

**MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Thursday, 21 April 2005
Room 301, Gowen Hall, 2:30 p.m.**

Introductory Comments – G. Ross Heath, Chair, Faculty Senate

I will focus on two brief topics today:

The first relates to the budget in Olympia. You will hear more details on this from subsequent speakers.

I will simply note that all versions of the budget include a 3.2% salary increase for 2006; a number that is likely to appear in the final budget. Compared to our experience in recent past biennia, this is an important step forward. Both advocates for the increase and its supporters in Olympia deserve our thanks. Yet we need to do more. I note that WSU is planning for 5% increases for each year of the next biennium. UW must match or even exceed this number.

Only then can we begin to address the need for the individual merit increases required to address salary compression and inversion problems that have accumulated over the past two decades and to recognize the efforts of our most creative and productive members. Your Senate leadership will continue to press for real progress in these areas.

The second topic is what has been euphemistically called “succession planning.” In the context of the Faculty Senate, this means ensuring that we have an adequate pool of members who are willing and prepared to take over the leadership of the Senate and its councils.

This requires long-term career planning. Just as a successful sabbatical requires several years of advance planning, effective involvement in the leadership of the Senate requires planning several years in advance and some preparation.

Based on my own experience and conversations with past chairs, the best preparations for this job are to serve as a department or program chair for a couple of years, and to get a couple of years experience on one of the Senate councils. This allows a new chair to hit the ground running.

If you have any interests in this direction, please feel free to talk to me or Lea or any past Senate chair. The job is exciting, exhausting and, at times, rewarding. By the time a chair’s term is complete, she or he probably has more insight into the workings of this place than anyone but the Provost.

Please give the idea some serious thought!

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) – Douglas Wadden, Chair, and Former Chair, Faculty Senate

In its now weekly meetings, budgetary developments in Olympia have driven the agenda. The two differing budgets, House and Senate, present somewhat different pictures for the University although both propose the same 3.2% and 1.6% salary increases in year one and year two, respectively. At the same time, we need to discuss the best use of the limited funds that are available to the University.

Last week, the SCPB completed discussion of a unit adjustment policy. It sets a new trigger, or “floor”, for considering such adjustments, and describes a process as well as criteria for making these adjustments. This policy will be presented to the Board of Deans, and University Budget Committee (UBC). This policy will provide more clarity for those units seeking an adjustment and make the process more transparent.

Another issue the committee has discussed is the recent move to a comprehensive review of all freshman applications. This will mean doubling the admissions workload, from about 8,000 to 15,500

files. This process will take more time, and involves the need to notify students of this change. It will also mean increased costs that will perhaps be reflected in raising the admissions fee from \$35 to \$55.

Finally, the committee has reviewed updated straw budgets that describe a total picture of fund allocation.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

Currently, the House and Senate are negotiating the final shape of the budget. One roadblock was removed when an agreement was reached on a transportation issue. As Wadden noted, the two budgets differ. For example, each has a different figure for new enrollment. The House budget is the best funded; the Senate's theory is that it is funding actions that should benefit students rather than institutions. There has been some talk of "COLA's" as well as an active discussion of health care premium differentials in which non-represented employees, e.g. faculty, would pay higher health care premiums. Similarly, on capital issues, the House budget is most favorable to the University. All three budgets have retained performance contract language. The existence of three budgets may make the general legislative tendency to split the difference a bit more complicated, but the resolution is on the horizon.

Report of the President/Opportunity for Questions – Mark Emmert

Following up on Stygall's report, Emmert agreed that the resolution of the budget still awaits us. The legislature is still discussing recapturing about \$17 million dollars (\$6.2 million is our portion) from increased tuition revenues for the general fund, but this is subject to change as negotiations are completed. He believes that we have made good progress in capital spending, although some projects are still "in play." For example, the life science discovery fund is still under discussion. And, even if it is approved, it is not clear what the exact contours of the program will be. The good news is that this has engendered a serious discussion about state funding for research. The life science building at WSU has also generated a high level of discussion, especially as it implicates their forest trust land. He thinks that we should come out of this in reasonably good shape and will be able to do salary increases, and agreed with Heath's comments about the need to make progress in salaries so that we remain competitive. We need to address compression, inversion, retention, and merit. Squeezing all of these aspirations into a four or five percent pool will be challenging, but he believes that we can do it. In conclusion, he would say that higher education has done well.

Emmert noted that he has initiated two processes. The first will involve a survey focused on the University's values and building leadership. We need to have a mechanism for supporting and encouraging faculty and staff to take leadership positions. As a University, we all need to have a common commitment to building the excellence of the University that transcends our departments or home units. For example, given the talent here, we should be able to fill many positions internally. And, everyone in the University needs to feel that they are a part of that process, and a part of something important. The survey will help us understand where we think we are and where we should be going. We will be reporting back to this body about the outcomes.

A second project will focus on enhancing the reputation of the University. In his opinion, we have done a particularly poor job in communicating the excellence of the University to the state and nation. We need to take control of defining our image. For instance, most would not realize that we are in the top three funded research universities. Everyone needs to know this. He has started a pilot project that will allow us to tell our story in a consistent and coordinated fashion. Along those lines, he noted some of our US News & World Reports rankings.

Update on Leadership Searches: The Provost search continues and candidates will soon be coming to campus for visits. We have just hired Suzanne Ortega as Dean of the Graduate School, and James Jiambalvo as Dean of the Business School. The committees are moving forward in searches for Social Work, Architecture and Engineering. Warren Buck, UWB Chancellor, has stepped down after six years at Bothell, and will return to the classroom. Steve Olswang will assume the interim chancellor position and will resign his position as vice provost to return to the faculty after a new Bothell chancellor has been found in an aggressive national search. Discussions continue about the design of the undergraduate program before any hiring is contemplated. Finally, he has asked Donna Kerr to be

Secretary of the Faculty. She has held a number of positions, including dean of both the Bothell and Tacoma campus, and will do a great job.

In response to a question about cultivating leadership and linking it to the salary and compression problem, he agreed with a faculty member who stated that growing administrative burdens and salary issues can fall heavily on associate level faculty and are related issues.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m., and the agenda was approved.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions

a. Minutes of the February 14, 2005 Senate Executive Committee meeting and March 3, 2005 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. b. Susan Jeffords, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Christine Ingebriksen, Associate Dean and Associate Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education presented an update on the University's response to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (formerly NASC). The interim report is due April 23, 2005 and will be available on the accreditation Web site at <http://www.washington.edu/about/accreditation/index.html>. c. Faculty Council current issues was attached as Exhibit A. d. Discussion on Faculty Senate Reapportionment; issue referred to Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Announcements

1. Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, reminded senators that senate elections will close on Friday, 22 April 2005, and that at next month's meeting, elections for group representatives, who serve on the Senate Executive Committee, will be held. Also, she called attention to the inclusion of the Faculty Council issues in the agenda. She hopes that the inclusion of these issue sheets will lead to more interaction between senators and faculty councils.

2. Heath reminded the body that there will be open meetings to meet the Provost's candidates, and urged faculty to attend.

Requests for Information: Update on Journal Licensing – Seelye Martin, Chair, Faculty Council on University Libraries, and Joyce Ogburn, Associate Director of Libraries for Resources & Collection Management Services

Martin introduced Ogburn's presentation. Referring to her handout (attached to minutes), Ogburn noted that journal costs will increase 7-10% next year which, in turn, will lead to budget shortfalls in the library. Some of the increase is due to the weakness of the dollar, as well as publishers passing on large increases. These prices far outstrip the consumer price index.

Another cost concern is the need to buy e-journal backfiles, and these can be quite costly, and often include older issues that we may not want. Similarly, we are examining the status of our Elsevier joint contract with WSU. It may be less costly to end this arrangement, but we are proceeding carefully before we go down this path.

In the meantime, the library has been active in a number of scholarly communication initiatives, an area of growing interest around the country. Many of these initiatives have enhanced the ability of the faculty to publish and to keep our acquisition costs down. We have been active in pursuing legislation that would require NIH funded research to be accessible on the internet. Finally, the Provost has appointed a university-wide committee on scholarly communication initiatives.

In response to a question about developing new revenue sources for the library, Ogburn stated that the library development campaign does look for funding for major acquisition costs, but many of these costs are too large for the typical donor. Another senator urged university presidents, including ours, to bring bargaining pressure as a group on journal publishers. He argued that these publishers are monopolies and that we need to bring more coherent pressure to bear on this matter. He also urged faculty to refuse appointments to the editorial boards of publications that charge these high prices. Finally, Ogburn said that information about faculty action plans is available on the Library webpage (<http://www.lib.washington.edu/ScholComm/>)

Nominations and Appointments

None.

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: Professor Emeritus Elizabeth Giblin of Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems who died on February 16, 2005 after having served the University since 1959. Professor Emeritus Wolfgang Leiner of Comparative Literature who died on February 8, 2005 after having served the University since 1963. Professor Emeritus Brian W. Mar of Civil Engineering who died on March 12, 2005 after having served the University since 1957. Associate Professor Emeritus Rosemary Pittman of Psychosocial and Community Health who died on February 27, 2005 after having served the University since 1964. Professor Emeritus Brian Reid of Chemistry who died on February 26, 2005 after having served the University since 1980. Associate Professor Emeritus Arnold Stanley Rosner of Architecture who died on March 27, 2005 after having served the University since 1966. Associate Professor Mary Durand Thomas of Psychosocial and Community Health who died on April 9, 2005 after having served the University since 1964. 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.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Proposed Amendments Requesting and Name and Status Change for SCFW and SCMFA – Daniel Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)

This legislation, explained Luchtel, will give a full council voice to these two important interests at the Senate Executive Committee, and it will empower important parts of the faculty. At the same time, it will end the current reporting system through the FCFA which is cumbersome and duplicative. Finally, he noted that while it was thought thirty-five and twenty-two years ago, respectively, that issues of race and sex would disappear, this has not occurred. Rather, the issues have become more complicated, and deserve forums which can focus exclusively on these issues.

Discussion/

A friendly amendment to change “faculty of color” to “minority affairs” was rejected after Fabien explained that while this was considered, the entire SCFMA membership rejected that wording. Answering a question as to whether the women’s committee will extend its interests beyond faculty, noting that the label “faculty” is not included in its title, Mandoli, Chair, SCFW, stated that they chose this description because of concerns about the pipeline for preparing women for faculty roles and thus deleted that word. Fabien noted that his group has also dealt with student issues, especially graduate issues. Both chairs noted that I-200 raised significant issues for both groups, and caused both groups to consider student issues at times although both are faculty committees. Heath noted that the role of the faculty councils is, under the *Code*, to consider the general welfare of the University which may include interests in addition to those of the faculty. Thus, consideration of students in these fora would be no different than the way in which SCPB considers student issues such as tuition.

Speaking in support of the motion, one senator described approval of the measure as a “no brainer.” These issues are central to the University and this change is long overdue. But, there are other issues that perhaps we should consider such as sexual orientation issues. Fabien stated that his group is very inclusive, while another senator, while noting the President’s diversity initiative, stated that sexual orientation issues are far more specific. Vaughn noted that FCFA can consider all of these issues and groups. This should be a topic of consideration next year for the FCFA and the Diversity Council. Finally, several technical friendly amendments to the precise wording were accepted: (1) “to” changed to “of” before color, and the inclusion of the word “for” in describing the councils. Wilson

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Class C Resolution: Resolution in Support of Electronic Doctoral Dissertations and Master’s Theses - Seelye Martin, Chair, Faculty Council on University Libraries

The purpose of this resolution would be to permit electronic submission of graduate theses. Over 140 universities now permit electronic submission; this is an idea whose time has come. The libraries are ready to take on this task, and have the facilities to do so. A library committee will work out the details of the program. Paper theses, such as those in the fine arts, will still be accepted. One senator noted that electronic publishing will make it easier and more economical to publish in color.

Vote: The resolution passed unanimously.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.

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

**University of Washington Faculty Senate
April 21, 2005**

**Update on Journal Licensing
Joyce Ogburn, Associate Director, University Libraries**

- 1. Inflation**
- 2. Weakness of the dollar**
- 3. E-journal backfiles**
- 4. Package deals**
- 5. Supporting scholarly communication initiatives**
- 6. What's happening on other campuses**

ATTACHMENTS: FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

Columbia University

University of California at Berkeley

University of Wisconsin

University of Kansas

http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/scholarly_information/scholarly_resolution.htm

Resources:

Libraries' scholarly communication web site:

<http://www.lib.washington.edu/ScholComm/>

ARL chart on pricing and inflation: <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/graphs/2003/monser03.pdf>

**University of Washington Faculty Senate
April 21, 2005**

**Update on Journal Licensing
Joyce Ogburn, Associate Director, University Libraries**

Inflation

Prices for 2006 journal subscriptions are expected to rise by 7-10%. In part because of higher than anticipated inflation and the weakness of the dollar, for 2005/06 we estimate a shortfall of approximately \$700,000 for the main campus and \$200,000 for the Health Sciences Library.

Weakness of the dollar

The strength of the dollar has slipped precipitously against major foreign currencies and this has affected our purchasing power in two ways: direct purchasing of materials in foreign currency and conversion of prices set by journal publishers into US dollars. Information provided by vendors corroborates data gleaned from analyzing currency changes over the biennium: since September 2003, monographs priced in British pounds or Euros have risen 16-20%. This is the most extreme example of the dollar's decline, but East Asian publication prices have also increased. For example in Japan, the leading Asian country for Libraries acquisitions, the yen has increased 7% against the dollar.

E-journal backfiles

Backfiles complement our current electronic subscriptions. Electronic access to many of our packages is from the 1990s onward. Purchasing more backfiles will allow us to move more print material offsite and will also advance the goal of increasing the productivity of our users and providing access to research results at any time and in any place. The backfile for the Lancet, a premier medical journal started in 1823, has been quoted at \$100,000.

Package deals

For the last several years UW and WSU have had a joint contract with Elsevier Science Direct that allows each school to have electronic access to titles that the other subscribes to, but that they do not subscribe to themselves. We gained access to about 125 journals that WSU subscribes to, and WSU has gained access to several hundred titles that we subscribe to. As Elsevier has acquired companies over the last few years (including Academic Press and Harcourt), under this contract each library's commitments have grown to 25% of each library's serials budgets (about \$1.5 M for UW and a little over \$1M for WSU). For us this represents just 4% of our journal titles.

A recent study conducted by Oxford University Press showed that Elsevier has the highest median price across all subjects, so the Libraries has been looking carefully at all its relevant subscriptions. While the contract provides an annual "price increase cap" and therefore helps control the prices we pay, we are not permitted to cancel any titles. UW has identified 80-90 little-used titles that cost \$25 per download (based on use and subscription prices), and we could save over \$150K annually if we cancelled them. However, that would mean opting out of the joint contract and accepting different terms under which we'd have to pay a 25% premium over and above "retail" prices, meaning that we'd have to cancel an additional 100+ titles and sacrifice access to the 125 WSU titles just to "break even." To cancel the 80-90 little-used titles, in other words, would require the sacrifice of ~ 225 additional titles and would result in no net savings.

UW also currently spends about \$400,000 annually for 175 journals from Wiley InterScience, an arrangement with similar problematic elements.

Supporting scholarly communication initiatives

- We have reallocated funding specifically for subscribing to publications that are intended to challenge or enhance the current models of scholarly communication.
- We joined the Public Library of Science, an open access journal publisher. Our membership allows UW authors to publish in PLoS publications for free. Similarly, we have an institutional membership to BioMed Central (a package of more than 100 open access journals) that allows anyone on campus to publish in their journals for a reduced fee. For both of these organizations, we are in effect subsidizing the publishing of our researchers.
- We have established a digital repository where faculty and other scholars can place preprints of articles or other scholarly resources such as images, web sites, and data. We have images from the Early Buddhist Manuscript Project, we are adding technical reports from the Information School, there are articles authored by a faculty member in the biology department, and we are in conversation with other departments about adding their scholarly resources.
- On the national policy front, Betsy Wilson worked with Barbara Perry and Norm Dicks on legislation to require researchers funded by NIH to deposit preprints of their research results in PubMed Central 6 months after publication. The rationale behind this was to gain widespread public access to scholarship funded by the tax payers. Its aim was to eliminate barriers to accessing research articles, which are often published by commercial publishers, and are difficult and expensive to obtain unless one is affiliated with a library that can afford to subscribe to the right journals. Moreover, these libraries may be spending public dollars to buy back research that was originally funded by the public, and the subscription dollars are often being paid to non-US publishers. The final form of the legislation that was enacted had its teeth extracted: the delay for deposit is 12 months and compliance is voluntary. But it is a start in the direction of opening up tax payer supported scholarship to a wider audience.
- The provost is appointing a university-wide committee to address scholarly communication issues at the highest levels of policy, practice and funding at the UW. More will be announced when the membership is firmed up, so stay tuned.

What's happening on other campuses?

In the last month the senates at four institutions, Columbia, Berkeley, Kansas and Wisconsin, passed resolutions in support of their libraries' efforts to address the problems with scholarly communication and new models of scholarly publishing, such as open access and depositing research results in their libraries' digital repositories.