

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
19 November 2001
Gerberding Hall, Room 142, 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), Killien (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjøvik; Faculty Council Chairs Wadden (FCAS), Carline (FCIQ), Diaz (FCET), Emerick (FCUR), Haley (FCFA), Martin (FCRIB), Nelson (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), UW Bothell Representative Jacoby, UW Tacoma Representative Stackman, GPSS Representative Nixon, Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Provost Huntsman,

Absent: Faculty Council Chairs Buck (FCEO), Heath (FCR), Meszaros (FCTCP)*, Zick (FCUL), Assistant to the President Niccolls. Government Relations Representative Taricani, ASUW Representative You.

* = excused

Guest: Norman Arkans

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the 8 October 2001 Senate Executive Committee meeting and the Senate meeting of 25 October 2001 were approved.

Announcements

None.

Report of the President

Administrative officials, like others, are very concerned about the state budget; the latest forecast will be made tomorrow. But already, we know that it will be bad. Any budget will very likely call for cuts of state agency budgets, including the University. Agencies that report to the Governor have already been asked to cut their budgets by 15%. Some of the implications of planned budget cuts have not been good: release of prisoners, loss of health care benefits, etc. Higher education will have to compete in that environment. Thus, we have several options in the coming months:

1. Making the best case we can for our budget. Here, we will argue that we are one of the engines that fuels the economy in this state.

2. Reduction of student enrollment. This might be acceptable for Seattle but imposes harm on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, both of which need continued growth to be a success.
3. High Tuition/ High Financial Aid Model: Our current policy is regressive, benefiting middle and upper income families. A high tuition, high financial aid model will end this regressive feature of our budget.

Besides taking steps to retain our current level of funding, we need to increase other revenue streams. One key aspect is development. In November, the Regents and the Development Foundation Board will meet to declare that the University of Washington is in the quiet phase of a capital campaign with an ultimate goal of \$2 billion. This will be announced publicly when we have raised half of that amount. Counting began on 1 July 2000, and we will try to raise significant funds from major donors. The campaign will probably last seven years, possibly eight years.

Finally, the President touched on the TA strike situation which continues to revolve around the issue of exclusive recognition. Negotiations continue to take place, and the parties met on Friday to draft joint legislation for submission to the legislature in January. There is now a chance of passage given Democratic majorities in both houses.

Sandra Silberstein (Vice Chair) asked about the Governor's reluctance to touch reserves, and wondered if the Governor's position is still that the University will be "protected, but not exempted." McCormick's understanding is that this is still our status.

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

Silberstein did not have much to add to the President's report, reiterating that the budget forecast would be released tomorrow, at which time we will have more information about the deficit.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig deferred to Jan Sjøvik who reported on enabling legislation for faculty collective bargaining. On Friday, 16 November 2001, the Council of Faculty Representatives met in Bellingham. Newly elected Representative Linville met with the group, and she opined that this would be a legislature that will be open to enabling legislation *if* it helps the state do its work better. But, she added, most of the focus will be on transportation and other issues.

At this point, Sjøvik reviewed the Senate's four point Class C resolution regarding enabling legislation. Dick Ludwig, Lea Vaughn, Steve Olswang and Karen Kavanaugh have been meeting since the summer to work on a draft bill that is now close to completion. When it is completed, it will be placed on the Senate homepage. Additionally, we will seek support from other four year institutions. We are also hopeful that the administrations of these institutions will support the legislation. There is a piece of competing legislation that will, most likely, be introduced by the WFT. Our concern is that their bill, similar to their prior one, will not protect our tradition of shared governance, since they believe that our bill "overprotects" shared governance. Our goal is to get passage of our bill, or, at the very least, build awareness for the need for such a bill.

Report from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs – Chip Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Chip Haley reviewed the Council's progress towards legislation

enhancing the status of lecturers. Originally referred to this Council from the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, which had learned some very unfortunate things about the treatment of lecturers, a subcommittee has been meeting since last spring to understand the issues. Haley stated that he wanted input on the legislation, particularly from representatives of the Bothell and Tacoma campus who have no one on the subcommittee.

Stating that there is a lot of variation in the way that lecturers and senior lecturers are treated, he noted that the three lecturer issues are governance, promotion and hiring. The relationship of many lecturers to the University is ambiguous and hiring terms need to be clarified. Some suggestions are that the route to full time employment should be clearer, and that senior lecturers should receive three-year contracts rather than one-year contracts. As it pertains to promotion, the procedure needs to be clearer. The way in which these improvements should be implemented is not yet clear. We need clearer criteria to define senior lecturers. Also, one suggestion is that merit salary decisions for lecturers should not be reviewed by new assistant professors in the first three years of their appointments. Another suggestion is that lecturers should be eligible for awards, particularly teaching awards since that is their primary responsibility. Haley pointed out that many of the senior lecturers have admirable research records and have equally strong service records. Many of these people look better than assistant professors, although it may take them a longer period of time to produce equivalent amounts of scholarship. Another suggestion has been to develop a third, higher classification of lecturers beyond that of senior lecturer. Finally, another group of proposals would grant lecturers the right to serve on the senate and be chairs of Councils. Craig Allen (Group V) asked whether the committee would examine how or whether lecturers should move to the tenure track. Haley replied that there had not yet been conversations on this point, and he urged people to contact him via e-mail regarding this issue.

Nominations and Appointments

1. Nominations for Vice Chair: First, Holt outlined the procedure and timeline for nominating vice chair candidates. This year, Holt set up a committee of former Faculty Senate Chairs to seek candidates. They have recommended that Douglas Wadden (Art) be nominated. By motion, this nomination was approved.
2. Faculty Councils and Subcommittees: Holt referred the body to the agenda. We have to determine the voting status of PSO and ASUW members. By motion, the nominations, with the Councils to determine the voting status of these non-faculty members, was approved.

Nominations were:

- I. Cynthia Fugate as the representative of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) to the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (*voting rights left to the discretion of the council*) for a term ending September 15, 2002.
- II. Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees, *with voting rights left to the discretion of the council or committee*, for terms ending September 15, 2002:
 - A. Representatives of the Professional Staff Organization (PSO):

Faculty Councils: Academic Standard, Richard Simkins, Educational Outreach, Bruce Bennett, Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Marge Baylor, Student Affairs, Bruce

Bennett, University Facilities & Services, Denis Martynowych, University Libraries, Kirsten Spillum, University Relations, Anita Whitney

Special Committees: Faculty Women Karen Stromberg

B. Representatives of the Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW):

Faculty Councils: Academic Standards, Will Rasmussen, Educational Outreach, Anthony Rose, Educational Technology, Luke Nervig, Instructional Quality, Lindsay Graff, Research, Sharon Takhar, Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Nick Hamilton, Tri-Campus Policy, Kevin Futrell, University Facilities & Services, Tony Schulz, University Libraries, Eric Stride, University Relations, Jeff Anderson

Special Committees: Minority Faculty Affairs, Rita Gobran

Class B Action on Honorary Degrees – Christina Emerick, Faculty Council on University Relations

First, Holt reminded the body about the procedure for approving Class B legislation. He emphasized that this is the only chance that the SEC will have to review this legislation. After a motion that the legislation be sent to the Senate for its approval, Emerick was introduced to explain the background and rationale for the legislation.

Emerick explained that the University has not granted honorary degrees for quite a long time. Most major universities give honorary degrees to commencement speakers and other distinguished visitors. For many years, the President was the commencement speaker. But for the past several years, we have had distinguished commencement speakers. Additionally, the Regents have the statutory authority to grant honorary degrees with the caveat that these are not to be in exchange for donations, but rather a recognition of intellectual and creative achievement. The statute also recognizes a role for the faculty in this process, and the legislation tried to capture a meaningful faculty role.

This issue first came to the SEC two years ago, and the first proposal, in the view of the SEC, did not provide for meaningful faculty review. Emerick brought it before the body last year as a Class C resolution but the SEC asked that it be recast as Class B legislation. She noted the ways in which honorary degree recipients enhance the standing of the granting University. The Council has voted unanimously in favor of this legislation. If this is passed, FCUR will develop protocols for the review of nominations.

Discussion: Emerick, in response to a question, said that the public exercise committee deliberations are confidential because of the potential for embarrassment to everyone involved. Nancy Maizels (Group VII) pointed out that the legislative language was a little confusing because it speaks first of forwarding to the President, and then a recommendation to the Regents. The exact order was not exactly clear. Emerick pointed out that it was worded this way so that the President's office would have input at a meaningful time. Maizels then moved to amend by adding "With the concurrence of the President" and asked that "and to the Committee on Public Exercises" be deleted. In response, Emerick stated that the Committee on Public Exercises does play a significant role when multiple candidates are submitted. Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, explained the way in which the Committee on Public Exercises works when multiple candidates are submitted. Emerick agreed to Maizel's suggestions as a friendly amendment. Clark Pace (Group II) said that he

had difficulty with this proposal because "exceptional merit" is not defined in the legislation and this makes him nervous. Emerick pointed out that state statute and Code already forbid award of degrees in exchange for donations, and that last year's SEC did not want this type of language included. Richard Stackman (Tacoma) stated that this reminded him of our distance learning discussion in which we deferred defining distance learning at another point. Emerick noted that the Council can develop criteria and that these may depend upon the fields represented in a nomination pool. Allen (Group V) stated that he thought it was a terrific idea and that he has confidence in the Council to develop criteria and carry forward. Marcia Killien (Group VIII) noted that she is pleased with this version over last year's because it appears to now be de-coupled from commencement speakers. But, she is concerned about the role of the Committee on Public Exercises. Norm Arkan (Associate Vice President, and Chair, Committee on Public Exercises) explained that this committee, while primarily responsible for commencement, is responsible for all formal academic convocations. He gave, as an example, the appearance of Queen Elizabeth in the early 1980s at a formal academic convocation rather than at commencement. Similarly, we were asked to grant an honorary degree to Archbishop Desmond Tutu when he appeared at Seattle University last year. We did not have this legislation, but if we had, the Public Exercises Committee would have handled this.

William Wilcock (Group III) expressed concerns that it will appear awkward to grant only some commencement speakers a degree. Emerick noted, ironically, that last year's SEC was concerned that these degrees become automatic. Killien asked for clarification of the role of the committee on Public Exercises, noting that it is not clear whether it is part of the approval process. Maizels said that if this is part of the reality, it could be taken out. Arkans stated that he was comfortable in having that reference removed. Lee Huntsman, Provost, said that it was clear that it would be for informational purposes, and McCormick moved to eliminate the phrase. This was seconded and approved. Dan Jacoby (Bothell) asked about the effect of this proposal on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses because it appears that the Seattle campus would control this process. Emerick stated that they expect this to be a rare phenomenon but that she did not exclude those campuses awarding degrees. McCormick confirmed that this would not forbid the award of honorary degrees at Bothell or Tacoma.

Wadden, Chair, FCAS, stated that the honorary degree should not be linked to commencement as a principled matter; this would be cumbersome and bad. Vaughn suggested that FCUR be charged with developing a protocol that would address the concerns of Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Arkans, addressing the linkage issue, stated that it has been the policy so far that the commencement speaker should be of such a high quality that he or she would also be an obvious candidate for an honorary degree. But, he could envision a situation, say, where students have more input, that the speaker would be a popular or entertainment figure, in which case one would not want a linkage between the degree and the speaker. Arkans said, vis a vis Bothell and Tacoma, that they would still be free to choose their commencement speaker and this would set up a mechanism for review for an honorary degree. Holt, who noted he had objected to this process in the past, felt that this was a good compromise and a good procedure. Donald Janssen (Group VI) stated that he viewed this as, originally, advisory and then, giving the President a veto power. Emerick replied that they had considered the role of the President and that they had agreed that the President should have a significant role. Maizels stated that she did not view her motion, adding "concurrence," as connoting a veto power. Wilcock suggested "After consultation with" the President. This amendment was approved. The question was called, and the vote on the motion took place. Yes: 10 Opposed: 3

Class B Legislation on Undergraduate Admissions – Doug Wadden, Chair, FCAS

Holt explained that this legislation was proposed originally by Tim Washburn, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, and would be a change in granting more long term flexibility and doing some "housecleaning." Holt asked for a friendly amendment that would clarify the role of SCPB.

Wadden then provided background on the legislation. A group of people including Bradley Holt, Tim Washburn, Fred Campbell and others considered this legislation over a period of time. It would bring us into compliance with state law and much of it is housekeeping. But it does clarify, on an annual basis, the way in which we determine admissibility of students.

Reviewing the parts of the legislation, Wadden pointed out that Section 1 brings our general admissions policy up to date with existing legislation. Section 2 addresses which faculty group, FCAS, will provide faculty guidance into matters of policy. This would return to faculty their role in making admissions policy, and would involve FCAS in a number of complicated technical and procedural issues. The language tries to balance the types of advice that must be provided. Another goal during the drafting was to streamline the language and make clearer how policy is made as well as to build in flexibility. As an example, he noted that specific tests are now deleted in the language but FCAS has the flexibility to specify which test shall be used. The legislation also defines what kinds of supplemental information will be considered in the admissions process in addition to test scores and GPA. He also noted that we have never used a GPA of 2.0; this is a reflection of HEC Board policy. At page 5 of the draft is a substantive proposal that four years of math are now recommended for those preparing for majors in the sciences or engineering. There were not many changes made in the case of direct transfers. There is new language in Sec. 5 regarding geographical diversity.

In sum, these give us compliance with existing law and also give us added flexibility.

Discussion:

Gail Stygall (Group I) noted that the HEC Board permits admission of some students without test scores. Jacoby raised the issue of how this policy would affect the Bothell and Tacoma campus. Shifting consideration of enrollments from the SEC to the SCPB would affect both of those campuses, and raises some concerns. Huntsman said that SCPB would be addressing an operational question about balancing the mix. This is primarily a decision made by the Provost's Office and he has traditionally consulted SCPB on these issues. Direct transfers have not been an issue at this point; it has always been about freshman. So he reads this as a management balancing act that the Provost performs in consultation with SCPB but also with the Chancellors of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Jacoby replied that the campuses feel pretty vulnerable on this issue. Holt said he initially had some concerns but later realized it is operational. Jan Carline raised a question about sections 3C and 3D that have to do with denials of admission, and asked who will review these requests. Holt said that is currently done in Tim Washburn's office. Carline said that last year, faculty were involved in that process and he believes that they should continue to be involved. Wadden replied that FCAS develops the policy and the Office of Admissions develops the process for implementing the policy. Wadden said that FCAS could develop a standing subcommittee on this issue.

David Nixon (GPSS) stated that GPSS has been in favor of admission standards that stress diversity. Pointing to the additional personal factors, he asked how that is squared with an

"applicant is adequately prepared to complete a degree at the University of Washington." Wadden said that this concern is addressed and there will be shifting thresholds in terms of which files are read to locate students who may raise questions but, after a read of the file, will be a success as a freshman. Silberstein reiterated Nixon's question, stating that it appears that the rank ordering trumps on the basis of how these characteristics affect the ranking, noting that it is well known that socioeconomic background is often a large predictor of success. Wadden conceded that almost all factors developed to seek diversity can, in many circumstances, continue to favor the non-minority, non-disadvantaged applicant. But, he noted, we are still looking at a pool where all meet the pool requirements where the GPA is 2.75 or higher. Huntsman asked if the last sentence satisfies some of her concerns. Janssen pointed out that this specifies who is admitted based on ranked probabilities and then who is admitted based on a comprehensive review of the file. Stygall noted that you could change this based on shifting the automatic admit criteria. Wadden pointed out that some of these mechanisms are being used now and have been successful in creating a more diverse and capable student body. Carline asked if there was any way to strengthen the statement about additional factors. Holt said that Washburn's office worked carefully with FCAS and it was not clear if it would make a difference. Huntsman pointed out that this order reflects the sequence in which the actual decision is made.

Jacoby asked for a friendly amendment that would include consultation with faculty leadership at Bothell and Tacoma regarding the proportion of students (after consultation with SCPB language): "and faculty representatives from the Bothell and Tacoma campuses on their respective budget committees." Seconded. Silberstein suggested deletion of "on their respective budget committees." This was accepted as friendly amendment. Holt expressed his preference not to add this language because it is a piecemeal approach of handling Bothell and Tacoma issues and he would prefer a comprehensive approach, perhaps by changing representation on SCPB. Wadden said that while SEC would be more representative, the SCPB is more efficient on the allocation of the pools. Huntsman pointed out that so far, the Legislature has set the admissions goals for Bothell and Tacoma and that it has not been made by anyone on any campus.

Vote on the amendment: Yes: 1 No: 8 Abstain: 2

Allen asked whether this approach is going to be adopted by the graduate schools, and was told that this pertains solely to undergraduate admissions. Janssen (Group VI) pointed out that graduate admissions are done at the departmental level.

Vote on the Legislation, as amended: Yes: 10 No: 0 Abstain: 2

Class C Resolution on Institutional Responsibilities in Courses with Teaching Assistants – Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate

First, Holt reviewed the history of this proposal, noting the appointment this fall of a special committee to develop a report on this issue. His sense is that most of the SEC accepted the contents of this report, and it provided useful guidance. If this report, however, were to be given as a public statement, it might not enjoy a favorable reception. Since then, there have been many suggestions for how to adopt the report as a Class C resolution. Thus, there are a lot of things that can be discussed in terms of actual legislation. An alternative is to look at this policy as advice; another option is to adopt the entire report. Under Roberts' Rules, this would have the effect of adopting every single word of the report but it would stop at this point and would not need to try to reword it as a public statement.

Moved and seconded. Holt clarified that this would be a motion to adopt the report, all of it, as our statement. Stygall asked about how people, especially faculty, would learn about this report. Holt suggested that there are several ways to do this. It could be put up on our webpage. Silberstein pointed out that one advantage of adopting this report is that it provides background for any subsequent Class C resolution we might adopt. We could measure anything else we do at a later point by this report. Nixon (GPSS) asked if this would be forwarded to the Senate; Holt said no. Allen expressed concern that the Senate would feel cut out of a discussion of this issue. He wondered how this decision would be presented to the Senate. Holt said it would be reported as an action of the SEC. Then, if someone wanted to adopt a Class C resolution, that is always possible since it does not have to go through the SEC. McCormick said he thought that this approach would be fine. He expressed his concern that some of the language at the end of the report suggests some selfishness rather than concerns about students. McCormick suggested three paragraphs as a summary, and then attaching the report as a summary but that it may be impossible to come to language that is acceptable to everyone.

Maizels stated that she would feel, if she were a senator, that she had been excluded from a discussion. So while she could see the advantages of this approach, she believed there are disadvantages also. Maizels also agreed that some of the language is self-serving. Silberstein said that there are several issues here. One would be to alter the report. The President tried to do something that could be more easily shared with the public. We can have a full discussion of these options. We could accept the report and then decide how to operationalize it at another time. Or we could debate it now. Pace said that he did not find the language objectionable when it is read in its entire context, especially considering the language that acknowledges student's interests and that in this sense, the document did a fine job. Allen said that the benefit of the report is its educational value and learning from the deliberations about it. He is afraid that if we just adopt the report, we will lose this educational value. Wilcock said that the report did not really change any policies, and that a Class C policy, at this point, would be a public relations exercise. He suggested that we adopt the report and that we consider this issue at a later meeting. This would give us more time to consider the President's statement. Holt said adopting the report would express our agreement with the content of the report. Ludwig said that he could not understand how adopting the report and telling people that they can raise a Class C proposal is shutting off people. Maizels, on the other hand, could not see the point of adopting the report. Huntsman said that one of the powers reserved to the SEC is to interpret the Code and that adopting this report would have some of that weight. Holt said this point is well taken although he does not see this as an interpretation per se. Holt said that adopting the report does not foreclose the ability to adopt a Class C report at a later date. Killien pointed out that she is not ready to vote on the report, and that the language of the report is not necessarily accessible to faculty who have not been following this issue. Maizels moved to table, but this motion failed.

Pace suggested that upon accepting this report, we will then consider Class C legislation at a later point. Formally, he stated that he moves to adopt the principles in the Junker Report and believes that it provides useful guidance for policy, including the possible drafting of a Class C resolution.

Vote: Yes:11 No: 1 Abstain: 0

Information

None.

Approval of Agenda

After item no. 14 was struck, the agenda was approved.

Meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

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

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