

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Room 301; Gowen Hall
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 13 May 2004

An election for 2004-2005 group representatives was held before the meeting formally started.

The meeting started at 3:00 p.m.

Farewell Remarks – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate

When I began to think about the last five years of my more recent Senate involvement, starting with the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the Senate Executive Committee, then as Vice Chair and now as Chair, I went back and reviewed my nomination speech of December 6th, 2001. I remember the day quite clearly since my wife and I were leaving immediately after the meeting to fly to Miami to be with my younger sister whose health had taken a very serious turn for the worse. Shortly before the meeting began the hospital called to inform us that she had passed away. I had a difficult time focusing on the task at hand, but felt better simply moving forward, trying as best I could to bring some perspective and calm to my anxious emotions. Whatever misgivings I may have had about that trip and for that matter this assignment, have since faded, and two and a half years later I must confess that I am very glad to have had the opportunity to serve as Senate Chair.

I revisited my remarks about the responsibilities of shared governance, that it needed to be pro-active, not reactive, about communication not confrontation, about valued traditions and the voice of the faculty, about contributing solutions and sometimes asking difficult questions...responsibilities that we must exercise with care and at times with passion. That we should not be seen as some mandated impediment to planning or as a court of last resort, neither should the Senate be the place where good ideas go to die. I said I realized that we might at times appear to be the eccentric family uncle, while at other times we resemble an off-duty traffic cop, but more often than not I felt our efforts clearly captured the lasting core values of the university.

I itemized the list of issues facing the campus community in 2001: the hidden difficulties among self-sustaining financial models, differential tuition, financial aid, access and demand, compensation and long-term planning. And lastly, I said that we must seek a unified collegial response to tri-campus development. Virtually all these challenges remain with us to greater and lesser degrees, waiting for us to manage and resolve our interests and differences.

I also recall, much to my astonishment, that the early exposure to the job seemed more reactive than proactive, more adversarial than collaborative and it was followed by the loss of faculty raises, significant budget reductions and the resignation of the President.

Fast forward to last October, when I welcomed you with remarks about the coming challenges and opportunities that face us. For my part, I seized on the university's accreditation report to highlight and reinforce what seemed to be the areas of greatest concern, namely, tri-campus operations, strategic planning and compensation. Then, with more instinct than insight, I added intercollegiate athletics to the agenda of the faculty, sensing a need for involvement that only briefly preempted more painful public exposure.

So what, if anything, has changed and what has been accomplished?

Well, for starters, the so-called Rose report that encouraged reorganization of University and faculty committees and councils has resulted in a renewed effort to jointly appoint many advisory bodies, from tuition policy, to intercollegiate athletics, enrollment, labor, diversity and performance contracts and from undergraduate education, to research and most importantly, a Presidential taskforce on tri-campus affairs. It is our expectation that this faculty dominant taskforce will position discussions across our three-campus community and before the Board of Regents and will identify the critical questions and numerous options we need to consider, for the benefit of all concerned. The President, the Provost and many members of the administration have worked with the Faculty Senate to broaden involvement and focus the debates, both internally and publicly, on funding, enrollment, mission and oversight. As an institution it is essential that we exercise ultimate influence over the development of our three-campus university and establish the best comprehensive strategy for programmatic growth and educational success. For example, should we maximize the differences between programs at the three campuses, making each campus the institution of choice for incoming students? Should students be encouraged to move freely between campuses? How do we maintain unique missions while maximizing the growth of undergraduate enrollments at the new campuses? Should the three campuses be highly integrated or fully independent?

But to answer these and many other questions, we will need to convince state government and the public that higher education is seriously under-funded and has been for some time. There is no denying that resources, or the lack thereof, will shape many of our options.

Together, with the administration, we have undertaken a re-examination of the financial planning structure of the numerous campus bodies that review and propose policy options and we hope to position our recommendations to the incoming president in an effort to enhance analysis and be more efficient.

We will continue to examine the process known as RCEP in order to identify ways to improve planning, reorganization and faculty involvement in the academic management of the university.

To be sure the gap I spoke of in October between the haves and the have-nots is still there, if not growing, threatening to create artificial and damaging distinctions between colleagues, departments and disciplines and we must increase our efforts to effectively support all sectors of the university.

Frankly, we should do a much better job of connecting the workings of the Senate to the equivalent counter-parts in our colleges and schools... and on another subject, we could do a lot worse than to consider the possibility of a faculty regent. We have a clear and distinct voice to share and it shouldn't be that difficult to listen to.

While we have succeeded in restoring the 2% continuing merit raise...isn't it amazing what just 2% can do for morale, particularly in the absence of funding cuts... we must find additional ways to go beyond 2%. We all realize that at that level our salaries continue to fall behind market relative to our peers and compression and salary inversion steadily grow worse.

Central to much of this however, is the way we define our academic mission, our intellectual values and our intrinsic worth to the region, the higher education community, state

government agencies and society. We must resist increasingly impoverished and impatient views of education, frequently revealed in the press, in hearings and on the street. Whether we speak of performance contracts or tri-campus matters, of access or state funding, the essential vision of a major research institution must capture the enormous breadth of mission and resources that is the University of Washington.

It is precisely, because we are so critical to the economic and intellectual health of the Northwest, that we must strive to define learning, innovation, research and service in ways that expand rather than limit the possibilities. On several recent occasions, President Huntsman has emphasized the enviable global position American higher education occupies, particularly our emphasis on innovation and creative exploration. Recognizing this suggests that a balanced perspective must be maintained between marketable job skills and life long learning and between efficiency and the process of discovery that is at the core of a great university. While we may resemble a supermarket of offerings, we are not a retail operation dispensing pre-digested shrink-wrapped learning in easy take home six packs. We must resist simplistic job corps notions of education and emphasize the far more complex and subtle curricular components that constitute learning across a broad array of disciplines. Seemingly simple and easily identifiable career paths are often networks of learning and specialization options. Our regional economy is fueled by this university, not only through a trained workforce and financial investments, but also by the value added environment this university builds through the efforts of its faculty, students and staff. The intellectual and cultural identity of the community is substantially defined and created by this university in ways too numerous and fragile to ignore and we must continue to promote our contributions and the synergistic possibilities they create.

If we can succeed in delivering this message with clarity and conviction, for as long as it takes to persuade our critics and skeptics, the support we badly need might follow. Perhaps if our various media pundits paid half as much attention to our true role and value in society than our occasional missteps, the outcome of this effort would seem less uncertain.

Lastly, while I still have a couple of months left in this role, I'm nevertheless quite aware that my fifteen minutes are almost up. I entered this job committed to maintaining not only a sense of balance but also my sense of humor and I need to thank several people for making it rewarding and enjoyable, let alone possible.

First, to President Lee Huntsman for his leadership, candor and gracious counsel, to Provost David Thorud for his insightful guidance and good humor and to Lea Vaughn, the Senate staff and Nancy Bradshaw for their support and hard work. To the many council chairs and council members who have worked many long volunteer hours to advance the agenda of shared governance and to the many members of the administration throughout the university who have made time for me in their busy calendars for thoughtful and candid discussions. To the Board of Regents for the unusual opportunity to participate in the search for the next president and to Ross Heath, my vice chair, for his willing collaboration, sage advice and abundant patience.

Now speaking of volunteer hours, like all of you, I found myself collecting bits and pieces of evidence for my annual merit file and I came across the letter of appointment sent by Provost Thorud to my Dean, explaining my Senate commitment and asking for any necessary accommodations. I guess I hadn't really thought about it until I reflected on the year to date, because in the letter the Provost lists my duties as chairing the six Senate and six SEC meetings... I'm sure David Hodge was thoroughly impressed. I mean it doesn't even mention the almost weekly SCPB and UBC meetings, let alone other committees...so I

started to wonder just how many meetings, retreats, interviews and presentations did this part time job entail?

So without counting classes taught, or faculty meetings, or department executive council meetings, or office hours, walk in appointments, phone calls or the 300 emails in a good week and the 500 to 700 in a bad week, is the answer...it's not 12 meetings, it's 330 meetings...just for the Senate ...and the year is far from over yet!

Nevertheless, I still want to thank the Senate for electing me, despite the occasional chaos, some dropped assignments and meeting fatigue, for I am deeply honored to have had this opportunity and I have enjoyed it immensely.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Ross Heath, Vice Chair and Committee Chair

The Committee has met twice since the last Senate meeting, and most of the discussions have focused on the completion of the 2004-2005 budget. The goals that had been announced by the Provost, for example, meeting increased utility costs, providing a salary increase without a budget cut, were met. Additionally, there are funds committed to buying equipment for research, and for minor repairs and improvement associated with research activities. One issue that remains open is wireless access to the campus network. Additionally, the SCPB began discussions related to unit increases and what strategy should be used in making these determinations.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

The House Higher Education committee has been meeting on our multiple campuses, and will also be doing this with WSU. This effort parallels our review of the tri-campus relationship. The HEC Board draft master plan is being presented for hearings, and she hopes to make a copy available to the Faculty. She encouraged faculty to comment on this especially because the faculty are not mentioned in the draft. She plans to attend the AAUP Lobby Day on June 10 which will allow her to see our Congressional delegation in Washington D.C., and she especially seeks research concerns to convey to the delegation. Finally, she urged senators to attend the various town meetings that will be held this summer and to ask questions about higher education.

Report of the President/ Opportunity for Questions – Lee Huntsman

President Huntsman began by announcing that this year's Annual Faculty Lecturer is Jim Banks, Professor of Education, a distinguished leader in multi-cultural education.

Huntsman then expressed his thanks, and the thanks of the administration to Doug Wadden, Faculty Senate Chair, for his leadership of the Senate.

The last few weeks, he reflected, have been difficult because we have taken a number of "hits," some of them deserved. Along those lines, we traditionally have had a rocky relationship with the press as well as the legislature and the business community. This "rockiness" is partly because of who we are and the costs of distinction in this state's environment. We have an unusual visibility in this state, both for good and bad. But, he would argue that these waves of attention are on top of a tide that is generally rising, recognizing the University's role and contribution to the state. General public reaction to

the University is generally quite high, and they think highly of our research mission. He recalled a set of six public focus groups in which everyone acknowledged the research mission, particularly that of the medical center, and did not mention athletics. While there are ups and downs, he believes there is a larger rising perception of excellence that will become rooted in the realities of the institution.

He then shared his key realities. First, "this is an absolutely outstanding university." This has been clear in every trip he has taken outside of the state as well as in his visits to various units within the University. The energy is astounding as is the entrepreneurialship and innovation. Some of these have been encouraged by special funding and other initiatives. The flexibility of various units and their willingness to change has been similarly astounding. We have demonstrated the ability to perform at a very high level at a time, in the last decade, of incredibly lean resources.

A second fundamental is our values: the focus on quality, on our students, and accessibility and making a difference in the community. The fundraising campaign has been a reflection of this. From all of this comes a key observation: In a time when we were very seriously tempted to wait until we felt citizens got their priorities straight, we did not wait for public perceptions to catch up with reality, and moved forward despite the paralyzation of the state's finances and politics. Thus, we have much to be thankful for. This culture has stood us in good stead. Huntsman stated that he is very optimistic about our future because we have a great deal of control over our destiny.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:36 p.m. Wadden has asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules to introduce an emergency Class C. Wadden introduced the motion.

WHEREAS, President Huntsman is unsurpassed in his enthusiasm for the Class C resolution as the highest expression of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, he has served the University of Washington in a distinguished career spanning a period greater than the age of many junior faculty, to wit, thirty-seven years; and

WHEREAS, he has rendered exceptional service to the University during his terms as Provost and President;

LET IT NOW THEREFORE BE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington gratefully acknowledges President Huntsman's unstinting service to the University, carried forward with candor, insight, wit and a genuine concern for the general welfare and excellence of the University. In recognition of the honor and dignity he has brought to the office of President, we now, herefore and therefore, bestow upon him, as first among equals, the title of Senator Emeritus for Life, without vote or obligation to attend meetings.

The motion was unanimously **approved** by a prolonged, standing ovation.

Senate Executive Committee Summary

In addition to the summary provided in the agenda, Wadden noted:

1. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has submitted a draft report on the Winn settlement. A copy of this report, seeking clarification of some faculty details, has been sent to the Dean of the School of Medicine. A response is due back from Medical School by 31 May 2004. The Council will prepare a final draft to be re-presented to the Senate Executive Committee this fall.
2. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards made a presentation regarding transfer admissions. There are some significant changes taking place, as we move to a more comprehensive form of applicant review.

Announcements

1. Prof. Stanley Fish's lecture has been cancelled.
2. There are two ballot issues before the Faculty with a voting deadline of May 26, 2004.
3. The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services is reviewing a draft of the University's Environmental Stewardship Policy Statement. The Board of Deans have endorsed the statement, and it will go the Regents on 9 June 2004. The Statement is posted on the Senate web site.

Requests for Information

Presentation from Pete Dukes, Chair, Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and George Bridges, Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education

As part of a continuing series of informational presentations about the athletic program, Wadden introduced Professor Peter Dukes (Accounting) and Dean George Bridges (Undergraduate Education).

a. Bridges: Within the Inter-Collegiate Athletics department (ICA) is a unit devoted to academic support which reports jointly to him and the Athletic Director. One part of the program that is not experiencing notoriety is the academic performance of our student athletes. This support unit was reorganized in 1988, and was the first to be directed by faculty – Stan Chernicoff of Earth Sciences. At this time, there are approximately 700 student athletes, generally performing at a high level, and their grade point and graduation rate is the same and sometimes higher than that of general student population. We know that UW ranks second after Stanford in the graduation of our football team, going from the bottom to nearly the top in a matter of years. Furthermore, campus-wide 481 students, or 2% of the whole student population generally, are on probation; of these 481 students, five are athletes (1% of the 481 students): one football player, two basketball players, one baseball player, and one golfer. Our task is to be sure that these students succeed in our classes.

But, he emphasized, we are on a collision course with our student athletes and academics. Admission has become increasingly selective as demand exceeds availability. In addition, undergraduate education has changed here and around the country. One of the most notable changes has been the rising number of students involved in intense research, public service (10 hours or more/week for either research or public service) or study abroad.

Participation in these programs in the last decade has gone from a few hundred to several thousand students. The dilemma is this: as the standards for admission and performance rise, we are still admitting some athletes with credentials that are widely disparate from that of the general student body and this disparity will make successful performance difficult. Therefore, he stated, we must remain extremely vigilant in this area.

He finished by suggesting a number of questions: First, we need to examine the culture of the ICA and the culture of athletics, asking what kind of relationship we, as faculty, want to have with student athletes. There needs to be a partnership between the administration and the faculty regarding academic support. Second, we need to look at the needs of the students, both athletes and students generally.

b. Dukes: This year was a more aggressive year for the group's involvement. Observing that many faculty do not know what his committee does, he said that this year, for the first time, the committee was jointly appointed by the Senate Chair and President. It is composed of faculty, students, and administrators – the Athletic Director (AD), the Associate Athletic Director, George Bridges, Ernest Morris, and Norman Arkans. The charge is to advise the President, the AD, and the Chair of the Senate regarding policies and practices in the department of athletics. They see themselves as the eyes of the faculty. To be candid, the focus in the past was on the students and their academic performance. The committee's role traditionally was not to be compliance experts or review personnel decisions. That has changed, however, as incidents involving the department began to emerge. Out of this came an expectation of greater and broader involvement. One new issue is to try to understand what is going on in the program at the University – the culture question. Second, they were asked to look at the management model in the department and where the faculty fits in. This is a broader mandate than in the past. At the same time, committee members have been involved in the search for the Faculty Athletic Representative and the AD search. Finally, the committee is involved in the recertification efforts.

At the same time as we examine our program, there is a growing national movement that is asking questions about athletic programs: Are college athletics too commercialized? What is the appropriate role of the student athlete? The Coalition for Reform has been spearheading this movement, and seeks to identify a set of best practices. The committee has been reviewing the best practice proposals and believes that the UW should become involved in this coalition. They have proposed that joining this effort be on the Senate's agenda this fall.

Questions/

1. One senator was curious about student athletes who do not meet admission standards. Bridges replied that there are 20 to 30 special admits per year, most of them athletes. It is a relatively small number, and they have lower test scores and grades than the normally admitted students. The NCAA is on the verge of raising minimum GPAs and that will probably take care of much of this issue. Even if that is changed, however, these students will still face enormous challenges. Another effect is that this will adversely affect students of color; 1/3 of our students of color are male athletes. Bridges concluded that we need to face this issue honestly and candidly.

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. Clinical Professor William B. Hamlin of Laboratory Medicine who died on May 3, 2004 after having served the University since 1969. Professor Emeritus Eugene C. Pizzuto of Art who died on April 17, 2004 after having served the University since 1957. Lecturer Robert Edward Willstadter of Mathematics who died on April 25, 2004 after having served the University since 1970. Professor Emeritus Peter Wootton of Radiation Oncology who died on May 3, 2004 after having served the University since 1959. 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 Appointment

In addition to the nominations that were presented in the agenda, Ross Heath, Vice Chair, made the following nominations from the floor:

Jan Carline – Chair, FCIO for a one-year term beginning September 16, 2004
Dina Mandoli – Chair, SCFW for a one-year term beginning September 16, 2004
Gerry Philipson – Chair, Adjudication Panel, for a two year term during the winter and spring quarters beginning the first day of winter quarter, 2005.
Clark Pace – Chair, FCSA, for a one-year term beginning September 16, 2004
Francoise Haeseleer (Ophthalmology)– Member, FCR, for a three year term beginning September 16, 2004

Approved.

New Business

a. Class C Resolution Concerning Collective Bargaining

The following resolution, presented by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, was **approved**:

WHEREAS the University, for the first time, is negotiating contracts with many of its non-faculty employees who are represented by collective bargaining agreements; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate encourages the University to use the 2004 bargaining process to show its appreciation, to the maximum extent possible, for the hard work and contributions to all facets of the institution's programs by its technical, medical, research and clerical employees; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to incoming President Mark Emmert.

b. Class C Resolution Concerning Voter Registration and Participation

The text of the resolution, proposed by Mary Gillmore, Senator, Group VIII, is as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington hereby endorses UW VOTE! – an effort to maximize voter registration and voter participation among faculty, staff, and students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington hereby challenges the Faculty Senate of Washington State University to compete for the honor of being the school with the highest registration/participation.

After a short discussion, the resolution was approved.

Concluding Remarks – Ross Heath, Vice Chair

Heath made remarks regarding Wadden's contribution on behalf of the Faculty this year. This year, Faculty leadership under Wadden has been very prominent, especially on the issue of tri-campus relations and athletics. Another, less visible role, however, is making sure that things do not happen. Wadden has carried out this function on behalf of the faculty collegially and collaboratively. Shared governance has never been healthier, largely because of Wadden's efforts. The body responded to Heath's remarks with prolonged applause.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate