

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Room 142, Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., Monday, 10 January 2005

Present: Senate Chair Heath; Vice Chair Emery; Acting Provost Thorud; Group Representatives: Coldewey (I), Rogers (II), Swalla (III), Buck (IV), Hardy (V), Christie (VI), Perkins (VII), Lam (VIII); UW Tacoma Representative Jackson; UW Bothell Representative Watts, Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Council Chairs: Janssen (FCAS), Erdly (FCEO), Kanal (FCET), Luchtel (FCFA), Boxx (FCRIB), Stewart (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Killien (FCTCP), Wadden (SCPB); Special Committee Chair Mandoli (SCFW), Fabien (SCMFA), Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, GPSS Representative Grupp

Absent: Group Representative Welton (VII); UW Faculty Council Chairs: Carline (FCIQ), Martin (FCUL)*, Seifer (FCUR); ASUW Representative Knowles * =excused

Guest: Professors Thomas Daniel (Biology), Dierdra Meldrum (Electrical Engineering), Vice President Rusty Barcelo, Alicia Palacio

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was **approved**.

Approval of the Minutes

Approved.

Opening Remarks from the Chair – Ross Heath, Chair

Last week I was surprised to learn about a proposal that the UW had submitted to build, on campus, a DHHS/NIH bio-safety level-3 Regional Bio-containment Laboratory (RBL) to work on Category A, B and C bioterrorism agents and diseases. These categories, by the way, include everything from anthrax to viral hemorrhagic fevers (which includes such viruses as Ebola).

Why was I surprised?

I was surprised because, despite an RFA date of 6/29/04, a letter of intent date of 11/29/04, and an application date of 12/29/04, a number of key people on campus (including members of cognizant faculty councils) were unaware, or only marginally aware, of the full implications of the proposal.

This proposal raises a number of important questions of significance to the Faculty Senate and its constituent bodies that deserve serious consideration. These questions relate to such topics as decisions on campus land use, security, probability and consequences of releases, emergency response, institutional control, and political/PR concerns. I list a few of these questions today – not because I want or expect them to be answered by a snappy PowerPoint response from a panel of experts - but because they deserve to be considered and debated by a broad population both across campus and from outside the University.

1. Security: Why was a site selected that is surrounded by three open public through roads, that is immediately adjacent to the main E-W pedestrian pathway through South Campus, and that lies close to a heavily used public waterway?

- Was a “defense in depth” strategy considered?

2. Probability of incidents: What methodology has been used to estimate the probability of releases from such a facility?

- What is the probability distribution of such estimates?
- Have the methodology and results been subjected to independent expert peer review?

3. Consequences of incidents: What impact would a release have on the ability of the nearby University Police facility to coordinate institutional emergency response?

- What impact would the closure of NE Pacific and Boat Streets have on access to University Hospital and on traffic flow in the University District?
- What would be the consequences of a release into Portage Bay with its uninterrupted connection to the entire Lake Washington freshwater system extending from the Ballard Locks to Issaquah?

4. Land use: What process was used to select the proposed site the RBL?

- What university constituencies were consulted in the course of making this decision?
- During the many meetings over 3 years associated with the development of the Southwest Campus plan, the site adjacent to the Marine Studies Building and fronting on to Boat Street and Portage Bay was designated for a future College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences building (due both to “water related uses” issues and to its role in connecting the Fisheries and Oceanography building clusters). When and why was this intent changed? What was the basis for the change?

5. Institutional control: In the event of a bioterrorism emergency, what control would the University exercise over the activities of the RBL?

6. Collegiality: What Faculty councils or joint administration/faculty advisory groups were consulted in the development of the RBL proposal?

7. Political/PR issues: There is a rich literature on the siting of hazardous facilities in populated areas. What consideration was given to risk perceptions and the “dread” values associated with a RBL sited on a university campus in the midst of a densely populated urban area?

- A number of other urban areas have argued that RBL’s should be sited in areas that have defense-in-depth capabilities, low environmental vulnerability, and low population densities (Washington examples might be Ft. Lewis and the Hanford Reservation). How were these objectives taken into account in developing the UW proposal?

A couple of closing comments. In my conversations on the RBL proposal, several people suggested that the University might not be serious about following through with this project.

I find this more than a little disturbing. Firstly, a proposal is a statement of institutional intent, so we should not be making such statements unless we mean them. Secondly, if funding agencies and reviewers become aware that our proposals are sometimes disingenuous, it will put at risk all the serious proposals that so many of us depend on to pursue our research goals.

Finally, for the past couple of years, I have worked under the premise that shared governance is most effective when it is collaborative, rather than adversarial. I greatly regret, therefore, that the university administration has elected to bypass shared governance in its development of the proposal for a Regional Bio-containment Laboratory.

Report from the Provost – David Thorud

Thorud's remarks responded to the questions raised by Ross Heath. He also promised that the appropriate mechanisms for input will be followed. The University has a \$50 million grant for studying infectious diseases as a result of funding approved after 9/11 and other initiatives regarding terrorist biological efforts. Some of this research is already taking place. A proper facility should enhance protective measures. The government put out an RFP through NIH. The institution was not sure that we should do this at first. They decided not to seek a level 4 (pathogens for which there is no cure) grant but rather to seek a Level 3 (pathogens for which there is a cure or treatment) facility, which is less dangerous. There is a \$35 million dollar gap between what the government will provide, what comes from indirect cost recovery, etc. and the actual cost. That alone may doom the project. The plan is to go through all of the procedures that are required, including FCUFS, CUCAC, and other consultation processes before we could go forward. The Provost will bring some one to the SEC to answer questions, and stated that he was "remiss" in not contacting Prof. Heath as this moved forward.

Most of the grants that have been made are on the east coast as part of a \$350 million dollar initiative. The University would be the only facility on the west coast. There are already some bio-containment labs at or proposed for other places in the country, e.g., Boston University (Level 4). The proposal for the UW, if it comes to pass, would be to build a facility that would work with the emerging centers of excellence in infectious diseases that are already here. There are substantial funding obstacles so that this proposal may come to naught. Thorud acknowledged the "dread factor" that may be expressed in community hearings. On the other hand, we have reason to believe that state health authorities would also like to see something like this established at the University. In the event of a national emergency, the federal government would be entitled to come to this facility for assistance.

In closing, he assured everyone that they will follow all processes. Thorud would like the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) to look at it for the first review and again apologized for being remiss in not presenting this sooner to the Senate leadership.

Moving to leadership searches, Thorud noted that Pat Spakes has been appointed chancellor for Tacoma. The Business School is in the final stages of its search as is the Graduate School. The Architecture search is up and running, and recently, Vice President Morris announced his decision to retire, which will also require a search. George Bridges will be leaving to become President of Whitman. A search committee will be set up but the timing of this will turn on the appointment of a new Provost. Finally, Denice Denton will become chancellor at University of California at Santa Cruz and will be leaving in February. The acting dean will be Mani Soma, and a search committee will be set up shortly. To put it mildly, there has been a lot of transition. In response to questions about open meetings in

the search process, Thorud noted that some of these meetings have already been held but he will be certain to check and see that all are invited.

Provost Search Committee Visit – Tom Daniel (Biology), Chair, Search Advisory Committee

Prof. Daniel introduced members of the committee. The committee is in the process of hiring a search firm. During January, the committee will hold open fora on all three campuses and meet with a wide variety of people to gather data and information. For example: What does the community want? What are the special opportunities and challenges facing the University? The initial screening will be confidential and then it will be open for the finalists. A discussion was held regarding the types of traits faculty would seek in a new provost. Nominations should be sent to daniel@ or uwsearch@ or the search firm, if desiring confidentiality.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Doug Wadden, Chair and Immediate Past Chair, Faculty Senate

There have been two meetings since the last SEC meeting. The dependent tuition proposal was presented, and the committee decided to hold off on action until we have more budget information generally. The initial thinking is that this is something that the Senate could endorse, but it will have a cost and there is a need to understand it relative to other budget proposals. Second, the committee has looked at the funding for Recruitment and Retention (R&R) and the initial state budget has been profiled. The initial budget as proposed looks reasonable, but this is at a very early point. The anticipated tuition increase would be 6-9% with financial aid going up to a ceiling of 5%; not as robust an increase as one might hope for nor does it fund enrollment increases. This is somewhat amazing given the well-known access issues. The tuition issue will be examined in future meetings, including differential tuition. We have reviewed a course fee policy that was well received; it has been reviewed in a number of forums. SCPB asked that it go out to affected departments for their review. A smaller subcommittee has been appointed to look at the unit adjustment policy.

When asked about the planning activities the committee pursues, Wadden described, by way of example, the information we got about the staff labor contracts that were recently negotiated. This allowed the group to see the impact of classified staff increases on the overall budget and salary picture. Planning tends to get buried in financial analysis, especially in budget years. SCPB does try to incorporate some planning. For example, if we bring up units to 20% behind cutoff, how do we assure that those units do not slip in the future? Thorud added that Emmert has indicated that he would like a strategic concept or statement developed for the University. Currently, the Board of Deans is working on a one-page statement. Emmert will then prepare his own statement. Then, it will be discussed with SCPB and the Faculty Senate. Emmert wants it to be a document that is actually used. Wadden mentioned the efforts made so far on a Vaughn-authored RCEP revision. The revision is designed to foster planning. The current version is driven by the concept of financial emergency and it needs to be shifted to one of strategic planning at all levels. He thinks that this could go a long way to providing a mechanism for planning. The unit adjustment could also provide a lot of information to do planning. Both of these are achievable this year.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative

We will know whether we have a certified governor tomorrow when the legislative votes to accept the results of the governor's race. Whoever becomes governor will start from a position of delayed implementation. Gov. Locke's budget is the current starting point. The governor's budget provides for a tuition increase although the 5% figure for financial aid acts as a cap on this. Performance contracts have "morphed" into performance agreements. It is unclear who could sign off on these and this has caused some problems. There will be higher expectations in performance than we had suggested. There are raises for non-classified staff in the budget that mirror the raises for classified staff (3.2% in Year One; 1.6% in Year Two); they will still need to be funded, however. There is some talk about faculty productivity, which has been disturbing. The performance agreements would mean that we would try to meet the state goals regarding things such as access. On the capital side, we did not get any planning money to get started for anything in 2007-2009, nor did we get the Bothell off ramp. So, there is work to be done.

Second, a number of higher ed bills are being developed. There will diversity bills in both chambers. The purpose would be to take us outside of the confines of I-200 for admissions; the legislature may now vote to override the initiative. Another bill would extend the student regent/trustee term to two years. Yet another bill would establish a Hispanic American scholarship, which appears to violate I-200. There will be a HEC Board bill that has faculty productivity provisions. One, for example, would be a student/faculty credit hour ratio and the suggestion that there be a distinction between lower division, upper division and graduate teaching. Some legislation would require more regulation of off-campus student housing in an effort to control "Greek Row" behavior.

Stygall ended her presentation by outlining committee and personnel changes in Olympia. She also briefly described the tax position of each gubernatorial candidate.

Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn

1. Current Issues: Vaughn reiterated her willingness to visit the councils and committees. She also described an initiative that she and Ross Heath will undertake to make the Special Committee on Faculty Women and the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs into permanent councils listed in the *Faculty Code*.
2. Vaughn sought input via a survey on legislative format preferences.
3. Transition: Finally, Vaughn noted that she will be leaving her position at the end of the academic year and described the transition measures that she is implementing.
4. Heath noted that he and Vaughn have discussed changing the ratio of faculty to senators, currently set at one to fifteen. Several proposals are being examined and one proposal, for example, would provide that every department have at least one senator.

Nominations and Appointments

1. Vice Chair Nominations: The nominating committee has submitted the following names:
 - a. Jan Sjøvik Associate Professor, Scandinavian Studies
 - b. Gail Stygall, Associate Professor, English

Approved.

2. Nominations: In addition to the names listed on the agenda, Stan Chernicoff (Geography) was nominated for a two year term on the Student Publication Board. All nominations were **approved**.

Reports from Councils and Committees

Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures – Marcia Killien, Chair, FCTCP

This grows out of a proposal that was included in the agenda as Exhibit D. When Pres. Huntsman issued this policy as an Executive Order last spring, the council was faced with implementation issues. The document is the process of a one-year discussion period, meeting with constituents on all three campuses. Some gaps still exist because of the lack of a clear vision on the relationship between the three campuses. The FCTCP seeks the endorsement of the SEC for the policy. It tries to uphold three things:

1. Coordination of curriculum between the three campuses
2. Establishing a formal venue for faculty involvement
3. Ensuring quality

The proposal attempts to locate a time before positions have hardened so that any input will be meaningful. To that end, proposals will be distributed to the involved campuses for comment. After it goes to the president, there will be a review that ensures that each campus has had a chance to make comments. The issues about this continue to focus on autonomy vs. coordination tensions that inhere in the relationships between the campuses. Heath added that it should be easy, with e-mail, to communicate. It also implicates the autonomy concerns for all three campuses so the proposal comes freighted with baggage that is independent of the merits of the proposal. Killien added there is nothing in this proposal that allows one campus to veto the proposal of another campus. Approval continues to rest with the campus and the usual university committees.

During discussion, Killien, in response to questions, said that there are additional implementation details in the Appendix. The council does not want this to become a Byzantine process. Also, the council is already coordinating these proposals by default; this proposal is preferable to what occurs now. Thorud added that Pres. Emmert has been delegating more responsibility to the Provost; this policy would need to be changed to reflect that. Heath added that this could be done by Executive Order, and noted that there were reporting relationships involving the chancellors, president and provost that made finalizing the policy sensitive. In a straw poll, the SEC supported the proposal.

Requests for Information

1. The Chair and the Secretary have recommended that our two special committees (Faculty Women, Minority Faculty Affairs) be upgraded to full council status. The numerous issues that continue to occupy these ad hoc committees more than justify a move to council status. Heath cited the continuing issues of diversity and the decision of some women going up for tenure to forego having children as examples of a need for these groups to become councils.
2. Draft Mission Statement on Diversity has been posted. Comments are being sought; it has also gone to the President.
3. Minimum Computer Security Standard Proposal (see report in attachments to the agenda): This report was generated by special committee that included a Faculty Senate member. The report documents special concerns regarding computer security at the University. We have 80,000 computers on the network and any computer could bring the system down. Similarly, AOL has refused to accept e-mail from UW partially because of our lack of a centralized security policy. This policy has been vetted with several groups. Members were asked to read over the policy and submit comments to ATAC.

Class A Legislation – Second Reading**Proposed Amendments Regarding Faculty Senate Operations**

Volume II, Various Sections, University Handbook

Vote: **Approved.**

New Business

None.

Adjournment

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

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

APPROVED BY: G. Ross Heath, Chair, Faculty Senate