The Faculty Council on Student Affairs met at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 15, 2003, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Co-chair Kathleen Fearn-Banks presided.

Approval of minutes
The minutes of December 17, 2002 were approved as written.

Student Athletes: Document for brochure to be distributed to faculty about student athletes
Fearn-Banks said that Stanley Chernicoff, Director, Student Athlete Academic Services, Intercollegiate Athletics, who addressed the council at its December 17, 2002 meeting, is interested in FCSA’s assistance in preparing a document about student athletes – a description of the particular challenges they face in trying to balance academic, athletic, and social life at the University of Washington – to be distributed to faculty campus-wide.

Fearn-Banks said she had a suggestion: to gather some student Communications majors (her own department), and some student athletes, and have them work together to prepare something on the challenges facing student athletes. Lewis said, “Yes. Students indeed could help in this project.” Fearn-Banks said the council could review what the students write, and shape it for inclusion in the brochure. Although Chernicoff’s office would be responsible for the final presentation of the document.

Kravas said, “If Chenicoff’s office has a particular slant in the presentation, the council will be able to discern it.” Fearn-Banks said the article “has to be unbiased.” She will speak with Chernicoff about the suggestions brought forward here.

Tuition Increases
Herwig said there cannot be any more pressing subject for undergraduate students at the UW than tuition increases. And with a 9% increase in tuition currently under consideration, this subject is especially urgent. As several council members pointed out, students desire and depend upon “some sort of predictability” in tuition during their undergraduate career. And in making their decision as to which university they will attend, tuition plays a major role. Fridley said, “It’s tough on students who come to a university with a specific tuition in mind, then see it change after they arrive.” Lewis concurred: “Students would like to know: Will the tuition go up in the four years I’ll be at the University?” She noted, “There are some private universities that do have fixed tuition rates, in that students, when they enter the university, have their tuition rate frozen for the course of their undergraduate career. If they are still an undergraduate after four years, their tuition rate may change.”

Fridley asked, “Are there tuition experts on campus? Perhaps someone on the HEC Board, if not at the University itself? Someone who has seriously looked at this issue. It would be good to see what drives tuition at the UW.” Lewis said, “It’s good to think about the practicality of the budget models; to go to the Budget Office.” She recommended that the council seek out Harlan Patterson, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, or someone Patterson recognizes as a genuine authority on tuition policy.

“This would be a good issue for this council to invest some time and energy in,” said Fridley. “It’s an issue that does affect students’ lives.”

Fearn-Banks said tuition policy at the UW will be placed on the agenda of the February 12th FCSA meeting. Harlan Patterson, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, will be invited to address the council.
Asked how soon the legislature might approve a tuition increase, Student Regent David Moore-Reeploeg said the legislature is generally hesitant “to go too far from the norm, so it might be awhile.” Kravas supported the suggestion that Harlan Patterson be invited to speak with the council.

**Presidents Student Forum – David Moore-Reeploeg**

Moore-Reeploeg said some students still do not know much, if anything, about the University’s budget process. He said it would be very helpful if professors spent just one half-hour of a class informing students of the process: how money is spent; how much of the budget comes from the legislature; how much money comes from endowments and other sources. Croft said there was a presentation in Autumn Quarter by Harlan Patterson. And Interim President Lee Huntsman gave an excellent perspective on the budget in a talk to students recently. (Both Kravas and Moore-Reeploeg commended the president’s talk.) Moore-Reeploeg suggested the council bring in presenters who are intimately familiar with the budget process. Croft said Huntsman will address the Student Faculty next week, and discuss the budget.

Fridley said the Daily could be asked to do a spread on this issue. Moore-Reeploeg said, “Students have misconceptions about the budget process. For instance, they wrongly think that the IMA fee – now $35 per quarter – is a way to extract extra money from them in lieu of a higher tuition, which is not the case.” Lewis said the president might be filmed giving his presentation to the students, and that presentation could be shown in other forums. Croft said a half-hour should be long enough for Huntsman’s presentation. “Anything much longer will run the risk of losing students’ attention.”

It was agreed that this subject could be combined with that of the tuition process in the presentation and question/answer follow-up at the February 12th FCSA meeting.

**Student attendance in faculty councils**

Fearn-Banks said greater student attendance is needed at faculty council meetings. Croft said, “Some students feel there is a great gap between them and both faculty and administration. Perhaps in the orientation process George Bridges’s Undergraduate Education Office could speak to the importance of student participation in faculty councils. This is my fourth council, so some ASUW representatives are extremely involved in faculty council work.” Moore-Reeploeg suggested that Faculty Senate Chair Sandra Silberstein might speak to the ASUW Senate and let that body know what the Faculty Senate is and what it does. “That could certainly enhance student interest in serving on faculty councils,” he noted.

**Update on University Councils discussions: the Rose Report – Kathleen Fearn-Banks**

Fearn-Banks said there is not much new to report on the status of the University Council discussions and the Rose Report. The Faculty Council on Research will be involved in a pilot program with the proposed University Council structure. No other experiments are foreseen at present. Any major change in faculty council structure and protocol will take both time and legislation to effect.

Fearn-Banks asked council members what their response to the idea of University Councils is with specific regard to its effect on FCSA and on other small councils. Lewis said her concern is that there are some areas in Student Affairs that have to be addressed quickly, that need faculty council attention quickly. And in the proposed University Council structure, the time of council response to Student Affairs issues may be lengthened considerably. This would be a definite concern.

Fearn-Banks asked, “Is there anything that should be excluded, or added, in the lists of combined councils and committees in the Rose Report?” The council agreed that Admissions should not be a component in any council into which FCSA is brought. Fridley said, “Yes, exclude all academic issues from this council. We’re about the life of students at the University. We do not address specific academic issues confronting students.”
Croft wondered if there were other solutions than those suggested in the Rose Report to the problem of parallel councils and committees. “Might there not be a simpler, better way to communicate than what is proposed in the Rose Report?” Fearn-Banks said, “Let’s wait for now and see how it goes in the Rose Report discussions.”

**Next meeting**
The next FCSA meeting is set for Wednesday, February 12, 2003, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

**PRESENT:** Professors Fearn-Banks (co-chair), Fridley and Herwig;
Ex officio members Croft, Feetham, Kravas, Lewis and Moore-Reeploeg.

**ABSENT:** Professors Karmy-Jones, Schwartz and Williams;
ex officio members Bennett, Hatlen, McKinstry and Morales.