

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Room 142, Gerberding Hall
2:30 p.m., Monday, November 15, 2004

Present: Senate Chair Heath; Acting Provost Thorud; Group Representatives: Rogers (II), Swalla (III), Buck (IV), 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), Schwartz (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Killien (FCTCP), Martin (FCUL); Wadden (SCPB); Special Committee Chair Mandoli (SCFW), Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, ASUW Representative Knowles, GPSS Representative Grupp

Absent: Vice Chair Emery*, Group Representative Coldewey (I)*, Hardy (V)*; UW Faculty Council Chairs: Erdly (FCEO)*, Carline (FCIQ)*, Seifer (FCUR); UW Bothell Representative Watts*, Special Committee Chair Fabien (SCMFA), Deputy Legislative Representative Souders

*** = excused**

Guest: Clark Pace (FCSA), Steven Demorest (FCRIB), Todd Turner, Athletic Director, Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative

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

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was **approved** as printed.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the 4 October 2004 Senate Executive Committee meeting and the 28 October 2004 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Opening Remarks of the Chair – Ross Heath

Heath noted that, unfortunately, I-884 did not pass. Given this, and other electoral outcomes, we will have to take our destiny in our own hands and work creatively.

Report from the Provost – Acting Provost David Thorud

[Heath noted that pursuant to new procedures from President Emmert, the Provost will now attend meetings as a voting member rather than the president.]

Thorud began by noting the success of the Tri-campus Retreat several weekends ago. Its success showed the benefit of shared governance, and he thanked former chair Douglas Wadden and others for their hard work on this retreat. At the same time, Bothell and Tacoma were able to preview their strategic plans. The retreat outcomes will be presented to the Regents. Tri-campus issues are becoming a matter of public interest as the HEC Board holds public hearings. WSU is moving in the same direction; later this month, there will be a joint meeting of both boards of Regents.

I-884 went down “big time” and this sends an important message. We may have some difficult times ahead and, echoing Heath, we will have to take more control of our destiny. We are facing a budget shortfall in Olympia at a time when we have some big issues facing us such as salaries. Again, we may have to take responsibility for this on our own and find funds internally. Similarly, the negotiated labor contracts will be presented in Olympia. It is unclear how this will play out. He believes that there may be a budget cut of 2-5% but he believes there will also be some funds for compensation.

One of the initiatives that survived the election is the performance contract. One of its advantages in addressing our budget dilemma is that it would change the nature of the conversation between the legislature and the University regarding what the University does for the citizens of the state of Washington. We continue to shape the discussion by focusing on the numbers of dollars per student as the discussion starting point. In the process, he hopes that all of us in the University community can come together and develop a common approach for our goals. This could enhance our position in Olympia.

At this time, we do not know who will be governor. Neither candidate has shown a lot of interest in higher education so it will be an interesting time.

After Thorud’s remarks, there was a discussion of the vacancy that has been created by George Bridges’ laudable appointment as president of Whitman College. Heath added that he hopes that we will take a moment to step back and look at that office and its relation to the College of Arts and Sciences before proceeding forward with a search.

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

The Committee continues to discuss the most recent versions of performance contract documents. Tentative budget figures are now being developed and an academic assessment group has been looking closely at the language of the draft. He expects that the next new version will be issued in mid-December when, it is hoped, a new governor has been elected.

Second, the Committee took a close look at course fees, discovering first that they produce less revenue (\$1.5 million) than expected. Suggestions were made about making information regarding these fees more accessible to students. Similarly, the group discussed some kind of review process where students could raise questions about these fees.

A third topic was unit adjustment policy. The group decided to form a joint committee to look at unit adjustment policy. Members will include Michael Halleran (Classics, Div. Dean), Tom Jones (Business) and Paul Hopkins (Chemistry) as well as SCPB members Craig Allen, Gail Stygall, Jim Gregory, Ashley Emery, Lea Vaughn and Ross Heath from Senate. A preliminary reporting date of January 2005 was set. While the group will look at the entire compensation policy, the focus is on unit adjustment.

Finally, the committee has looked at the wireless campus project which will be phased in over three years. It will be funded by local charges based on the number of unit phone lines. There has been some discussion as to whether a phone line surcharge is the best way to achieve stable funding for the maintenance of this initiative. The Board of Deans will also examine this topic.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative

While we are still without a governor, the two largest issues for the University are the budget deficit and the performance contract. We face a real change in the legislative composition of the body. The new senate leader is a faculty member from Gonzaga University who should be more sympathetic to our concerns. In the House, the Democrats picked up three seats. Given who was re-elected, we have retained some people who are familiar with performance contracts. Stygall then gave an extensive review of the changes in the legislature. Even with these changes, it will still be difficult for higher education.

The choice of governor will affect how the performance contract issue is presented. If Gregoire should win, the Office of Financial Management can carry the ball. If Rossi should win, it is not clear who would present this issue. Rossi is not interested in higher taxes, but he is not interested in tax loopholes either.

The main issue for the Council of Faculty Representatives is "salary, salary and salary." Most of the other institutions have asked for salary increases.

Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn

- a. Council Reports – Vaughn distributed a handout outlining council issues.
- b. Legislative Format: Council chairs will be polled on their preferred format for proposed legislative changes (one versus two columns).

Nominations and Appointments

a. Faculty Senate Vice Chair Nominations– The nominating committee has asked for a little more time and will present nominations in the winter quarter.

b. Nominations:

1. Shannon Mills, Joint GPSS/ASUW Representative to Senate Comm. on Planning and Budgeting for a one-year term ending 15 September 2005
2. Kalpana Kanal (Radiology), Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Technology for a term ending 15 September 2005

Approved.

Reports from Councils and Committees

Tuition Benefit Proposal - Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits – Karen Boxx, Chair

Steve Demorest (Music) made a brief power point presentation regarding the proposed benefit. The committee has consulted several groups within the University. The majority of HEC Board peers offer this benefit; currently, staff and faculty get a six-credit tuition benefit on a space available status. This would extend that benefit to spouse/child/same sex domestic partner for a quarterly tuition waiver up to 50% of full-time undergraduate tuition at the UW. The beneficiary would have to compete in the regular admissions process, and this would count against our enrollment cap although enrollment would be blind. Eligibility

determinations would use the PEBB definition of dependant, i.e., up through the age of twenty-three. The longer the qualifying period, the less it costs us. If, for example, there were a five-year waiting period, it would cost 1.5-1.8 million dollars per year. These figures are based on the need to be admitted and experience at other universities. It would be for the cost of undergraduate tuition only, and extend to people with appointments of 50% and greater.

During discussion, some stated that this proposal benefits younger faculty because of the dependant age cutoff. This led to a discussion of cafeteria-style benefits plans. Boxx stated that if that is the proposal, then the cost figures presented change entirely. Another segment of the discussion focused on the portability of the benefit. This would require buy-in from other institutions, although Demorest noted that this is the way that Oregon went: system-wide. A tuition benefit would be taxable. Thorud noted that this is an attractive benefit but that it needs to be viewed against other budgetary commitments; there would have to be a trade-off somewhere. The consensus emerged that the proposal should go to SCPB as its next step.

Information and Class C Resolution

Information: Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative, and Todd Turner, Athletic Director

Presentation of Class C Resolution: Endorse the Spirit of the Framework for Athletic Reform of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) – Jeff Schwartz, Chair, Faculty Council on Student Affairs

1. Dobel Statement

The NCAA regulations, while requiring that each university have a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR), do not describe the position's duties. Within the Pac 10, the trend is to assign more responsibilities to the FAR: academic eligibility determinations, a right to vote at Pac10 and NCAA meetings if the president is not present, and partial responsibility for compliance. The nature of the position has changed from more day-to-day involvement with compliance to focus on academic integrity issues, and to work with coaches and the faculty. Recent athletic department personnel changes made it possible to rethink the FAR position. Dobel asked the SEC to review the FAR/Senate agreement regarding the working relationship between the two. There will be a FAR report once a quarter, as well as a yearly December report from the Athletic Director to the Senate when data has been prepared regarding student performance in the program.

Dobel stated that this agreement is important because it is easy for the FAR to become a part of the athletic department; this agreement keeps the FAR accountable to the Faculty. A number of steps have been taken to more fully integrate faculty involvement into the athletic department. For example, he was part of a strategic planning meeting with the student and academic support services of the athletic department. Third, he noted that the Academic Council on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) has been re-invigorated by Pete Dukes (Business) as chair, with a charter to become involved in policy and to be sounding board for faculty advice to the FAR. Also, the director of the student academic services will be sitting on the Faculty Council on Student Affairs. Finally, the athletic department has created a council to coordinate all of the services provided for student welfare.

Dobel then introduced our new athletic director Todd Turner. He previously held positions at Connecticut, North Carolina State, and Vanderbilt. He was selected in part because of his commitment to academics as part of the student athlete experience. He has been a leader in pushing for academic reforms.

2. Turner Statement

After distributing a fact sheet about the program, he noted that 659 students are involved in the program with nearly a 50/50 split between men and women. It is a large commitment of resources and therefore needs to be managed carefully. Turner highlighted the academic outcomes of the students. Coming in, they may be slightly below the average of the incoming student body but the outcomes are about the same – they are very much like the rest of the student body. This is a good outcome but he believes that we can do even better and take further steps to integrate athletes into the activities of the student body. He complimented George Bridges on the partnership he has provided in this effort. Graduation rates are within 4% of the rest of student body.

Turner next focused on the proposals for NCAA academic reform. Miles Brand, current NCAA president (and former president of Indiana University) proposed these reforms. First, it would change the core curriculum requirements that a student athlete must pass in high school in order to be eligible. The proposal would call for an increase to sixteen core courses by fall 2008. The second component would be to increase the academic performance requirements of enrolled student athletes. This would be a huge change. The biggest change was that by the fifth semester, a student must have completed 40% of the courses in their major. This would ensure progress towards graduation. This is accompanied by a GPA requirement; both must be maintained to be eligible. If they compete, they should be headed toward graduation. This changes the landscape on campus in two ways: the students must be willing to engage the academic enterprise and it moves them to an assumption of degree completion.

The third part of the reforms would tie rewards and punishments to academic progress. For example, poor performance might reduce the number of scholarships and recruiting opportunities. Thus, academic performance could affect a program's competitive advantages. There are new metrics: an academic progress rate which would be calculated for each team, retention, continuing eligibility and graduation. He referenced the preliminary numbers in the Fact Sheet to show our success so far. These numbers are calculated for every scholarship athlete; there are no regulations yet for walk-ons although this is being studied. The metrics are designed to catch habitual underperformers and penalize them.

Discussion/

Three topics emerged in discussion:

1. Some concern was raised about the utility of these metrics and whether they will actually change behavior. The concern is that the students must be taking courses that are typical of other non-athlete students for these numbers to be meaningful. Turner agreed that these are minimal requirements and we could do better, but that we do not have courses that are designed for athletes and easy grades. At the end of the day, though, Turner commented faculty are the ones in charge of the curriculum and only they can ensure that the courses are appropriate. In the long run, he would like student athletes to do better since they are recruited to come here and should be performing at a higher level.

We will need to also watch the changing competitive structure of the rest of the undergraduate body.

2. In response to a question, Turner noted that students can receive up to five years of support over six years. Despite this, we are counseling students into a four/ four-and-a-half year graduation track.

3. There was some concern expressed about the monitoring of the program and how widely available information should be. Currently, the University is undergoing a NCAA re-certification that will collect the kind of data discussed at this meeting and it will be available in the spring. Currently the website is internal to the department but it will be public in April. Last time, the report found nearly identical academic results in non-revenue sports with distortions only in the two major revenue-generating sports.

Presentation of Class C Motion

Schwartz presented the Class C motion (attached to agenda). First, Schwartz presented information about the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) which is sponsoring the reform efforts that are the subject of the Class C resolution. The hope is that this group will be out in front of the NCAA, spurring reform. Students also support the proposal. Heath noted that Dobel will be meeting regularly with students and this is a way to show our support. COIA is composed of a group of different faculty senates that would send a representative to meet and discuss athletic reforms. Heath talked about the need for the University to be out in front in leading the reform movement. In terms of a COIA representative's relationship to the FAR and the Faculty Senate, Vaughn pointed out that SEC would appoint this person; we could require regular reports and establish that the FAR would work with this person. Within the University level, Heath stated, we can make sure that the COIA representative is plugged into our councils and on the other side, this representative would be involved in the NCAA. Wadden suggested that we should think this through holistically and work out the connections between the various faculty bodies and representatives that work with the athletic program. **Vote: Passes unanimously, with the friendly amendment that the COIA representative would also serve on the ACIA.**

Class A Legislation: Proposed Amendments regarding Faculty Senate Operations, Volume Two – Various Sections. Presented by Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.

Vaughn described the "housekeeping" nature of many of the proposed amendments. Several of them are necessitated by the change to electronic voting, while others reflect changes in departments. A written rationale will presented for the Faculty Senate meeting.

Vote: Passes unanimously, with the addition of a friendly amendment suggested by the Faculty Code Advisory Committee.

Class B Legislation: Policy regarding the Acceptance of Transfer Credits, Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 1, Section 6. Presented by Donald Janssen, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Referring to the rationale included in the agenda, Janssen stated that changes mandated by the state legislative motivate this proposal. Last spring, the council gave temporary

guidance to the Admissions Office; this legislation would be a permanent policy. It would limit transfer credits to ninety credits at time of transfer and once in major, students could seek to transfer in their additional credits. There is a maximum of 135 credits total. Majors require 180 credits. The council sought information from both the Bothell and Tacoma campuses about their practices and requirements, but has not heard back from Tacoma. His opinion was that this requirement is not inconsistent with their requirements. Seattle, actually, is in a worse position in the sense that most of our students have 2/3 of their credits in lower division courses. Vaughn asked for statement of the impact of the proposal on Bothell and Tacoma. **Vote: Approved unanimously.**

New Business

The Faculty Senate agenda for the 2 December 2004 meeting was amended to reflect the change in Vice Chair nominations.

Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

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