

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

Present: Senate Vice Chair Silberstein and President McCormick; Vice Chair Silberstein; Group Representatives Stygall (I), Pace (II), Wilcock (III), Salas (IV), Janssen (VI), Maizels (VII), Killien (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjøvik; Faculty Council Chairs Wadden (FCAS), Diaz (FCET), Buck (FCEO), Haley (FCFA), Carline (FCIQ), Heath (FCR), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Emerick (FCUR), UW Bothell Representative Jacoby, UW Tacoma Representative Stackman, GPSS Representative Nixon, Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Provost Huntsman, Government Relations Representative Taricani, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

Absent: Senate Chair Holt *, Group Representatives, Allen (V)*; Faculty Council Chairs Martin (FCRIB), Nelson (FCSA), Meszaros (FCTCP), Zick (FCUL), ASUW Representative You

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. Sandra Silberstein, Vice Chair, thanked everyone for attending, and explained the Brad Holt, Chair, was called out of town on a family emergency. She then asked everyone to introduce themselves, and their affiliation.

Approval of the Agenda

Silberstein noted that under approval of the minutes, we would also be reviewing the minutes of the 1 October 2001 meeting. Agenda approved, as amended.

Approval of the Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes of 7 May 2001 and 1 October 2001. **Approved.**

Announcements

Appointment and charge letters have been sent to the members of the two Special Committees authorized at the last meeting. These committees will review issues related to the negotiations between the Administration and GSEAC/UAW.

Report of the President

President McCormick began his remarks by reminding us that the University will hold a Day of Reflection and Engagement on 11 October 2001. There are about sixty events planned so far, and George Bridges, acting Dean of Undergraduate Education, is coordinating this effort. Classes will be suspended that day, and faculty, staff and students are invited to attend events planned that day that will fall roughly into four time slots. He also expressed his pride in the way that the entire University community has responded to this crisis with lecture series and other thoughtful events and actions. An institution like ours, he

continued, has an obligation to prepare our students for global citizenship and to bring our expertise to bear on the events of the last month.

The President's annual address will take place tomorrow, 11 October 2001, in Kane 130. After the address, the President will take questions and answers from members of the community.

The President expressed his pleasure with the charge and the members appointed to the special committees regarding the TA situation. There is, however, very little new information to report. The recognition issue continues to be the difficult point although the University is willing to recognize the union for those students who wish to have that representation. The UW has 33 unions; 34 would be just fine – if there is enabling legislation. The University has always been willing to recognize unions in the presence of appropriate enabling legislation. At this time, GSEAC is asking for something that no other union has, and that the Attorney General's office has made clear that we do not, as a state agency, have the authority to offer without legislation. Characterizing this as a difficult situation, he assured the group that the University administration is taking steps to minimize any impact from a job action this quarter, although he noted that the effect of the spring's job action was "considerable." He concluded by expressing the hope that GSEAC/UAW will recognize the administration's sincerity in these efforts, and by asking for any suggestions to solve this difficult situation. He expressed sympathy for both the involved undergraduate students and the graduate students, who are essential to our undergraduate teaching mission as well as developing promise in their own careers.

The other concern that faces the President is the legislative budget. We face the prospect of cuts, particularly in the second year of the biennium. There are several ways that the legislature might handle this: no enrollment increase, no salary increases, and/or budget cuts or a freeze on expenditures. As more details become available, this group as well as the SCPB will have to develop a response. He asked for the community to stick together, noting that while there may be disagreements about how to proceed, we will all get through this working together. He pledged that discussions and decisions will be "made in the sunshine."

Questions:

William Wilcock (Group III) asked whether, aside from the legislative issues, the administration thinks it is a good idea for the graduate students to unionize. McCormick responded by presenting a history of this issue. He began by noting that until last year, the administration had routinely refused to recognize any graduate student union. Last year, however, the great majority of TAs said they wanted to unionize, and the issue became one of free choice – a decision that is theirs to make. At that point, the administration agreed to go to Olympia with GSEAC/UAW to secure enabling legislation, and the University followed through on this commitment. The legislation did not pass, and we are now in the current dilemma. What remains, however, is a recognition of the TAs' choice. Regular functions of the University continue to be performed. In response, Wilcock expressed a concern that this is going to "drag on forever." McCormick acknowledged this concern but did not see a way to "unring the bell." As to a strike situation, he pointed out that much of this situation is in the hands of the union since they control the timing and form of any strike.

Daniel Jacoby (Bothell) asked about other options for representation patterns as between those graduate students who want the union and those who do not. McCormick responded that he cannot bind those who have refused to be represented.

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

Silberstein stated that McCormick had been quite articulate about the context of this year's budget situation, and covered most of the topics she had planned to include in her report. This year, the SCPB will be addressing both this year's budget as well as preparation for the next biennium. Much of this discussion has focused on what values inform our approach to the budget.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative

Ludwig said that any discussion, at this point, is in general terms since the legislature will not meet until January. The local newspapers, however, have highlighted a number of issues that will face the legislature. Things are very uncertain, and the revenue forecasts are not yet reliable given the instability in the economy. In November we will get a forecast of caseloads as well as a revenue forecast. This will set the groundwork for the Governor's proposed budget in December.

It was not a good year for the legislature last year. In addition to budget problems, there was an earthquake, a draught, skyrocketing energy and health care costs, and other challenges. He characterized the session as suffering from a failure of leadership, especially as it pertains to finding revenue sources. On the other hand, he was tremendously impressed by the good will that the University enjoys in Olympia and that this is something we have to build on. We have to work on maintaining a positive note. The University did have to dip into reserves last year and most likely will need to do that this year. He is in the process of developing a faculty agenda for the session. Two issues that will be before us will be the TA legislation as well as enabling legislation for a faculty collective bargaining bill. The President has appointed two representatives who will be meeting with Ludwig and Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, to discuss their bill.

In response to a question from Gail Stygall (Group I) regarding a change in Snohomish County, Ludwig pointed out how much acrimony there was in a divided legislature last year. There is a critical seat in the Mukilteo area that may break the tie, although it will still be a slim majority. So, a majority would help but it is hard to predict exactly what would happen either way. Wilcock asked about the effects of the 11 September 2001 bombing. Ludwig expressed the hope that we would have a gentler, milder legislature that would work harder to get along.

Nominations and Appointments

Silberstein called everyone's attention to the list that accompanied the agenda.

Nominate, for Senate appointment: Jaime Diaz (Psychology, IV) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on Educational Technology, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; G. Ross Heath (Oceanography, III) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on Research, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; Charles (Chip) Haley (Finance and Business Economics, V) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; Diane Martin (Health Services, VII) as member and **chair** of the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; James Whittaker (Social Work, VIII) as member of the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits, effective immediately, for a term ending 2004; Joseph Stowitschek (Education, V) as member of the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits, effective immediately, for a term ending 2004; Jacqueline (Jack) Meszaros (Business,

Bothell) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; Gregory Zick (Electrical Engineering, VI) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, effective immediately, for a term ending 2002; Peter Vitaliano (Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, VII) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Research, effective immediately, for a term ending 2004; David Thorud (Forest Resources, VI), as a voting member of the Faculty Council on University Relations, effective immediately, for a term ending 2004; Santica Marcovina (Medicine, VII), as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, effective immediately, for a term ending 2004. Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees all **without vote**, for terms ending 2002: Representatives of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington: Academic Standards, Karen Liston; Educational Technology, William Jordan; Instructional Quality, Peter McCracken; Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Charles Chamberlin; University Facilities & Services, Richard Jost; Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs, Ju-yen Teng.

Representatives of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS): Academic Standards, Christopher Quarles; Educational Outreach, Berta Weissman; Educational Technology, Gorkem Kuterdem; Research, Joy Ghosh.

Representatives of the Administration. Faculty Council on Academic Standards: Acting Dean, Undergraduate Education, George Bridges; Executive Director, Admissions & Records, W.W. Washburn; Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Tom Colonnese. Faculty Council on Educational Outreach: Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary. Faculty Council on Educational Technology: Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs: Vice Provost Steven Olswang. Faculty Council on Instructional Quality: Acting Dean, Undergraduate Education, George Bridges; Senior Consultant, CIDR, Wayne Jacobson. Faculty Council on Research: Assistant Controller, Grant & Contract Accounting, Susan Camber; Director, Grant & Contract Services, Carol Zuiches; Assistant Vice Provost for Research Malcolm Parks; Director, Purchasing and Stores, Kerry Kahl. Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits: Vice Provost Steven Olswang; Assistant Director, Human Resources, Benefits, Kathleen Dwyer; Director, Retirement Center, Patricia Dougherty. Faculty Council on Student Affairs: Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs, Eric Godfrey; Associate Vice President, Minority Affairs, William Baker; Associate Dean, Graduate School, Elizabeth Feetham; Vice Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations, Konstantinos Kravas. Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Bothell, Raymond Lou; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Tacoma, Jack Nelson; Vice Provost Steven Olswang. Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services: Assistant Vice President, Facilities Services, Jeraldine McCray; Associate Vice President, Capital Projects, Richard Chapman; Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, John Coulter; Capital & Space Planning, Director, Marilyn Cox. Faculty Council on University Libraries: Director, University Libraries, Betsy Wilson; Director, Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center, Sherrilynne Fuller. Faculty Council on University Relations: Associate Vice President, University Relations, Norman Arkans; Assistant Vice President, Regional Affairs, Theresa Doherty. Special Committee on Faculty Women: Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick; Director, Women's Center, Sutapa Basu. Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs: Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Tom Colonnese; Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick.

There were no nominations from the floor. Silberstein then added the following nominations:

Russell Herwig (Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, Group III) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, a term to end 15 September 2004.

Staff members for the Adjudication Panel for terms ending 15 September 2004: Monica Banks (Equal Opportunity Office) and Bruce Bennett (Sociology Department).

Marilyn Gray pointed out Diane Martin should have been listed as a voting member of FCRIB. She also noted that she has not heard from all groups that are entitled to place people on councils.

The nominations in categories one through eleven were approved.

Marilyn Gray then explained category 12. The SEC is entitled to decide the voting status of the non-faculty members of Councils. The default has been non-voting status, although there are three choices: no vote, grant a vote, or let the Councils decide. There is no consistent SEC history on this issue.

It was moved that each Council make this determination from the following categories: librarians, GPSS and the administration. In discussion, it was pointed out that we will also be hearing from the ASUW as well as retired faculty. JoAnn Taricani (Government Relations Representative) pointed out that the Faculty Councils do not want to be outnumbered by *ex officio* members. The motion was clarified to mean that voting categories will be determined by faculty in the councils as to which *ex officio* members will be allowed to vote. A friendly amendment that "Category C – Administration" be excluded from voting status was accepted. Finally, it was noted that voting status changes quorum status. The motion was approved.

Action Item: Special Committee on Organization of Faculty Councils

Silberstein noted that Brad Holt, Chair, had spoken to every council chair about forming a committee that would study and make recommendations regarding Faculty Council structure. Norm Rose has agreed to chair this group. Recommendations would be made in February or March regarding any reorganization. Ross Heath (Chair, Research) asked for the rationale for this committee. Silberstein explained that increasingly there is overlap in some council functions, and that there is an uneven distribution of work between the councils. Doug Wadden (Chair, Academic Standards) addressed this issue, pointing out that the workload between these councils can vary tremendously. Additionally, the *Code* descriptions of these councils does not always comport with what the councils are actually doing or the issues that they are facing. For example, last year three councils were looking at distance learning issues. This allows people to "shop" problems around, and lessens the chance of a consistent result and leads to burn-out. Jaimie Diaz (Chair, Education Technology) pointed out that the burnout effect is also that administrators may refuse to attend councils because of the overlap issue as well as institutional memory slippage. Steve Buck (Chair, Educational Outreach) opined that there is also need for greater coordination between various councils.

Wilcock (Group III) asked if there is any plan or goal in place that would shape the committee's work. Jan Carline (Chair, Instructional Quality) noted that there had been some discussions last year about combining councils. Wadden pointed out how important the involvement of administrators is for institutional memory, and to keep councils from "reinventing the wheel." The goal, from his perspective, would be to make them a more efficient mechanism of shared governance. He also pointed out that there has been a

problem of parallel committees – Senate groups as well as administrative groups. Faculty also, Wadden said, fail to understand that these are University councils, not Senate councils. Carline underscored the concern about duplicative senate and administrative councils. Silberstein then sought a motion that would authorize Holt to set up a committee and charge it in light of this discussion. This was moved, seconded and approved.

Action Item: Class B Legislation on Distance Learning

Silberstein introduced Wadden and Buck to address this legislation, and its background and function. Wadden explained that this resolution was given as a discussion topic at the SEC and the Senate last year. This legislation represents two years of work. Originally, this began “innocently” as a move to remove the residency requirement and blossomed out into a consideration of distance learning issues. The legislation is the result of a number of campus wide discussions.

Buck then took the SEC membership through the text of the legislation. He pointed out that there are three major parts to this legislation: (1) establishment of a category of DL courses that would assure that these courses are held to the same standard as traditional, classroom based instruction, (2) changes in the residency requirement that would permit more flexibility although less opportunity for waiver at the college level, and (3) procedures and standards for review of DL degrees and programs to be consistent with other traditional programs.

Currently, distance learning courses can be offered either directly through departments or through extension. As such, they escape the FCAS review that is given to other traditional courses. The DL courses receive a designation of “C” on transcripts and may be included towards the 180 credits required for graduation, but are not included in computation of the GPA. Some of these provisions date back to the time when these classes were correspondence classes and not thought to be the equivalent of classroom courses. At the same time, traditional courses are integrating web based instructional technology and the line between the two types of courses is becoming blurry. Thus, they worked under three guiding principles: (1) the same level of review to obtain equivalent educational outcomes (2) departments have full responsibility for staffing and content of courses, and (3) assure that students receive equal academic credit for DL courses. He then pointed out some of the specific features of the legislation. The bottom line is that equivalent courses be assessed in the same fashion, and that students experience equivalent assessment and credit. This is only for undergraduate courses because the Graduate School has ended all residency requirements. If a course has a UW course number, all versions of the same numbered course should be comparable. This legislation has received the approval of UW Outreach since they are interested in upgrading their course offerings.

Wadden added a few final comments. There are a variety of opinions about how DL courses should be handled, both around the country and also on this campus. There was a considered decision that DL courses should be listed as such and that the start and end date should be listed. The council was concerned that students not be penalized for taking DL courses. He sees this legislation as exerting more faculty control over these courses. For the moment, the Council decided to table discussions about compensation and workload so that the basic curricular issues could be addressed. As such, he felt that this legislation was the product of a series of reasonable compromises.

Silberstein then explained that as Class B legislation, this will, if passed, be the only time that this group will review the legislation. It will then go to the Senate for approval, and

from there it will be approved unless 5% of the Seattle Faculty, or 2/3 of the Bothell or Tacoma Faculty object. Moved, to send this legislation to the Senate. As discussion began, Clark Pace (Group II) asked about the legislative approach to incompletes. He was told that the Council worked to find a deadline that would be analogous to classroom based courses. A number of approaches were considered before this approach was selected. Again, the goal was to achieve as much consistency as possible with traditional classroom courses. Pace's second question regarded the 45 credit residency requirement. "Why have it at all?" he asked. Wadden said that the legislation was designed to give individual departments an opportunity to experiment as well as to recognize the great number of students who transfer into the University and to recognize the mix of courses that a senior may be taking, depending upon their past experience. The council did not want to impose a hardship on students in unusual circumstances given the diversity of situations in which our students find themselves. This legislation strikes a balance between a wholesale waiver of the requirements and imposing unforeseen hardships on students. The Council surveyed other universities before proceeding, and pointed out that we are behind almost all other universities and that the accrediting bodies have put together guidelines on best practices.

Sjåvik (Deputy Legislative Representative) raised concerns about students who go abroad, particularly during their senior year to improve their foreign language fluency. He wondered how this residency requirement would affect that type of student who currently receives a waiver from the Dean of Arts and Sciences. He fears that these students will have to incur additional expenses to register here or will need to seek an exemption or go abroad prior to their senior year. Wadden explained that this will not add insurmountable obstacles for students, particularly where they have received decanal support. They would need to only seek FCAS approval – the point is that it would put these kinds of practices out in the open and have them go through a uniform approval process. Right now, a lot of these practices are completely unknown and have no form of meaningful review, and some are done with just individual faculty authority. This, he continued, does not seem appropriate. Buck pointed out that this type of waiver would not be obtained by an individual student, but in situations where it occurs regularly and is sought for a group of students.

Marcia Killien (Group VIII) sought clarification of the purpose of the legislation. If the objectives are met, should it matter by what method a course is taught? She also asked how the line would be drawn between "traditional" courses and DL courses. A traditional course, depending upon the instructor's use of technology, could be called a DL course. Wadden explained that many of these issues had been addressed in the prior two years of discussion. This legislation, again, sought a middle ground: the same credit and grade is given, but a notation is added to notify a transcript reader of the DL status. But in all other ways, it is treated in the same fashion. He gave the example of courses in which we may partner with another University to offer a course and trying to assure some form of quality control on this campus, and this legislation allows us to step into this area with some type of review rather than to allow an "anything goes" regime. Killien responded that the example given did not respond to her example, where the courses are synchronous. Wadden said that the trigger would be that when more than 50% of the course is delivered this way, then it becomes DL. Pace asked how the 50% would be measured. Wadden said that the current definition tends to focus on "seat time" rather than the use of technology in courses. Killien added that the whole concept of "meeting" now seems outmoded to her so that she is having a hard time applying this legislation to her situation. She thinks this would raise issues for implementation and how it will get through the Senate. How would she decide if she is offering a DL course? Buck responded that this has been a discussion topic over several years. The point of the legislation is that there is increasing pressure to move to DL format, but that at the same time there is a need for some type of oversight. Thus, he sees it as a way to legitimize DL course rather than hamper them.

Richard Stackman (Tacoma) raised an issue about Chapter 15 and localized campus autonomy regarding curriculum. Buck pointed out that course approval appears in the Operations Manual that is written by the Administration. Buck tried to anticipate ways in which tri-campus course approval might take place. All he wanted to say is that the DL process should be consistent with the traditional courses review, no matter what the campus. Wadden pointed out that this legislation is the first effort and it will probably require some fine tuning down the road. Stackman asked that there be a recognition of the differences between the three campuses. Wadden pointed out that the drafters thought about this as well as trying to recognize student concerns. Students wanted to know whether they are signing up for a DL or a traditional type of class. They want to know what they are getting into, and whether they have the personal technological resources. This also affects diversity. DL courses may not promote diversity because it tends to be an individualized approach.

Diaz said that maybe we should be talking about synchronous classes rather than seat time. That might be the better metaphor, although it then becomes tricky to assess the 50% threshold, as where someone uses asynchronous ways of teaching. He expressed concerns that students not be punished for their choices in pedagogy. He said he felt that this was a good first effort to address this change in teaching methods.

Stygall noted that she was on a taskforce within her department on this issue. She said that they realized that there were all kinds of approaches in her department, and felt that this legislation addressed most of the different situations that they encountered. She also noted how many courses were getting rubber stamp approval because no one knew what was going on, and felt that this legislation did a good job of addressing that lack of oversight. Diaz agreed, pointing out that oversight will generate additional information about new types of teaching. Wadden agreed – we can always revisit this issue as we get more information.

Killien asked a question about course approval, and noted how long it can take. Hypothetically, she asked at what point or with how much advance work would she need to seek course approvals. It depends. Her point is that it was difficult for her to determine when courses would need review. Buck also pointed out that there are not curriculum police, but that students are entitled to know what they are getting into and that their complaints might draw attention to particular situations.

Nancy Maizels (Group VII) raised a question about six versus twelve months in two different parts of the legislation. Her second question pertained to student expectations about their ability to get a degree through a DL experience. On the twelve month wording, it is the current wording for C courses which is being phased out and the current practice is six months and the new DL would be six months. So the point is that c-prefix would be phased out. As to the second question, students need to inform themselves about graduation requirements. Will courses disappear out from under them, she asked. Wadden said that first, students know that there is a residency requirement and that he would characterize these as departmental issues rather than FCAS review issues. Pace said that he agreed that we need truth in advertising but he still feared that there is a bias against distance learning classes. Christina Emerick (Chair, University Relations) said she felt the point of this legislation is to legitimate these courses with some type of review. At this point, Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty pointed out that in the legislative process, at some point deference has to be given to the colleagues who were trusted with trying to codify a difficult issue.

Then, the question was called. Vote: Yes: 4 No: 3 Abstain: 1

Information

None.

New Business

None.

Approval of 25 October 2001 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Approved.

Adjournment

Adjourned at 4:41 pm.

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

APPROVED BY: Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate