quarter. As a result of the nominating process, the name of John Schaufelberger (Construction Management) was proposed for forwarding to the Senate. This was unanimously approved.

2. Faculty Councils and Appointments

Chair Coney referred the group to agenda item no. 7, which contains the list of nominees. The nominations were approved.

3. Nominations for the Undergraduate Education Advisory Council

Secretary Vaughn suggested that we either select two or that we approve the entire slate and allow Dean Fred Campbell to select. Approved.

Class A Legislation: Voting Rights for Research Faculty,

Chair Coney explained that at the last Senate meeting, the Senate Executive Committee was charged with making amendments to this legislation in two targeted ways. The first was to add "assistant professors" to the legislation and the second was to prohibit research faculty from voting on tenure and promotion matters. The packet contains proposed language drafted by Secretary Lea Vaughn. Vice Chair Holt moved that we approve these provisions as capturing the spirit of the discussion at the Faculty Senate. Robert Holzworth, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, pointed out that the amendment made at the Senate meeting, if taken literally, would take away the existing rights of senior research professors to vote on research faculty personnel issues as they currently do. He thinks, rather, that the intent of the motion was to address academic faculty, i.e., regular faculty and without tenure (WOT) faculty. Secretary Vaughn proposed two alternatives on the voting issue. There was a discussion regarding the merits of the two alternatives. Vice Chair Holt altered his motion to endorse alternative two in the proposed legislation, and this was seconded. Kate O'Neill (Group V) made a Motion that alternative two read: except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks. Holt accepted this as a friendly amendment. The Motion was approved. It was understood that while research faculty may sit on councils as mandated at Sec. 23-45, the legislation as amended would not allow them to vote on promotion and tenure matters as noted.

Class C Resolution on Public Sector Collective Bargaining Enabling Legislation for Faculty in Higher Education

Robert Holzworth introduced this legislation, after Chair Coney explained the status of Class C legislation. He reviewed the rationale for the resolution, which he felt is explained in paragraph two of the introduction. Secretary Vaughn explained the meaning of interest arbitration, and how it limits the bargaining of contract terms. Holzworth explained why the committee thought it was appropriate to rule out interest arbitration, and that we would still have other options. Storti moved that the following sentence: "Enabling legislation should not compel the faculty to engage in interest arbitration" be inserted at the end of paragraph three after the "i.e." The Motion carried. Storti proposed a second amendment to paragraph one. He suggested that the word "entire" be replaced with the word "voting." Holzworth said that another issue that will come up is whether the faculty should be allowed to divide into smaller sub-groups of faculty. Holzworth argued that the faculty bargaining unit should be the entire faculty. He suggested that having the entire faculty speak as one voice will be more powerful than a set of smaller sub-groups. Holt suggested that we try to keep amendments to this to a minimum because we are not trying to write the entire bill, but explain what we need in a bill. Vote: Yes-4, No-0, and Abstain-2. The vote carried. The strike and lockout provision was discussed. The legislation prohibited strikes but said nothing about lockouts. Paragraph four here addresses political realities, and corrects the deficit of the earlier legislation's failure to address lockouts. Storti called the question, but before the group passed on this, Prof. Cirtautas asked about the Faculty Code and what happens to it if there is a contract. It would be preserved for non-negotiable items. The resolution was approved with one abstention. Vote: Yes-5, No-0, and Abstain-1.

Discussion of Tri-campus Issues

Vice Chair Holzworth provided some background on this issue, explaining that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) has been working on this issue for the last two years. FCFA has worked with representatives from both Bothell and Tacoma, and sought to recognize the growth of the two campuses. The proposed legislation would give the Bothell and Tacoma campuses a representative voice on the Senate. But it would also address the "distance" issue, which makes it difficult for them to attend meetings in Seattle. The compromise here was to provide for a Tri-Campus Council that would review legislation and policies that have impacts on the campuses. The chair of that group would sit on the SEC. Another part of the compromise was to let the chairs of the Bothell and Tacoma faculty groups have a vote on the SEC. That would be a real increase in voice for the Bothell and Tacoma campus. Holt added that Class B legislation (curriculum, admissions, etc.) would also be affected by this legislation. If two-thirds of the faculty at either Bothell or Tacoma object, then they could send the legislation back to the SEC.

During the discussion, Cirtautas asked about what level of participation we should expect from the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. She asked if we could solve some of these problems using modern technology, e.g. video conferencing. Then, both Robert Crawford (UW Tacoma representative) and Meszaros (UW Bothell representative) made statements. Crawford pointed out that it is not just a matter of technology, but also a matter of faculty workload since they have program responsibilities as well as typical faculty committees. He stated that the Tacoma campus is enthusiastic about this legislation, and believes that the Tacoma campus will continue to grow. Their goals are to create mechanisms for cross campus involvement, and a vision for greater integration of the three campuses that at the same time paradoxically recognizes the differences among the three. Same faculty code, but three handbooks. Meszaros, speaking for Bothell, said that people are supportive of the legislation. She said that her faculty is excited about the spirit of fairness in this document, and the opportunity to have the Tri-Campus Council. She feels that this could lead to some valuable opportunities for faculty on all three campuses.

Holzworth said that this will come at the Senate meeting on 30 November 2000 as a discussion item and will be introduced for a first reading in January. Coney commented about what a good experience it has been getting to know the faculties at the two campuses as we have gone through this drafting experience. Doug Wadden, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), asked about the Class B provisions in the legislation. He pointed out that many of the activities of FCAS do not come before the SEC. He asked how programmatic issues would work under this arrangement. Coney stated that, personally, she sees a situation with three distinct campuses and believes that legislation must address that. One of the big issues will be program review, and this is central for Bothell and Tacoma since they are in the middle of program building, but that said, there needs to be some kind of review especially since this is an area of special faculty responsibility. She proposed that maybe there could be three SCAP (Senate Committee for Academics and Programs) groups acting under FCAS, one for each campus. This is something that she would expect the Tri-Campus Council to address as one of their first pieces of business. She did not want this concern to stop the legislation. Holzworth said the legislation doesn't address this, but that the legislation would allow us to make appropriate adjustments and we could work out this oversight but that the important thing would be faculty oversight of these issues. Tina Emerick, Chair of Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR), asked about the 2/3 vote on class B matters, and asked that this be clarified. It could be returned to the SEC if 5% of the faculty votes against it or if 2/3 of the faculty at Bothell or Tacoma vote against it. Storti asked about the proportionality. Holzworth said that the formula would be the same. Holt and Holzworth agreed that representation on the SEC would be disproportionate but that this was a deliberate choice given the distance problems. Coney encouraged people to talk to their senators about his.

Information

None.

New Business

Chair Coney distributed the agenda for the special Senate meeting to be held on Tuesday. Coney asked that the agenda be revised in the following way: re-ordering of the speakers to have Tim Washburn and Lea Vaughn speak before President McCormick and Ken Lang. Coney said that her purpose is to keep comments at the beginning to a minimum so that we can move to discussion, and she hopes to end by seven that evening. Each speaker from the floor will be allowed two minutes. Storti asked whether people can bring action items. Coney said that people could do so. He asked that a request for action be included. Coney characterized the resolutions that she had received so far as extreme. One said that the graduate students should not strike. Another urged that the parties bargain. A third urged that the parties, with the

Senate, draft enabling legislation. Agenda item #6 was amended to read Discussion and Consideration of Resolutions. Coney accepted this as a friendly resolution. Jo Ann Taricani, Government Relations representative, suggested that the Class C resolution be presented at the meeting as a reference. Holzworth said it was not clear what the purpose of the meeting is. On the one hand, it seems informational and on the other, it seems oriented towards Class C resolutions. He did not think that there would be a quorum and that it would not be representative, and he was concerned that any resolutions made would not be fully considered. Chair Coney stated that the first purpose was to bring the faculty together and have an opportunity to ask questions. Coney stated that she saw part of this as our responsibility for shared governance. Also, she felt that given the prior publicity about this

issue, that there had been enough information disseminated that people could make considered judgments. And, even without a quorum, we could take the resolutions forward as a sentiment of the people gathered. Holzworth suggested that we have by-passed a lot of the normal instruments for faculty governance. Holt pointed out that Class C resolutions could be presented at any time. Coney stated that she thought about presenting it only at the SEC but decided to have a wider hearing of the issue. Also, this meeting is not to be a debate between President McCormick and Ken Lang or other members of the community. The focus of this meeting is for faculty, and she believes that we need to have a voice. She feels a goal of this is to preserve the campus community. Storti agreed that proper procedures need to be followed, and noted that this had been mentioned at the previous Senate meeting and that we could defer the conversation or a vote until the meeting on 30 November 2000. Vote: passes.

Approval of Agenda for Senate Meetings

Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Mary B. Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate