

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
4 April 2005; 142 Gerberding Hall**

**Present:** Senate Chair Heath; Vice Chair Emery, Group Representatives: Rogers (II), Buck (IV), Christie (VI), Perkins (VII), Welton (VII), UW Tacoma Representative Jackson; Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Council Chairs: Janssen (FCAS), Kanal (FCET), Luchtel (FCFA), Stewart (FCR), Schwartz (FCSA), Martin (FCUL), Killien (FCTCP); Special Committee Chair, Mandoli (SCFW), Fabien (SCMFA), Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, GPSS Representative Grupp, Acting Provost Thorud,

**Absent:** President Mark Emmert\*, Group Representative Coldewey (I)\*, Swalla (III)\*, Hardy (V)\*, Lam (VIII)\*; UW Bothell Representative Watts\*, UW Faculty Council Chairs: Erdly (FCEO)\*, Carline (FCIQ)\*, Boxx (FCBR)\*, Schaufelberger (FCUFS)\*, Seifer (FCUR); Special Committee Chair Wadden (SCPB)\*, ASUW Representative Knowles, Assistant to the President Niccolls

\*=excused

**Guest:** Christine Ingebritsen, Associate Dean and Associate Vice Provost Office of Undergraduate Education, Susan E. Jeffords, Vice Provost for Academic Planning; Mr. Paul Constantine, Associate Director of Libraries Research & Instructional Services (FCBR), Mr. Jim Allen, GPSS,

The agenda, as amended, was **approved**. The minutes were **approved**.

**Opening Remarks from the Chair – G. Ross Heath**

Heath, beginning brief comments, noted that the Class A legislation regarding Faculty Senate operations has passed and that the council chairs are now voting members of the Committee. One of the good things that came out of this vote was an impression of how well the move to electronic voting has worked. Voting is up 33% from paper ballots so this has made a real difference. In a similar vein, the number of faculty expressing interest in councils is up by a factor of two, again something he attributes to an electronic nomination process. This is all a good sign for shared governance, and he thanked Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, and Tasha Taylor, Ass't to the Secretary, for their work in this area.

**Information: Update on University's Response to Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities – Susan Jeffords, Associate Provost**

(Reports and handouts distributed) The progress report is a two-year progress report responding to two of the six recommendations regarding the first, the future of the three campuses, and second, student learning objectives. Although she will address only two issues today, this does not mean that we are ignoring the other four areas. All six recommendations will be addressed in the five-year report. In the meantime, the interim report is due 23 April 2005.

Regarding the first area of concern, tri-campus relationships, she acknowledged the leadership of the Faculty Senate in moving this issue forward, noting the retreat that took place in October 2004. For the retreat, the Senate gathered a great deal of information regarding other multi-campus models around the country so that the various models could be discussed in a pro-and-con format at the retreat. In addition, each branch campus has developed two reports have been developed in response to state legislative requests. There has also been a discussion about administrative frameworks for the tri-campus arrangement, and the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy has pursued a number of issues relating to harmonizing the new *Code* provisions on tri-campus relationships, and has developed a successful and newly launched tri-campus curricular review procedure. Given these, she believes we can successfully show the accrediting group that we are seriously addressing these issues. She characterized these relationships as evolving, but that we have done a significant amount of work in the last two years.

Second, the conversation about student learning objectives has shifted to one about student learning goals. Here, again, there are a number of projects under way. Many of these developments

have been gathered in report authored by Christine Ingebritsen, Assoc. Dean, College of Undergraduate Education. Jeffords presented a summary of this report and Ingebritsen reviewed the progress in finalizing the documents and to make it a three-campus document. It will be on the web when it has been finalized. Jeffords also distributed a list that describes the progress that has been made by each undergraduate department regarding student learning goals. One problem that remains, however, has been trying to map and capture the interdisciplinary programs.

### **Report from the President – David Thorud, Acting Provost for Mark Emmert**

First, Thorud described the status of the budget process. One thing that has prevailed is the commitment to salaries, both for faculty and staff. The current proposals call for 3.2% for first year and 1.6% for the second year, and this is a better base than we have had in the past. We have reason to believe that the House will retain these salary increases. Therefore, we will have discussions about how best to use those dollars within the terms of the faculty salary policy in the *Faculty Code*. For example, we will need to discuss additional merit, recruitment and retention, and unit adjustments, all of which have been the subject of conversations in the SCPB. He pledged that there will be full faculty participation in these discussions. Thorud also noted the proposal, based on a health care surplus, to have higher premiums for non-represented employees. The legislature is hoping to end by late April. Leadership Updates: After six years of service, Warren Buck is resigning as chancellor at UWB, and will be going back to teaching. He will join the Seattle faculty in physics and an interim chancellor will be appointed. The School of Social Work dean search committee is up and running as is the School of Engineering search. There will be some other searches given George Bridges' appointment as president of Whitman College, and Ernest Morris' retirement, but search committees will not be appointed until other decisions about the shape of the undergraduate program have been made. Christine Ingebritsen will be interim dean for the Undergraduate College; Morris will not be stepping down until the end of September. The Architecture and Urban Planning search is going forward, and the Provost search committee is making good progress; there will probably be some visits in May.

### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Immediate Past Chair and Committee Chair**

This quarter, the committee will meet weekly. As the budget comes into final shape, we are having more discussions about the straw budget. There have been several discussions about unit adjustment policy. These have been difficult discussions because of the overall absence of faculty salary funds. We have received profiles of differential tuition allocation in the units that have those increases, and what their five year plan is for these reinvestments. With this in mind, Wadden noted that we will need serious discussions about the 2% policy in light of the small increases that we have received in the past and the relatively new existence of differential adjustments. These are new developments that were not anticipated when the 2% policy was developed. Because the legislative budget has used the language of COLA's, it means we need to discuss this policy in the changed budgetary context. Fabien asked questions about which units are pursuing the differential tuition policy and whether it would be extended. Thorud said that no other units are under consideration but this question will not go away.

The RBL Review Committee has met twice and has three more meetings scheduled before its May report is due.

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

In all three budget proposals, salary increases of 3.2% in the first year and 1.6% in the second year have been proposed. In the proposals, however, these have been called cost of living adjustments, and a sentence says that "(f)unds provided for this purpose cannot be used for any other purposes" which means we would need to find additional funds internally for merit increases. On health care premiums, the idea is that the average increase would be 12% but it would be borne differentially by represented and non-represented employees. This is the first time in a long time that there has been this distinction. Gregoire and the Senate have proposed different enrollment increases. The problem with the proposed increases, however, is that while Gregoire funds the increases at \$7,000 per student, the Senate funds enrollment at \$5,500 per student. This is a substantial difference. The Senate proposes a

1% cut to non-instructional funds. Finally, Gregoire proposes a tuition increase of 5% while the Senate proposes 7% in Senate with one-half of the increase to be given back to the general fund.

Stygall also reviewed the capital budgets and the funding for various building and renovation priorities. Oddly, despite the call for increased enrollment in Tacoma, no funding is provided for new buildings.

The Senate budget ends the promise grants and instead puts funding in need grants, a significant change. All bills so far have a version of the performance contract with a variety of measures for success.

In response to a question, Stygall mentioned that there have been some interesting statements about student financial aid. There may be money for capital projects at Tacoma but Bothell appears off the table because they have not resolved where growth should be north of King County.

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

Vaughn made announcements about upcoming Senate elections, reviewed the council issues sheet, and described the new tri-campus curricular review process.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

None.

### **Information: Proposal for Senate Re-apportionment – Ross Heath, Chair**

Heath called attention to Exhibit B, which describes some plans for Faculty Senate reapportionment. The Senate is about 100 senators larger than a decade ago, and if everyone attended, we would not have enough room in Gowen 301 to seat everyone. From a policy perspective, this raises questions about (1) what is the most appropriate ratio of voting faculty to senators, and (2) questions about unit representation where senators are shared, and the communication issues that develop between the units. A third issue is whether there is a minimum number of faculty for senate representation, e.g. units with less than four faculty members. On the other hand, a fourth issue is whether the representation of large units be non-linear. Exhibit B outlines the current situation and some scenarios for proposed changes. Thus, the point of this exhibit is to begin a discussion about whether we re-apportion the Senate, and at what points should we make changes.

This initial proposal generated a great deal of discussion. There are about twenty very small units, and often communication is not good where two units share a senator. Some members were concerned about non-proportional representation, but Heath observed it is a senate (non-proportional) rather than a house (traditionally proportional). Killien asked how these numbers would affect UWB and UWT. Bothell is one unit, but there are three units in Tacoma. Taylor and Vaughn noted that there have been extensive discussions with those campuses about their preference for representation in the past and any changes would not change this level of consultation.

Welton pointed out that the representation pattern picked should reflect the purpose and role of the Faculty Senate for the faculty as a whole and the University administration. So, part of this question is not just numbers, but at heart, relates to the purpose and what we want to do as a Faculty. The form should follow the function. Heath spoke generally about the role of the Senate, and pointed out that the heart of our role is that the Senate represents the diversity of the faculty across the University. He acknowledged that the Senate is working well but given the change in size, it seemed an appropriate time to ask this question before any possible problems emerge.

Asked about representation in large departments, Vaughn noted that the voting faculty franchise has been expanded which increases the number of senators in schools with large numbers of lecturers and/or research faculty. Wadden noted that attendance over the last three years has increased. It may be that this has affected units disproportionately in terms of which units have had the largest gains while other units might be static. Jackson (Tacoma) noted that they have a parallel structure at their campus and at Bothell, and believes it would be useful to have a leadership discussion about the functions of these different bodies. Vaughn noted that this issue was discussed at the tri-campus retreat.

Heath asked about the desire of the group at this point. Mandoli asked whether the size of the Senate has become unwieldy. Wadden said that there are times that the perception of size is not an inducement to participate and this may affect quorum. Sometimes we can lose quorum because the size

can allow disengagement; the current size may not always be an inducement for informed involvement. We have been getting between 150 to 180 senators per meeting where as about three years ago it was only 90 people.

Action: The issue was referred to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

## **Announcements**

None.

### **Class C Resolution: A Resolution in Support of Electronic Dissertations and Master's Theses – Presented by Seelye Martin, Chair, Faculty Council on University Libraries**

This resolution, attached as Exhibit C to the agenda, was originally approved in the GPSS and was referred to FCUL where it passed unanimously. The idea would be to put graduate theses in an electronic archive, and Betsy Wilson, Library Director, has endorsed it. Basically, we would treat electronic theses the same way as paper versions. For example, there would be limited access to conform to various considerations about publication. This proposal would not exclude paper submissions, however, which is common in fine arts and implementation would be done by the Graduate School and Library. Jimmy Allen, GPSS senator in Urban Planning, also addressed the merits of the proposal, pointing out that competing universities such as UCLA and Berkeley already follow this practice, and that this is a direction in which we need to move.

During discussion, Stygall asked about University Microforms and what would happen to that system. Paul Constantine from the library spoke and said that University Microforms is selling electronic copies and there may be some questions, but other universities are pursuing this policy with no problem. Adam Grupp (GPSS) said that this is part of the GPSS policy to make more information available in an electronic format. The Graduate School would develop an implementation policy for this. Allen noted that this would give PhD students visibility and recognition of their scholarship. Janssen asked about the cost to students, and Martin suggested that this cost will come out of the Graduate School committee, but noted that the technology is already in place. It will not be mandatory to use this system. In response to questions about the exact contours of the policy, Vaughn noted that an implementation committee will develop the final details of the program.

**Vote: The Senate Executive Committee votes unanimously to forward this resolution to the full Senate for its endorsement.**

### **Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Proposed Amendments Requesting a Name and Status Change for SCFW and SCMFA – Presented by Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs with Dina Mandoli, Chair, SCFW and Brian Fabien, Chair, SCMFA.**

Luchtel noted that each committee has been in existence for over at least twenty years and that each group now acts independently. Fabien noted that the committee cannot bring independent resolutions to the Faculty Senate, and that any policy making process involves multiple meetings above and beyond what is normal because of the need to go to FCFA as well as their own meetings. Independent status would give each group a place at the table so that they can suggest changes to the *Faculty Code*. The FCFA voted unanimously in favor of this legislation. Mandoli pointed to the reports that have come out about women and minority representation in academia, and stated that this is an apt time to make these bodies independent. Second, she said, the FCFA is overworked and its agenda is already too large without considering these issues. Raising the boat for faculty women will help everyone on the faculty. Heath said that when these “ad hoc” committees were set up, people thought these problems would be solved quickly, but it has taken much more time given how embedded in our society. That view, then, was unrealistic and this proposal recognizes that reality.

During discussion, Fabien noted that the historical connection between the three committees will not be lost because there are interactions at SEC and interlocking administrative members of the **three** committees. Vaughn explained mechanisms for coordination further. After some changes to the rationale that accompanied the legislation, the matter was put to a vote.

**Vote: Unanimous, that the legislation be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration.**

## **New Business**

The agenda for the 21 April 2005 Faculty Senate meeting was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty  
APPROVED BY: G. Ross Heath, Chair Faculty Senate