

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Regents' Room, Gerberding Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Monday, 17 November 2003**

**Present:** Senate Chair Wadden and Vice Chair Heath; Interim President Huntsman; Group Representatives: Stecher-Hansen (I), Pace (II), Buck (IV), Gile (V), Tanimoto (VI), Johnson (VII), Scheuer (VII), Lovell (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall; Faculty Council Chairs: Plumb (FCAS), Carline (FCIQ), Gillis-Bridges (FCET), O'Neill (FCFA), Kiyak (FCR), Pace (FCSA), Killien (FCTCP), Martin (FCUL); UW Tacoma Representative Kalton; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW); Acting Provost Thorud; Assistant to the President Niccolls; ASUW Representative Goodnight; GPSS Representative Harrison

**Absent:** UW Faculty Council Chairs Erdly (FCEO)\*, Schwartz (FCSA), Brandt (FCRIB)\*, Schaufelberger (FCUFS)\*, Seifer (FCUR); UW Bothell Representative Krishnamurthy

**Guests:** Vice Provost for Research Craig Hogan, Vice Provost Steven Olswang, Associate Vice Provost for Research Malcolm Parks, Sam Castic, ASUW

**The meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m.**

**Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda, subject to announced changes, was **approved**.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the 5 October 2003 Senate Executive Committee meeting and the 23 October 2003 Faculty Senate meeting were **approved**.

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

Because of the full agenda, Wadden made brief remarks. His emphasis today was on facilitating discussion from an informed point of view. To that end, he invited guest speakers who can give the members more information about items on the agenda.

**Report from the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President**

Similarly brief, the President presented a capsule summary of external developments. The expectation of an active legislative session is low, but there are developments related to the legislative arena. There has been moderate interest and activities in the task force on compacts. At the same time, the HEC Board has come out with a draft master plan sooner than expected, and has made a series of sweeping recommendations on access, governance and funding. For example, they have suggested that there be a combined board that oversees all higher education functions. His only concern is that the governance proposal could be distracting from the key issue of how we will pay for education. An unexpected player in this is the Competitiveness Council, and they are focusing primarily on education issues with particular attention to higher education. The business community is also more active than they have been. Thus, while legislative activity is minimal, there are other pressures developing.

Outside of the legislature, the League of Education Voters has announced a new initiative to raise a dedicated revenue source (a 1 cent raise in sales tax) that will support pre-K to16 education. While it is not clear how these funds would be divided among the three education sectors, there is a real commitment to making something happen, and the University has been involved in these efforts. Their polling suggests that the public is interested in the higher education aspects of this proposal. Moreover, the K-12 community believes that they need the higher education community to be successful because of their different and richer contacts. At the very least, it demonstrates a growing interest in higher education and in some quarters, its relationship to economic development.

The President announced that the partnership with the Cougars will continue, and that there will be a joint meeting of the WSU and UW Board of Regents this week.

Finally, he noted that he was glad to see that the Tri-Campus Executive Order was on the agenda. It addresses some technical issues, and is basically a mid-term management tool.

#### Questions/

Wadden asked about the Evans-Gardner proposal. Huntsman noted that this proposal focused on capital funds, and that they have not developed a proposal for operations costs.

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

Heath noted that the Committee's focus has been on the HEC Board Master Plan. The committee has also continued discussions about different long-term funding options.

Third, the committee reviewed a proposal to hire an Investment Officer to improve the return on our investment portfolio, and move from the top quartile to top decile in performance. Committee members have raised some questions about this, and discussion will continue.

#### **Report of Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative**

A short session will begin soon, and Stygall has been meeting with the councils regarding Faculty issues. For example, FCRI is preparing a benefit comparison sheet that compares us to peer institution for benefit level funding. The last revenue forecast was revenue neutral, and the final public meetings of the 2011 and 2076 workgroups will be on 11 December 03. Noting the open meetings of the League of Education Voters, she urged faculty to attend the meetings in their area since they tend to be heavily populated by K-12 constituents. Regarding the HEC Board master plan, she regarded as telling and inverted, the list of priorities for the University:

1. Take more students
4. Increased funding.

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

Vaughn distributed the current issues spreadsheet, and reminded council chairs of the need to keep Senate leadership informed about developments and initiatives in their councils. By doing so, we can "work smarter" and coordinate our efforts for maximum impact. This

information is also useful for planning an agenda that can be completed in the coming school year and at each SEC meeting; thus, forwarded items will not always be placed on the next SEC agenda. It will depend on what matters are already pending and the anticipated amount of time need to complete each item of business. Wadden concurred.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

**a. Vice Chair Nominations:** Wadden reviewed the requirements for nominating vice chair candidates. This year's nominating committee consisted of Mary Coney, Mark McDermott and Miceal Vaughan. They have nominated Steve Buck (Psychology) and Ashley Emery (Engineering) for presentation to the Senate as candidates for Vice Chair in the 2004-2005 academic year. **Approved.**

**b. Faculty Councils and Committees:** In addition to the names listed in the agenda, Vaughn presented a list of nominees for the Adjudication Panel. As to the latter, she pointed out that one nominee was a member of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (the Code Cops) who would recuse himself from the latter committee in the rare event of a conflict of interest, and that the list also contained the names of two senior lecturers. Typically, the Adjudication Panel is composed of tenured members of the faculty and Vaughn presented pro and con arguments for extending panel membership to senior lecturers who have had long term relationships with the University.

#### **Nominees:**

William Erdly, Computing & Software Systems, UW Bothell, to the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, for a term ending September 15, 2006

William Erdly, Computing & Software Systems, UW Bothell, as chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, for a term ending September 15, 2004

Constantin Behler, Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, UW Bothell, to the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy, for a term ending September 15, 2006

#### **Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, PSO representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2004:**

Brian E. Geppert, Business Manager Kirsten Wind Tunnel; Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services

Christene James, Virginia Merrill Bloedel Hearing Research Center; Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

#### **Nominations for the RCEP Public Review Committee in the College of Education, School Counseling:**

Mary Coney, Technical Communication  
Steven M. Demorest, Music Education  
Judith Howard, Women Studies  
Kurt Johnson, Rehabilitation Medicine  
Debbie Ward, Psychosocial & Community Health

One representative from the ASUW (Appointed by the ASUW)  
One representative from the GPSS (Appointed by the GPSS)

**Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, members of the Adjudication Panel for terms ending September 15, 2006:**

Miceal Vaughn, Assoc. Prof. English (Group 1)  
Christine Distefano Assoc. Prof. Political Science (Group 4)  
Jan Sjøvik, Assoc. Prof. Scand Studies (Group 1)  
Clare Ryan, Assoc. Prof. Forest Res. (Group 6)  
Arnie Berger, Sr. Lect. CSE – Bothell  
Lisa Coutu, Sr. Lect. Communication (Group 2)  
Charles Haley, Prof. Business (Group 5)  
Jacqueline Meszaros Assoc. Prof. Business (Bothell)  
Marcy Stein, Assoc. Prof. Education (Tacoma)  
Peter May, Prof. Political Science (Group 4)  
Barry Witham, Prof. Drama (Group 2)

**All nominations were approved.**

**Information**

**a. NIH Grant Policies – Craig Hogan, Vice Provost for Research and Malcolm Parks, Associate Vice Provost for Research**

Hogan explained that this latest legislative effort is theoretically targeted at eliminating frivolous NIH grants. It came about quite suddenly this summer when there were legislative proposals to de-fund several grants in health science research. Typically, most of the grants had something to do with sexuality in their titles, and the proposed legislation almost passed. There was a substantial outcry about these efforts in the press. Later, the Traditional Values Coalition had their staffers inquire about grants that they deemed “questionable.” Because of these inquiries, this is still a live issue.

The University response has been to issue an e-mail that outlines the facts in this matter, and they have also prepared an op-ed piece for the *Seattle PI*. (Copies were distributed.) Our legislative representative in D.C., Barbara Perry, is also addressing this issue. Parks characterized this issue as a series of miscommunications. The NIH is up for budget renewal and is under a great deal of scrutiny and may have therefore overreacted. But, because of the press, there has been a strong reaction in the academic community about the inappropriateness of the congressional inquiry. At this time, the issue is fading but this is a group that will continue to push.

One group representative stated that there is a consensus in his group that the Senate do something to address this, suggesting, perhaps, some type of resolution. A brief discussion about the form of a resolution ensued.

**b. University Response to the Patriot Act – Steve Olswang, Vice Provost**

Vice Provost Olswang addressed the immigration aspects of the Patriot Act, and noted that since 9/11 there has been a significant complication of policies that have primarily affected student and faculty visa approvals. These visas now require an additional step that goes

through the local consul and requires an interview. For seventeen listed countries, even more steps are required. These changes result in delays and in some cases denials. We have not lost any faculty members, but for students, it has been a little bit rougher. Some doctoral students from Muslim countries and China have elected not to return to the University. Students in other countries are simply deciding that the efforts are not worth it, and that they can study in their country of origin. Despite this, we have more international students this year than we had last year – an increase of about 76. It has affected the ESL programs which are down about 30% and the University has had to lay off some graduate students in the TOEFL program. Overall, however, we have done better than most of our peers.

Parks addressed research aspects of the Patriot Act. He characterized the Act as a mishmash that layers over existing legislation. He distributed a handout that targets four areas where the law affects us:

1. Access to student records
2. Information Systems
3. Greater ease in obtaining subpoenas and warrants
4. Greater monitoring of biological agents and toxins

It is the last that has had the greatest impact in terms of personnel time because we had to perform an inventory of all affected substances. After the inventory, it became clear that only one lab is affected by the legislation (a Hospital clinical lab which needs samples of pathogens for clinical comparisons.). This lab must be registered, and requires background checks for personnel. Also, his office has noted increased use of restrictive access language. In the discussion of these developments, members shared anecdotes they had heard around campus. Olswang noted that there are three other recent laws that affect access to various toxins. Wadden urged group reps to share this information and to feel free to bring additional problems and questions to the Senate leadership so that any concerns can be addressed.

**c. “The Next Wave” – Article by Danial J. Evans (Regent):** Wadden called attention to Regent Evan’s article in the *Seattle PI*. It is now posted on the Senate Web page.

**Proposed Revisions to (unnumbered) Executive Orders Regarding University Structure (original source date - 31 May 1956)(Tri-Campus Policy) – Wadden and Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy**

Killien, by way of background, noted that her council has been considering these issues for the last two years. For pragmatic reasons, there needs to be some definition of the relationship even as we continue to move forward in developing a mature relationship. Currently, there is no mention of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma in the *University Handbook*, and nothing therefore to legitimate their campus procedures. At the same time, there was a gift to the Tacoma campus that requires the creation of a collegiate unit, which is currently not provided for in the *Faculty Code*. The most efficient way to begin this process was through the Executive Order process, and Killien directed attention to the drafts appended to the agenda. These revised orders would acknowledge both campuses, allow the creation of collegiate units, and provide for consultation of faculty in decision-making at all three campuses. These were filed with the Senate today, and start a 45-day comment period.

Wadden added that he has supported these changes. He believes that Class A legislation would be premature until we have more direction for the policies. This discussion has not been particularly robust on the Seattle campus although it is quite lively on the other two. Wadden will solicit reactions from various faculty bodies. Some of the changes are house-keeping; others mark significant policy decisions. Chancellor Carwein's resignation may accelerate the discussion of these issues in this transitional period.

Huntsman noted that while the proposed Order "cleans up" interim issues, it does not address some outstanding important issues such as program approvals. He proposes living within the spirit of the *Faculty Code* on such proposals from Bothell and Tacoma. Responding to a question from Wadden, he agreed to forward all new degrees and minors to the Faculty Senate for broad distribution and comment. The idea is to continue the tradition of quality control without spelling out all of the changes in the Executive Order. He believes that this is the intent of the Senate leadership as well.

Olswang added his agreement to these comments. He noted that the current *Code* is a compilation of Regents Orders, Executive Orders and Class A legislation. This is an attempt to work within the existing *Code* and adapt to modern changes. We need to recognize that the two campuses have inherited procedures from the Seattle campus through the *Faculty Code* even though this is not spelled out. Rather than change each section, the point is to overlay it and provide a technical correction to existing Orders.

Kiyak (Chair FCR) asked whether these proposals will respond to criticisms in the Accreditation Report, and noted that we could have gone in one of two directions: three separate universities or three parts of one whole. She saw this Order as assuming the latter and wanted to affirm that this is the relationship desired. Killien said that the proposed orders do not answer this question and are intermediate steps. The entire University is undergoing tremendous change, and that the ultimate relationship will be the product of multiple conversations in the future. Wadden said he feels we are moving away a little from the federation model and that the proposal gives more sanction for the unique features of each campus than was previously the case. Vice Provost David Thorud said this is a positive response to the Accreditation Report, hoping it leads to increasing collaboration rather than separateness. Kiyak said it seems to call for more cooperation rather than less, and recognizes one *Code*. Wadden pointed out though that it recognizes three separate faculty organizations: GFO, Senate and the Faculty Assembly. We still have a lot of work in front of us and this is a step in moving the conversation forward.

Kalton, UW Tacoma Representative, responded to Kiyak's observations by saying this came through as unopposed because it tidies things up and does not commit us to either direction. There is a lot of concern about those directions at Bothell and Tacoma because this is still a pretty fluid situation.

Wadden said these revisions are not aimed at addressing the future organization of the University. Those conversations will be initiated by the Regents and involve everyone. He will make certain that this document is distributed widely and discussed. The 45-day period take us up to the holidays, and can be extended a few days if necessary.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Voting Membership in the Faculty, extending voting rights to long-term part-time lecturers

**Volume Two, Part II,  
Chapter 21, Section 21-32  
Kate O'Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

Kate O'Neill introduced the legislation, and noted that it is the product of three years of work. It was originally part of legislation, subsequently passed, that addressed improving the status of lecturers. One of the concerns was that the legislation might enfranchise a large number of lecturers which in turn could disproportionately affect personnel matters, which require a quorum majority under the *Code* for passage. Given this, O'Neill directed attention to an appendix to the legislation that lists data on the current numbers of long-term part-time lecturers employed at the University. Her Council has approved this legislation three successive years, and it grants basic respect to an important part of our community. While it will require some administrative difficulties in tracking these personnel, the Secretary of the Faculty and her staff have assured her that this is possible.

Discussion/

Heath asked about how this would affect Senate apportionment, and Vaughn explained how this process takes place. He expressed concerns about the variability of this population and how they will be tracked for voting purposes. Vaughn described how this will be handled administratively in her office using the HEPPS database and conferring with departmental administrators. Huntsman asked about how the Council came to unanimity on this issue given the different interests of various parts of the faculty. O'Neill noted that some of the unanimity came from the fact that while the lecturers can vote on hires, they cannot vote on the promotion and tenure of colleagues senior to them. As to their qualifications, they are reviewed on a more regular basis than many faculty because of the appointment provisions appearing in the *Code*. Barbara Kreiger-Brockett (Chair, SCFW) added that a lot of the investment in this issue came from anecdotal evidence. About 45% of lecturers are women and many are part-time for family reasons. Over the years, these anecdotes swung the day. Chip Haley (Business), prior Chair FCFA, did a great deal of the work on this and came from a department with a large contingent of part-time lecturers. His experience with this group of faculty led him to make this proposal. Clark Pace (Group II Representative and Co-Chair, FCSA) expressed a concern about the wording of the legislation, wondering whether it covers the group intended. O'Neill noted that it will be reviewed by the Code Advisory Committee. Wadden noted that it will change quorums in some department s.

Steve Buck (Group IV Representative) stated that he feels conflicted about this legislation. His department makes a great deal of use of lecturers for their program, including part-timers. Noting that he has hired these people for the last 13 years, and the efforts of his department to integrate them into the department, he stated that not every part-timer desires to be an integrated member of a department. Given this, he inquired whether the council had considered some type of opt-out provision. He also noted that if they chose to vote as a block that could also have an impact. He has never been able to get more than 50% of research faculty to appear at meetings, and he expects even fewer lecturers; this could have unintended consequences for departmental operations. It may also make the department think twice about continuing these appointments. He asked if the committees considered these factors. O'Neill said that these problems had been considered and debated in the Council. They did not specifically consider an opt-in or opt-out provision. The Council did address concerns about apathy and noted it can be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Vaughn noted that the *Code* permits departments to adopt e-mail and mail for balloting; this might address some of the concerns. Buck felt that this still would not help with those people who are not interested in participating. He reiterated concerns in tracking the quorum numbers

from quarter to quarter. Vaughn explained that the staff agreed to the extra work generated by this as it pertains to senate voting; it would also have to occur in departments.

Huntsman asked whether there had been an inquiry about part-time lecturers' interest in voting. Krieger-Brockett pointed out that two lecturers led this initiative. Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges (Chair, FCET) commented that there are many lecturers she has never seen at meetings in the creative writing program in English. She pointed out, however, that the lecturers that do attend present points of view that would not have been considered, and led her department to be more inclusive. Wadden asked how we compare to other universities in our use of lecturers. Committee members did survey other universities, and we do better than many other universities although there is a growing trend everywhere to rely on lecturers for teaching. Pace expressed the wish that there was more survey information rather than anecdotal information about this. Buck explained that part of his conflict is that this proposal will affect different parts of the University differently. He opined that the SEC is a small group of people making major decisions that will affect everyone, and expressed reservations that the legislation will be easily implemented. Killien noted that while she shares some of Buck's concerns, the concern is that in her department, the part-time lecturers have different qualifications and often work at some distance from campus and perhaps for several different universities. On the other hand, lecturers feel very disenfranchised in her department. This legislation will present a challenge to informed voting. Kiyak raised analogies to research faculty but noted that part-time lecturers have more at stake in curriculum issues, wondering how that will play out. O'Neill, stepping out from her neutral position as chair, said that the Council did not want to paper over problems but sees this as a voting rights issue that should not be obscured by administrative difficulties.

Wadden asked for Huntsman's concerns. Replying that he is conflicted, he has some concerns about the different patterns of lecturer use and whether that has been fully considered. On the one hand he cited Killien's concern about part-time clinicians in the field, but on the other hand, it enfranchises those engaged with the teaching enterprise. Krieger-Brockett pointed out that the subcommittee drew from widely varying parts of campus. It may get people more involved in all segments of faculty.

**Vote: Yes- 8                      No-0                      Abstain-1**

### **New Business**

The agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting was **approved** as written.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty  
APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate