

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Room 142, Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., Monday, 12 January 2004

Present: Senate Chair Wadden and Vice Chair Heath; Interim President Huntsman; Group Representatives, Pace (II), Swanson (III), Buck (IV), Gile (V), Tanimoto (VI), Scheuer (VII), Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS), Erdly (FCEO), O'Neill (FCFA), Kiyak (FCR), Schwartz and Pace (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Assistant to the President Niccolls, ASUW Representative Goodnight,

Absent: Group Representatives, Stecher-Hansen (I)*, Johnson (VII)*, UW Faculty Council Chairs Carline (FCIQ)*, Gillis-Bridges (FCET)*, Brandt (FCRIB)*, Killien (FCTCP)*, Martin (FCUL)*, Seifer (FCUR)*; UW Bothell Representative Krishnamurthy, Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, Acting Provost Thorud, GPSS Representative Harrison

Guest: Vice Provost Steven Olswang

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

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the 17 November 2003 Senate Executive Committee meeting and the 4 December 2003 Faculty Senate meeting were approved as amended.

Opening Remarks from the Chair – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate

Wadden began his remarks by commenting on the loss of Marsha Landholt, Dean of the Graduate School, and how greatly she will be missed. Her contribution to the Tuition Policy Committee was just one example of her tremendous service and a void that will be difficult to fill.

A group has been meeting regarding revisions to Chapter 26: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP), and Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, has prepared a draft of the revisions. The draft has been reviewed and will need to have some changes added to reflect the new Executive Order regarding Bothell and Tacoma's role. The thrust of the revisions is to develop a more flexible process that can be bottom up as well as top down, and provides for academic planning not just a response to financial emergency. The SEC will be reviewing this legislation this year.

Another forthcoming piece of legislation for the SEC will be to change Chair and Vice-Chair terms so that they begin on 1 July of each academic year and would allow for a smoother transition. A second structural change has come out of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. The SCPB has been discussing the formation of a President's Council and changing the way that budget discussions are held. This would lead to a change in the function of SCPB, with a suggestion that it be chaired by the past chair of the Senate. This would lead to a three-year commitment for people who become Senate chairs, and would be

a better use of the time of the Vice Chair in getting up to speed on these issues. There will also be a change regarding the designation of faculty deputy legislative representatives.

The Executive Order regarding tri-campus relationships has been out for discussion, and the President had agreed to grant more time for discussion of the order. At this point, "time's up" and we need to move forward on this issue. At the request of Michael Kalton (Tacoma), the final date for comments was extended to Friday, 16 January 2004.

Finally, Wadden noted that he has been asked repeatedly for the faculty position on athletics. He has monitored this issue, and he will probably make some type of statement in the spring. In the interim, all faculty need to do some homework on getting up to speed on this issue. There are a number of sensitive issues involved, and we should be careful, especially when talking to the press. There are many venues of activity on this issue. The ICA council has been expanded, with more faculty involved. Wadden met recently with Pete Dukes, Chair, ICA, and Asso. Vice President Norm Arkans. There is a coalition of faculty senates at other universities that are working with the NCAA to prepare a reform package; this effort has gained a fair amount of momentum. This group is also asking the Faculty Senate to review and support their recommendations. Some of this may work for us; other parts may not. He has explained our current position to the leadership of this group. Thus, we are about to thoughtfully engage these issues. He then turned the floor over to Lee Huntsman, President.

Comments from Lee Huntsman, President

President Huntsman's comments were direct, as he began by noting that "there's no question that we've had problems with ICA," and the investigation has been underway for some time. His approach will be to get at the facts systematically, and then make management decisions as the facts warrant. Along those lines, as to the reliability of the factual findings, he has been trying to chart a course between what is in the press, which is not necessarily reliable, and a legal standard of evidence. He is developing a solid, thoughtful approach to management of this situation.

He is taking action on a number of fronts. The "investigation" involves the Scheyer case. He has invited a consultant to review our compliance efforts and we have revisited the Memorandum of Understanding between the ICA and the Medical Center. There have been some suggested changes; that is not to say that the agreement is broken but rather to make it clear that medical decisions are made by medical people and they are held responsible for that; athletic people do not make medical decisions.

He is also trying to determine what the values of the athletic department culture are. While he has his own values about student athletes, he wants to make sure that the culture is solid and he additionally wants to determine how the faculty view student athletes. He has nearly completed the process of recruiting a former university president and a former athletic director to review our program. The NCAA re-certification process will be getting under way and there will be three committees as part of that process: compliance, finance and academic integrity.

With Barbara Hedge's resignation, Dick Thompson will take over as interim athletic director. Thompson is trying to make sure that fundamentals are addressed. A search committee will be formed soon. One of his goals is to "dial down" media attention to this issue, especially since this is only about two percent of what our students do.

Despite the difficult news, people have been rising to the challenge; donations to the program continue to be quite strong. He is determined to do it right, but at the same time, he wants to develop a more holistic picture of the program before acting. Thus, he was pleased that the press did report on the progress in the last decade on rising graduation rates for athletes and the overall balancing of the program across all types of sports.

Connecting this to the national picture, he noted that there has been a push for academic reform. There is a proposal for academic progress that would be measured on a term-by-term basis. This would lead to substantially increased rigor. A quiet revolution by presidents at leading institutions is emerging in which the presidents are taking charge of these programs and saying "enough is enough." This is especially true when it comes to post-season football. The really deep and difficult problems are the revenue sharing issues, not just the computer algorithms for national team selection. His read is that presidents and provosts are uniformly opposed to a national champion play-off system which they believe would distort the system.

In conclusion, he hopes that the review of the program will be conducted this winter or spring. Given the timing of the search for a new athletic director, this should be ideal timing.

Questions/

Clark Pace (Group II; Co-chair, FCSA) asked whether the consultants are looking at conformance with NCAA standards or whether they looking in terms of the three things the recertification process focuses on. Huntsman replied that there are three things going on simultaneously. The review would be for internal value. The NCAA compliance review is a formal audit of the compliance function. The re-certification process is a formal NCAA review that takes place every seven years. A University is given guidelines for conducting the review and sets up multiple committees for a self-study. The culmination of this process is the site visit by outside reviewers. The re-certification process takes about a year.

Jeffrey Schwartz (Co-chair, FCSA) asked about where and how the Faculty Senate would contribute. Huntsman answered that faculty involvement will be achieved in several ways. For a long time, there has been a faculty oversight committee which had fallen into dormancy; they have re-activated it. Their intention is that it be quite active. Faculty will be involved in the search committee for the new Athletic Director; in fact, he would like it chaired by an academic because while we need to give the external community a clear involvement, he also wants to make sure that the external constituency gets the message that they are not in charge. In the NCAA re-certification, the three committees will have heavy faculty involvement. There will be faculty fingerprints all over.

Wadden Remarks (continued)

The Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC) decision regarding the graduate student union has come down. The ruling, which could be characterized as unfavorable to the University's position on the unit, is that there will be another vote and the group includes readers, graders and mentors. There are large arrays of committees being created to deal with the issues that arise from these changes. Patti Carson, Vice President for Human Resources, plans to have these groups meeting in the next two weeks. Senate leadership met with Carson last week to express our interest in being engaged in this process. We have been asked to name faculty for negotiating teams, and we have suggested, for example, Robert Stacey (History) for one of the teams. There will be more

news about this. There are seven teams now that are a mix of faculty, administrators, professional staff and legal advice.

Noting that he has joined one of the teams, Wadden observed that this impacts labor relations with other categories of employees on campus. We are entering a whole new era in labor relations, and it will take some time to fully understand the nuances of the impact of the PERC decision. In response to a question about the inclusion of research assistants in the unit, Huntsman said the short answer is no, we do not know enough about this development yet. The original agreement for enabling legislation was for teaching assistants and as time went on, GSEAC added RA's. PERC heard an enormous amount of testimony and found that all RA's are entitled to be in the bargaining unit, contrary to our arguments about the evidence and the legislative intent. PERC also decided that there must be a vote, a decision which the union does not like. PERC sets the time table and runs the vote, probably in the next couple of months. Then, negotiations will start if they should win. One issue will be the differential stipends for RA's. The question is how will that work? There are different models in use around the country. So we do not know yet about how the inclusion of RA's will affect matters, and the election will not resolve these issues. If students want to be represented, he would prefer that representation not diminish our ability to attract top graduate students. The election will involve about 4000 students, and the election choices would be "no union" or "UAW." The PERC decision has set parameters for which students are in the voting unit; PERC has generally set a very low threshold on eligibility.

Vice Provost Steven Olswang elaborated on some of this. GSEAC has asked PERC to review whether an election is necessary and this may slow everything down. Wadden noted that in a conference call with Carson, they discussed what data base they will use to identify the affected students. It will be difficult to determine who is in the unit. Olswang added that everyone can vote and then there can be challenges. Huntsman added that we will have to be very clear with the faculty about the rules about what can and cannot be said to the students. There will be legal boundaries on discussions and we have an obligation to engage in proper behavior; we cannot use our position of authority to ask students to vote a certain way. Carson, Wadden noted, had also spoken to this issue. Wadden and Heath have suggested to Carson that they set up some Question and Answer lines about this, and Olswang said they have prepared an information sheet about legitimate faculty behavior. Olswang said that the winner of the election will be determined by a majority of those who vote, although very few people tend to vote. We will, Olswang added, encourage voting.

Report from the President – Lee Huntsman, President

First, Huntsman noted that the last ten days have been a real rollercoaster, starting with the tragic loss of Dean Landholt and her husband. On the other hand, in three-and-one-half years, we have raised \$1 billion of the \$2 billion dollar goal in our fund raising efforts. This goal line was crossed on 31 December 2003 in a time of a down stock market. Meeting this goal is a remarkable testament to the commitment of our alumni and friends to the University.

At this time, we have some leadership transitions to work on. The athletic director search has already been discussed. With regards to the Graduate School, he will be meeting with the Executive Council and others in listening sessions. He will be asking questions about how to run the search and the qualities we should seek in a new dean. A parallel search needs to be set up for the Chancellor position in Tacoma. We have a little more time since

Chancellor Carwein is thinking about 15 April 2004 as her transition date. They have already visited that campus several times and feel ready to begin a search.

On a very different front, the legislature convenes today. It has been an extraordinary season with an unusually high degree of interest in higher education. The Governor has put some money in the budget for higher education, and even some money for research. Gov. Locke has put forward an executive request bill that would allow him to engage two universities, one research and one regional, in a performance contract pilot project. We have long been advocates for this so that we can depart from accidental budgeting. He believes that this is the way to have a straightforward discussion with the state about expectations for higher education, and how it will be funded. Rumors have it that a legislator is going to drop a bill on branch campuses but we have no idea what this covers. The League of Education Voters has put together a major proposal to raise sales tax by one cent for funds for K-12, and higher education. While he does not believe it will pass, a great deal of thought and work has gone into the proposal. The HEC Board has been more forceful than ever and issued a new master plan. Thus, there are many ideas out there regarding higher education.

Huntsman announced that Dick Thompson, who had planned to retire as Director of Government Relations, has agreed to take over as athletic director and we have hired Randy Hodgkins to take Thompson's place. One agenda item is to make higher education a major issue in the gubernatorial race. He would also like to get more lobbying support from external communities.

With respect to internal issues, the biggest issue has been to set tuition for graduate students so that there is more advance notice. A major goal will be to develop a long-term strategy for tuition setting as well as a more nuanced approach.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Ross Heath, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate

The committee has discussed the impact of civil service reform, observing that there will be a large set of contracts being negotiated across campus in the near future. He has met with Vice President for HR Carson, and her preference is to do this without confrontation. The SCPB has discussed tuition issues, and the tuition policy committee is still working on a proposal. The Provost's office has announced a \$1.2 million dollar fund for Innovation. Finally, the SCPB has spent a considerable amount of time talking about performance contracts.

Today, he introduced a proposal for a President's Council. (Archival copy attached.) For a number of years, the University has had a number of committees that have met to discuss the budget. This has not been a particularly effective or coordinated process. Provost Thorud put together a group of five people to discuss a new approach. The proposal, which was distributed to the body, would be to provide a final forum, the President's Council, for discussion of issues which has input from all sources. This proposal is an opening gambit, and to start a conversation. It will not be implemented immediately and he encouraged people to start thinking about it. He called the attention of the body to the chart on the last page of the handout as a way to explain how it would work. This new council would replace the University Budget Committee (UBC). This new body, given the number of constituencies, would be large and it would meet infrequently. A subcommittee of the President's Council would perform the day-to-day work, meeting on a near weekly basis. At the beginning of the year, groups would identify major policy issues that would be given to

the subcommittee. The subcommittee would either refer these to other policy or advisory bodies, or it would prioritize and develop items for the Council as part of its agenda. A support staff would help to prepare information, and the information would go out to involved constituencies that could debate these and arrive, if they so wish, at an opinion. The sub-committee would screen these proposals for forwarding to the Council. The objective is not to have hard and fast positions; the councils' members are expected to adopt a broad viewpoint for the University, not to reflect their constituency's interests. This would allow the President and Provost to act with confidence that they have the views of the University community before them. Wadden added that it remains to be seen what would happen to SCPB. This would be the President's council, not the Senate's.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

The report was omitted because Stygall is in Olympia.

Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn presented the Council update. She also described the new electronic preference selection system for council and committee nominations.

Nominations and Appointments

Nominated, effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2004, Kate Quinn, GPSS representative member of the Special Committee on Faculty Women. **Approved.**

Information

Wadden noted that two items were postponed from the last Senate meeting, a Class C resolution regarding NIH grants and Class A Legislation regarding the voting status of part-time Lecturers. He asked the body if it would be at all helpful to seek comments on the conduct of this next meeting in regards to friendly amendments.

Olswang said that a coalition of departments will introduce amendments regarding the Class A legislation because the departments are dramatically affected by the proposal. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chair, SCWF) reminded Olswang about the origin of 50% number in the legislation. He acknowledged her comments, but stated that there is opposition to the legislation in general and the strategy, as he understands it, is to make the legislation die. That is, there is more opposition than was expected. Vaughn suggested time limits on the presentations that Olswang says will be coming. One person said it would be nice to know in advance about the content of the presentations so that proponents of the legislation could prepare a response. Olswang stated that about five departments believe themselves to be affected: CSE, two units in the Business School, Psychology, two Medical School departments, and Speech and Hearing.

Kate O'Neill (Chair, FCFA) asked for Olswang's clarification that everyone has the right definition of lecturer. Olswang said yes, but added that some of the numbers are different from the information we had previously. Steve Buck (Group IV), by way of providing an example, said they have something approaching 60 FTE voting faculty in Psychology so the proposal raises quorum by five votes and typically they have something slightly more than quorum at meetings. Asked whether this reality would be incentive to attend faculty meetings, Buck replied that it could but this did not happen when research faculty were

added; behavior did not change. It was pointed out that lecturers would not be involved in promotion and tenure; only appointments and curriculum. Wadden said he has been asked if the threshold has been set too low; that is, how many years show evidence of a commitment? Others say these are valuable people but work at some distance from campus; others talk about implications of these additions. Wadden asked for some help in anticipating debate. O'Neill also asked for advance notice of arguments and presentations so that she is not blindsided at the Senate meeting. She suggested that if the point is to kill the legislation that we should address that directly and look at the policy rather than become involved in a series of amendments that ultimately have that effect. Olswang said there are those who oppose it for policy reasons and others who oppose it because of the lack of a commitment.

Another question is whether there should be a delayed effective date on the legislation. Vaughn and Olswang reminded the group that if it is to be delayed, there needs to be an amendment to that effect. Krieger-Brockett noted her committee, SCFW met recently, and they have a member who is a lecturer. Lecturers are about 45% women which is higher than ladder faculty and this legislation would therefore disproportionately affect women. She opined that she would like to say there is a symmetry about a three year requirement that mirrors the reappointment process for ladder faculty, so it seems fairer to extend length of time of commitment than to change the percentage. Wadden pointed out that some have pointed out lecturers are not subject to national search, and reminded the group that this proposal may change the appointment behavior of departments that do not wish to enfranchise these people.

Buck said he has heard many kinds of objections. Some object flat out; others object to the details of the proposal. O'Neill pointed out that she has addressed every e-mail that has come her way. Also, when she presented this to FCFA after the Senate meeting, they were still unanimously in favor of the proposal. The commitment issue rubbed some people in the wrong direction, i.e., that to have some people pass on the level of commitment is "disturbing" to some members of the council and very patronizing. Buck replied that one of the questions from his group was whether there could be a system for opt-in, opt-out of the legislation. O'Neill expressed some reservations about this because of possible pressure to opt-out, and noted that there is some discretion within a department to determine who votes on what things depending upon committee structure, etc. On the other hand, it may not be wise to exclude lecturers from curricular issues given their responsibility for teaching. David Lovell (Group VIII) asked that information also be forwarded to group reps as is appropriate before the meeting. Pace asked Olswang to qualify a comment in which he said that the comments are meant to destroy the bill. Is that your interpretation or their actual intent? Olswang replied that there are departments that have significant concerns about the policy and they would like to avoid the impacts they believe will flow from the legislation. It may well be that the proposed amendments will no longer reflect the original intent and thus raise questions as to whether it should go forward.

Announcements

Brittany Goodnight, ASUW President: A resolution that was just passed for Student Lobby Day which is scheduled for 18 February 2004. She asked for Senate endorsement so that faculty understand when students are not in class.

New Business

a. Brittany Goodnight, ASUW President, asked that a Class C resolution on Lobbying Day be forwarded to the Senate. **Approved.**

b. Wadden asked the President about the recent decision to cancel classes because of the snow fall in mid-morning. Huntsman replied that Exec. Vice President Weldon Ihrig makes the decision. He uses the police department forecasts. The information he had in the morning was that it would be clearing with rain. By mid/late morning, the forecast had changed and it was decided things were getting out of hand. The question became how we would give notice and the noon hour was chosen as making the most sense. Wadden followed up on these comments, asking about the post decision assessment. Huntsman said his sense was that it was pretty grim that afternoon and canceling classes was the right thing to do. The biggest complaint was holding classes in the morning. We have to decide at 5:00 a.m. or 6:00 a.m., and there is no winning on this. Heath pointed out that there are now more students living at a greater distance from campus so that we need to consider a broader geographical area.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate