

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**142 Gerberding Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Monday, 24 February 2003**

**Present:** Senate Chair Silberstein and; Vice Chair Wadden; Interim President Huntsman, Group Representatives, Cummings (I), Pace (II), Heath (III) Rorabaugh (IV), Nolen (V), Janssen (VI), Johnson (VII), Scheuer (VII); Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Sjåvik,; Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS), Buck (FCEO), Carline (FCIQ), , O'Neill (FCFA), Kiyak (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Seifer (FCUR); UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Interim Provost Thorud, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

**Absent:** Group Representatives,; Deputy Legislative Representative Stygall, UW Faculty Council Chairs Gillis-Bridges (FCET), Geoff Sauer (FCUL), Emerick (FCUR)\*, Meszaros (FCTCP)\*, Whittaker (FCRIB), Special Committee Chair Tom Colonnese (SPMFA), UW Bothell Representative Kubota, ASUW Representative Narvaez, 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 Agenda**

There is one revision to the agenda at item 13a. The date of the meeting should be corrected to read 13 March 2003. The agenda, as amended, is **approved**.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meeting on 13 January 2003, and the Faculty Senate meeting on 30 January 2003 were **approved**.

#### **Opening Remarks of the Chair – Sandra Silberstein**

Silberstein reported on deliberations regarding a salary plan in SCPB. This plan would not displace the *Faculty Code* provisions, but rather is a document that shapes a long-term faculty salary plan. It will be shared with the Board of Deans. Today, there were two points of agreement on this plan:

1. At the very least, the University has as its principle and goal not to fall behind our peers.
2. When the institution prepares "straw budgets," the "shalls" of the Faculty salary policy shall be built into the budget as an institutional commitment. In this way, salary will not be competing with other items as a budget is built.

This plan passed unanimously after a very constructive discussion in SCPB.

## **Report from the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President**

Huntsman focused on the high points of recent progress in Olympia. The Administration is pushing to make the tuition setting authority for non-residents and graduate/professional students permanent, and this bill is going forward. At the Regents' meeting last Friday, tuition levels were set for non-residents and graduate/professional school students. This is an advance since this gives notice to the students, although it may also draw attention to these numbers in the legislature. This is not a huge step, although it is fundamental, but it is important because it is a break in the pattern of the way we have set tuition.

Second, another bill that is going forward limits the amount of state subsidy provided to students who take over a maximum number of credits. The administration has been in favor of this bill. Basically, it provides that if a student takes additional credits beyond those needed to complete the degree, the state should not subsidize those extra credits.

The last front involves the budget. Recalling the Governor's "draconian" budget, he noted that the Senate has been using the Governor's budget as the foil. Applying the Governor's principles to the current "continuing" budget, they have proposed they go into effect immediately on March 1, rather than on July 1. There appear to be some measures in this bill that would protect higher education. That is important in terms of the symbolism as well as the cost savings. We are still getting positive reactions to our budget message. We are carefully watching other bills to make sure that there are not unintended consequences from some of the bills that have been introduced. Again, we continue to work with WSU. As we move forward, we are trying to determine whether this is a year in which we can only act defensively or whether this is a year that we could achieve real change, as some other states are. Colorado is a state that is making some universities public corporations. They are trying to gauge whether there is enough of a crisis mentality to engage in discussions about real change. Although some have advocated "privatizing" the University, the Administration has not signed onto these conversations.

In closing, he noted that the presidential search continues, that admissions figures are remaining constant from last year, and that the capitol campaign is progressing.

### Questions/

1. One person asked why the limit on credit hours is good for the University. Huntsman explained that there is a fair prevalence of students taking more credits than the degree requires. They have tried to determine why this occurs. There are the "wanderers" as well as our best students pursuing double majors. We get a lot of pressure about over-enrollment and in effect, the need to ration the state subsidy. So the question is whether we will be allowed to manage this or whether the legislature will manage it for us. Huntsman believes that there should be some kind of rationale for how much subsidy a student gets. There is no argument that these students would be charged out of state tuition for the extra credits. The likely fall-out would be that students who go beyond some type of cutoff would have to pay a dramatically higher tuition for the extra credit hours. David Thorud, Interim Provost, noted that another way to characterize this is as an access problem. If these students stay beyond where they need to be in order to graduate, this denies a space to someone to enter. Using this argument may make it easier for students to understand why they need to move on.
2. Clark Pace (Group II): Is there any way to determine how many students need to do this because they do not receive enough information about programs? Huntsman said

this is a good question. Also, Thorud noted that about half of these students are in music and art. Susan Nolen added that based on her daughter's experience, some students do not know whether they make it into a program until after the end of their second year and sometimes need to begin over. Wadden added that there are also high numbers of transfer students. But that having been said, he added, a reasonable ceiling would address many of these problems and still leave time to obtain a minor.

### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Chair**

Wadden noted that the Regents approved the tuition plan on Friday. The Provost has appointed a committee, chaired by Dean Marsha Landholt, to develop a long-term strategy for graduate and professional school tuition. This would look at the structure of the tuition charged as well as residency issues. This would allow us to control the issue rather than have it controlled by the legislature.

Second, the SCPB has been discussing compensation. The goal in these discussions has been to develop a plan that addresses where we stand in relation to our peers. The committee will also discuss how this pertains to staff. The committee is getting up to speed to engage in the substantive discussions that will be taking place in April and May. Technology investments will be discussed this spring also.

### **Report on Legislative Affairs – Jan Sjøvik, Faculty Legislative Representative**

Today is the beginning of the seventh week of the session, or about 1/3rd of the way through. He and Gail Stygall have been working with their counterparts at other institutions as well as working with Dick Thompson and the student lobbyists. The message has been uniform: There is a need for funding for core functions. They have spoken with a large number of legislators, but are targeting members on the appropriations, ways and means, and higher education committees. They have been met with a great deal of good will by representatives of both parties. These legislators agree we are worthy of support, but at the same time regret that it is so difficult to do something for higher education. As Huntsman mentioned, there have been a flurry of bills, of varying degrees of import. It is still too early to forecast what will happen with the budget. His last comment was that the legislators are very interested in hearing from constituents, and once again urged faculty to write as constituents.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Nominated, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees ***with voting rights to be determined by the SEC***, for terms ending September 15, 2003:

#### A. Representatives of Associated Students of the University of Washington:

##### Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards  
Educational Outreach  
Educational Technology  
Faculty Affairs

Cammie Croft  
Elese Washines  
Jay Kealey  
Cammie Croft

---

|                                    |               |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Instructional Quality              | Cammie Croft  |
| Research                           | Sun Hahm      |
| Retirement, Insurance and Benefits | Oscar Rosales |
| Student Affairs                    | Cammie Croft  |
| Tri-Campus Policy                  | Luke Swinney  |
| University Facilities and Services | Else Washines |
| University Libraries               | Else Washines |
| University Relations               | Else Washines |

Special Committees:

|                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Minority Affairs | Ane Phillips      |
| Faculty Women    | Jenna Huntsberger |

**Approved** as listed.

### **Faculty Councils and Committees – Current Issues**

Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn called attention to the issues sheet. She asked for names for chairs and members for next year's councils.

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

**a. Special Committee on Faculty Council Organization** – Steve Buck, Chair (who co-chairs this committee with Ross Heath): Update on Progress

Buck began by explaining the background of this group and the three-part charge that they had received in the fall. He also called attention to the Progress Report and attachments that were sent to SEC members with their agendas. Asking that SEC members consider the entire report, he chose to highlight some of the issues that have developed in their discussions.

The main benefit of these councils is that this would allow for earlier consideration of issues in a joint setting. As they tried to create uniform characteristics for these councils, they realized that they would have to vary in some respects. Being composed of faculty and administration members, they would report to both the Faculty Senate and the Administration. Their structure and utilization of sub-committees would likely vary somewhat. It would be expected that relevant issues would be brought to these groups rather than creating alternative forums for discussion, and Councils would retain the authority they have in the *Faculty Code*. Only a change in the *Code* could change a council's function or operation.

There have also been discussions about how to move existing councils to a new form. It has become apparent that the transition may take longer than originally envisioned, even where it appears to be a relatively simple change. Size, efficiency, and purview have been issues that pop up across the board. A couple of councils have opined that they should not be changed, for example FCFA. On the other hand, FCUR, FCR, and the President's Diversity Council have begun to move. A big concern has been that, depending upon the number of stakeholders, the proposed councils could become too unwieldy.

Heath added that they picked one council that they thought would be easy to change - FCR. As they began to think about this, they realized that this is more complicated than expected. (See example in App. 2.)

Silberstein thanked Heath and Buck for all of their work. She pointed out that even though we have been moving slowly, there have been beneficial corollary effects. For example, SCMF and SCWF have been recognized as standing groups and are working with Rusty Barcelo's Diversity Committee. Also, there have been smaller initiatives; an example here is a jointly appointed Accountability Committee. Thus, there have been some real successes as a result of these discussions. As new issues have cropped up, there has been more willingness to work together at an earlier point. Finally, we have been setting up an experimental Undergraduate Council. One of the major issues we have discovered has been staffing. An example of this was negotiating staff coverage for the Accountability Committee where the Administration had requested that it be staffed by the Office of University Committees' recorders. It is a tribute to the staff in Senate office that they are so highly in demand. Vaughn will be working on a reasonable scheme for using staff resources.

#### Questions - Discussion/

1. Susan Nolen (Group V) asked a question about having one council for undergraduate education. This may be problematic at times because some councils, for example, instructional quality, address both graduate and undergraduate issues. Buck agreed and pointed out that the Graduate School stands outside of most of the Senate operations, and this makes it difficult to coordinate activities. This has caused problems for councils even in their current form of operation. But, they felt that there was a very real need for a council that focused on broad issues of undergraduate education, not just the ones identified in individual councils.
2. Thorud opined that we should continue to explore this and incrementally introduce these changes. At the same time, we should be committed to a continuing dialogue on this topic.
3. Michael Kalton (UW Tacoma) asked that the reform group think about how this would apply to the three-campus structure. It is the case that although Bothell and Tacoma became a campus, it is also the case that Seattle became "a campus" rather than "the" university. Given this evolution, there are some real questions about the assumptions that came with the one university model. An example he cited was the Undergraduate Council. In some ways, he suggested, these issues are campus specific with only a small smattering of issues that rise to a university level. In conclusion, he asked committee members to be conscious of this and to continue to consult faculty at Bothell and Tacoma.

#### **b. Faculty Council on Instructional Quality – Jan Carline, Chair: Recommendations for Use of Student Evaluations in Merit and Promotion Decisions**

Carline called attention to a document titled "Recommendations for Use of Student Evaluations in Merit and Promotion Decisions." This document arose out of a set of concerns that had been presented to the Senate leadership regarding misuse of the evaluations, particularly in personnel decisions. The Council considered the identified issues and also reviewed the literature on these topics. This topic came up at the last meeting of the SEC in the 2002-2003 year, and they have consulted with a wide range of people. His intent is to bring this forward for discussion. They would like this to be forwarded to the

Provost for distribution to deans, directors and chairs. It has already been posted on the Teaching website.

In the wide-ranging discussion that followed, everyone agreed that these guidelines had the potential to be useful. Two members of the committee were very concerned about the metrics that would be used for evaluation, and how the document would refer to the measures of teaching effectiveness. It was agreed that the document would be presented for final consideration at the next SEC meeting, and that the two committee members who raised concerns about the metrics would consult with Carline on the final wording of the document. It was also understood that this document, in its final form, would be advisory rather than binding on the administration. Huntsman suggested that this document, when finalized, be presented at an administrative workshop in the hopes of influencing department and unit chairs.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Policy Regarding Designation of Emeriti Faculty. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-34.B.10.

### **Presented by Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs – Kate O'Neill, Chair**

O'Neill explained that although this comes from FCFA, it also has the approval of FCRIB. The genesis of this was a discrepancy between the Washington Code and the *Faculty Code*. The state code lists retirement age as 65, while the *Faculty Code* makes retirement possible at 62. This legislation closes the gap between the two pieces of legislation; thus, this is only a technical clean-up. The point of doing this is to make people who retire at 62 eligible to receive emeritus status. This can affect parking pass status, or the ability to be listed as a principal investigator on a grant. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chair, Special Comm. on Faculty Women) noted that Steve Olswang also vetted this. Sarena Seifer (Co-Chair, FCUR) asked about research faculty in other plans, and O'Neill pointed to the language "another State of Washington retirement plan." Buck asked about the meaning of "regular" faculty, and whether this covers lecturers. O'Neill pointed out that this does not affect other parts of the *Code* but only the technical meaning of "retired." William Rorabaugh (Group IV) asked why 10 years of service is required. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chair, SCFW) explained that there are other retirement plans, and some of these require certain numbers of years of service; this makes us congruent with those requirements. Vaughn explained that the President has the right to grant this status to people who do not meet this requirement.

Approved.

### **Announcements**

1. There will be a Faculty Forum on March 10. The subject is the presidential search.
2. The Senate office has received a substantial re-working of intellectual property policy. Two councils are looking at this, and we will be putting this on the web for faculty review. Silberstein encouraged colleagues to look at the policy.
3. There will be a Student Lobby Day on 27 February 2003. Instructors have discretion for how they treat student absences on that day.

**Information**

None.

**New Business**

The agenda for the 13 March 2003 Faculty Senate meeting was **approved**.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4: 29 p.m.

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