

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Regents Room – 301 Gerberding Hall
2:30 P.M., Monday, 13 January 2003

Present: Senate Chair Silberstein and; Vice Chair Wadden; Interim President Huntsman, Group Representatives, Cummings (I), Pace (II), Rorabaugh (IV), Nolen (V), Janssen (VI), Johnson (VII), Scheuer (VII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Sjävik,; Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS), Buck (FCEO), Carline (FCIO), , O'Neill (FCFA), Kiyak (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA), Fearn-Banks (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Emerick (FCUR), UW Bothell Representative Kubota, UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; ASUW Representative Narvaez, Special Committee Chairs Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Tom Colonnese (SPMFA) Interim Provost Thorud, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

Absent: Group Representatives, Lovell (VIII); Deputy Legislative Representative Stygall, UW Faculty Council Chairs Gillis-Bridges (FCET), Geoff Sauer (FCUL), Seifer (FCUR), Meszaros (FCTCP)*, Whittaker (FCRIB), GPSS Representative Nixon, Government Relations Representative Taricani

Guests: Cammie Croft, ASUW

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meeting of 18 November 2002 and the Faculty Senate meeting of 5 December 2002 were approved.

Opening Remarks – Sandra Silberstein, Chair

Because there are not many action items on the agenda, Silberstein announced that she would like to use this meeting to begin discussion of the faculty policy regarding the budget.

Report of the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President

Focusing on the legislative session that starts today, Huntsman stated that he believes that we have hit on a successful strategy that highlights a partnership with the Cougars in which both parties target the impact of budget cuts on students and the quality of their education. That campaign has continued in earnest. All of the indicators suggest that this campaign is having a good effect; we have not had "push back".. There have been two responses: "What can we do about it?" or "How can we help?" This leads to the management challenge of how to take advantage of the advocates that have emerged to support our position. All of this is "positioning." The encouragement that comes from this, however, is the positive press that has emerged, most notably the eight-day series in the *Post Intelligencer*. (Huntsman distributed packets with the *PI* articles and commentary.)

Huntsman expects a full legislative agenda, and this week he will appear twice before the legislature. There is a common Presidents' agenda that is much like the UW/WSU agenda.

There are some loose cannons; for example, some business leaders are pushing for complete autonomy. This, however, is not a substitute for budgetary support.

A very important part of this strategy is to put enrollments in play. To further this, the UW and WSU Regents met at the Apple Cup, and resolved to hold enrollments at current levels unless more funding for enrollment increases is provided. To do otherwise shelters the citizenry from the real cost and impact of current policies in funding higher education. The Legislature has four choices: find more money, choose consciously to do a dramatic cost shift to students, reduce enrollments or choose the continued slide into what the *PI* called "mediocrity." Given the decade-long avoidance of these issues, this is not a year in which the legislature can take a "pass."

His concern is that while we use the above approach in Olympia, the same language can be a source of discouragement for those at the University. He is hopeful that we can communicate internally that we are committed to sustaining the excellence of the institution and building on it. Together, faculty and staff have to convince taxpayers and donors of our quality and that we are worth supporting.

Questions/

1. Jan Sjøvik, Legislative Representative: Faculty legislative representatives met with Terry Teale last Friday from the Council of Presidents. At that time, the agenda discussions were still underway. Sjøvik queried whether the Presidents have arrived at a common agenda, and how it overlaps with the UW agenda. Huntsman replied that he thinks there is more agreement than Teale indicated; she had not quite heard from everyone at that time and he believes that there is a common platform; there has been general agreement from the start. He also characterized their agenda as essentially congruent with the UW/WSU agenda. Along those lines, this strategy utilizes the anxiety about the economy in the state to demonstrate the role that four year institutions, particularly the research universities, play in fueling the economy and being one of its "engines."

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) – Douglas Wadden, Chair

Wadden characterized SCPB discussions as moving into more details, and continuing to work in parallel with other University budget bodies. Topics under discussion have included admissions, tuition, and fees. We know that enrollment will be controlled. The "direct transfer" agreement with the community colleges was recently "discovered" after fourteen years, and there is now a plan underway to conduct discussions regarding this as well as to limit enrollments generally. SCPB is also discussing how the tuition increases can be applied. Another topic has been the Evans/Gardner initiative that would increase funding for the capital budget. Finally, obviously, a big topic of discussion has been the Governor's budget proposal. The current picture is one of no salary increase, budget cuts and increased costs to employees for health care costs. But this is still an early point in the budget discussions. Today, the Committee began discussing what could be a possible framework for an approach to funding salary policies over the long run.

The discussion of compensation was turned over to Sandra Silberstein, who has worked with Phil Hoffman, Director, Office of Institutional Studies, to develop some models for discussion of faculty salaries. This modeling helps us to understand what trade-offs we will have to discuss. First, Silberstein distributed a table titled "What Will It Take to Catch-up?" This

table is based on the benchmark established by the HEC Board (the 75th percentile of our HECB peers). The point of this document is to help us to do a scaling exercise in which we can determine how different percentage salary increases move us forward or drop us further behind as compared to a variety of possible increases at our peer institutions. Silberstein indicated that the actual numbers needed to be confirmed. [The correct numbers appear in these minutes.] Our sense currently is that it would take six years of increases at the 5% level to bring us up to the benchmark.

Next, Silberstein displayed a chart with different salary proposal scenarios:

- pulling forward to our peers (5% per year over six years)
- a midway scenario
- the status quo (3% per year over six years)
- falling behind (2% per year over six years)

The last scenario is what will occur if the current minimum salary policy is applied. The data predicts an 18.9% gap. Ironically, she noted, it doesn't take much to either go forward or fall behind.

The questions that we need to discuss are:

- (1) If there is additional money, how should it be distributed over time among the "shalls" and the "mays" of the *Faculty Code* salary policy in Chapter 24?
- (2) If we are deciding among goals, how should we be thinking about that as an institution? For example, should we say that that the 5% scenario is pie in the sky and thus unattainable or should we base it on revenues we know that we will have? On what basis should we begin a discussion that shapes long-term scenarios? What values should we honor?

Discussion/

Kurt Johnson (Group VII) pointed out that peer institutions are not necessarily the place to begin the discussion given the cost of living in Seattle. Don Janssen (Group VI) asked for exactly where we are in the ranking at this time, and wondered additionally, who is below us. Wadden replied we are at 52% of the HEC Board comparison group. UCLA is at the top of the list. Additionally, sometimes the relevant peer group changes depending upon what type of comparison you are trying to make. Silberstein read a list of the universities that are above and below us.

Kate O'Neill (Chair, FCFA) queried what would happen to these salaries if the professional schools were pulled out, and Silberstein pointed out that this type of fine tuning is considered when unit-based adjustments are made. Wadden added that we have rankings and comparisons on a discipline-by-discipline basis that measures this in a more nuanced way. O'Neill was concerned that certain departments' salary problems are camouflaged by aggregate data, and Wadden agreed that this is true, especially as it applies to the compression that can occur in senior ranks. Carole Kubota (Bothell) has been looking at comparable salaries just across the three campuses, and has discovered that Bothell salaries are lower on average than any of the other two campuses. Second, she stated that it is not helpful to see that the average salary of the UW professor is \$75,000 since that is certainly not the case. Silberstein agreed, pointing out that this figure also reflects the

professional school salaries. She pointed out that we have listed median salaries on the Senate web site, and Kubota agreed that this is helpful. Kubota hoped that this information could be communicated to the press so that people will have a better understanding of the faculty salaries. Wadden noted that there is a big difference between the "average" and the "median" in some departments.

Silberstein asked whether we should have some preference between a unit-based adjustment approach versus trying to increase all salaries. Kate Cummings (Group I) pointed out that it is an important question and that the differing approaches have a synergistic effect. But, she continued, these choices can also have consequences for retention and recruiting. Thus, you could bring someone into a totally dispirited department. Sue Nolen (Group V) followed on this point to note that this is more than a morale question – new people are not comparing average salaries but real-time job offers that they currently hold as well as the Seattle cost of living. Tom Colonnese (Chair, SCMF) pointed out that this also becomes a *moral* issue to point out what the real salary situation is, and that this can be at cross purpose with recruiting the best people. Johnson (Group VII) pointed out that there needs to be some type of effort to bring everyone up noting his colleagues rebel when they talk about differential merit in this situation.

Silberstein asked that people continue to communicate any ideas that they have regarding these proposals.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Jan Sjøvik, Legislative Representative

Sjøvik began his discussion by describing the work of the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) which includes the legislative reps from each four-year college. The group tries, whenever possible, to speak with one voice. The legislative representatives' first duty, however, is to the University of Washington. The unity of CFR, however, can help us to achieve our UW goals. He and Gail Stygall, Deputy Legislative Representative, also work with Dick Thompson, the administrative legislative representative. He recommended www.wa.leg.gov as an excellent website for following legislative activity. Faculty can receive information on the UW account but cannot lobby legislators using UW equipment.

Their chief message this year is the old message of quality and access. The next big budget step will be the Senate's budget proposal; then, there will be one from the House. It is highly likely that there will be substantial differences between the two houses of the legislature given the differences in their political composition.

Questions/

1. Kate O'Neill (Chair, FCFA) asked why the *Post Intelligencer* has suddenly developed such a keen interest in the plight of the four-year colleges and universities. Huntsman replied that he thinks one of the causative events was a meeting in October attended by McCormick, the WSU President, and former Governors Evans and Gardner.

Nominations and Appointments

None.

Faculty Councils and Committees – Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

Vaughn distributed a chart that summarized the current issues before each Council.

Silberstein asked about student learning objectives and Jan Carline (Chair, FCIO) reported that his Council has begun investigation of this issue. Kubota asked what A/B salary means. Wadden explained that this is a policy, crudely put, in which individual faculty and units can arrive at an agreement, retaining teaching and tenure, to move from a 100% tenure down to a lower number. This allows affected faculty to retain the state portion of their salary at the same level and increase their salary by generating funds from grants. For example, one could reduce the appoint to 80% and then raise their salary another 20% based on grant income. It is used principally in the health sciences and other grant-based fields. Huntsman explained that the rationale for this policy is that those faculty who have stable funding sources can use grant money to move their salary to market level. The faculty member still has to provide the same level of services. If your grants fail, you lose that part of your salary. The rationale is a product of desperate times and it allows those who have access to these funds to take advantage of them while working very hard. This issue is under exploration by the FCFA and the Board of Deans.

Reports from Councils and Committees

- a. Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs – Tom Colonese, Chair

Action: Seeks approval of Proposed Revision to Committee Charge

Building on the document given to support this proposal, Colonese explained that this change in the charge is to adjust to recommendations in the Rose Report as well as changes in the campus climate. The committee feels that this will allow the committee to do better work.

The prior charge, approved in January 1983 states:

The Committee work(s) with the central University administration officers in monitoring the status of minority faculty, propose(s) to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs measures as appropriate to ensure equitable treatment of minority faculty on campus, act(s) as a consultative body on minority faculty affairs for the Senate Executive Committee, the Tenure and Grievance Committees, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, and the University administration on all matters relating to minority faculty.

The proposed charge states:

BE IT RESOLVED that the mandate of the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs is to review the status of minority faculty and to propose measures to correct inequities by:

Providing a written annual report to the Faculty Senate containing statistical data on the status of minority faculty, including facts and trends in hiring, promotion and retention.

Proposing measures for improving the status of minority faculty, including employment issues, climate issues, and other issues and concerns that may arise.

Promoting equitable treatment of minority faculty by defining and implementing solutions, in its role as a consultative body to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. The chair of the Special Committee on Minority Affairs, or the chair's designee, shall continue to be a permanent member of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, and the chair, or the chair's designee, may represent the Committee on other Faculty Councils as appropriate to carry out the Committee's mandate.

Further, the Committee will serve as a group to advocate for a campus climate where any form of racial prejudice is absolutely not tolerated; and as a group that helps promote curricula that are focused on the study of racism.

Approved.

Announcements

1. For any member who has not done so, Silberstein asked for volunteers to write articles for University Week. Nancy Bradshaw maintains the list.
2. At this point, we are assuming that any legislation is coming in the spring. If there is any pending legislation, it needs to come as soon as possible so we aren't overworked in the spring. This also allows the Advisory Committee on the Code an opportunity to review all proposed legislation.

Information

Huntsman added a comment about salaries. He is concerned not just about faculty salaries, but about everyone's salaries: staff, faculty, and librarians. He acknowledged that we had already noted that this was an initial, partial discussion of one part of the salary problem. Nonetheless, his concern is that because we focus, here, on faculty salaries, and legitimately so, we might imply a lack of concern for other groups. This is a season in which we need to be conscious of perceptions and we want it understood that we are concerned about the salaries of everyone at the University.

New Business

- a. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda:

Asked to note that Chair candidates will make remarks. With this amendment, the agenda was approved.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate