

MINUTES of the SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Monday, 21 October 2002
220 Odegaard Undergraduate Library

Present: Senate Chair Silberstein and; Vice Chair Wadden; Group Representatives Janssen (VI), Scheuer (VII), Johnson (VII), Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Sjøvik; Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS), Buck (FCEO), Carline (FCIQ), Schwartz (FCSA), Kiyak (FCR), Brandt (for Whittaker) (FCRIB), Emerick (FCUR), UW Bothell Representative Kubota, UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; GPSS Representative Nixon, ASUW Representative Narvaez, Special Committee Chair Tom Colonnese (SPMFA)

Absent: President McCormick, Group Representatives, Cummings (I), Pace (II)*, Ghioso (III), Rorabaugh (IV)*, Nolen (V)*; Deputy Legislative Representative Stygall, UW Faculty Council Chairs O'Neill (FCFA)*, Whittaker (FCRIB)* Meszaros (FCTCP)* Schaufelberger (FCUFS)*, Seifer (FCUR), Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW)*, Provost Huntsman*, Assistant to the President Nicolls, Government Relations Representative Taricani

Guests: Dean, Emeritus, Norman Rose: Michael Laslett, SEIU Representative; James Gregory, History; Cammie Croft, ASUW

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. The agenda was amended to add discussion of the SEIU Local 925 (representing classified staff) proposal as item 2, and to change the status of the Discussion of the Rose Report from "Discussion" to "Discussion and Action Item" as item 3. These changes were approved.

Action Item: Approval of SEIU Local (Classified Staff) Proposal for Health Insurance and Prescription Drug Funding – Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate

Michael Laslett, from SEIU Local, was present to discuss and explain the proposal, which was posted on an overhead transparency. (See attachment for archived edition.) Sandra Silberstein reported that the SEIU had asked the faculty to endorse this proposal. She envisions that this proposal would be forwarded to the Senate on Thursday and then on to the administration, and it would also allow our legislative representatives to advocate for these positions in January. Laslett, explaining the proposal and the Prescription Drug Bill, pointed out that the University has been neutral regarding these issues so far. Although he does not ultimately expect the University to absorb the costs of increased health care, he characterized this as a "fight worth having." The SEIU has also approached other campus constituencies seeking their support. Patty Brandt (FCRIB) noted, as a process point, that this proposal had not been brought to the Council and that their involvement would have been desirable, especially since they have staff and student members. Moved, that the proposal be forwarded to the Senate for action as well as to the Faculty Council for Retirement, Insurance and Benefits for further input from the Council as this moves forward.

VOTE: Yes – 8 No – 0 Abstention – 0

Discussion and Action Item: The Rose Report (Continuation of discussion begun on 7 October 2002)

The discussion began with observations from Norm Rose. Looking at the most general aspect of the committee's work, he characterized it as focused on the nexus between the faculty and the administrators. It did not have to do with power and control vis a vis the administration, the Senate or the faculty; rather, this is basically about that nexus rather than proposing a change in the allocation of power. To that end, Rose distributed a handout that describes the nexus of which he speaks. This has to do with the characteristics of shared governance at the point the faculty and administrators come together to discuss issues of common concern.

Looking at this memo, Rose asked people to ignore, for a moment, whether there is a senate or a union or some other representative of the faculty. Instead, he asked people just to assume that faculty and administration need to discuss the items assigned to shared governance. Somewhere, those discussions have to take place. The Rose Report proposal suggests a framework for those conversations in which administrators with speaking authority would be present to discuss items of mutual concern. He supplemented this with an example of the kind of discussion he envisioned. Additionally, these discussions need to take place at a time when the input will be meaningful. Suppose, for example, that the administration were proposing a move to the semester system and that they had discussed this among themselves for three years. Then, assume that they presented a finalized proposal to the faculty for "comment." Would this be reasonable? Probably not. Similarly, item five in his memo suggests that either the administration or the faculty will have the ability to place items on the agenda without being vetoed by the other.

In thinking about this approach, the Committee was concerned about the best possible use of faculty time as a human resource issue. The idea here was very simple: it is not about power control, or changing the balance of power, but about having a structure that fosters cogent, focused discussion at an early point in the development of an issue or proposal. If the President or Provost were bought into this, he suggested, this might avoid some of the late hour discussions that currently take place. He then read from the President's Annual Address regarding the need for working shared governance.

Carole Kubota (Bothell), expressing general satisfaction with the proposal, and asked about the operation of this proposal as it pertained to the Bothell and Tacoma campus. Before addressing that, he called attention to the proposed amendment to Sec. 13-20 regarding the University as a community of scholars. The proposed first paragraph embraces the notions stated in the 1956 language and then builds on it from a contemporary perspective. He urged people to read this first paragraph carefully. Rose then addressed Kubota's concern, stating that he did not know how the faculty would address this difficult issue. Obviously, if Bothell and Tacoma faculty are placed on committees, it would increase the burden on them. But there might be ways to implement the principles that take account of that. Silberstein added that this concern will be addressed in Tri-Campus and in the Senate. She noted that this, in many ways, is not different than the current arrangement of Councils. Thus, under either approach, this remains an issue. Doug Wadden, Vice Chair, pointed out that some of these groups may meet only once a quarter, while working groups might be local with subgroups on the Bothell and Tacoma campus.

Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards, discussed this proposal at her council's most recent meeting and she summarized their observations and concerns. The membership felt that this would end duplication and lead to clearer accountability for

problem solving and policy development. It was hoped that this might lead to more faculty participation. Some of the concerns revolved around perceived power issues. The present situation developed from a tradition of shared governance and that the tradition was not very much in evidence. The question her council asked is whether the structure would change that. Might we end up back in the same place? Thus, some suggested that perhaps we use the current councils to take advantage of the current economic situation to create a commitment to governance without undertaking these changes. For example, there was a concern about dilution of faculty voice, concern about whether the size would be unwieldy, and whether there could be problems with the co-chair arrangement. She also wondered whether this would have other effects on administrative structure at the University.

Rose responded to this by noting that he had asked people, at the outset, to forget about the exact faculty organization. He understands that you cannot legislate good will, but that Sec. 13-20 represents an important set of principles for which it would be important to have buy-in from President McCormick on behalf of the administration. That would not be a guarantee against marginalization, but that at least there would be a record to which to point. The final tool in the Senate's arsenal is the creation of these kinds of common understandings of good faith.

Wadden noted that we have had these discussions about how this problem came about. He pointed out that there is a larger aspect to the administration than this captures. There are a number of bodies which undertake governance. Structural change is a quicker remedy to the shared governance problems than trying to change attitudes. Along these lines, Rose framed the interesting observation that we do not really interact with the Regents, although he stated that that is another issue entirely.

Asuman Kiyak, Chair, Faculty Council on Research, stated that the Vice Provost for Research, Craig Hogan, attended her meeting in addition to council members. She reported that the Research Advisory Board, the administrative parallel body, has not really done much lately and that a joint council might actually result in more activity. The basic structure proposed seemed to work to the Council. Another advantage that her council identified was that it keeps issues in front of the faculty rather than having it disappear into the administration.

Tina Emerick, Chair, Faculty Council on University Relations, endorsed this approach, noting that her council already tends to work in this fashion. Her Council has also focused on deficiencies on conversations within the University and how they take place. The joint councils would give everyone more information early on. One concern that surfaced was whether the Senate and its council cede any power by agreeing to this new arrangement. She expressed the hope that we would lose less than we would gain. We would get a pipeline to information much earlier and hopefully end our reactive position.

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, characterized this proposal as capturing the idea of "bargaining in good faith" that was first described in the National Labor Relations Act. In labor law, the duty to bargain in good faith means providing information at a timely point, sitting down with people with speaking authority and addressing issues of common concern (mandatory and permissive topics). Adoption of this ideal does not mean that we must be represented by a union, but rather is a recognition of the preconditions of meaningful discussions.

One person said that the shared working conversations have been very effective. Even if we do not win, this proposal would leave us more informed. It was also pointed out that

there are other loci of power as the Regents and the Legislature also affect how power is used on this campus so that this proposal will not address all of those concerns.

Steve Buck, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, said that his full council will discuss this soon although a sub-group has discussed it already. The good news is that his council feels, in part because of the problems that they deal with, that the sooner that they can get information and deal with the administration, the better. On the other hand, because of the interests of people on the council, i.e. technology vs. program issues, there are some concerns about how this difference would get worked out in practice. He pointed to the problems that the Council has had with distance learning issues. The Council has found it to be very satisfying for the faculty to work with the administration and guide how the proposals would be implemented. On the other hand, there was a negative experience where the administration presented legislation regarding distance learning and residency as a fait accompli and the Council was placed in a reactive role. This led to continued discussions where a compromise was reached that resulted in a better program, but they would have been better off to involve the Council from the beginning.

Donald Janssen (Group VI) asked how many councils have had difficulty getting information from the administration on the issues directly under their purview. Kiyak pointed to the indirect costs issue that the administration has traditionally kept "close to the vest." She suggested that there might be more of an obligation to share information where the power is equal. For example, at this point the administration deals with units directly on indirect costs and bypasses the Council. Kiyak also supported Buck's point made when he described the distance learning situation. The involvement and dialogue that took place between the faculty and the administration was very productive.

Wadden then brought the discussion back to the policy principles. He pointed out that you could have councils with the same subject matter but that all appointments would now be joint, and that this would be a huge difference in the status quo. It would end administration appointed committees that parallel faculty councils. This has often led to the faculty being placed in a reactive position. This policy makes it a mandated set of principles about information, input and faculty making their own appointments to councils co-equal to the administration. Here, the final document would have to be known to all rather than different documents from different sources, some of which the faculty may not see.

David Lovell (Group VIII) stated that his initial reaction to this proposal was that no one would be worried about this proposal because most decisions take place at a local level. Given this characterization, campus wide faculty input is modest.

Silberstein pointed out that this is another arm of the Faculty Code. She noted that she visits many existing College Councils every year and reminds those groups of the faculty's role in these discussions at the local level. This is independent of the Council structure but it is not independent of the Faculty Code.

Silberstein made a proposal regarding how we might move forward while being cognizant of the fact that there is a lot that we do not know. Displaying her proposal on the overhead, she suggested a new group that would extend the work of the committee that drafted "The Rose Report." It would develop three categories of proposal as follows:

This group will extend the work of the Special Committee on Faculty Council Organization appointed on November 13, 2001, and chaired by Professor and Dean Emeritus Norman Rose. Its work continues in the spirit of what has become known as "The Rose Report," by

further developing working proposals that will allow the Senate to refine interim proposals. Specifically, the task of this special committee is to develop three categories of proposal:

1. Understanding that different purviews may best be served by different structures, the committee would develop scenarios for relationships between the proposed University councils and existing Faculty Senate councils and standing special committees.
2. In an effort to create a trial period for University councils, a proposal should be developed for several (probably three) university councils.
3. A proposal should be developed to indicate how the remaining councils and standing special committees will operate during this trial period.

The committee report is due at the February SEC meeting.

She illustrated her proposal with examples of how we might go forward as it pertained to each of the three parts of her proposal. She noted that Steve Olswang should be added to the committee. Another person, George Bridges, could be placed on the committee given the centrality of undergraduate education. Tom Colonnese, Chair, Special Committee on Minority Faculty, pointed out that we still need to confront the appointment of councils without faculty consultation and the resources that provide some of the administrative councils with their power. He also noted how long it takes to understand some of the issues, and that the administration has the advantage in that they are more likely to be up to speed. It is those resources that often really represent the power. Buck added, similarly, that he wanted to see a commitment from the administration and to make sure that they are involved with this process as much as possible. Jan Carline, Chair, Faculty Council for Instructional Quality, however, pointed out that if this committee is too large, it may not produce results. Todd Scheuer (Group VII) said that this committee should have the same kind of structure we would the new proposed councils to have so there must be equal faculty and administrative representation. Wadden suggested, along these lines, that the committee could meet in smaller working groups on discrete issues. Also, special guests, such as George Bridges, could be invited as needed to these working groups or the larger committee. Emerick added that the representation of administrators on this group is important so that they buy-in to the proposal. Kubota added that there should be an administrator on this group from Bothell or Tacoma.

In the end, it was decided that a Bothell or Tacoma campus representative would be added and that the list originally proposed by Silberstein would be the minimum membership of the group.

VOTE: The proposal passed unanimously.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate