

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**14 January 2002**  
**Gerberding Hall, Regents Room, 2:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Senate Chair Holt and President McCormick; Vice Chair Silberstein; Group Representatives Stygall (I), Pace (II), Wilcock (III), Salas (IV), Allen (V), Janssen (VI), Maizels (VII), Souders (VII), Killien (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjävik; Faculty Council Chairs Buck (FCEO), Diaz(FCET), Carline(FCIQ), Martin (FCRIB), Haley (FCFA), Heath (FCR), Meszaros (FCTCP), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), UW Bothell Representative Jacoby, UW Tacoma Representative Primomo, GPSS Representative Nixon, Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Provost Huntsman, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

**Absent:** Faculty Council Chairs Wadden (FCAS)\*, Nelson (FCSA)\*, Emerick (FCUR)\*, Zick (FCUL), ASUW Representative You, Government Relations Representative Taricani

\* =excused

**Guest:** Norman Arkans, Asso. Vice President and Director, University Relations

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m.

**Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as written.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the November Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting and the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

**Report of the President**

The legislature convenes today and much of the University Administration's efforts will be directed there. The Governor is seeking an 18 million dollar, 5 percent cut in the University budget, placing even more stress on an already constrained budget. These cuts will raise issues regarding tuition. Describing the current tuition policy as regressive, because it subsidizes many families who could well afford the education at the expense of those who cannot, McCormick noted that they are working on several proposals. The Governor has proposed giving full tuition setting authority to the two research universities. There is considerable resistance to this proposal in some quarters so it is not clear what will happen. The President commented, however, that whatever happens, we need to be sure that the increased financial aid needs of our students will be met. These needs can be met from a variety of sources: federal, state and private. In fact, tuition revenue itself can be used as a source of aid monies. Thus, the agenda in Olympia will be quite complicated this session.

The Administration has been very actively planning the quiet phase of a capital campaign. He has been advised that this campaign will take more of his time than traditional forms of fund raising.

Questions:

William Wilcock (Group III) asked how this type of cut might translate into real actions on campus. Provost Huntsman, answering for the President, said that some of this will depend upon how tuition is set. If funded solely through tuition, it would amount to \$900 per student. It will also matter whether tuition is set differentially, varying from unit to unit, and being higher in professional schools such as law and business. Wilcock followed this up with a question about the effect of increased energy costs. Huntsman said that this is also a budget factor, but that he is hopeful that the mid-year budget update/review will show savings as a result of conservation efforts around campus. He continued, after a further question, that the University cannot maintain a deficit budget picture; it will need to be rebalanced.

David Nixon (GPSS), asking for clarification of the \$900 figure, was told that it would be per year increase. Wilcock then asked about Harlan Patterson's statements at the last Senate meeting regarding targeted cuts. Huntsman said that all units and the Administration are now in the midst of a budget planning exercise, looking at both short and long term commitments and plans. Discussions are also going forward about the ability of each unit to absorb cuts and/or to generate revenues. The current plan is to avoid across the board cuts because each of the thirty-five units has different needs, budget plans and funding potential. The criterion with which they are starting this conversation is not quality, but rather who has the capacity to absorb cuts by shifting to other revenue sources. These sacrifices are for the good of the institution.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Sandra Silberstein, Chair

Today, Gary Quarfoth, Associate Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, reported that the state collected slightly more revenue than they had expected, but this appears to be a one time situation and may mean weaker collections in the coming months. The overall trend, however, is downwards.

Silberstein met with the CFR reps on Friday in Olympia. She came away with two impressions from that meeting. First, there is a wide range of perspectives about what will happen in legislature. For example, they heard two diametrically opposed points of view about tuition setting authority. Similarly, there was a range of impressions about the effect of this budget on four year institutions. Some think that it could have been a lot worse; others had the opposite point of view. Her conclusion is that we need to make the strongest possible case for the University before the legislature.

Finally, she noted that this year SCPB has a dual role. It will both provide advice to the Faculty as well as seek input from Faculty as they go forward in the budget process. They want to be as accurate as possible in their representation of faculty interests and points of view. For example, they are generating input on faculty salary policy. Brad Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate, added that he and Silberstein continue to meet with departmental faculties and college councils.

## **Report on Legislative Affairs – Dick Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative**

The good news, he started, is that a faculty collective bargaining bill was filed on Friday, enjoying a wide base of support. Ludwig reviewed, briefly, the history of the drafting of this bill. It is an all-institution bill enjoying the support of five universities, the WFT and was jointly drafted by Senate and Administration representatives. It has been, he remarked wryly, an "intense" process. The head of PERC has reviewed the bill to alleviate any inconsistencies and features that might affect the budget note. It is scheduled for two hearings. He also noted that this is a compromise bill; there is something in here that everyone does not like. On the other hand, its basic features are acceptable to all parties.

The bill as written incorporates the four Senate approved principles. It will receive a bill number in the next day or two, and the Senate will provide a link to the bill at its website. Finally, he commented that most legislators seem focused on the budget.

The TIAA-CREF bill is back on the agenda, and is before the Rules Committee. As to tuition, Ludwig said that the Governor is interested in getting the tuition issue off the table. By giving local control, he gets this issue off the table so that the legislature can focus on other higher education issues. Silberstein added that everyone commented, in her CFR visit, that they believe we will raise tuition to meet the cuts. She rebutted that the only way to avoid that scenario is to be able to plan, and that tuition setting is an important part of the planning process.

### Questions/

Gail Stygall (Group I) asked about what helpful things Faculty might do regarding the various bills before the legislature. Ludwig would say the most important thing is to pack the room with faculty at the hearings, and to let your legislator know of your support for these bills.

### **Introductions**

Holt introduced Jennifer Souders (Group VII) and Janet Primomo (Tacoma) who are new to the group.

### **Issues Currently Under Consideration by Faculty Councils and Committees**

Holt explained the handout that describes the items on the agenda of each Council for the rest of the academic year (attached to archived copy). This resurrects a past practice before the SEC so that everyone is kept up to date. Also, Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, passed out a notice regarding the state Open Meetings Act.

### **Reports from Councils and Committees**

- a. Jan Carline, Chair, Faculty Council on Instructional Quality – Student Evaluations:** Some faculty have expressed concerns about the ways student evaluations are used in the merit salary process. Concerns arise on a number of points, and Carline directed attention to a draft memo on recommendations. The Council is now in an information gathering phase, consulting faculty, instructional offices and doing some research about practices at other universities. Carline sought a sense of how significant this issue is around campus. Chip Haley (Chair, FCFA) commented that they

are certainly used as a ranking device, and suggested that some measure of standard deviation be noted in the reports. Ludwig suggested that some attention be paid to how faculty respond to these evaluations as part of the process. Carline responded by noting that many universities use a portfolio approach to track these kinds of concerns. This approach, however, takes more time and effort than the "quick and dirty" numbers. Stygall asked if anything would be done with the written commentary of students. Carline said that this information goes only to faculty; he did not think that there had been any content analysis done. Jaime Diaz (Chair, FCET) noted that evaluations tend to reflect a student's expected grade in a class. Marcia Killien (Group VIII) said that much of this data is used in reappointment and tenure evaluations, but tends not to be used in merit evaluation where there is more time pressure. Silberstein spoke about the chilling effects of evaluation. First, she asked whether they have to be on the web. Carline responded that they are public information and that is the reason for publication. She stated that she fears these public evaluations may chill innovation. Second, she asked if we are mandated to use the provided mark sense form or whether we can use some other format. Wilcock joined this comment, casting skepticism about reviews that are based on twenty seconds of thought and explained that he seeks more careful reviews of classes. But these techniques often require more resources. Diane Martin (Chair, FCRIB) commented about an alternative approach that the School of Public Health uses. Asked about recommendation number eight, that students be informed about the use of the document, Carline responded that research shows the ratings tend to be higher when students know the reason for the use of the ratings. Faculty and SEC members were urged to contact Carline about these recommendations.

- b. Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy – Jack Meszaros, Chair – Campus Honors:** Meszaros explained the background of this proposal. Because the Tacoma and Bothell campuses begin with junior year, students have difficulty meeting the University honors requirements. This is also becoming a problem on the Seattle campus as it accepts more transfer students. The sentiment of the Council is that campus specific honors would be a good idea. Bothell already has such honors; Tacoma had just approved them and the President asked that the issue go to this Council before approval. This resolution asks for approval of campus honors as distinguished from University honors (which are described in the *University Handbook*). The Handbook, commented Holt, is silent on this issue. Meszaros noted it has come before the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. Carline and Stygall noted some past legislative history that made it clear that this must be clearly distinguished from University honors. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chair, SCFW) asked about the difference in numbers between the number of students who get campus honors (proposed to be 10%) versus University honors, which requires 90 hours in residence. Questions were also asked about the admission requirements at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses and whether they vary from Seattle. Vaughn asked where the various forms of honors are noted: transcript, or diploma. Holt also noted that various colleges may want to have an honors notation for their transfer programs; he wondered whether, if this is approved, those colleges should be notified. Meszaros noted that FCAS might appropriately look at this issue, and that the notation is now on the transcript. She also wanted to be sure that is now approved that this be an acceptable practice for the Tacoma campus. Stygall noted that this will also be an issue for early entrance and distance learning students.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Moved, from the agenda and Vaughn introduced the following from the floor: Tom Colonnese, to be Chair of Special Committee on Minority Faculty

For the office of Conciliation Officer:

Professor Emeritus Peter Balise, Mechanical Engineering  
Professor Gordon A. Bradley, Forest Resources  
Professor Rose Ann Cattolico, Botany  
Professor Alan Kirtley, Law  
Professor Mehmet Sarikaya, Materials Science and Engineering

**First Consideration of Class A Legislation Regarding Policies Regarding Competitive Offers and WOT Faculty – Chip Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs: Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-40 and Section 24-71.**

Haley explained that both amendments would require that the policies be kept on file with the Secretary of the Faculty. As it pertains to the competitive offer policy, it also describes

During discussion, Craig Allen (Group V) said that his colleagues had some concerns about how the proposed amendment to Ch. 24-71 would work. Questions had arisen about the funding source of competitive offers and how this affects faculty review. Haley acknowledged that the source of the funding can make a difference on the decision but it leaves design of the policy in faculty hands. Holt confirmed that Faculty votes on this matter would be by majority vote. This must be reviewed every two years. McCormick asked about the housing of the policies in the Secretary's office since the Deans' offices are responsible for these policies and suggested the Deans' offices are the logical place. Haley explained that there should be one central place for housing all of these policies so that people can look comparatively at what is being done. McCormick asked questions about why this is necessary, and wanted information about the practical implications of this. Holt explained that under the current system, many faculty do not know what the policy is. McCormick concluded that he thinks that this is an inappropriate role for the Secretary of the Faculty. Vaughn stated that she did not anticipate that this would add materially to the workload of the office given database and mail merge features of a computer (in terms of soliciting policies from departments). McCormick pointed out that this would involve 150 departments and stated that enforcement should be undertaken by Deans who are employed to do this. Don Janssen (Group VI) proposed the following amendment: "This process shall be recorded with the Dean's office of the appropriate unit, and the Dean's Office shall forward the policy to the Secretary of the Faculty. " McCormick suggested the same wording for the second part of the legislation. Wilcock seconded. Ludwig asked whether it would work for the Secretary to seek this information on an as needed basis. Stygall pointed out that sometimes people like to look at a variety of practices in a comparative fashion. Motion to amend carried. John Schaufelberger (Chair, FCUFS) pointed out that the WOT policy matters only for those departments that have WOT faculty.

Dan Jacoby (Bothell) asked for clarification of the default policy. Haley explained that if a department goes with the default policy, there will be full knowledge of the offer unless the department adopts an alternative policy. An amendment was proposed: "This policy shall be recorded with the Dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. This policy shall be reaffirmed by a vote of the faculty biennially." Allen clarified that this is going to be an advisory vote as to Section 24-71. Amendment to motion carries.

Discussion on the main motion, as amended. **Vote:** Yes: 9 Opposed: 0 Abstention: 1  
Motion Carries.

**First Consideration of Class A Legislation Regarding Policies for Eligibility for Senate Membership– Chip Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs: Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Sec. 22-43**

Haley commented that this is straightforward and would allow lecturers to be senators. Vaughn checked that its implementation would not affect staff, and it appears that it would not. There was no further discussion.

**Vote:** Approved without dissension.

**Class C Resolution on NCAA Division I Athletics– Chip Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

Haley noted that this came before Faculty Affairs last year, and their reaction was favorable. Holt noted that this has been passed by most of the Pac 10 faculty bodies. It is before the body now because it was not possible for the entire faculty to consider this issue last spring. McCormick noted that Holt and Coney had communicated to him that FCFA had approved this and he was able to use that information at the Presidents' meeting last spring. It was noted that most of the specific references to basketball have been eliminated. McCormick explained that this came about in light of the firing of Coach Knight from the basketball program. Norm Arkans, Asso. Vice President and Exec. Dir. University Relations, explained that there is a lively athletic reform movement, especially in the areas of football and basketball. He characterized this as a work in progress as part of an effort to make meaningful reforms of NCAA regulations. The other Pac 10 faculty bodies wanted to be on record for their support for these reform efforts, and give the sense that presidential efforts in this regard have the support of the faculty. Thus, the question is whether the faculty want to express their opinion about this now. Wilcock expressed his desire to have more information about this resolution and reforms, expressly as to how fund raising takes place. Silberstein pointed out that this kind of concern is important to student athletes. Huntsman asked whether the Faculty understand that no central campus funding goes to the athletic program, a situation that is unusual among campuses nationwide. Clark Pace (Group II) explained that he is against this proposal, noting that he is currently an athlete and was when a student. He stated that most of us are not informed about the issues surrounding athletic programs, and questioned the wisdom of voting for a proposal about which little is known.

Primomo (Tacoma) stated that she thinks that the language needs to be updated in light of subsequent developments, and that it should be returned to Faculty Affairs. Silberstein agreed. Killien asked McCormick if there was a time pressure on this issue. McCormick stated the presidents are currently going forward, and strictly speaking, the resolution is not necessary. Its absence, however, does leave the University in an unusual position of not commenting on these issues. Killien said a report to the SEC on athletics would be useful. Vaughn suggested that FCFA update the language and bring it to the next Senate meeting. Haley outlined changes that could be made to bring the statement up to date, and noted that he did not want to engage in extensive changes. Holt thought that it would be useful to hear what has happened, consider some adjustments and bring it to the Senate. Allen was concerned about the amount of time it might take when we are faced with pressing budget issues, and that developments have rendered it obsolete. Moved, to refer this proposal back to the FCFA. Motion carried.

**Announcements**

None.

**Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda**

It would be the same as listed, but with the deletion of Item 14 regarding the Class C resolution on athletics. Approved.

**New Business**

None.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Bradley R. Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate