

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**7 October 2002**  
**Gerberding Hall, Room 142, 2:30 p.m.**

**Present:** Senate Chair Silberstein and President McCormick; Vice Chair Wadden; Group Representatives Cummings (I), Pace (II), Ghirso (III), Rorabaugh (IV), Nolen (V), Janssen (VI), Scheuer (VII), Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Sjävik; Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS), Buck (FCEO), O'Neill (FCFA), Kiyak (FCR), Bliquez (for Whittaker) (FCRIB), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Seifer (Co Chair FCUR), UW Bothell Representative Kubota, UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; GPSS Representative Nixon, ASUW Representative Narvaez, Special Committee Chairs Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Tom Colonnese (SPMFA), Provost Huntsman, Assistant to the President Niccolls.

**Absent:** Group Representative Johnson (VII)\*; Deputy Legislative Representative Stygall, UW Faculty Council Chairs Carline (FCIQ), Schwartz (Co-Chair FCSA), Whittaker (FCRIB)\* Emerick (Co-Chair FCUR)\*, Meszaros (FCTCP)\*, Government Relations Representative Taricani

**Guests:** Professor and Dean Emeritus Norman Rose

The meeting began at 2:39 p.m. It was called to order at 2:41 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda**

Before approval of the agenda, members of the Committee introduced themselves as this was the first meeting of the academic year. Sandra Silberstein, Chair of the Faculty Senate, asked members to form a new agenda item 9 regarding the formation of a Working Group on Collective Bargaining. Approved, as amended.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meetings of 6 May 2002, and the Senate meetings of 2 May and 16 May 2002 were approved.

**Opening Remarks – Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate**

Silberstein began by asking committee members to read a document she posted on the overhead that had been written by a prior faculty senate chair. Noting that these were "difficult times," the documentary remarks addressed the issues of the budget, activating the faculty senate, the consultation process, and long term planning. She then revealed that these were the 1984 comments of Ted Blalock.

Silberstein, commenting on the document, noted how these four issues seem to be perennial. Additionally, she noted that all chairs characterize their year as a "year of consequence." Thus, the same consequential issues appear. The budget is under severe stress, calling for budget cuts at a time we seek to preserve quality, and faculty merit increases. On the second issue, she and the President have met to discuss ways to engage consultation, and Professor emeritus Norman Rose will present a new plan for structuring the Faculty Councils. Thus, people will need to "work harder" and bring their energies to these tasks and challenges.

## Announcements

Silberstein asked for volunteers to sign up to write University Week columns. We would like to have a column in every issue.

### Report of the President – Richard McCormick

President McCormick started with the same issues as Silberstein. He directed attention to a document entitled "Restoring the Core." (Copy attached to archived copy.) This is the document from which he will be working with constituent groups to present the budgetary position of the University. Given how far behind we are, this is a very streamlined request that focuses on the provision of funds for current enrollments. Page five shows the amount of slippage that has occurred in the last ten years in our relative state appropriation per FTE Student. This shortfall amounts to an average of \$2600 per year per student in funding. Characterizing this as "appalling," it has also led to large salary lags behind our peers (and noting parenthetically that many of these peers enjoy lower prices for housing). Therefore, our bottom line request is to close the gap in student funding.

How would we use these funds? The funds would be for obvious needs such as salaries, which will be at the top of the list. The Regents were emphatic that we should not take additional enrollments unless this shortfall or gap is addressed. This is stated at page two: "If, and only if, significant progress is made in the per-student funding situation of the University of Washington will be able to consider taking additional enrollments." Similar issues occur regarding capital investment. While new buildings would be nice, we need funds for maintaining what we already have.

As it pertains to salaries, the "U-shaped" graph at page six shows that improvement is possible; the early 1990s demonstrate this. But in the time after I-601, there has been a steady erosion in salaries.

These realities will call for shared governance as we face challenges. These challenges he enumerated as follows:

1. Cuts: How shall we take cuts? What kinds of cuts shall we make?
2. How shall we maintain the University's forward progress? There is very little funding available for the UIF program, for example. How should that program, or other innovations and initiatives, be funded?
3. How shall we fund salary increases on 1 July 2003, especially if there are further state budget cuts? How shall we balance this need with program cuts? What is the balance between program cuts and salary enhancement (that we must have)?

One of the things the Administration is doing is to make sure that everyone has complete information. The Administration is developing a webpage that will provide information and data to all members of the University Community. He is committed to making all requested information available, although this webpage is obviously an attempt to anticipate requests.

Finally, he commented on shared governance in light of the failure to provide salary increases. This summer, there were ongoing discussions about the decision not provide increases as well as the way in which that decision was reached. Brad Holt, former Chair, provided some guidelines for "living with the *Code* that we have." McCormick, who will share

Holt's comments later, sees his statement as a companion piece to the Rose Committee documents that will be discussed later.

Tomorrow, McCormick will present his annual address that will focus largely on the budget situation. In it, he will undertake to describe the challenges we face and the possible solutions we might pursue.

#### Questions and Answers/

1. Silberstein asked about the President's reference to programmatic cuts. Why not talk simply about "cuts" since the adjective "programmatic" suggests a decision has already been made? McCormick replied that this is not an attempt to limit the discussion, but to prepare people for the hard choices we face. There will be administrative cuts as well. In fact, these may well be deeper than cuts facing academic programs.
2. David Lovell (Group VIII) pointed out that it is not likely that the legislature will change its funding priorities, nor has the Governor really, in his opinion, defended public goods. What should our response be? McCormick agreed with Lovell's observations, and asked him to note how these points will be covered in his annual address.
3. Douglas Wadden, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, asked about page two of the budget document regarding salaries. It seemed to him that this focused on retention and recruitment rather salaries. McCormick asked Wadden for help in re-drafting the "third bullet" so that the proper balance between salaries, and recruitment and retention would be delineated.
4. Susan Nolen (Group V) asked when the webpage will be up, and she was told that it will be soon.

#### Report of the Senate Committee on Planning & Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Chair

The committee has already met twice. The subject of the first meeting was the residency requirement for undergraduate and graduate students. There is a widespread sense that the ease with which one can move from non-resident to resident status needs to be re-examined. Decisions about this policy will have many ramifications, i.e. graduate student waivers, "grandfathering" of current students, etc. Today's meeting focused on the budget calendar and planning for the coming year. The hope is that the Committee could be actively involved in the planning process rather than being reactive or merely a conduit for information.

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

Sjøvik will be working with Gail Stygall, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative. Rather than dwell on the multiple challenges, he chose to focus on some of our successes. For example, we were successful in passing a collective bargaining bill. The legislative representatives have tasks both here and in Olympia. In the past, they have worked as representatives of the University of Washington but they have also worked with the Council of Faculty Representatives in a cooperative manner.

But, their allegiance is always first to the University. He pledged to answer all questions from faculty, and asked people to e-mail him with any concerns.

---

## Nominations and Appointments

Approved, as listed and made from the floor.

- I. Nominate for appointment to the Conciliation Board: Margaret Fenn (Business, V) and Jean Kruzich (Social Work, VIII). These names will be forwarded to President McCormick, who will choose one person to serve on the Board.
- II. Nominate, for Senate appointment, Carolyn Plumb (Technical Communication, VI) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2003.
- III. Nominate, for Senate appointment, Jeffrey Schwartz, (Radiation Oncology) as co-chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2003.
- IV. Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2003 **with voting rights to be determined by the SEC (unless otherwise specified)**:
  - A. Representatives of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington:

### Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards----- Karen Liston  
 Educational Outreach----- Thomas Deardorff  
 Educational Technology ---- William Jordan  
 Faculty Affairs ----- Carol Green  
 Instructional Quality----- Susan E. Clark  
 Research ----- Jon Blake  
 Retirement, Insurance & Benefits Charles Chamberlin  
 Student Affairs----- Jill McKinstry  
 Tri-Campus Policy ----- Cynthia Fugate  
 University Facilities & Services Elaine Jennerich  
 University Libraries ----- Joyce Ogburn  
 University Relations ----- Linda Whang

### Special Committees:

Minority Faculty Affairs	Cory Murata
Faculty Women	Suzanne Redalje

- B. Representatives from Retired Faculty:

### Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards----- Hazard Adams  
 Educational Outreach----- Norman Johnston  
 Educational Technology ----- Robert Albrecht  
 Instructional Quality----- J. Ray Bowen  
 Retirement, Insurance & Benefits Ernest Henley  
 Student Affairs----- Jack Hatlen  
 Tri-Campus Policy ----- Fred Campbell  
 University Facilities & Services --- Martha Fales



Faculty Council on Research:

Assistant Controller, Grant & Contract Accounting, Susan Camber  
Director, Grant & Contract Services, Carol Zuiches  
Associate 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:

Director, Student Financial Aid, S. Kay Lewis  
Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Enrique Morales  
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:

Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Bothell, Jane Decker  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Tacoma, Jack Nelson  
Vice Provost Steven Olswang

Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services:

Associate Vice President, Facilities Services, Jeraldine McCray  
Associate Vice President, Capital Projects, Richard Chapman  
Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, John Coulter  
Director, Capital & Space Planning, 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 Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick  
Director, McNair and Early Identification Program, Gabriel Gallardo

Vaughn indicated that every year at the first SEC meeting voting rights for ex officio council members are determined. Vaughn then explained last year's motion. At last year's meeting it was moved that each Council would make this determination for the following categories: Librarians (ALUW), GPSS, ASUW, PSO, and the Administration. The motion was then 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.

Nolen (Group V) moved to adopt last year's policy on non-faculty voting on councils.  
Approved.

#### Faculty Councils and Current Issues

Vaughn explained the process for submission of issues. An issue sheet will be presented at each meeting to further discussion and coordination of council business in the future.

Action Item: Working Group on Collective Bargaining – Silberstein, Chair

Silberstein first provided background on this issue, noting the passage of the collective bargaining bill last year. She asked the group whether they would approve a fact-finding group on this issue. The charge would be as follows:

This working group of 5-7 faculty members will investigate the implications of enabling legislation for the University of Washington. Information on collective bargaining will be collected, including data on the experience of other institutions of higher education; research by other organizations such as labor institutes, unions, boards of regents; and any other information deemed relevant by the group.

Group members will be chosen to represent a range of perspectives, expertise, and home units across the University. The report will be due to the Senate Executive Committee at its first meeting in January 2003.

Upon receipt of this report, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) could decide what further action, if any, they might wish to take. Silberstein did not intend to make this a high profile group but rather to collect information. This report should anticipate common faculty questions.

Vote: Approved with one abstention.

Discussion Item: Rose Report on the Reorganization of Faculty Councils – Norman Rose, Professor and Dean Emeritus as well as Former Chair, Faculty Senate

Silberstein introduced Professor Rose, noting that his group began working when former Chair Brad Holt asked for an examination of the efficiency of Faculty Councils. Today's discussion will be largely informational and we will, at a later meeting, need to decide whether action should be taken. She also noted that we could have an additional meeting that would focus on this issue, if we so choose.

Rose thanked committee members for their contributions, and for their good will. He then explained how the committee proceeded in its work. While the committee did not address the participation of librarians, staff and students, their contributions would be important and they would be easy to integrate into the proposed structure. The issue became how to undertake shared governance in the most effective way, especially in trying times. He noted that shared governance is even more important in times of stress, as now. While good will cannot be legislated, it is important to design, in so far as possible, structures that will enhance desirable governance characteristics.

The group proposed that a new structure be substituted for our current one. New councils, grouped around various administrative functions, would be formed and co-chaired by a faculty member and an administrator. Another feature would be that the proposed councils would be matched with the "big subjects" that emanate from administrative structure, but that there would be smaller working groups, as needed, for discrete topics and issues. The goal would be to eliminate duplication of functions. For example, the University Budget Committee and the SCPB would both be abolished and replaced by one council of joint membership focused on the budget. The councils would provide advice and information to the SEC and the Administration. Also, it would be hoped that councils arranged in this way would encourage candid discussions and avoid surprise. For a more detailed look at how these councils might look, Rose directed attention to the chart that accompanied the report. Finally, he described the proposed amendment to Section 13-20 of the *University Handbook*.

#### Discussion:

Tom Colonnese (Chair, SCMF) asked the first question, seeking information about the placement of the SCMF. Rose said it would be placed in the Diversity Council. Colonnese wanted to be sure that any Diversity Committee would address the issues of minorities, not only of women. Rose added that the examples on the chart are not exhaustive. Additional work would be needed to make all sure all topical committees are folded into this recommendation. In response to an additional question, he pointed out that smaller working groups could either provide information or be actual working groups developing proposals. Provost Lee Huntsman wondered whether the group talked about timing – would the councils be permanent? What about the working groups – would they have some kind of timeline? Rose replied by providing the example of a hope that at some point we would not need a Diversity Committee. The Committee did not assign sunset dates to committees; this is a detail that would need to be worked out. Most of these would be permanent while working groups would serve on an "as needed" basis. Clark Pace (Group II), noting that he could not see where there was streamlining, asked how this proposed structure would be more effective. Rose pointed out that this will eliminate duplication and it will also become efficient if the Faculty and Administration view them as legitimate. Then there will be an interest in bringing up topics at the earliest point, rather than starting at a later and arguably more inefficient point. It should also be easier to recruit faculty for these councils.

Doug Wadden, Vice Chair, noted that Pace is asking the central question: What is the structure that will make the best use of people? Council performance varies widely. Currently, some committees, Administrative or Faculty, act in total isolation. Wadden believes that this arrangement would lead to more information sharing at an earlier point and enable all of us to make a more nimble response to issues. He pointed to his prior council, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, as an example. It has a variety of agendas that require different work patterns. Carol Kubota (Bothell) asked how this would accommodate the interests of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Rose pointed out that those interests are important, but that not all examples of campus overlaps were noted in the proposal.

Silberstein addressed the group regarding the problem of timing in regards to acting on the report. She pointed to the change in the academic calendar as an example of one that cannot move sequentially through councils. She anticipates both positive and negative reactions to this report.

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, spoke in support of the proposal. She especially lauded the proposed amendment to Sec. 13.20. Also, she stated that she had seen this type of shared governance work at other institutions. One advantage of this arrangement is that because different constituent groups work together, there is likely to be more "buy in" to proposed solutions.

Rose pointed to the example of the Undergraduate Council as another example. It could have two major working groups, one for lower level courses and another for upper level that might involve Bothell and Tacoma. Another person stated that he found the report convoluted because it collapsed too many issues into one. Also, he found the concept of co-chairs a dubious one, especially if personality difficulties emerge. He suggested that we create two or three joint councils as an experiment for two or three years and then study whether it should be enlarged. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chair, SCFW) asked how we might efficiently continue this discussion. Asuman Kiyak (Chair, FCR) noted that this was the first time that many of us have looked at this report and suggested that the first step be to take it back to councils for examination. Don Janssen (Group VI) agreed with Kiyak's suggestion, and that the council chairs would bring back comments back to the meeting.

Wadden stated that there are two levels of discussion, one regarding appointment and another regarding the structure. One assumption, which has not been addressed, is that many administrative committees are staffed currently by Faculty that are appointed by the Administration rather than the Senate. Part of the point of the new proposal is that the Faculty appointments to these proposed Councils would come from the Faculty rather than from the Administration. Also, the proposal requires contact with the administrative officials who are actually making the decision under consideration. Huntsman said that he has not made up his mind about this report, but that he does not want to lose sight of its premise: How can we best do our work, and how can we best convey information to the decision makers? This proposal does not change decision making authority but asks if there is a more efficient way to make our common decision-making work, and that this will be a worthy conversation.

Silberstein again asked about how to proceed. One way would be to use e-mail. Wadden suggested that we separate out the structure of the councils as opposed to the intention of the report. He suggested that we focus on the intention. The next SEC meeting is 18 November 2002. There seemed to be a consensus that an extra meeting should be held on 21 October at 3:00 p.m.

Information

None.

Review of Agenda for the Faculty Senate

The agenda was approved.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

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