

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
142 Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., 7 April 2003

Present: Senate Chair Silberstein; Group Representatives, Pace (II), Heath (III), Rorabaugh (IV), Nolen (V), Janssen (VI), Johnson (VII), Scheuer (VII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Sjävik; Deputy Legislative Representative Stygall; Faculty Council Chairs Buck (FCEO), Carline (FCIQ), Gillis-Bridges (FCET), Kiyak (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA), Meszaros (FCTCP), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Emerick (FCUR) UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Interim Provost Thorud, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

Absent: Interim President Huntsman*, Vice Chair Wadden*; Group Representatives, Cummings*, Lovell (VIII)*; UW Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS)*, Fearn-Banks (FCSA), O'Neill (FCFA),)*, Whittaker (FCRIB), Seifer (FCUR)*, Geoff Sauer (FCUL), Special Committee Tom Colonnese (SPMFA); UW Bothell Representative Kubota*, ASUW Representative Narvaez, GPSS Representative Nixon, Government Relations Representative Taricani

Guests: Steve Olswang, Vice Provost; Catherine Graubard (FCFA); Laura Newell (FCAS); Tim Washburn, Assoc. Vice President, Cammie Croft (ASUW)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:38 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

There will be several changes in the agenda. The changes are as follows:

- a. Item 12: Please amend this to read that the legislation is designated as "Class B" legislation and it is coming forward only from the Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
- b. Item 9a: The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality will not be bringing its report to the floor today.

Approved, as amended.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meeting on 24 February 2003, and the Senate meeting of 13 March 2003 were **approved**.

Opening Remarks of the Chair – Sandra Silberstein

[Because Doug Wadden, Chair of SCPB was unable to attend the meeting, Silberstein's remarks addressed both her report and Wadden's.]

Silberstein directed attention to a spreadsheet entitled "What Will It Take to Catch-Up?" (Attached to archived copy.) The purpose of this spreadsheet is to demonstrate what it will take for the University to catch up to its benchmark – the 75th percentile of our HEC Board

24 peers in allocating funds for faculty salaries. This document is helpful for measuring the differences between what appears in our budget and what our goals might be.

The second document that Silberstein asked the body to review is titled "Principles and Goals for Faculty Compensation." This policy was developed in the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, approved by the Board of Deans, and presented here for information. Silberstein reviewed the document, highlighting the objective, assumptions, principles and implementation listed in the document. She noted that she was particularly pleased that the implementation section requires that the "shall" categories of the current salary policy will appear in internal budgets as an institutional commitment, that is, part of the carry-forward budget. To aid in planning and informed decision making, this section also asks the Office of Planning and Budgeting to collect data each year, and make a "good-faith estimate of HECB 24 increases."

The third document Silberstein presented was titled "University Compensation Principle." It addresses support for staff compensation increases. Again, this has been approved by SCPB and the Board of Deans. It has also been reviewed by the librarians.

Questions/

1. In response to a question, Silberstein stated that she will present these documents to the Board of Regents.
2. Asuman Kiyak (Chair, FCR) expressed concerns that state policy makers might not view these policies in the same light as the Faculty. Because we do so well in terms of garnering research grants and maintaining overall quality, the state may not be inclined to give us salary increases. Thus, she asked Silberstein if this message will get through if we are not, as are K-12 teachers and social welfare, on the edge of desperation. Silberstein acknowledged these concerns, but also framed this as a question of audience. The document will certainly be used internally. At the same time, this community is responding to risk and has to explain the ways in which it will use resources. Clark Pace (Group II) agreed with Silberstein that raising the issue of "risk" is a good strategy. He wondered whether the legislative perception of us is the same as our own. This document, she noted, is not for presentation in Olympia but is an internal document. Kiyak reiterated her concerns that the Regents hear only good news; Silberstein disagreed, stating that she believes the Regents know exactly what is at risk. Provost Thorud added that similarly, the University has changed its message in Olympia to one of per student funding rather than asking for funds for discrete categories of spending. He also noted that this was the first time in his twenty-two years at the University that the Deans and the Senate have come together in agreement on principles. The policy states what our priorities are, and noted that the 2 percent increase has already been built into the first straw budget. This means that, given what we see coming, there will be some budget cuts and, as Silberstein described them, "difficult conversations."

Report from the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President [David Thorud made remarks on behalf of the President.]

Noting first that while President Huntsman has spent a great deal of time in Olympia, he has also been busy on the development side. That said, the State Senate has now approved a budget that was much worse than the Governor's budget, and would require a 5 percent cut. We have been told that there will be a budget in the coming week, but people are now concerned that the House will not be able to adopt a budget. If Rep. Somers can get out a

budget, we believe that it will be more favorable to higher education than the Senate budget. Based on these emerging budgets, preparation of straw budgets has begun. The plan is to go to the Regents on 16 May with a straw budget and a final budget in June. This is conditioned on agreement of a final state budget. There will now be numerous internal conversations about preparation of budgets.

House Bill 1453 is now dead – this would have had an outside group telling us what courses we would accept from community colleges to meet our General Education requirements. He also announced that three Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) procedures have been initiated. Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn confirmed this, and both noted that this is the first time the full procedures have been used. She noted that numerous questions, not answered in the legislation, have already come up and that she plans to review the legislation this summer. Thorud agreed, suggesting that for some changes we need an “RCEP-lite.”

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

Silberstein, segueing from the Provost’s report, also noted that we have undertaken three RCEP procedures. As we implement these, we will be noting what revisions may be needed.

Other matters the committee discussed include administrative unit costs. Gary Quarforth has been helpful in compiling information about these costs. Today, the committee viewed the first straw budget and heard a presentation on indirect costs. All of these indicate a new level of transparency as we move forward in budget building.

Questions/:

1. Clark Pace (Group II) asked whether there is any format for how administrative expenses will be viewed. Silberstein said yes, that there is a format. The Board of Deans has asked that the deans provide each other with a breakdown of these costs to share with their colleagues.
2. Kurt Johnson (Group VII) asked how units are nominated for the RCEP process. Silberstein replied that this is done when the dean requests the process. This spring, it became apparent that we need to look at the way in which an RCEP process can be triggered. There is nothing in the legislation for changes which come from the bottom-up; it had assumed top-down changes. We need to think about what triggers it, and at what point. Vice Provost Olswang added that the elimination of a degree track has been the trigger in all of these cases.

Report from the Legislative Representatives – Gail Stygall, Deputy Legislative Representative

At this point, Stygall and Jan Sjøvik have seen over 100 legislators, and presented testimony on a wide variety of bills. Today, Stygall passed out the first faculty profiles that they have prepared. Most of the hearings today focused on “sin” taxes, and there is also some discussion about temporarily raising the sales tax. She is hopeful that there will be a House budget given the nature of the Senate budget.

Bill 1453, regarding articulation with the community colleges, has died. It would have set up outside committees to set general education requirements. They have been pleased that they have been able to bring faculty, as a group, to the attention of legislators as they consider bills that affect higher education. It has become clear that faculty are not at the table most of the time, and we need to be, so one task is to increase visibility. One suggestion she has is that Faculty Councils invite legislators to their meetings. She suggested that Academic Standards ask the chairs of Senate and House higher education committees; Rep. Dunshee for Facilities, and for accountability, it would be good to invite key legislators to meet with the Council on Instructional Quality.

Most legislators have been fairly friendly, and express some type of connection with higher education. Stygall described one interaction she had with one legislator who was somewhat skeptical about the work of faculty. We are probably the only social program that the Republicans are inclined to support. She believes we will see a budget from the House. She and Sjøvik may be asking members to make their views known to legislators.

Nominations and Appointments

Moved, that Gail Stygall (English, Group I) be nominated as Faculty Legislative Representative for a one year term during the 2003-2004 academic year at the Senate meeting. **Approved.**

Faculty Councils and Committees – Current Issues

Omitted.

Reports from Councils and Committees

a. Faculty Council on Academic Standards: The Council presented a recommendation regarding questions for the Decennial Report. This item is presented for information only, and arises out of meetings with Dean Bridges, Chair Silberstein and the expression of concerns from Regent Gates. Donald Janssen, presenting for the Council, directed attention to Exhibit C. The rationale for this is to locate disparate parts of the decennial study questions regarding teaching in one place, and give more prominence to teaching in the decennial report. These questions will go to the Regents and various academic offices.

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

Approved, pending approval of the Code Advisory Committee.

Class B Legislation – First Consideration. Award of Honors for All Three Campuses. Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, Section 3: Grades, Honors and Scholarship. Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Tim Washburn explained the legislation. Basically, this is a recommendation that the Senate add three more Presidential medals to the one that already exists. These three would be one each for Bothell, Tacoma, and the outstanding transfer student. Over the last several years, it has become increasingly difficult to select *the* most outstanding student. In the past, the selection committee tended to favor those students who had been at the

University for all four years. But with more transfer and Running Start students, this seemed unfair. This legislation allows us to recognize a wider range of excellence. As this discussion began, it became apparent that the Bothell and Tacoma campuses would like a local award of honors.

Discussion/

1. Clark Pace (Group II) asked whether having four medals is a way of saying there are four different programs. He suggested that perhaps we should find different criteria of excellence, and that this plan admits that there are differences between these students. Steve Buck (Chair, FCEO) said that another side of it is that it does not say where these students have to come from – that in fact, the categories will overlap. The same student could be eligible for several of these awards.
2. Jack Meszaros (Bothell) suggested that this may not be the most recent version of the legislation. Donald Janssen (Group VI) noted that a last version was approved on Friday, 4 April 2003.
3. William Rorabaugh (Group IV) raised concerns about students who attend other colleges than the University of Washington.
4. Vice Provost Olswang said he had serious concerns about this legislation. The President approved separate honors for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses as an executive order.

Moved, and approved: tabled to the next meeting.

Note: Later in the meeting, a motion was made and **approved** to remove this legislation from the table because the latest version of the legislation was now available. The discussion continued:

Tina Emerick (Chair, FCUR) said that she understands the rationale but does not agree with the need for a second medal. Instead, we should change the way in which the person is selected, and that she fears multiple medals will dilute the message. Two President's medals do not make sense but a Chancellors' medal does. Rorabaugh asked about the requirements for university honors. Washburn explained that one must qualify as summa cum laude to be eligible. Thus, it is the case that parts i and ii of the legislation are more restrictive than part iii. Washburn agreed that these medals are for specific populations, albeit large populations. Rorabaugh was concerned that students who do not meet these criteria would be eliminated from consideration. Laura Newell, Chair of the FCAS subcommittee that drafted the legislation, addressed the argument about the legislation creating "second class citizens." She explained that we get excellent students from the community colleges. When the grade point is calculated, however, we consider only University of Washington credits. One year, 80 percent of the candidates were from community colleges. This is because the difference between those students who spend their first two years at the University and the fact that those first two years are not considered for transfer students. Consequently, you can make a mistake as a transfer student and it will not affect your record; this would not be true for someone who took all four years in Seattle. Thus, it became a comparison between apples and oranges.

Kurt Johnson (Group VII) asked why we cannot calculate and consider the community college grade point as we do when they are admitted. Newell said the committee

considered this but felt that it might introduce inequities that come from the wide range of community colleges throughout the state. Pace noted that these discrepancies apply as between departments at the University. Newell responded that the candidates come from every department on campus; it is not an award for certain departments – it is very representative. Every department has a top student, and they make it into the pool. Janssen pointed out that while graduate admissions picks several students; this selects only one student. Ross Heath (Group III) suggested that we name the transfer award the Provost's Medal. Newell said that this had been considered also. They rejected this because they did not want it to seem a secondary medal.

Rorabaugh asked why the legislation confined its requirements to Washington community colleges. Washburn stated that this was a way to publicly recognize the contributions of community colleges. Olswang stated that this is the only group of colleges with which we have a formal articulation agreement which specifies admission requirements. This is a relationship that deserves an award. Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges (Chair, FCET) disagreed, stating that this recognizes a student rather than a relationship. Stygall commented that the rationale is clear to her after being in Olympia; the formality of the relationship is pretty important to people in Olympia. Legislators think that we do not think much of our transfer students. This is an important relationship, and this is a state university in a state system. Rorabaugh commented that one way to deal with the 10 percent problem of transfer students from other colleges is to substitute A for section i. Vaughn pointed out that students who transfer need to be aware that there may be downside consequences to transferring, and that it is important to recognize fidelity to the state system. Pace was concerned that it differentiates between transfer and four-year students, and Olswang disagreed. The distinction, said Pace, is that there is something different. Newell pointed out that if we do not make this change, we will never have a transfer student who will win this medal because they do not have the variety of courses taken compared to students who are here for four years. The decision is based on more than GPA because the committee is looking at what students have done, and a student who has been here for two years cannot compile a record that compares to a record compiled over four years. Pace thought this would be the same for departments but Newell and Janssen disagreed, having sat on the committee. Olswang pointed out that the only way to satisfy Pace is to specify the last two years. He also asked how this affects the Chancellor's Medal. This allows Bothell and Tacoma to finalize their criteria. Tacoma will call theirs the Chancellor's medal; Bothell's designation is still under discussion.

Vote: Yes: 6 No: 2 Abstention: 1 **Passes.**

Class A Legislation – First Consideration. Title: Provisions Relating to Voting and Elections – Electronic Initiative. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-34.B.9. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs unanimously recommends that this legislation be forwarded to the Senate. Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn made a presentation that highlighted the rationale presented in her memo for this legislation. (Attached to archived copy)

Discussion/

Donald Janssen raised concerns about confidentiality. Olswang replied that there are questions about what "secret" means. Under state law, there is virtually nothing that is "secret." E-mail could be disclosed under state law because it is a public record. State law

also says that any action by a public body is a public record; theoretically, someone could ask Catalyst for data on ballots. The systems are in place to protect anonymity, but the University cannot contravene the law. Similarly, members of the public could get the paper ballots to see if your name is on it. He ended his comments by stating that the administration supports this legislation.

Kurt Johnson asked whether Catalyst can insure that no one votes more than once, and whether Catalyst can guarantee some level of confidentiality. Vaughn responded that the most recent opinion of the Attorney General's office stated that under the Open Meetings Act, we would probably have to have an open public meeting when the votes are finally tallied to comply with the law. At this point, Olswang suggested that maybe the word "secret" should be removed and substituted with the word "confidential" at 22-47b. This was **moved, and approved.**

Another line of comments concerned the effect of this legislation on departments and the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Vaughn explained that both the Bothell and Tacoma votes come through the Faculty Senate offices both for legislation and for Senate elections. When Janssen expressed concerns that departments might adopt electronic voting, Vaughn pointed out that e-mail voting is already authorized at the departmental level in the *Code*. Vaughn also assured the body that there will be a demonstration project. Finally, Emerick suggested that someone from Catalyst be present at the Senate meeting.

Approved.

Announcements

1. The Accreditation Committee will be on campus 9-11 April 2003. There will be a forum at 3:00 pm on Wednesday for faculty to attend.
2. 23 April 03 has been set aside as the Day of Reflection for the war in Iraq. Until 2:30 p.m., people are encouraged to discuss the issue in their classes. From 2:30 to 6:00 p.m., there will be a series of workshops and colloquia. More information is available through the Undergraduate Education Office.

Information

None.

Approval of the Senate Agenda

Approved.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

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