

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
25 February 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), Souders (VII), Killien (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjøvik; Faculty Council Chairs Wadden (FCAS), Buck (FCEO), Diaz (FCET), Haley (FCFA), Heath (FCR), Martin (FCRIB), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Emerick (FCUR), UW Bothell Representative Jacoby, UW Tacoma Representative Primomo; GPSS Representative Nixon, Special Committee Chairs Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Tom Colonnese (SPMFA) Government Relations Representative Taricani, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

Absent: Group Representatives Allen (V)*, Janssen (VI)*, Maizels (VII)*; UW Faculty Council Chairs Carline (FCIQ)*, Nelson (FCSA), Meszaros (FCTCP), Zick (FCUL), Provost Huntsman*, ASUW Representative You

Guests: Steve Olswang and Steve Tanimoto

Introductory Remarks – Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate

In coming months, Holt began, there may be some need for continuation meetings given the complex budget issues facing us. Second, there will be a review of the Faculty Senate and Office of University Committees. It has been about ten years since that was last done, and he and the President are in the midst of appointing a review panel. Finally, one of the duties of the SEC is to review questions about the *Faculty Code*. In his view, an emerging issue is the role that collegiality should play in merit reviews as well as in promotion and tenure. This matter would go before the Code Advisory Committee before it would come to the SEC. Thus, it may well be a very busy spring.

Approval of the Agenda

Approved.

The minutes of the 14 January 2002 SEC minutes and 31 January 2002 Faculty Senate were approved.

Report from the President

The budget picture continues to be grim and grow grimmer. The commonest figure heard is that of a \$1.2 billion dollar deficit. Because no cuts are being taken this year, it would all have to be absorbed in the second year of the biennium. This revenue shortfall has led to conversations in several areas. He highlighted the current discussion regarding tuition setting authority for all groups of students except resident undergraduates. As to that group, the legislature will set an "up to" number and this year's figure is likely to be quite high although not high enough to meet the budget gap.

Given this, there needs to be some type of campus forum to discuss these issues. He has talked already to Brad Holt and Sandra Silberstein, Vice Chair, about planning a meeting.

Last week, Provost Huntsman notified all members of the campus community that we will comply with the Governor's budget freeze. While the University intends to comply with the spirit of the freeze, he also pointed out there may be occasions for exceptions to that policy, e.g. hires that absolutely must be made because they will contribute to the excellence of the University.

Also last week, former Governors Evans and Gardner held meetings to discuss an initiative on behalf of higher education. This might involve two proposals, one having to do with capital expenditures, modeled on a North Carolina effort, and a second that would focus on developing a targeted revenue stream. While neither of the former governors is a fan of dedicated revenue streams, the recent experience with tax cutting initiatives has made the necessity for a dedicated stream of funding apparent. Hearings are being held in Olympia and there will probably be more developments on this front. In the long run, the real help for higher education will have to come from other sectors, particularly business. Along these lines, a salutary development has been Paul Allen's \$14 million contribution for the Computer Science Building. This provides the hope that despite developments in Olympia, we will continue to find ways to pursue excellence.

Questions

1. Douglas Wadden (Chair, FCAS; Vice-Chair Elect) asked about the future of differential tuition. McCormick answered that this will continue to be an area of development but needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, there is a strong interest in self-sustaining programs. Efforts to educate chairs and unit heads about these programs are under way. Holt noted that even under the last budget, we were given limited authority, up to 6%, to pursue differential tuition. McCormick stated that he wanted to think long and hard about any differential tuition approach for differing undergraduate programs.
2. Gail Stygall (Group I) asked the use of fees as well as differences in, for example, freshman/sophomore tuition versus upper class tuition. McCormick said that this approach is not under active discussion at this time.

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

Silberstein built on the President's remarks about the budget. She stated that we are probably looking at targeted as well as across the board cuts. Given the imminence of this scenario, Silberstein and Holt are actively exploring ways that a forum could be provided to faculty to discuss this issue. She wants this to be a responsible discussion, mindful that the media will be monitoring any meeting that we have. It would be informational and then seek input in the second half. The goal is transparency in the budget process. Suggestions were sought on how to hold a campus wide meeting that would be meaningful and well-attended.

One suggestion that Holt and Silberstein have pursued is greater contact with faculty councils. These *Code*-mandated groups address budget issues within each unit. Because budget cutting is being approached on a unit-by-unit basis, reaching out to college councils seems to make a great deal of sense.

McCormick asked whether all members of campus would be invited to the budget forum. William Wilcock (Group III) asked how much influence faculty members really have on the budget. McCormick pointed out that thanks to Senate efforts, the College Councils are by

and large involved in budget planning. Holt amplified this and while recognizing the differing unit cultures, said that they are trying to move to a culture in which the Councils do play a vital role. Wilcock was afraid that faculty would just "blow off steam" at such a meeting, and that they would feel powerless to do anything. Silberstein agreed that what we do in this regard is advisory; on the other hand, she has learned that faculty do have a great deal of influence on the budget building process when they are informed and weigh in through their governing bodies like the Senate and the College Councils.

Stygall pointed out that the average faculty member does not know much about the budget. She asked where one might find accessible budget information. Holt said that before a meeting would be held, there would be information available for any interested faculty member. The old budget website is available but it has not been updated. Clark Pace (Group II) pointed out that his college has had budget deliberations, but that because the budget is a moving target, these discussions have been frustrating for all involved. Holt said that they would try to address this by timing the meeting to coincide with a time at which useful, meaningful information is available. McCormick, acknowledging the frustration level, pointed out that given the small window we have, we need to be prepared to move quickly from an informed basis. Silberstein echoed this by saying that if we wait until the "eleventh hour," the decisions may have already been made.

Steve Buck (Chair, FCEO) asked about across the board cuts and what that would mean at the University. McCormick said that at the end of the legislative day, there will be an across the board cut of the University. The issue is how to take that cut. We can look at ways to increase revenue, we can do targeted cuts, and then, after all of that has been done, there may well be a residual across the board cut that is necessary.

Finally, regarding the budget forum, McCormick said that it could be jointly called or it could just be the Senate, but that he would like to see students and staff invited as well. Holt asked for any e-mails with ideas about how to proceed.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative

Ludwig did not have much to add to the proceeding comments. He expects to see a Senate budget in the next week or so, and that when it is produced, it will be a "done deal." The budget will have two aspects: the amount of the cuts, and the ways and amounts by which we can raise tuition revenue. The tuition setting bill he has seen also trims some of the tuition waiver authority, from 21% down to 18.9%. If tuition goes up, there will also be some provision for increased financial aid.

The hearings regarding the higher education initiative were somewhat disappointing, from his point of view, because they initially called for a study. Part of this comes from the "lack of credibility" that higher education has in Olympia. Our self-assessment is not trusted, and it has been suggested that we need an independent body to review this.

The TA bill has been moving along and will probably be moving on to the Senate Ways and Means before it appears on the floor. Along the same kind of path is the Faculty Enabling Legislation bill. It was reported out of the House with a 53-44 vote. Another bill that may affect us is the Civil Service bill. The Retirement Plan Adjustment bill is also of interest. It would remove the supplement provisions but it would also remove the ceiling on contributions and has passed easily in the House; it is now in the Senate.

Some questions were asked about waivers; there would be an effect, particularly for graduate students.

Issues Currently Under Consideration by Faculty Councils and Committees

This handout is attached to the archived copy. Diane Martin (Chair, FCRIB) added some corrections to the Retirement Council report. They will be reviewing issues about the 40% arrangement, the senior professor emeritus title and the retirement plans.

Reports from Council and Committee Chairs

- a. Chip Haley, Chair, FCFA: At the next meeting, he expects to have legislation regarding lecturers and the use of Chapter 24 meetings. Another item that is on their agenda is the unit salary adjustment policy. It has been linked with ten year program reviews which have generated more interest than the salary adjustments.
- b. Christina Emerick, Chair, FCUR: The legislation regarding honorary degrees became effective on 1 February 2002 and there has been discussion as to whom should be the first honorary degree recipient. While still pending Regents' approval, we have asked that Desmond Tutu, who will be in Seattle in May for a forum on Children's Global Health Issues, be the first honorary degree recipient. It would be rewarded at a formal academic convocation in May. These degrees will be awarded only at commencement or formal academic convocations.
- c. Steven Buck, Chair, FCEO: Since the passage of the Distance Learning legislation, the Council has been working on protocols for the design and evaluation of DL courses. There are a lot of resources available and a need to provide information about how these courses can be put together. The current course approval form is not designed for distance learning courses and will need to be redesigned. He asked for input from SEC members regarding these guidelines. Holt pointed out that most of the Senate review has been directed to program review, but he wondered whether we would want to look at DL courses in their first year or two. Buck commented that he hopes to have this on line in the near future. Doug Wadden (Chair, FCAS) added that FCAS would have the obligation to review waivers for the residence requirement.

Nominations and Appointments

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, added Professor and Captain Kim Buicke as a member for the FCAS to the list of nominees. Approved.

Class A Legislation – Second Consideration: Policies regarding Competitive Offers and WOT Faculty. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Sections 24-40 and 24-71. Charles Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Consideration of the legislation began with an explanation of the legislative process at this point. Changes suggested by the Advisory Committee on the *Code* were approved unanimously. The legislation was approved and will go to the Senate.

Class A Legislation – Second Consideration: Policies regarding Eligibility for Senate Membership. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-43. Charles Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Approved and forwarded to the Senate.

Class C Resolution on NCAA Division I Athletics – Charles Haley, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Haley began by filling in some of the history behind this proposal. There are three options at this point: forward it to the Senate as is, drop the issue because it is now moot, or finally, re-write it in light of subsequent events. Haley noted that this should actually have gone to the Faculty Council on Student Affairs. Pace stated that he felt that this resolution was based on erroneous notions about the relation between athletics and universities, and thus, it does not address the real problems in these programs. Wilcock said that this resolution is now completely outdated by events. Nor, he noted, is there a public outcry to continue with this proposal. Moved to forward it to the senate: Vote: Yes: 0 No: 6 Abstain: 3

Announcements

We need volunteers/nominations for the Annual Faculty Lectureship Committee. It will meet twice in late March. Nominees from Groups II, III, VII, Bothell and Tacoma are needed.

Information

None.

New Business

1. Approved with the excision of Item 13 on the Class C NCAA resolution.
2. Questions and Answers regarding the Freeze
 - a. Buck asked whether there would be implications for graduate school admissions. TA offers, in light of this, are being reviewed. These are decanal level decisions and the policy was clarified today. The memo went out on Friday.
 - b. Stygall asked for a definition of "necessary travel." Again, Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, said that these decisions will be made locally. It did seem that these will be more essential for junior faculty, who need these to progress in their careers, than for senior faculty.
 - c. Silberstein asked about the status of trips scheduled before the freeze. Olswang said that units would have to review the cost effectiveness of canceling versus going on trips. Second, she asked about special requests for hires that will be going to the provost. Olswang pointed out that much of this will be tied to the unit's ability to fulfill its program commitments to students.
 - d. Diane Martin, Chair, FCRIB: On the revenue side, she wanted to know about the timeline for raising tuition for graduate or professional students. Olswang replied that if there is authority by March or April, there may well be increases by September. We will not know what tuition will be until late spring.

Adjournment

After Holt's urging that members work with their senators and faculty regarding issues before the next meeting so that we can be as efficient as possible, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

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

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