

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
301 Gowen Hall
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 27 January 2005

The meeting began at 2:34 p.m.

Introductory Comments – G. Ross Heath, Chair

Firstly, the Senate office is seeking expressions of interest in serving on councils and special committees or advisory groups for the next academic year. When you get the questionnaire, please think seriously about volunteering to serve on one of these bodies. We depend on you!

Secondly, since our last meeting, the very successful Tricampus Task Force retreat has been held. The key results are on the Senate website. Doug Wadden and Nancy Bradshaw, as well as the 90 odd participants deserve our thanks. There were many creative insights and suggestions that can only serve to help the University as the three campuses continue to develop.

Finally, this has been a very interesting month!

As many of you may have heard or read, the University, in late December, submitted a proposal to the federal government to construct a regional Biocontainment Laboratory on campus. This facility would be funded under the National Biodefense Effort, which is part of the US Homeland Security component of the federal budget. The National Biodefense Effort is designed "to improve state and local preparedness for potential bioterrorist attacks and to fund biodefense research."

The proposal, which included detailed descriptions of a southwest campus site and of the proposed facility, was submitted without any communication with the Faculty Senate office or with cognizant faculty councils (such as the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services, which has direct responsibility for reviewing proposed new capital facilities, for example).

This was a total breakdown in shared governance.

I am not going to say much more about this breakdown today. I have already made strong statements to the SEC (which will soon appear in the minutes on the Senate website), to the Provost, to the President, and to the Board of Regents. And while the proponents of the RBL appear relatively unconcerned about either questions related to the merits of the facility or to the breakdown in collegial consultation, the President has emphasized that he has made no commitment to the proposal as submitted.

He has directed the Provost to establish a working group to fully consider not only the RBL as described in the proposal, but also an off-campus option (perhaps at a secure site that is not in an environmentally sensitive location in the midst of a densely populated urban area – Fort Lewis might be an example of such a location), and a business-as-usual option (where BSL-3 labs are established in existing facilities as needed). Only after the pros and cons of the three options are fully developed will the President make his decision.

Today, instead, I wish to focus on risk, and the difficulty that a project such as the RBL can get into when it deals ineffectively with risk.

For new hazardous facilities, there are three aspects of risk that need to be addressed. They are "objective" risk (what the experts might call "real" risk), perceived risk, and risk management.

"Objective" risk is determined by the exhaustive identification of all the things that could go wrong (whether resulting from mechanical or system failures, human error, natural disasters, or malice), then by assigning probabilities and consequences to each. When properly analyzed, the result is a probability *versus* consequences diagram that can be assessed by the supporters, regulators, and opponents of a facility. This is conceptually simple, but difficult to do well in practice due to the many uncertainties surrounding each scenario. It does **not** resolve the issue as to whether or not a facility is acceptably "safe."

Perceived risk is the human view of risk. It incorporates "objective" risk, but not very well in most cases (rare large-consequence risks tend to be given much more weight than more common low-consequence risks, for example). Perceived risk also incorporates the degree to which the risk is imposed *versus* accepted voluntarily, and a parameter called "dread," as well as many other factors.

I focus here on "dread," because it is particularly relevant to the RBL. Certain risks are feared to a much greater degree than would seem reasonable, based on "expert" knowledge. Exposures to low doses of radioactive materials or carcinogens have large "dread" values, in contrast to highway driving or alcohol consumption, which are actually much more lethal. "Dread" relates to factors such as fear of the unknown, risks imposed by outside authorities against the will of those affected, risks associated with slow or painful death, and risks from invisible agents.

"Dread" is notably resistant to the common bureaucratic response that "this facility is really very safe; you just don't understand it; but we are here to educate you." The skepticism appears to be mostly intrinsic to those impacted, although incidents such as Three Mile Island and the recent Tularemia infections in a BSL-2 facility in Boston have not done much to build confidence in "experts."

Perceived risk also encompasses quality-of-life issues associated with a hazardous facility. Living next to a radioactive waste repository may be incredibly safe, but very few people would feel comfortable doing so.

Risk management, the third side of the triangle, attempts to resolve the conflicts between a hazardous facility and those forced to work or live with it. Risk management cannot be successful unless it takes seriously and is responsive to both "objective" and perceived risks.

In conclusion, I have two major concerns with respect to the university's proposed RBL. The first is the lack of collegial consultation prior to the decision to submit the proposal. The second is the weak treatment of risk in the proposal: the consideration of "objective" risk is incomplete and unsophisticated; perceived risk is essentially ignored; and the risk management plan is sketchy to put it charitably.

I happen to believe that an RBL somewhere in the Pacific Northwest is a good idea. I just wish that UW's initial attempt to create such a laboratory had been more open and more thorough.

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

This week's SCPB meeting was also dedicated to the Regional Bio-containment Laboratory Proposal issue. Personnel from the medical school briefed the body on the grant and the plans for public discussions. Second, the SCPB has looked at the impact of the civil service collective bargaining agreements on the compensation picture. Along those lines, the committee has also begun discussing the different components of the faculty compensation plan. Related to this are preliminary discussions regarding the University's tuition proposals. It is, however, still early and the legislature has not begun budget discussions. A Unit Adjustment subcommittee has been meeting on a regular basis to discuss this topic. The group hopes to present a policy statement at the next SCPB meeting. In his closing remarks, Wadden addressed the use of peer data in building budgets, noting that we are looking also at FTE losses and budget cuts so that we can look for trends and patterns before we complete budget planning. Performance contracts continue to be an issue; we are looking at the conditions and expectations for these agreements to establish the best interests of the Faculty.

A question was asked whether the Athletic Department would have enough funds to cover a judgment in the Neuheisal matter, should he prevail, without affecting state funds. Wadden responded that this question has not yet come up, and information will be made available.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative

"Olympia is pretty crazy this year." Many legislators have new "big" ideas, and the organization of the body has changed somewhat in response to these initiatives. Stygall posted and reviewed bills that are of interest to higher education. Most of the discussion, however, has focused on Governor Locke's budget proposals. This budget provides a Year One 3.2% and Year Two 1.6% COLA increases for state employees. This means that merit for other university employees would have to be provided from internal funds. Also, the budget proposal decouples financial aid and tuition, which would place a greater budgetary burden on the internal resources of the University. This year, all four universities came up with a joint budget request list; not all items on the list were funded.

There are some significant differences between the House and Senate. The House now has a Kindergarten-Higher Education (K-16) committee. The House has a study bill regarding K-16 educational financing. Gov. Gregoire dropped a study bill in the Senate regarding the financing of education although elements regarding higher education are postponed to the future. Stygall characterized this bill as "something of a disappointment." There are a number of accountability and performance contract bills, and lots of meetings.

Report of the President/Opportunity for Questions – Mark Emmert

Today's report will be given by Acting Provost David Thorud for President Emmert.

Thorud first addressed the Regional Bio-containment Laboratory (RBL) proposal, noting that Pres. Emmert has heard Heath's concerns. First, there will be public meetings where the

University and the wider community can discuss this issue. This is the next step. These meetings will focus on two questions: (1) Should we have an RBL facility in the Northwest? and (2) If so, should the University be involved in that effort? There will be a joint faculty-administrative committee to look at different sites for this facility. One option will be to continue our current arrangements, a second option is to build a new facility on campus and the final option is to build a new facility off campus. The public vetting was previously planned and included in the proposal. In retrospect, however, early notification of the faculty and community should have been undertaken. Therefore, the administration is also working on earlier notification procedures for the faculty. Thorud emphasized that a final decision has not been made and that the final decision will not be made until the proposal is fully vetted. Another major issue is that a \$35-40 million gap in funding exists between what the federal government would provide and what the facility would actually cost. This alone may scuttle the project. NIH was informed that we do not have the funding for the gap at this time, and that the vetting process had not been completed at the time the proposal was sent in.

Second, Thorud provided an update on performance contract talks. Thorud reminded senators that this proposal is an attempt to turn around the higher education funding debate in this state. We are now ranked 49th in the country in funding; despite this, expectations have not changed for a high quality education. Our goal is to arrive at an agreement with the state on three points:

1. What levels of outcomes are expected from the University?
2. How do we know if we have successfully delivered these outcomes? How will the outcomes be measured? These would not be faculty input measures but markers such as access, ranking of programs, percent of students that receive Pell Grants, research, and graduation rates.
3. What resources are needed to achieve these goals? This will involve a discussion of the appropriate mix of state funds and tuition revenues.

Thorud conceded that there are dangers in this approach. Outcomes could be increased without an increase in resources. Or, it could lead to more micromanagement of the University by the legislature. Thorud said we will work diligently to keep this from happening but noted these are the risks we currently face in any case. There have been early discussions with the legislature and the Governor. In response to a question about this issue, Thorud stated that he will work with his colleagues on the SCPB to make sure that more information about this proposal and its status is available to the faculty.

Discussion/

After the Thorud's remarks, a lengthy discussion began in which senators and Thorud raised the following points and questions about the bio-containment lab:

1. Several senators were curious about the current status of Level 3 labs on campus, and the safety precautions that are taken. There are about thirty labs on campus pursuing level 3 research. Generally, level 3 pathogens are those for which there is a cure and level 4 pathogens are those for which there is no known cure. The labs in which this research takes place have been retrofitted so that the research can be conducted safely. We are currently one of the leading research centers for infectious diseases in the world, and last year received a \$50 million grant to study emerging infectious

diseases. From the administration's point of view, we expect to continue doing this type of research and therefore it seemed appropriate to involve the federal government in seeking funding for the space for this type of work. The health sciences faculty regard this grant and the proposed lab as an opportunity for growth. Ultimately, Thorud characterized the current RBL grant proposal as a placeholder and noted that the proposal required that some site be identified as the location for the lab.

2. Several faculty pointed out that there needs to be more University and public education about this proposal, both as it pertains to the actual science and as it pertains to the public impact of the proposal. For example, one senator noted that level 3 pathogens are fairly common organisms and diseases. They are generally not rare nor would they wipe out a population. In fact, noted another senator, most of the facilities on campus that have level 3 labs are for HIV and tuberculosis research. Also, most of the hospital labs are designated level 3.

On the communications level, one senator pointed out that given the "dread" factor, we should not be surprised that people are reacting so strongly when this proposal is linked to words like "bioterrorism." We need to be aware of the impact on the faculty and the public of the words we are using to discuss this proposal.

3. Several faculty raised concerns about the extent to which the discussion of this issue sets a precedent for the ability of one group of faculty to question, or impliedly, interfere with, the research priorities of another group of faculty. Heath pointed out that the *Faculty Code* requires review of classified and proprietary research to see that academic values are preserved. Also, this review focuses on whether appropriate protections are in place rather than on the merits or specifics of the research. Thorud added that where there are legitimate safety issues, some discussion is appropriate. Several faculty said that they did not want the University to arrive at a point where some research is questioned and other types are not. That is, it would be inappropriate to subject NIH funded research to a faculty vote (as one senator had suggested) or faculty micromanagement.
4. Another concern that was raised was the extent to which this proposal may involve other agencies of the federal government, such as Homeland Security, in the facility. There was some sense that this would be undesirable, and should be out in the open if it is part of the plan. Thorud said that in the event of a national emergency, the federal government can come to the facility.
5. The vetting process for this proposal will unfold over the next several months. A final decision will not be made on this proposal for several months so there should be adequate time for the vetting process. Although the administration has planned several public meetings, the Senate has planned its own vetting process, beginning with the faculty councils.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:27p.m. and the agenda was **approved**.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions

- a. Minutes of the November 15, 2004 Senate Executive Committee meeting and December 2, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. b. In preparing for the provost search,

members of the search committee attended and asked SEC members to comment on what they believe special opportunities and challenges face the University. The committee further indicated that the initial screening of applications will be confidential and then made public when finalists are identified. c. Reports on the following were presented: 1. Three Campus Curriculum Review Procedures, 2. Draft Mission Statement on Diversity, 3. Minimum Computer Security Standard Proposal. Documents can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Web page under current issues at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/>. d. The status of special committees of the Faculty Senate was discussed. The issue is whether or not special committees should be moved to Faculty Council status.

Announcements

None.

Requests for Information

None.

Nominations and Appointments

Nominated for Senate appointment, effective immediately:

Karen Cheng, School of Art, Group Two, Special Committee on Faculty Women for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Arvind Tripathi, Management Science, Group Five, Faculty Council on Academic Standards for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Representative of the Professional Staff Organization:

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, Bridget Warbington, The School of Public Health and Community Medicine.

Representative of the Administration (without vote):

Faculty Council on Academic Standards, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, Susan Jeffords, Vice Provost for Academic Planning.

Representatives of the Associated Students of the University of Washington:

Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards Sohaira Siddiqui

Retirement Insurance and Benefits Will Rasmussen

Tri-campus Policy Alvin Chen

Approved.

Statements from Candidates for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate

a. Gail Stygall

I want to begin by thanking the Senate Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee for the opportunity to speak to you today outside my usual role. I am honored to be a candidate for Senate Vice-Chair.

I am Gail Stygall, a faculty member in the English Department, where I also served for six years as the Director of Expository Writing. This is my fifteenth year at the University of Washington. I have been a Senator for eight years, serving twice as the Group 1 Representative. I have also been a member of a number of university-wide ad hoc committees including a special committee on Admissions, after the passage of I-200. I am currently on the Faculty Council on Academic Standards where I chair the Admissions and Graduation Subcommittee, and I have been a member of the Adjudication Panel for my group for two terms. As either your Faculty Legislative Representative or Deputy for the past three years, I have also been a member of Senate Planning and Budgeting. As an English language linguist, I work in the area of legal discourse and language (which probably explains why I like to read hundreds of legislative bills). I have learned enormously from my work in Olympia, I have been proud to represent you there, and I hope that I have been an effective voice for you.

I hope to represent you in another arena now here on campus, bringing back that knowledge gained in Olympia. I believe in a strong faculty version of shared governance. Our participation in shared governance makes the University a better place. And as Ashley Emery suggested in his speech last year, rarely are the changes faculty want initiated by the administration. We need to do the initiating and we do it effectively in the Faculty Senate. The university makes better decisions when we are full participants. And we, as faculty, make better decisions when the faculty are truly informed about the issues facing the university. The issues I see as critical to our full participation in shared governance are two: full transparency on major issues, and full consistency and strength in shared governance across all sectors of the campus.

Let me start with what I've learned in Olympia and how I think it might be applied here on campus. Three years ago when I started driving to Olympia for the session, many people told me that most of the legislature thought we were lazy, do-nothings, teaching occasionally, but only in small graduate classes, and either working only on our research or relaxing at home. I still hear these claims about the legislature. But it turned out that many legislators were supportive of us and many others were willing to learn about what we do and what our value is. When the faculty are not included in the planning of the legislative agenda, the entire university suffers. Faculty bring legislators closer to the daily life of the university. Faculty and their relations with students are among the very things about which legislators care most. For another group of legislators, faculty who work in actual and potential economic growth areas appeal as part of the solution to the state's economic problems. Administrators can't tell those stories. Only faculty can. The more faculty we could get down to Olympia to talk to legislators about what they do and what their daily lives are like, the better we would do.

In addition, the faculty often have excellent ideas about various pieces of legislation and their perspective should be part of how the university formulates its position and how it is represented. Why not make use of our expertise, our commitment, and the communication skills we have developed as teachers when the university speaks to the Legislature and the public? When the university government relations person, the faculty legislative representative, and the undergraduate and graduate student representatives work together in Olympia, the entire university benefits and the university benefits most when faculty speak with a strong voice. So my most important lesson is that the strong voice of faculty is critical in addressing the world beyond the university.

So let me turn to the issue of transparency, which plays a key role in many areas of the university. Two come to mind immediately. One is the university's budget. The budget

process--both here at the University and with the state and federal government--is complex. But information about the budget needs to be more widely known among faculty. The budget processes in Olympia ultimately play themselves out in public with public statements, recorded testimony and on-the-record votes. Perhaps we could borrow a bit from that model. On campus, faculty need to know how the budget works in order to ask good questions and to make informed decisions. I suspect that many faculty on the north campus, outside of the natural sciences, have little idea how costs are recovered from federal grants and contracts and how these funds are spent. And I suspect that many people on the south campus don't realize how severely depressed the salaries and operations are on the north campus, funded primarily by state support and tuition. Thus, the entire budget process needs to be more transparent to the entire faculty. We need to know when it is prepared, how faculty participate, what parts of the budget are mandatory, how decisions on cuts are made, even who counts as faculty in a budget, so that we have a strong faculty voice in the process.

Transparency has also recently been an issue on campus with the proposal for a Level 3 biodefense facility to be located on the Seattle campus. Whatever the merits of the proposal and I am sure the merits are considerable, the faculty should have had an opportunity to discuss the proposal before it was officially made. Perhaps the faculty could have told the proposers what the likely reactions from the community would be, as other proposals had been visible in the news for nearly three years. Perhaps the faculty could have told the proposers what the issues were at Boston University and UC-Davis. Perhaps the faculty most informed in the areas could have spoken to the science issues involved. Perhaps the faculty could have discussed with the proposers the size of the grant compared to other sites and how the need for additional funds to be drawn from the university's budget might make less money available for other needs. And perhaps the faculty could have raised questions about the secrecy associated with the Bioterrorism Act (can campus evacuation plans be secret?). We'll never know. All of our discussions will take place after the proposal has been made. Discussing the application did not mean that the university community would reject the project. Informing the faculty, however, would have meant a better-planned and more thoughtful presentation of the proposal to the university and neighborhood communities, a proposal well known to have been controversial in other locations. Lack of transparency is often simply an unfortunate habit and it can be improved, both through the Senate and with the administration. I would work hard to make transparency on major and potentially controversial issues the first thought and not the afterthought.

The second area I want to address is the consistency and strength of shared governance across all sectors of the campus. While many sectors—schools, colleges, particular departments—are attentive to shared governance through the work of Senate Chairs, some sectors are still not attentive to their responsibilities under the faculty code. Some departments still need to apply parts of the faculty code to faculty evaluation. Others may think that the complexities of their units mean the faculty code is not relevant to their work and departmental and school governance. These inconsistencies need to be addressed, because without all of us participating in shared governance, we lose the strength of our collective voices. We also need to strengthen how Senators participate in shared governance. When I was first elected as a Senator, only two years after I arrived, I was truly puzzled by the Senate meetings. Report followed report; council proposals for legislation appeared by what mechanism I couldn't tell. We argued about drafting but not about substance. All that had already taken place in Senate Council meetings. Though much has changed, our newest Senators often share the puzzlement I had when I first came to the Senate. My reaction was to get more involved so that I knew what was going on, but that's not always possible. Some of those new Senators over time begin to think

that the Senate isn't the place for substantive policy discussions and turn to grading papers and reading articles while the reports are heard. I know because there were times when I did it myself. We need to strengthen the participation of the Senators by better integrating the Senators with the Councils and perhaps we need a way to move issues from the floor to the Councils as well as issues raised by faculty outside of the Senate. Continuing the work of the Rose Committee, in combining already existing faculty and administrative councils and committees, may also have the effect of raising faculty interest in participation. I would like to work with you to improve these aspects of shared governance.

The Faculty Senate has accomplished a great deal in the past few years. Without faculty insistence, we might not have had the robust discussion on a three-campus policy. The plans proposed by our other urban campuses were improved by our planning and our input. The Faculty Senate also has been successful in establishing the 2% ordinary merit plan. The Faculty Senate has established a stronger role in overseeing the academic side of student athletes and has initiated a more extensive process for continuing review of the relationship between the athletics programs and academics. And the Faculty Senate has been successful in making the faculty review process more consistent and more open. These are considerable markers of the value of our input. We can do even more.

We are still at a transitional moment in the new presidency of Mark Emmert. He must still select a Provost and a number of deans. Transitional times are also times of great opportunity. This is a great university, perhaps by accident from the state's point of view, but whether by accident or intent, I would like to do what I can to keep it so and to do so with the strong voice of the faculty, the heart of the university.

b. Jan Sjøvik

Thank you very much for reading this statement, in which I will offer a few comments on why I am a candidate for the position of Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.

I have served as a faculty member in the Department of Scandinavian Studies since 1978. During these years I have worked with many talented students and been active as a scholar. I am very fond of teaching and my students consistently give my courses high ratings. My graduate students have generally done very well in a field that, admittedly, is not among the more glamorous in the academy. My scholarship has been received with much interest by colleagues both in the U.S. and in Europe. I write mostly on Norwegian literature and have so far published two books and a number of articles.

Some of my most interesting and rewarding work over the years has, however, been in faculty government. When the Vice-Chair Search Committee approached me and asked me to be candidate for this position, I was excited because it is such a great opportunity to serve the faculty. I feel that my past experiences have prepared me reasonably well. I have served as Faculty Legislative Representative and Deputy Legislative Representative (2000-2003), as a member of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee (early 1990s), as a member of the Senate (early 1980s), and as a member of a number of faculty councils. I am currently serving on the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and the Adjudication Panel.

I believe strongly in the value of shared governance at the University of Washington. The welfare of the institution is safe-guarded as the faculty and the administration make decisions together. Since the faculty constitutes the core of the university, the welfare of the faculty is crucial to the health of the institution.

There are occasions, however, when busy administrators do not take the time to adequately consult with the faculty and its leadership as important decisions are made. While it may be understandable that such incidents will occur from time to time, it does not promote the welfare of the university. As your elected representative, I will exercise the utmost vigilance so as to insure that faculty input is sought by the university administration and provided by the appropriate faculty bodies.

In my view the crucial issue that faces the university is faculty compensation. Salaries and benefits at the University of Washington simply must be brought in line with the compensation packages offered by our peers. Protecting the two percent minimum salary increase is not enough. Salaries and benefits must both keep up with ongoing inflation and recoup the losses of the past, so that we will be able to attract top talent and retain our long-time loyal colleagues. And not only must our average salaries keep up with the average salaries of our peers, but funds for salaries must be distributed fairly. I am particularly mindful of senior faculty who suffer from salary compression.

I am also concerned about what most of us see as a disturbing trend in higher education nation-wide, namely the erosion of tenure that results when tenure-track positions are downgraded to temporary lectureships. Lecturers make a vital contribution to our teaching mission, but tenure must be re-enthroned as a ruling principle in faculty hiring, especially in the fields where tenure used to be the rule rather than the exception.

Downgrading a tenure-track position to a lectureship solely for the purpose of saving money is an example of poor professional ethics. I take the principle of equal pay for work of equal value to mean that a lecturer should, in principle, be paid on the same level as a tenure-track faculty member with equal qualifications. I will work toward strengthening the compensation and employment security of our non-tenured colleagues.

Of particular concern to me is the position of those colleagues, primarily in the sciences, whose salaries and benefits are paid from research grants. As federal funds for research become more limited, it is incumbent on us to find ways to mitigate the impact on those of our colleagues who are affected. Some departments have come up with different kinds of bridge funding or buffer accounts, but greater efforts are necessary. If elected, I will actively pursue this matter by asking the appropriate faculty council to gather information about the practices that are currently being followed, so that the practices that seem to work well may be encouraged across the university.

As state employees we should always be mindful of our relationship with the Legislature and the Governor. The State of Washington has seriously under funded the university for more than a decade, and during the past several years the situation has become critical. I applaud the university administration for its attempts to secure higher levels of funding. My experience has taught me, however, that we are likely to have greater success in Olympia if the administration and the faculty leadership work together in a spirit of openness, trust and mutual respect. I have every reason to believe that our current President and Provost are committed to working with the Faculty Senate as equal partners. I share that desire.

One of the specific strategies vis-à-vis the Legislature currently pursued by the administration is known as "performance contracts." In response to a legislative mandate, a model performance contract was drafted and discussed with the Board of Regents as well as with the Faculty Senate. Although currently stalled in Olympia, this effort may move forward this year or later. As the issue of performance contracts is further discussed and the concept is further refined, it is essential that the faculty is not only kept informed about

developments but also invited to participate on all levels of planning and possible implementation.

Another issue that seems not to want to go away is the question of quality of instruction vs. access to the university. Although we may wish that we could provide top-quality instruction to all qualified applicants, we must guard against the pressures to admit more students than we can responsibly educate. We must increase not erode the quality of instruction, and classes must not be allowed to exceed the appropriate size. We must never forget that quality of instruction is less a matter of technological wizardry than the skill, knowledge, experience, and dedication of the instructor.

This leads me to my final point, which is the need to safeguard faculty morale. Morale is fragile. Faculty morale is the result of the experiences of the individual faculty member as well as the collective experience and memory of the group or groups with which the faculty member identifies. I suppose that with some luck faculty morale can be improved at about the same rate that it can be caused to decline. When we lost our two percent raise a few years ago, for example, faculty morale took a hit. I will do all that I can to keep us from having that kind of experiences, and I want to capitalize on every opportunity to improve faculty morale. Of course, that will require the enthusiastic cooperation of the administration, which I am certain shares this concern. As we work together to promote the welfare of the University of Washington by ensuring the welfare of its faculty, its staff, and its students, we will make this university an even better place to study and work.

Thank you very much.

Election of the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate

Gail Stygall (English) was declared the winner of the election and will serve a term from 1 August 2005 to 31 July 2006 as vice chair, and thereafter will be Chair of the Faculty Senate from 1 August 2006 through 31 July 2007.

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: Associate Professor Emeritus Katharine Fox of Kinesiology who died on December 6, 2004 after having served the University since 1945. Acting Associate Professor James Wesley Hopkins of Architecture who died on December 26, 2004 after having served the University since 1971. Professor Emeritus Calvin Y. Takagi of Social Work who died on January 8, 2005 after having served the University since 1961. 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 – Second Consideration: Proposed Amendments Regarding Faculty Senate Operations – Volume Two, Various Sections. Presented by Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

Vote: Approved unanimously.

New Business

a. Class C Resolution on Student Lobbying Day

Introduced by Ashley Emery, Vice Chair, and seconded, the Faculty endorses the following ASUW resolution:

Whereas, Lobby Day will be held March 1, 2005, and

Whereas, this is an opportunity for all University of Washington students to present their opinions regarding higher education to their legislators, and

Whereas, March 1, 2005 is a scheduled class day,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Associated Students of the University of Washington, that the faculty of the University of Washington make every effort to facilitate student involvement in Lobby Day by excusing them from class on March 1, 2005, except in the case of an exam, lab or other important class related event, and

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED, that in the case of such important class events every effort be made by the faculty of the University of Washington to accommodate student involvement with Lobby Day by rescheduling said event, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUW Senators urge their constituents to attend and volunteer in the organization of Lobby Day.

APPROVED.

b. Prof. James Gregory (History) withdraws a Class C resolution. Gregory noted that he had discussed the matter of the President's attendance at SEC meetings, and that it had been resolved to his satisfaction. He read e-mail from Pres. Emmert:

Thank you for copying me on this e-mail. I appreciate the concern expressed within it.

I have discussed this matter with both David and Ross Heath. Please know that I want to always be attentive to faculty issues and to the shared governance process. My lack of attendance at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been predicated on the time and attention I have given to the flurry of meetings around campus and around the State as I have been getting to know the UW and Washington. It was certainly never my intent to convey a lack interest in or attentiveness to faculty issues.

I am certainly happy to attend Senate Executive Committee meetings, recognizing that their may well be occasions when I have unavoidable conflicts. I have conveyed to Ross my intention to join these meetings beginning with the meeting of the 14th.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:59 pm.

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

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