MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Gowen Hall, Room 301
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 31 January 2002

Introductory Comments – Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate

Holt started the meeting by noting that many of the presentations would focus on the budget. He reminded senators of the need to keep their colleagues apprised of legislative developments, and of the need for unit executive and college councils to be involved in budget planning. The need to develop good revenue sources will be a long-term problem and Faculty will need to monitor the situation for some time to come.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Sandra Silberstein, Chair

The legislature, she began, has begun meeting and the issue that looms large is the budget deficit. This is not, echoing Holt, a short term problem and long term solutions are needed. Both she and Holt have been visiting college councils, groups that are elected in part, to deal with college budget issues. It is important for these discussions to take place on the college level for two reasons. First, the Provost’s office has mandated that cuts will be made differentially between colleges. Thus, deans need to consult with an informed group of Faculty about the decisions that they will be making. Second, these decisions will be made late in the school year and Faculty need to be up to speed and discussing options before any final decision is made. Because we do not have precise budget numbers, many of these conversations will be in principle. But establishing principles and priorities will be important given the timing of hard budget data. The SCPB can only be responsive to the Faculty if these conversations are held in advance of final budget decisions.

Legislative Report – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig covered three items: the Governor’s budget, the TIAA bill, and the two enabling legislation bills. Turning to the first, he discussed an overhead presentation of the budget (attached to archived copy). The figures show that revenue is down because of the downturn in the economy. As a result, there is a $54 million shortfall in higher education funds. A third of that total will be attributed to the University of Washington. While all institutions have been asked to take a five percent cut, UW’s looks larger because we are the largest state institution. Part of this deficit will be made up by starting salary increases to September rather than July, if the Governor’s budget is approved. Another savings will be exacted from pension plans. Apparently PERS I and II are over-funded and the state hopes to recover revenue from those programs. It should not affect the viability of the funds available for retirement. Another proposed cost savings is exacted from changing health plan benefits. Co-pays will be increased ($10 to $20) as will the minimum contribution which currently averages 10%. At the same time, there will be some additional expenditures for Initiative 732 cost of living expenses. Finally, an important proposed change would be the grant of tuition setting authority.

Ludwig opined that his biggest problem has been the way in which the budget staff is presenting data and information to legislators. For example, the staff has not reflected how tuition setting authority would be used at each campus. Because of this, some legislators believe that the universities would not be making cuts but rather meeting shortfalls through tuition increases. Therefore, he has had to explain that cuts are indeed planned.
The retirement bill was a bill that was presented last year with the support of the Faculty and the Administration. Based on that, we will continue to support the bill this year. This bill would affect the amount of funds that future employees could take out of their retirement funds, and it does affect supplementation provisions.

Finally, HB 2402 and SB 6440 regarding faculty collective bargaining have been successfully introduced, and will cover all institutions of higher education. Each bill received a high number of sponsoring signatures. Last, there are plans to hold a forum that would involve legislators and business on the future of financing higher education.

**Report of the President**

The President underscored the previous remarks regarding the budget. Legislators, in his experience, find themselves caught between a “rock and a hard place” given the anti-tax initiatives and the deficits. His emphasis has been on the damage any cut would inflict. Cumulatively, over the recent years, this would amount to an 18% cut in University funding. His efforts have also been directed towards tuition and tuition setting authority. There is growing momentum for this, and he is cautiously optimistic that we may finally achieve this goal, even in the face of legislative resistance. The biggest concern has been maintaining access for needy and middle income students. He remains confident that we can meet students’ needs if tuition is increased, and that this will reverse the current regressive tuition setting policy. One outcome may be that we get tuition setting authority for all categories of students except resident undergraduates, and in that case, we may be granted a high tuition ceiling for this population.

Conversations within the University are ongoing. It is the Administration’s hope to make targeted, sensible cuts that will inflict the minimum amount of damage on educational programs. These cuts will be felt in every unit: President and Provost’s office, departments, schools and the Faculty Senate. Given this, it is vitally important that we develop other revenue sources for maintaining the excellence of the University. In addition to tuition, another source of revenue will be private giving.

President McCormick then directed attention to a handout (attached to archived copy) prepared by the American Association of Universities (AAU), of which the University of Washington is a member (covering the top 62 universities). The bottom bar graph compares us to the other 61 AAU universities, places such as Harvard and Yale. The point is what a fine record of achievement we have compiled on a number of fronts compared to many outstanding universities.

Finally, McCormick invited people to attend the annual Faculty Lecture.

He also noted that it appears that there is an agreement between the University and UAW-GSEAC on submitting one piece of legislation regarding TAs to the legislature and that passage looks likely. This means that we could avoid a repetition of the job action as we had last June.

**Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 3:10, and the agenda, as amended, was approved.
Announcements

1. Today is the last day to register objections to the two pieces of Class B legislation. There have been very few objections to either and it will become effective tomorrow.

2. The University now has a policy on the siting of temporary buildings, thanks to the efforts of Duane Storti, John Schaufelberger and Weldon Ihrig.

Requests for Information

None.

Election of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate

At the last meeting, Douglas Wadden (Art) was nominated for this office and presented his remarks to this body. Ballots were distributed, and Wadden was elected as Vice Chair.

Memorial Resolution

Be it resolved that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues: Part-time Lecturer William Bissell of School of Music, who died on December 20, 2001 after having served the University since 1970. Associate Professor Emeritus Warren T. Hill of College of Architecture and Urban Planning, who died on October 27, 2001 after having served the University since 1959. Clinical Professor Emeritus Clair Laidig of Urology, who died on January 5th after having served the University since 1959. Part-time Lecturer Betty Jane Narver of School of Public Affairs, who died on December 9, 2001 after having served the University since 1985. Professor Emeritus Robert B. Pinter of Electrical Engineering, who died on December 11, 2001 after having served the University since 1964. Associate Professor Emeritus Annemarie Sauerlande of Germanics, who died on May 11, 2001 after having served the University since 1949. Professor Emeritus Donald "Gene" Strandness of Surgery, who died on January 7th after having served the University since 1962. Clinical Professor Joseph Yon of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on December 6, 2001 after having served the University since 1983. Be it further resolved, that the senate chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

Nominations and Appointments

The Executive Committee nominates for Senate appointment, effective immediately:

I. Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees with voting rights to be determined by the individual councils or committees, for terms ending September 15, 2002:

A. Representatives of Retired Faculty:

Faculty Councils: Academic Standards, James Gerhart; Educational Technology, Robert W. Albrecht; Faculty Affairs, Norman Rose; Instructional Quality, Ellis Evans; Research, Ed Perrin; Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Ernest Henley;
II. Tom Colonnese, to be a voting member and chair of the Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs.

III. For the office of Conciliation Officer: Professor Emeritus Peter Balise, Mechanical Engineering; Professor Gordon A. Bradley, Forest Resources; Professor Rose Ann Cattolico, Botany; Professor Alan Kirtley, Law; Professor Mehmet Sarikaya, Materials Science and Engineering

Adjudication Panel: Robin Stacey (History); Gail Stygall (English); Peter Vitaliano (Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences); Ashley Emery (Mechanical Engineering)

Sandra Silberstein nominated Maureen Henderson from the floor for Special Committee on Faculty Women, Retired Faculty Representative.

All nominations were approved by the Senate.

**First Consideration: Class A Legislation - Policies Regarding Competitive Offers and WOT Faculty, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-40 and Section 24-71. Charles Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.**

The original legislation was passed two years ago, and required departments to develop a process for reviewing competitive offers and continued funding for WOT Faculty. It did not, however, specify where the process could be found. Thus, he characterized this as a housekeeping provision that would allow interested Faculty to review policies. The policy regarding competitive offers is a little different. In addition to the housekeeping provisions, it establishes a default policy if a unit should fail to develop its own policy.

During discussion, John Gastil (representing Speech Communication) asked whether the legislation should make the advisory nature of the Faculty’s input on competitive offers clearer. Kent Sirotnik (Education), moved that the phrase “cast an advisory vote” should be added after “provided the opportunity to...” Warren Guntheroth (Pediatrics) opined that this amendment would make the legislation weaker. He also objected to this legislation because it can result in the waiver of faculty interests based on the vote. The amendment passed with only five dissenting votes.

One questioner sought an explanation of what this legislation entails. Holt explained that it gives Faculty the ability to determine what level of input they will have on competitive offers. This would be advisory to the dean and the chair. Carol Kubota (Bothell) wanted to know if this applied only to salary offers or whether it would cover responses that include changes in rank or status. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, pointed out that this only has to do with salary since changes in status and promotions are covered by other parts of the Code that provide for Faculty input. One senator asked why we did not make all departments develop a policy, thus eliminating the need for a default policy. Holt and Haley noted that the original legislation did mandate a policy but it was discovered that many units had not followed through and developed their own policy.

On an overwhelming affirmative vote, the main motion carried.
First Consideration: Class A Legislation – Policies Regarding Eligibility for Senate Membership, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-43. Charles Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Haley explained that this legislation grew out of explorations of the status of lecturers on this campus. It seemed unfair to the Council that lecturers could be voting members of the faculty but be ineligible for election to the Senate. Cass Weller (Philosophy) asked about the intent of the second sentence. Haley explained that it sets a date certain to determine one’s voting status and eligibility for election. Mark McDermott (Physics) asked for a definition of a full time lecturer. Olswang explained that a full time lecturer is someone who has a 100% appointment over the entire 9 month academic year. It would not include, for example, a lecturer who is working in one quarter and receiving full pay for that one quarter but is not employed in the subsequent two quarters.

The motion carried with no dissent.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned 3:42 pm.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Bradley R. Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate