

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Room 142, Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., Monday, 4 October 2004

Present: Senate Chair Heath; Vice Chair Emery; Group Representatives: Rogers (II), Swalla (III), Buck (IV), Hardy (V), Christie (VI), Perkins (VII), Welton (VII), Lam (VIII); UW Tacoma Representative Jackson; Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Council Chairs: Janssen (FCAS), Luchtel (FCFA), Boxx (FCRIB), Stewart (FCR), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Killien (FCTCP), Martin (FCUL); Special Committee Chair Fabien (SCMFA), Wadden (SCPB); Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative Souders, ASUW Representative Knowles, Acting Provost Thorud, Assistant to the President Niccolls

Absent: President Emmert*, Group Representative Coldewey (I)*; UW Faculty Council Chairs: Erdly (FCEO)*, Carline (FCIQ)*, Schwartz (FCSA)*, Seifer (FCUR); UW Bothell Representative Watts*, GPSS Representative Grupp

* excused

Guest: Vice Provost of Planning and Budgeting Harlan Patterson, Professor Kathleen Fearn-Banks (FCSA)

The meeting was called to order at 2:31 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Approved.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the 3 May 2004 Senate Executive Committee meeting and the 13 May 2004 were **approved**.

Opening Remarks of the Chair – G. Ross Heath

Analogizing the start of the academic year to the start of a baseball season, with both optimistic and pessimistic expectations, Heath noted the academic year starts in a context of uncertainty that awaits the election.

For the last twenty years, business as usual has been cuts in the general fund for education. The outcome of this is that tuition has been raised to compensate for cuts without giving anything additional to students, we are overcrowded, and our salaries have fallen compared to our peers. Part of the problem is that the legislature starts anew each session and looks at a very short period of time rather than a long range view, historically or prospectively. One new aspect, though, of the "business as usual" agenda will be the introduction of performance contracts, a development which has potential advantages and disadvantages.

On a positive note, there were no cuts this year and we did receive a small salary raise. Discussions have also begun regarding the future of a three campus university and inter-collegiate athletics. Both of these issues will be recurring topics this year.

In terms of shared governance, we are generally in good shape. The new president has expressed his support of shared governance, and he had a good record on this at his former university. We look forward to working with him in the coming year.

Report from the President – Mark Emmert

[In the President's absence, David Thorud, Acting Provost, presented the report.]

Thorud started by putting the performance contract issue in context. One of the metrics used for this university is dollars per student expended. In past years, we included many more metrics and departmental "wish lists" in our budget requests. Over the years, we learned that what came out of the legislative session had nothing to do with the original request. During Huntsman's tenure, we decided to use a straightforward approach. The central metaphor for the budget now is dollars per student. The idea has gotten some traction but it has not been fully embraced. For example, over the years, our standings in per pupil expenditure have steadily dropped. As a result of this erosion, we are now 17th on the list of 24 peer institutions in per pupil funding. Thus, although many parts of the University are flourishing, core expenditures for student programs are in trouble. There are many approaches we could take to addressing this. We have rejected privatization. Another approach would be to approach the legislature, requesting more money for higher education. In spite of the merits of our arguments, this has not been successful given the other demands on the state budget. We have also rejected the third option: that we accept the decline of the University in the face of current economic and political trends.

As a result, we have sought another way of addressing these issues. We wanted enrollment, state funding and tuition all simultaneously on the table in a way that would allow us to be competitive. With all of these on the table, the performance contract idea emerged from discussions about raising tuition or cutting access. The legislature passed legislation in the last session that directed the research universities to develop a prototype. Thorud admitted that the term "contract" has made some faculty nervous. This word, however, was used because it carried more weight than "compact" which was regarded as a "softer" term.

Over the past few months, we have been putting together a document that will be a starting point for conversations. Similar developments have occurred at WSU. The Governor's Office and the HEC Board have also been involved. Directing attention to the draft attached to the agenda, Thorud stated that if we can negotiate the right relationship with the state, that over the next eight years (the term of the contract), we could improve our competitive position. Doing so, however, will require that we provide some benchmarks of performance. Thorud said that the contract has to work for both sides; we cannot put the state in a "box." This is a starting draft; there will be lots of conversations over the next few months. Finally, he commented, even if this does not result in a contract, the administration still believes that the conversation itself will have benefits in attracting attention to our issues and problems.

Finally, Provost Thorud reminded everyone about the launch of the public portion of the Campaign for Washington on October 15, 2004 at Hec Edmundsen Pavilion, and expressed the hope that everyone attend.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Chair

The SCPB has met once this year. This is a budget year so this will be a more intense year, especially in the winter term. Performance contracts consumed the agenda of the first meeting. Wadden also noted that there have been a lot of questions about the document and the process that led to it. The steering group for this has included faculty, and a faculty group assessed the drafts prepared by the Administration. Numerous meetings took place over the summer.

Since then, the contract has been profiled for the Regents. Similarly, there was a good discussion of the draft at the SCPB meeting. The document varies in the level of both explicit and implicit expectations, as well as exclusions. Similarly, we have reviewed the WSU draft. His goal at this point is to present it to the Faculty Senate at its first meeting.

He acknowledged that there are omissions in the document, and it is not intended to reflect the entire mission of the University. This is not a strategic planning document and is not intended to reflect everything we do. Faculty Senate leadership has raised questions about how we raise those different dimensions. Another issue has been measurement of access and other outcomes. The document has provoked a number of questions and comments that will be addressed as we move forward in this process.

Finally, the Tri-Campus Task Force will be hosting a retreat on the future of the three campus university at the end of October. Simultaneously, both Bothell and Tacoma campuses are producing HB 2707 reports in response to legislation passed last session.

Questions and Comments/

The performance contract generated a great deal of discussion in which the following points were made:

1. To ensure consistency, the administration will attempt to integrate the accountability measures discussions that grow out of the HEC Board planning process and the performance contract. Harlan Patterson, Vice Provost for Planning Budgeting, commented that our response to the HEC Board accountability proposals will be to refer them to the performance contract as a more appropriate measure than the generic ones proposed by the Board.
2. Drafts of the performance contract have not been released to the general University community pending the release of restrictions that the Governor's office imposed.
3. The current performance contract draft does not include actual benchmark numbers. Patterson said that currently we are in a conceptual phase, discussing what general ideas should be included. The second phase will be to fill in the blanks with actual numbers. We have data on all of the elements regarding where we are now and the benchmarks. We have used HEC Board peers or other historical trends if peer information is not available. We want to be able to point directly to a measure and also to pinpoint the amount of money that would be required to meet a particular outcome. We want to establish a linkage between what they want us to do and what we have as resources. Gov. Locke has indicated an interest in following this process even as he leaves office, and both candidates have indicated some willingness to do so.

4. There will be a number of University-wide discussions on this proposal once the Governor's office lifts the embargo, which should be soon. It is anticipated that there will be a wide range of opinions about the document, and a need to put the document in context. Several administrators have volunteered to speak to faculty groups. Once the legislature is in session, however, we will need to speak with one voice: Administration, Faculty and Students.

5. Some concern was directed at selecting and describing the appropriate measures for the University. The measures will need to be flexible because of the breadth of activities at the University, and they should be perceived as valid measures of what we do. The administration is endeavoring to keep the measures at a macro level for the entire university so that they are not driven down to individual units, leading to micromanagement. The stress on developing these measures is to find things that are good for us and good for the quality of education. This should not lead to a regime of the much disliked faculty activity reports.

6. There was a concern that the obligations described in the document be mutual, and lead to increased revenue since the current document was perceived as placing heavier burdens on the University than on the state. State officials, and both gubernatorial candidates, are aware of this process and are willing to do the work to bring it to fruition.

7. The purpose of this document is to move the University forward. We have rejected an approach, proposed by the Governor's office, that would have begun with the status quo. The idea that the contract should "do no harm" to the University has informed discussions to date.

8. Another audience for the contract will be the external public and business communities. They may well be supportive of this contract as a way to improve the University's competitive position.

9. There was an extensive discussion about the desirability of a public relations aspect in the performance contract. Currently, it is not intended to be a public relations or "sales" document, although there was some sentiment at the meeting that we should consider and incorporate this angle. The rebuttal is that its purpose is to change behavior in Olympia. In a sense, it asks the legislature directly whether it wants to make an intentional decision about having a top public research university in the state. The fact that we have become so is due more to growth and accident rather than a series of explicit policy decisions. Second, if we were to incorporate the public relations aspect, we would have to make a conscious decision about whether our job is to engage in workforce training or to provide a well educated workforce, or arrive at an appropriate balance of both functions.

7. Some of the benchmarks may not appear to move us forward that much. Patterson said that the premise is that our performance level is really outstanding but that it cannot be maintained in the current resource environment. That is a hard argument to make when nothing is broken yet so this is taking a risk. But, in education, by the time you are broken, it is too late to fix it. Three years ago no one in Olympia thought there was a problem with higher education. Now, many people believe that there is a problem but there is no agreement on a solution. Patterson invited comments from faculty about points that could be included in this document.

As this portion of the discussion continued, one identified problem is that the legislature identifies some of the problems we pin on it as our problems, such as time to degree and

taking to many classes. And, their response has often been to pass legislation on these topics without offering resources. The legislature tends to conceptualize education differently than we do; Patterson added that the legislative response tends to be an expectation that we should just be more efficient or "just" grant more degrees. While the state's production of bachelor's degrees overall is very low, the University is actually extremely efficient at producing bachelor's given measures like time to degree.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

Stygall reported that she spent most of her summer visiting various legislative personnel. The upcoming election is important; there are twelve to fourteen seats in play. Any change might affect performance contracts, but this depends upon who is ultimately elected both in the legislature and in the Governor's office. She noted that some legislators are concerned about access as we approach 30,000 students without seats in higher education while others are interested in the needs of the business community. There are many legislative reactions to this. Some, for example, point to how cheaply we can educate people in the community colleges. One concern she has is that by UW and WSU going forward on the performance contracts, it splits the higher education community during a deficit budget year. She opined that we are most successful when all six colleges and universities speak with one voice.

The Council of Faculty Representatives has begun meeting and developing a "Plan B" on salaries. All four comprehensives are asking for raises in a deficit year. The plan would address either compression or unit adjustments, depending upon circumstances on each campus.

Questions/

1. Brent Stewart (Chair, FCR) asked what responsibility the University has to address the regressive nature of the tax structure in the state. Thorud said that while the University will seek more state funding, no one has ever said we should seek increased taxes. Stygall said that from time to time, we have discussed making University expertise available to legislative committees about these topics. In fact, we could improve our reputation if we were willing to do this. Perhaps councils can gather information along these lines.

Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn

1. Issues: No new issues have been reported since the SEC Orientation.
2. Husky Card Report: Vaughn directed attention to the report of this committee, stating that the University will be adopting a one card approach for identification, U Pass, and service.

Nominations and Appointments

Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately:

Bruce Balick, Astronomy, Group Three, Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Jeffrey L. Schwartz, Radiation Oncology, Group Seven, Faculty Council on Student Affairs for a term ending September 15, 2007 and as chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs for a term ending September 15, 2005.

Marcy Stein, Education, UW Tacoma, Group Ten, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Carol Leppa, Nursing, UW Bothell, Group Nine, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Ilene S. Schwartz, Education, Group Five, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Craig H. Allen, School of Law, Group Five, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Jim Fridley, Forest Resources & Mechanical Engineering, Group Six, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting for a term ending September 15, 2006.

Susan Woods, School of Nursing, Group Eight, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Brian Fabien, Mechanical Engineering, Group Six, Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs, for a term ending September 15, 2007 and as chair of the Minority Faculty Affairs, for a term ending September 15, 2005.

Sandra Silberstein, English, Group One, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Gerry Philipsen, Communication, Group Two, as chair of the Adjudication Panel Winter and Spring quarters, 2005, 2006.

Jan Sjavik, Scandinavian Studies, Group One, as chair of the Adjudication Panel Fall Quarters 2004, 2005

Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2005, **with voting rights to be determined by the SEC (unless otherwise specified):**

Representatives from Retired Faculty:

Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards Jody Nyquist, Communications
Educational Technology Robert Albrecht, Architecture
Faculty Affairs Robert Blumenthal, Mathematics
Research Samuel Dworkin, Dentistry
Retirement, Insurance & Benefits Ernest Henley, Physics
Student Affairs Jack Hatlen, Environmental Health
University Facilities & Services Martha Fales, Dental Public Health
University Relations Rheba de Tornay, School of Nursing

Special Committees:

Faculty Women Maureen Henderson, Epidemiology

Representatives of the Professional Staff Organization:Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards Mariko Navin, Information School
 Michelle Trudeau, Forest Resources, Alternate
Faculty Affairs Melissa Johnson, School of Public Health
Instructional Quality Michelle Trudeau, Forest Resources
Research Suzette-Asby-Larrabee, Management Accounting & Analysis
Retirement, Insurance & Benefits Ross McKenzie, Architecture/Urban Planning
 Marilyn Gray, Graduate School, Alternate
Student Affairs Bobbe Miller-Murray, Student Affairs, UWT
Tri-Campus Policy Christene James, Human Development & Disability
 Bobbe Miller-Murray, Student Affairs, UWT, Alternate
University Libraries Laurel Sercombe, School of Music
 Jeanette Mills, School of Art, Alternate
University Relations Alicia Palacio, Development/Alumni Relations

Special Committees:

Faculty Women Suzanne St. Peter, School of Social Work

Representatives of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington:Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards Louise Richards
Educational Outreach Thom Deardorff
Educational Technology Nancy McMurrer
Faculty Affairs Paula Walker
Instructional Quality John Holmes
Retirement, Insurance & Benefit Paul Constantine
Student Affairs Jill McKinstry
Tn-Campus Policy Cynthia Fugate
University Facilities & Service Charles Chamberlin
University Libraries Joyce L. Ogburn
University Relations Linda Whang

Special Committees:

Faculty Women Susanne Redalje
Minority Faculty Affairs Laura Lillard

Representatives of the Administration (without vote):Faculty Council on Academic Standards:

Dean, Undergraduate Education, George Bridges
Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services W.W. Washburn
Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Enrique Morales
Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Emile Pitre

Faculty Council on Educational Outreach:

Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary

Faculty Council on Educational Technology:

Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs:

Vice Provost Steven Olswang

Faculty Council on Instructional Quality:

Dean Undergraduate Education, George Bridges
Associate Director, CIDR, Wayne Jacobson

Faculty Council on Research:

Assistant Controller, Grant & Contract Accounting, Susan Camber
Assist Vice Provost for Research, Carol Zuiches
Associate Vice Provost for Research, Malcolm Parks
Director, Purchasing and Stores, Kerry Kahi

Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits

Vice Provost Steven Olswang
Director of Benefits, Benefits Office, Kathleen Dwyer
Director, Retirement Center, Patricia Dougherty

Faculty Council on Student Affairs:

Director, Student Financial Aid, S. Kay Lewis
Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Enrique Morales
Acting Associate Dean, Graduate School, Tom Gething
Vice Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations, Konstantinos Kravas
Interim Director of Student Athletic Academic Services, Pam Robenolt

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy:

Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Bothell, Jane Decker
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Tacoma, Jack Nelson
Vice Provost Steven Olswang

Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services:

Associate Vice President, Facilities Services, Jeraldine McCray
Associate Vice President, Capital Projects, Richard Chapman
Director of Budget and Administration, Health Sciences Administration, Kathryn Waddell
Acting Director, Capital & Space Planning, Colleen Pike

Faculty Council on University Libraries:

Director, University Libraries, Betsy Wilson

Director, Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center, Sherrilynne Fuller

Faculty Council on University Relations:

Associate Vice President, University Relations, Norman Arkans

Deputy Director, Regional Affairs, Aaron Hoard

Special Committee on Faculty Women:

Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick

Director, Women's Center, Sutapa Basu

Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs:

Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick

Assistant to the Vice President, OMA/NEW Initiatives, Gabriel Gallardo

Approved.

Reports from Councils and Committees

None.

Information

1. Performance Contract (discussed earlier)
2. 2. Internet Technology and Wireless Access on Campus: Currently, we do not have a formal policy on this and some departments have put together their own networks, which have the potential to cause security problems. The University, in collaboration with the students, has proposed to move forward with wiring the entire campus over a three year period at a cost of \$7.5 million. Some of the funding will come from the student technology fund. More problematic than the installation is the on-going maintenance of the network. The proposal is that it be handled by increasing line charges by \$2.38. Bothell and Tacoma have been addressed but not off-campus facilities. The list only covered 04-05. Some units may have to pay the costs themselves. The Faculty Council on Research (FCR) and Faculty Council on Educational Technology (FCET) should be in the loop on these conversations. One person noted that his department is trying to eliminate or decrease phone service to avoid the maintenance fee tax on lines.

Announcements

1. Come Together Washington – This is the launch of the public part of the fund raising campaign, and faculty are encouraged to attend as we benefit from many of the programs that will be funded through this effort.

New Business

- a. Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda: **Approved.**
- b. 2004-2005 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule. A change was to accommodate the new president's schedule. **Approved.**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

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

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