

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**301 Gowen Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 2 December 2004**

The meeting began at 2:34 p.m.

**Introductory Comments – G. Ross Heath, Chair**

The past month has been busy. Apart from the election, about which I will say more later, the highlight was the two-day Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat at the end of October. This event was attended by about 90 people and gave us all a much greater appreciation of the complexity of devising an optimum future for the three campus University of Washington. A number of the creative ideas that emerged will help launch the next stage of planning. The results of the Retreat will be posted on the Senate website in the next few days as the final typos and format issues are cleaned up. Doug Wadden and Fred Campbell deserve enormous credit for pulling this together and Nancy Bradshaw deserves a medal for the smooth execution of an enormous logistical task.

The last time we met, Election Day was imminent and the polls suggested that Initiative-884 had a good chance of passing – with huge potential positive consequences for UW funding. As we now knew, that didn't happen. We are back to facing a projected State deficit of more than \$1.5 billion, and a governor who is unlikely to have higher education at the top of her or his list for additional state funding.

What are our options? Firstly – damage control. The faculty is well represented in Olympia by Gail Stygall and her colleagues on the Council of Faculty Representatives, and by the University's representative, Randy Hodgins – all seasoned veterans of the budget wars. As in the past, we are likely to fare slightly better than most state agencies, but still, we will be lucky to escape some cuts.

A new wrinkle this year is the prototype performance contracts that have been produced by UW and WSU in response to legislation from the last session. (Ours were discussed at the last Senate meeting). Whether such an approach will result in any additional general funds is unclear. The contract does, however, provide us with an opportunity to emphasize the link between: adequate funding per student (based on our peers), general fund support, the number of state-subsidized students, and tuition (which, in turn, has implications for financial aid).

This linkage suggests that if more general funds are not available we can only maintain and restore the quality of our programs by modifying the enrollment of state-subsidized students or modifying tuition, or both. Quality has many facets, including faculty salaries, teaching facilities, libraries, support staff, and departmental operating budgets, to name but a few. All are currently hurting and must be addressed if the current erosion of quality is to be stemmed.

Finally, I feel we must be more aggressive in our reactions at the end of the legislative session. For as long as I have been here, we have always put on a positive face and made statements such as "we did well given the budget problems faced by the legislature." This translates loosely as "we did not get clobbered as badly as some other parts of state government."

I suspect that our statements are meant to be kind to our supporters in Olympia by not drawing attention to how little they have been able to do for us. But being nice is not always the best strategy. I am reminded of Winston Churchill's description of an appeaser - someone who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last. I believe we do no favors to the legislators, to the people of Washington, or to ourselves by concealing the bad news; the reality is that the cumulative effect of a string of cuts over the past couple of decades is a major disaster. The quality and variety of the education that we are able to offer our students has been degraded, we are unable to reward and retain many of our best faculty, and teaching support staff and departmental operating budgets have almost disappeared.

We cannot simply stand by and watch this trend continue. If the state is unable or unwilling to help us, we must do all we can to take control of our own future. To do otherwise is to abdicate our responsibility to present and future students, to the people of the state, and to ourselves.

### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Chair**

Four topics have been covered in the last several meetings:

1. The Performance Contract: There is a new version available, and target goals are now being developed.
2. Course Fees: A near final draft of a new course fee policy has been completed after extensive work by faculty, students, and the administration. It would provide an avenue for students to ask questions about these fees, make them more transparent, and provide a mechanism to make policy.
3. Budget and Compensation: The committee has begun to look at the budget possibilities for the next biennium. SCPB has created a subcommittee on Unit Adjustment Policy.
4. Tuition Waiver Benefit for Faculty and Staff: There has been a preliminary discussion of a Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits proposal to provide a tuition waiver for the dependants of faculty and staff.

### **Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative**

Stygall briefly highlighted the November election results, noting that the Democrats now control both chambers of the Legislature. Notably, Lisa Brown, a faculty member at Gonzaga, will assume leadership. The Governor's race is as yet undecided; the outcome could make a significant difference for the University. There will no longer be a higher education committee; a K-16 committee has taken its place.

Stygall also noted that the state faces a deficit of approximately \$1.7 billion. The budget contains several features relating to health care costs and the wage increases negotiated under the new Civil Service Reform bill. This budget situation raises, more sharply, the issue of a performance contract. Any contract will include some constraints on the University. Additionally, the students have made their position clear: they do not want a tuition increase.

The Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) has two legislative agendas, one having to do with the performance contract, the other with salary.

In answer to a question, Stygall confirmed that Prof. Souders has resigned as deputy faculty representative and that she is actively seeking another person to take her place.

### **Report of the President – Opportunity for Questions – Mark Emmert**

Picking up where Stygall and Wadden left off, Emmert addressed the changes in the legislature. There will be some changes, particularly in the Senate, this upcoming session. Although Initiative 884 failed to pass, we did develop a coalition of people who care about higher education. If we can hold this coalition together, and work with the K-16 committee, we may be able to bring more pressure to bear on these issues. In the meantime, we are trying to understand why I-884 failed. One of the challenges, initially, appears to be that because there was something for everyone in the initiative, it also meant that there was something for some people to dislike and vote against. The challenge will be to find a commonality of interest with our colleagues in education and hold together the coalition.

Another issue will be our alliance with the business community, particularly the high tech industry. There is a nascent interest in working with us to build our agenda in Olympia. Of course, this runs up against the reality of the huge deficit and the budget problems that flow from it. While he suspects that the deficit may end up smaller, the Governor's obligation to submit a balanced budget means that revenue assumptions must be conservative and expenditures must be cut. Complicating the need to make cuts is the delay in resolving the gubernatorial election. The delay means that current Gov. Locke will be responsible for submitting the budget that will be the starting point of discussions.

The WSU and UW performance contracts have also generated discussion. At the same time, the Regents have reaffirmed their decision to hold firm on not admitting students for which we are not funded. This means we have chosen to cut enrollment rather than cut quality - which he regards as the correct decision. This also means that tuition will go up. Agreeing with Heath, he stated that if the legislature will not help us, it needs to give us the means to help ourselves. We also need to make clear the types of resources that the University needs.

Our joint collaboration with WSU goes forward, and has broadened support across the state. He believes that he and President Rollins will be able to do a number of positive things around the state for higher education.

The President provided an update on the following leadership searches: Provost, Chancellor-Tacoma, Dean of the Business School, Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean of Architecture as well as the search for a new football coach. He noted that we need to congratulate George Bridges, who will assume the leadership of Whitman College. It is fitting that the person who was responsible for undergraduate education is asked to move to this position. Stan Barer, an attorney, a significant donor at law school and real supporter of UW has joined the Board of Regents. He joins, however, three members of Board whom the Senate has not confirmed. There is a huge backlog of gubernatorial appointments that have not been approved by the Senate. It is not inconceivable that there could be some Board changes if a Republican is elected.

After the President's remarks, a number of points emerged in the ensuing question and answer period. As it relates to the performance contract, there continues to be concern about the word "contract" in this context and a preference for another term such as "compact." There was also discussion about gaining the ability to set our own tuition; the President pointed out that seeking this authority would be one of the core components of

the performance contract. In budgetary terms, we seek to be funded at the benchmark of 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of our peers. This would mean increasing our total support (legislative and tuition) to approximately \$3000 per student, and would generate \$100-120 million in additional funds.

A second line of questions spoke to our relationship with the business community. Conflicting points of view were presented as to whether the business community would like the University to prepare more "employment-ready" graduates, or whether it would prefer to "import" talent. Washington leads the country in employing engineers and scientists but we are 38<sup>th</sup> in producing these people in our universities. The trend towards importing talent could weaken support of the universities in this state. Emmert described the business community as more supportive of the performance contract approach than of I-884 because they can see the return in the contract. While some businesses do "import" talent, others, like Microsoft, have made a commitment to being a part of this place. For those employers, that means that education here is a part of the business environment, and that it matters to the business as well as to their employees. For them, education is a vital part of the state infrastructure.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

### **Summary of the Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions**

a. Minutes of the 4 October 2004 Senate Executive Committee meeting and 28 October 2004 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. b. Nominations for the 2005-06 Faculty Senate Vice Chair were delayed until the January 10, 2005 Senate Executive Committee meeting. c. The Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits presented the Dependent Tuition Benefit Proposal. The proposal will next be presented for consideration to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

### **Announcements**

To give the search committee additional time to complete its task, vice chair nominations that would normally have been presented at this meeting have been delayed to 10 January 2005, as noted in the summary above.

### **Requests for Information**

a. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) – Patrick Dobel

Directing attention to documents in the agenda, Dobel noted that he and the Athletic Director (AD) are trying to create closer ties between the athletic program and faculty governance. The NCAA rules do not describe the FAR position, and universities are free to give content to this position. The FAR and Faculty Senate have signed an agreement that the FAR will meet with the Senate Executive Committee three times a year, and at least once a year, the FAR and the AD will meet with the Faculty Senate.

There have been significant changes in the department in the last six months. National searches have yielded a new AD, a senior associate director for compliance and two other

senior staff in the compliance office. This is a huge operation with 172 employees, a huge budget, over 600 students and a sprawling physical facility.

Second, there has been a significant change in the FAR position. In the last five years, the position had become largely a regulatory one, assuring compliance with the large overwhelming number of regulations. His model, in contrast, is to hire a compliance officer that would be directly responsible for this function and this person will handle day-to-day issues regarding compliance. Dobel will meet with the compliance officer several times a week.

The NCAA is a self-regulating monopoly and generates, because of this, huge numbers of regulations. Dobel provided an example of how complicated this can become, describing how minor overlaps in flight schedules of recruiting coaches can cause a violation.

The other change in the FAR position is to be more embedded in the governance structure. In addition to the agreement, the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) membership is now jointly appointed by the President and the Senate, and the group has been reinvigorated. This should provide more input before he votes on policies at the NCAA. As issues come up, he will bring these to the ACIA.

The third change is take advantage of the opportunity presented when the FAR determines student eligibility each quarter. This means that he can check on academic progress each quarter. He has found a universal commitment to make sure that the student athletes are getting an education. The staff member who works on eligibility now reports to him rather than to the athletic department. This protects the integrity of the academic program.

Currently, he identified the largest issue as the leadership change in a program that has competing goals. He then introduced Todd Turner, the new Athletic Director, formerly AD at Vanderbilt University. Dobel described Turner as deeply committed to educational values as well as excellence in athletics.

b. Report of the Athletic Director (AD) – Todd Turner

Referencing his twenty-eight years in college athletics, Turner gave a quick assessment of the program here based on his first four months on the job. Calling attention to documents in the agenda, he noted that he agreed with the report on the athletic culture. The culture is far better than one might think; all of his experience bears this out. There is a core of people in athletics that are deeply committed to doing the right thing and committed to the students, but they are frustrated by the things that drawn have negative attention to the program. They want to get back on track. And, by and large, the student athletes match the profile of the rest of the student body in composition and achievement. The program has been very successful; we were ranked 8<sup>th</sup> nationally last year for Division I programs for competitiveness in athletics. We were ranked 4<sup>th</sup> for competitiveness in athletics and academics, Penn, Ohio State and Stanford the only colleges ahead of us. Athletic graduation rates mirror the rest of the student body. But we can still do better.

The goals are to better integrate the student athletes; to do this, we need to improve communication with the rest of the University community. He is now on the President's cabinet which allows him to talk to leaders in other parts of the University. Another important thing will be to come before the Senate on a regular basis. The FAR position will also help communicate developments in this program to the Faculty. The Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate athletics, chaired by Pete Dukes, will now be meeting regularly

to discuss a wide variety of topics. In his opinion, this can form the base of better communication. The welfare of the student athletes is first and foremost - promoting their complete growth as young adults and students as well as an athlete.

Directing attention to the handouts, Turner noted that the NCAA has just gone through a period of academic reform. Three new components are now in place. They include (1) higher standards for initial eligibility for movement from high school to college in terms of core courses – it will now be 16 by 2008 so that they are more prepared. (2) Improving and strengthening the progress standards for continued eligibility. Students must have a prescribed grade-point, pass at least six hours of coursework each term, and be making regular progress towards completion of the degree. (3) Developing incentive and disincentives for academic performance at each college. This measure looks at retention rates and eligibility to compete. Using a snapshot metric – academic progress rate – schools will be assessed competitive penalties if they fall below a given line. They can lose scholarships, access to competitions, etc.

How has the University of Washington done so far? So far, the University has done very well on this metric. The NCAA will soon be setting the penalty line, and he is hoping that the NCAA will choose to set this line at a fairly high point. He believes our students should do well. They are recruited to come here, receive scholarships and are closely monitored to be successful. They should succeed.

In the discussion that followed, two points were covered. First, Turner and Dobel outlined the status of the investigations in the department. Turner described the compliance program as good and improving. The football issues are now behind us; we are on probation until the winter of 2007 and we have lost some recruiting opportunities. There are some unresolved legal issues regarding the football and softball programs. Dobel described the efforts that are underway to educate those who work with students about all of the regulations. Finally, Turner explained the financial status of the department. It is self-supporting, although it currently has a deficit. This is an inherited problem although there are some reserves in the department that will help.

**Class C Resolution – Endorse the Spirit of the Framework for Athletic Reform of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) – Presented by Jeffrey Schwartz, Chair, Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

Schwartz explained who makes up the group that has proposed this reform, noting that it is not an NCAA group and draws from a broader group of people interested in athletics. The proposal allows us to contribute a faculty voice to the reform movement. This gives us a seat in this body and allows us to participate in discussions. It does not obligate us in terms of commitments; this is not a rule-making body. The ACIA and the FAR are in support of this resolution.

**Vote: Approved unanimously.**

**Nominations and Appointments**

Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately:

Shannon Mills, Joint GPSS/ASUW Representative, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting for a one-year term ending September 15, 2005.

Kalpana Kanal, Radiology, Group Seven, as Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Technology for a term ending September 15, 2005.

Jimmy Allen, GPSS Representative, Faculty Council on University Libraries for a one-year term ending September 15, 2005.

George Martin, Pathology, Group Seven, Faculty Council on University Libraries, for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Thomas Bellamy, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at UW, Bothell to replace Jane Decker on the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy, Administration representative, without vote, for a term ending September 15, 2005.

Joseph Stowitschek, Education, Group 5, Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Marko Liias, Graduate as GPSS representative, to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services, for a one-year term ending September 15, 2005. **Approved.**

### **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 Roma Kittelsby Blaschke of Nursing who died on October 11, 2004 after having served the University since 1953. Acting Instructor William "Bill" Hoekendorf, of Economics who died on October 17, 2004 after having served the University since 1958. Professor Emeritus Paul Dewitt Tufts of Music who died on November 23, 2004 after having served the University since 1958. 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 Regarding Faculty Senate Operations – Volume Two, Various Sections. Presented by Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty**

Vaughn presented as a friendly amendment two wording changes proposed by the Faculty Code Advisory Committee. Vote on friendly amendment: Approved. Vaughn answered questions about whether the proposal to give chairs a vote at Senate Executive Committee meetings will change the size and dynamics of the meetings. She responded that the chairs currently attend SEC meetings and are active participants. Also, she noted that chairs must be members of the faculty. Second, she noted that because some of the councils are now chaired by Bothell and Tacoma faculty members, it actually increases the influence of those campuses. **Vote on main motion: Approved unanimously.**

### **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**

Janssen directed attention to the rationale for the legislation, which was attached to the agenda. Faculty on all three campuses as well as FCTCP have reviewed the legislation. For example, as a result of these consultations, he suggested some language changes regarding student requests about the status of their transfer credits.

Janssen then introduced a substitute amendment proposed by FCTCP that reflected student practices on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. **Vote on substitution: Approved.**

He then presented a summary of the main motion. The state legislature decided that we could no longer treat the lower division credits from community colleges differently than those presented from four year colleges. We have been operating with a temporary fix, and this legislation would be a permanent policy. The proposal has three parts. We lift the restriction on the source of the credits that are presented at initial admission. A second part says that once the student is admitted, we will examine their additional credits that may advance the student in their degree program. Finally, it puts a limit of 135 credits on the total number of credits that could be transferred in.

During discussion, Janssen answered one question regarding notice to students of these changes by explaining that because of the differences between campuses, the Council did not include detailed provisions for student notice. The Council will be working with academic advisors to design a process for informing students of the limitations. Janssen noted that the distribution of credits between the lower and upper division is a separate issue that is currently before the Council. These requirements are controlled by departments, and embarrassingly, some departments require only thirty upper division credits. This is a significant issue and the Council will be reporting back to the faculty. **Vote: Approved.**

#### **New Business**

None.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

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

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