

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Room 142, Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., Monday, 6 October 2003

Present: Senate Chair Wadden and Vice Chair Heath; Group Representatives, Stecher-Hansen (I), Pace (II), Gile (V), Tanimoto (VI), Johnson (VII), Scheuer (VII), Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall; Faculty Council Chairs, Gillis-Bridges (FCET), O'Neill (FCFA), Brandt (FCRIB), Pace (Student Affairs), Killien (FCTCP), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Seifer (FCUR); UW Bothell Representative Krishnamurthy, UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), Acting Provost Thorud, ASUW Representative Goodnight,

Absent: Interim President Huntsman*; Group Representative Buck (IV)*, UW Faculty Council Chairs Plumb (FCAS)*, Carline (FCIQ)*, Kiyak (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA)*, Seelye Martin (FCUL), GPSS Representative Harrison*, Assistant to the President Niccolls*.

Guests: Don Janssen (FCAS), Sam Castic, ASUW

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

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was **approved**.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the 15 May 2003 Faculty Senate meeting, and the 5 May 03 Senate Executive Committee were **approved**.

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

Wadden's opening remarks alerted members to upcoming legislation. Faculty Affairs will be bringing legislation regarding part-time lecturers, while the Tri-campus Council legislation will address the definition of a "campus." Originally to be presented at this meeting, it was thought better to withdraw them until fully prepared.

Thorud, at Wadden's request, explained some reasoning for the withdrawal of the tri-campus legislation. Both campuses are growing, Thorud noted, and have some need for independence and flexibility. After meeting with the leadership of these campuses, discussions have been focused on what matters could be delegated to these campuses. Most of the focus has been on business matters but at the same time, there have been developments in the program development area, citing the Milgard School of Business in Tacoma (the result of a \$15 million dollar gift from the Milgard family in June, 2003). At Tacoma in particular, some programs now may need a different kind of structure, possibly in a collegiate arrangement. The Provost's office would like to work with the Senate as this work goes forward, and will be bringing some proposals to the Senate. These will be accompanied by five to ten year projections on where these campuses will be going.

Wadden next turned to long-term planning issues that he will be working on with Ross Heath, Vice Chair. Characterizing many of tri-campus operations as *ad hoc*, he stated that we need some kind of plan when it comes to the relationship between the three campuses,

especially about curriculum. We also need to make some kind of decision, long-term, for what the arrangement between the campuses will be and define the status of the Handbook on each campus.

Other long-term policy issues are also on the horizon. At the Provost's request, he has met with Graduate School Dean Landholt and Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting Patterson regarding the structure of Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) and its relation to the University Budget Committee (UBC) or the Board of Deans, in the hope of achieving greater efficiencies. For example: What's the best way to sequence the meetings between SCPB, the Board of Deans and UBC? What's the best way to coordinate and reconcile the various budget committees? He would also like to address some housekeeping issues for SCPB in the Code, and gave the example of the student representation on that committee. In passing, he noted that student representation issues arise in other contexts such as RCEP and the Councils.

Another issue raised is the term of office for the Chair and Vice Chair. It may make more sense in terms of preparation for an academic year for the terms to run from July 1 to June 30 rather than September 16 to September 15. Also, it may make more sense for the immediate past Chair of the Senate, who will have had two years of budget experience, to chair SCPB than the new Vice Chair. And, given new some new arrangements in place this year, we need to fine-tune the terms for deputy legislative representative. For Wadden, the fundamental concern is the best use of people's time.

Two last areas of concern are athletics and accountability. He has been looking at faculty oversight of intercollegiate athletics with the goal of improving and deepening shared governance in this area. He has also discussed the accountability committee with Provost and its continued role, if any.

In summary, he concluded that quite a number of things are happening on a number of fronts. Acknowledging the uncertainties of the times, he stressed that we are continuing to advance the Presidential search and other activities. In his view, we can continue to do business and move the interests of the Faculty and the University forward.

Questions/

The sole question concerned the future of the Rose Committee, a shorthand term for the effort to promote shared governance and the most effective use of faculty councils. That discussion is continuing, Wadden affirmed. For him, the central concern is to have faculty at the table where the initial plans and policies are made, and that they receive the same information as any other policy maker at the University. To that end, the discussions regarding the SCPB/UBC as well as the athletic issues continue in this same spirit of jointly appointed bodies. Highlighting a number of issues surrounding research and intellectual property, he noted that we are seeking collaborative discussions with the administration. On some issues or topics, like research, there are no alternative bodies and we may want to "bulk up" existing councils to do even more. In other cases, a jointly appointed body may be the answer. The Administration has been responsive to our suggestions so far.

Report from the President - Lee Huntsman, Interim President

David Thorud, Acting Provost, presented the report for the President.

Thorud presented a snapshot of key topics and developments for the upcoming year. This year, at the Regent's request, there will be a thorough assessment of our diversity efforts. We are trying to understand, in the broadest possible sense, where we are and what we could be doing. Vice President for Minority Affairs Barcelo is taking the lead on this, but she will be working with faculty to identify "pinch points" and areas for investment.

A second topic is higher education funding, and the League of Education Voters. The current thinking is that we need an initiative to improve and increase funding for K-20 education, and the expected increases in enrollment. They are talking about \$700 million to \$1 billion dollars in increased funding.

Another topic is the transfer agreement. We have made a new arrangement regarding transfers of community college students to the Seattle campus. This was done after it was clear that the old agreement was no longer workable. We could not take all of the students who met the transfer requirements, and the old agreement provided no way to enhance diversity. The new agreement calls for a total comprehensive review of the incoming transfer students much like that given to the incoming freshman class. It will lead to increased costs, but he believes these to be well worth it. (Attachment 1 details the essential elements of the program.) The old agreement will be honored for one more year, and then we will move to the new arrangement.

The budget continues as an on-going discussion issue. The supplemental session tends to focus on technical corrections. But this is also the year in which we will start working on the 2005-2007 biennial budget request. We used to send notebooks of elaborate wish lists to Olympia, but have learned that we need to use a more streamlined, realistic approach. We need to be in large part prepared by June of the preceding year. And, we are not "out of the woods" when it comes to budget cuts. Hopefully, given the flat budget projections, there will not be cuts but they have asked deans to be prudent. The cut for this biennium was 2.47%, which was better than the projected 5%.

A looming issue will be the 40% rehire program for retiring faculty. The pool of funds for this group is not sufficient to meet the needs of people who ask for this status. The administration knows this is important to faculty, but will need to come up with additional funds to meet the needs of this fund. This has led to a need to study this issue. On another compensation topic, the administration continues to be very interested in a compensation package for the faculty, but does not wish to undertake this discussion until the legislative session is over. So, we will return to this in March for a serious discussion.

Finally, under Vice Provost for Research Hogan's leadership, we are looking at the research infrastructure at the University. With the assistance of the Research Advisory Board and Faculty Councils, the plan is to look at this issue and identify points for additional investment so that we can remain as competitive as possible.

Questions/

1. Use of GPAs and other criteria for the transfer agreement: Thorud directed attention to the back page of the handout, and Legislative Representative Stygall stated, as a member of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), that she expected that there will be the same type of comprehensive review that is given to those freshman files that do not meet the automatic cutoffs for admission. Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn noted the effect of the Michigan affirmative action decisions. Wadden noted that this review would also dovetail with the on-going review of entrance to majors as a way to think about transfer

admissions. Thorud pointed out that all of these considerations call for students to be more thoughtful. Pace (Chair, FCSA) pointed out, however, that credit limits are useless when there is no room in the student's desired major. Thorud said that one thing has not changed: we are still pledged to take 30% of our incoming students from community colleges; it is just the process that will change.

Pace directed attention to bullet point four on the transfer agreement, and asked how much information students will be given on acceptance to majors. Thorud said that input from Tim Washburn will be helpful on this point, but the criteria for entrance will turn on the programs in departments as well. Stygall noted that the Legislature is concerned that departments have contact with community college students, and had proposed a bill last year, that subsequently died, that would have mandated this discussion. Thorud pointed out that the 210-credit requirement came out of legislative bill also. Wadden concluded this discussion by noting that there have been discussions with program and departmental advisors about this situation, and the need for faculty to become more involved in this process and how to evaluate in-coming students. This will be more time intensive, and faculty will need to be involved in these discussions at the University and local level. Thorud concluded by noting that for the most part, these transfer arrangements are working well. This review will require an investment of resources to make this work. Brittany Goodnight, ASUW President, asked that students be involved in this process also.

2. Status of Presidential Search: Thorud stated that the Regents announced that they will continue the search, and have reactivated the search committee. They are to report back to the Regents by 1 May 03.

3. Forty Percent Re-hire Program for Retirees: Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits (FCRIB) Chair Brandt asked about the review of the 40% program, wanting to know if this review is a policy or financial review. Thorud said that this review is driven by financial concerns. We need to find a way to finance the program, and she said FCRIB needs to be involved. He agreed.

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

This year, because it is not a legislative session, will be a planning year. Heath would like the committee to look at the available models for higher education funding that are in use around the country, giving the examples of the Michigan model and the Oregon model. The committee will assess the positives and negatives of these models, with the hope of ending up with a position paper on this issue for the incoming president.

Additionally, the administration has highlighted a number of upcoming issues. One of the largest of these will be upcoming negotiations with existing unions under the Civil Service Reform Act. This will be a substantial change of business since those unions will now be able to bargain wage levels. Similarly, we are still awaiting a final PERC decision on the TA/RA issues.

Quickly, he sketched other likely issues. The 40% rehire issue will be examined by the committee as will separate reports on graduate tuition and undergraduate financial aid. Unit Adjustments, for those more than 20% behind their peers, will be considered. If this is phase one, what should phase two look like? In response to a question, Heath characterized the discussion on unit adjustments as "wide open." Thorud said that the adjustment for units this time was a first time matter, and was centrally funded.

Three other issues will be the budget ramifications of the institutional review of diversity efforts, computer system security and the research infrastructure.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

This year's session will last only sixty days. Last session, the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) got itself named as stakeholders in two legislative matters. This is new; in the past, faculty have not been so named.

House Bill 2076 is the new strategic master plan. This bill comes out of some unhappiness with the HEC Board planning process, and will look at access, funding, service delivery models, economic development, accountability (particularly an issue for us), life long learning, tuition and financial aid. The Governor is also interested in the issues raised by this bill, and some national groups are also studying these issues, providing statistical and survey information. The accountability provisions have not talked about "counting", but there is a strong legislative staff desire to reduce accountability to numbers. The legislative workgroup is to come up with general principles in each of these areas.

The compact bill, House Bill 2111, ultimately was a smaller bill than originally proposed. These are mutual agreements in which the state and the educational establishments make mutual promises regarding outcomes and funding. In other states, however, the states have not followed through on their promises because of funding difficulties. This could be intriguing, however, if there is mutuality in these discussions. Thorud provided a set of talking points on this issue (Attachment 2) and reiterated Stygall's point about mutuality. Stygall has focused on persuading legislators that evaluation measures should parallel the kind of measures we already use rather than create whole new mechanisms.

An AAUP government affairs expert, Mark Miller, will be here to do a lobbying workshop. Stygall asked council chairs, especially, to attend the workshop so that she would have some help during the year. She will be sending an e-mail about this session. It will be held on October 24th, 1:30-3:30 in Gerberding 26.

Stygall will have two interns this year. One will be working on developing a website on legislative affairs while the other will accompany her to Olympia. The second intern will help her produce the very useful faculty profiles.

Stygall hopes to meet with each council at least once this term to see what issues she might bring to Olympia. Last, on the budget, the neutral revenue projection is good news. The budget did have a rainy day fund built in which means there is still something left in the rainy day fund, and we may escape without cuts.

In response to a question about whether discussions have taken place in Olympia or the University about reforming the tax structure, Stygall replied that legislators have asked whether the faculty have a position on this issue, and noted that there is an obvious Republican/Democrat split. Given the split in the legislature, tax reform does not seem likely. Stygall thought that it might be useful to talk about this in the Special Committee on Legislative Matters, which she plans to revive this year.

Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn

a. Electronic Voting Update: Vaughn directed attention to the handout on voting procedures (Attachment 3). This handout outlines how she plans to implement the new electronic voting procedures. She noted that in the limited tests of the system so far, the response has been very enthusiastic. Tasha Taylor, her assistant, was credited with a long summer of work in preparing the database and Catalyst programming for this effort.

b. Faculty Councils and Committees, Current Issues: Vaughn distributed an outline of current issues before the Councils. At the same time, she is working on revisions to Chapter 26 of the *Faculty Code*. These provisions outline our procedures for making changes in academic programs. We learned a fair amount about what needs to be done to make it more effective as a result of the three RCEP procedures begun last year. For example, we may need people involved earlier, and she has met with Senate leadership on this. Similarly, a “drop dead” deadline of January 31 is being proposed as the final point at which an RCEP could be initiated.

Nominations and Appointments

a. The list of nominations included in the agenda was approved. Additionally, the following nominations, made from the floor were **Approved**:

Trisha Matthieu, jointly appointed student member with vote to SCPB from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2004.

Jacob Hildebrandt, Physiology and Biophysics, to the Adjudication Panel from a one year term, September 16, 2003 to September 15, 2004.

Cpt. Jennifer Nicholson, Military Sciences, to the Faculty Council on University Relations, from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2006.

Cpt Thomas Gravlee, Military Sciences, to the Faculty Council on Education Technology from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2006.

Maj. Michael Ridgeway, Military Sciences, to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2006.

Thaddeus Spratlen, Retired Faculty to the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2004.

Brent Stewart, Radiology and Medical Education to the Faculty Council on Research from September 16, 2003-September 15, 2004.

b. Delegation to Councils: It was unanimously **agreed** that each council could determine the voting status of its members from the following categories: retirees, professional staff and librarians.

Requests for Information

None.

Vaughn discussed mechanism for submitting requests to the Senate and SEC. This is a very useful device for getting information on discrete topics or concerns before the Faculty. Anyone wishing to make such a request is urged to do so at least one week in advance of a meeting by contacting Vaughn, and she will arrange to the administrator or faculty member most knowledgeable about the topic to be present at the meeting. These requests should also be copied to the Chair.

New Business

The agenda was **approved** as written.

Adjournment

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

APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate