

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
301 Gowen Hall
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 April 2004

The meeting began at 2:37 p.m.

Introductory Comments – Doug Wadden, Chair

Wadden began by noting recent developments, most notably the appointment of President designate Emmert. In his thirty-four career at the University, he described the search process as one of his most interesting and rewarding experiences. He characterized Emmert as a thoughtful, high energy and good appointment. Another announcement regards Stanley Fish, Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at the University of Illinois in Chicago, who has been invited to speak at campus on May 17th. This event was put together by state Senator Ken Jacobson, after reading Fish's article "Make Them Cry," a portion of which Wadden read to the body.

The thrust of today's information session will be focused on intercollegiate athletics. Wadden noted that the Faculty Senate homepage lists a number of resources on this issue. The most recent document addresses best practices in this area, and provides a roadmap for how faculty and administrators should work in support of, but also towards reform of, intercollegiate athletic programs.

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

There have been three meetings since the last Senate meeting. The SCPB endorsed the RCEP request of the School of Education to end its school counseling program. Most of the activities have been following up on the end of the short legislative session in collaboration with the administration. Two study activities came out of this last session. One pertains to performance contracts while the other addresses the futures of the newer campuses at Bothell and Tacoma. The budget is in nearly final form, and will soon be presented to the Regents. It includes a 2% increase for faculty and staff. New issues regarding the budget come from indirect costs, as well as a number of unfunded mandates. Some funds are for reform of administrative processes and moving towards the electronic provision of services and support. There will be some funds for maintenance. The capital budget remains largely unchanged although work has begun on the 2005-2007 budget. The most significant development has been the requirement of a single capital request from all state college and universities rather than discrete proposals from each campus.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

Characterizing her report as the "veto report," Stygall reported on which legislation had been vetoed by the Governor. These vetoes include:

1. The requirement that schools stay within 2% of their budgeted enrollment. The Governor would prefer that we over-enroll, thus the veto, although the Regents have said "no" to over-enrollment.
2. The requirement of a Bothell and Vancouver study, on the theory that this is already required by HB 2727 where there is no pre-determined outcome for the study.

3. A provision that would allow private schools to bid for high demand enrollment programs.
4. Reversing restrictions on supplies, equipment, and travel funding.

In regards to the capital list, there appears to be a high degree of agreement as to what should appear on that list. Wadden used this occasion to update the body on the progress of the TriCampus task force, which has begun the information-gathering phase of their operations.

Report of the President and Opportunity for Questions – Lee Huntsman

Huntsman has been able to spend time with President-designate Emmert, and he has been very impressed. What was impressive also was to hear about Emmert's experience and achievements at Connecticut and LSU. The interesting features of these conversations were how quickly Emmert understood the circumstances of each university and was able to put together a vision for each place, yet he understands that each university is a unique place requiring its own vision. He is articulate, a quick learner but also a good listener. He is already grasping many facets of the University and its environment.

While in D.C., Huntsman participated in a group that is an attempt to create an international consortium to facilitate faculty student exchanges, to take advantage of research opportunities across borders, and to see where there are partnerships in e-learning. Attending these meetings sheds light on changes that are taking place in American universities, especially when compared with the more rapid rate of change taking place in Europe, Japan and other places. These experiences also make it clear that while American policy is not emulated, many attributes of American research universities are. Many of the participants were interested in maintaining independence from their government as well as developing peer review. Most of these universities also want to send their students here to have the American experience of innovation, and tolerance.

In contrast, this makes our national picture more interesting. Sitting at the American Association of Universities roundtable of the 60 top research universities, many of the members face the same problems vis a vis the federal government. While the headlines have been preoccupied with Iraq, most of the AAU discussions focused on the size of the federal deficit, which may well paralyze funding, let alone any growth.

Here in the state, Huntsman reminded senators of the e-mail he recently sent to all faculty summarizing the legislative session. The legislature now seems to understand the issues confronting the state about higher education, and it is now the "season of decision." One development that may force decision is the League of Education Voters initiative that would raise funds for K-20 education. If passed, this would increase higher education funding by 30%. If not passed, we may well be forced to a higher tuition, higher financial aid model of funding. He hopes that these decisions will be about how we move forward rather than whether we move forward.

Questions/

1. One senator raised a question about the difficulty in getting visas, an issue highlighted in this morning's paper. This was a major issue raised at the discussions in D.C., especially after the passage of the Patriot Act. There seems to be a growing understanding in

Congress that the Patriot Act overshoot the mark and needs to be corrected to address these types of problems.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. and the agenda was **approved**.

Announcements

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, announced the elections for Faculty Senate. This is the first year elections are being conducted electronically, and so far the process seems to be going smoothly. Second, she reminded senators that at the next meeting, elections for group representatives will take place. These representatives will play an important role in governance by sitting on the Senate Executive Committee.

Requests for Information

Wadden began this section of the meeting by introducing visitors who had come to speak about the intercollegiate athletic program. He created the context for this portion of the meeting by describing a recent article in the New York Times about athletic program problems and the recent scandals in the corporate sector. Since the last meeting, thirty-four schools have joined the reform coalition, which has addressed the performance of all constituents in the program. The Faculty has an important role to play in this process. One reform document coming out of Penn has suggested that there should be certification each year of the faculty's involvement in the athletic program, or a statement of the obstacles to that involvement. Wadden's remarks stressed the important role that faculty must play in regards to the student athlete. He then introduced Rob Aronson (Law), Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) for the last eleven years; Patrick Dobel (Evans School), the newly appointed FAR; and Dick Thompson, Interim Athletic Director. Pete Dukes, Chair, Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA), was ill and could not attend today's meeting. These individuals will provide the Senate with additional background and information on these programs.

Remarks of Rob Aronson

Noting that he was once Faculty Senate Chair, Aronson stated that he was glad to be back before the body. Unfortunately, he noted that he has not been that involved with the Senate, a lapse on both sides. That works well when things are going well, but the current situation makes it clear that this relationship needs to be strong regardless of circumstances.

He is responsible for being a liaison between the athletic campus and the upper campus, focusing on the welfare of student athletes. There are over 700 athletes in twenty-three programs, and with few exceptions, their grade points and involvement are at a higher level than that of the average student. Making sure that these students have an appropriate academic experience is one of the FAR's responsibilities. The NCAA has extensive eligibility rules and the FAR makes sure that each student is eligible and that students meet these requirements on a continuing basis. This will become more important in the future as the NCAA has implemented stronger controlling eligibility requirements. Another portion of the position requires that the University comply with the NCAA compliance regulations. Currently, they are trying to make this a more professional job handled by trained staff

rather than by the FAR. Without elaborating on NCAA committee responsibilities and other duties, Aronson described this as a substantial position.

Remarks of Patrick Dobel

Dobel is faculty member in the Evans School, having served seven years as associate dean, with a specialty in leadership, management, and ethics. He has sat on the King County and Seattle Ethics Boards. Dobel described the FAR selection process and said that he took the job because he has immense respect for student athletes. We have a responsibility to the students and parents to see that these students get a good education. He stressed that probably no one understands how hard Aronson has worked in this position and Aronson's high level of involvement in Pac 10 reform efforts.

Characterizing this as an "interesting moment," Dobel noted that the new president describes athletics as a strategic aspect of the modern University. We are also hiring a new athletic director, and we are hiring a new compliance director. Therefore, we have the opportunity to rethink and renegotiate how we address athletic issues. He and Huntsman have agreed on the following agenda:

1. Do not prematurely commit to policies until the new team is in place.
2. Make sure that in a real way the FAR connects with the Faculty. Arrangements have been made to consult with the Senate Executive Committee quarterly and Senate annually. Additionally, he wants closer ties to students to be sure they have a role in making policy changes.
3. Make sure coaches have a better understanding of their academic role, and meet with them on a regular basis.

Noting he oversaw the governance and compliance recertification ten years ago, he was struck by the differences in language and discourse between the two parts of campus. These differences leave the students stuck in the middle.

The athletic department has access to our students in ways that most faculty would envy. Coaches command the full attention of students twenty hours a week on issues of character, commitment, team interaction, the ability to deal with failure and success, focus, and publicity. The students must also meet extraordinarily high degrees of performance. The way in which lessons are conveyed in the athletic setting present a unique opportunity for the faculty to explore ways of learning that we may be underutilizing. A second set of issues has to do with the issues that involve, especially, minority students as athletics becomes the center of affirmative action in the modern university.

Finally, there is a national movement looking at reform efforts at the same time there are growing demands for commercialization. These pressures go in two different directions. We have the opportunity to become one of the leaders in this effort. He stressed he hopes to work in candor and collaboration with the Faculty.

Remarks of Dick Thompson

Obviously, he noted, the department is working through some difficult issues that will culminate in a hearing on June 11th before the NCAA. There is also an ongoing

investigation of Dr. Scheyer's involvement in the softball program. At the same time, we have hundreds of student athletes who are doing excellent jobs. Pointing to the softball program, despite its problems, it is fifth ranked and recently beat the second ranked team in the country. Last night, eight of the women's basketball team were honored as being listed on the Dean's List.

Last winter, Barbara Hedges requested a review of the compliance program by a group specializing in such reviews. Their report has been used as a road map for reforming that office. Currently, the office is staffed with four people and recently was down to two people. It has been important to rebuild that office, and we currently have a compliance officer on loan from the review group. One of the suggestions is that the individual professional that focuses on continuing eligibility for the NCAA and Pac 10 is to report to the FAR rather than the Athletic Director (AD). Other recommendations are being put in place, and a search is underway for a new compliance officer, hopefully to be completed by June. A conversation has been begun with Undergraduate Education on the best way to deliver academic services, although this is awaiting the arrival of the new president and AD. Past efforts have resulted in an improved graduation rate. For all students, the rate is 71%; for athletes, it is 70%. Similarly high results are evidenced for students that stay all four years.

Wadden then asked these individuals to answer questions; next month Pete Dukes and George Bridges will appear. He is also asking for recommendations from these people, as well as FCAS, and a faculty dominated Advisory Committee. Then we will be able to determine whether to formally join the reform efforts.

Discussion and Questions/

1. One senator focused on Aronson's comments that most athletes excel. That seems to serve as a substantial focus on what needs to be fixed; that is – emulating the successful programs. Aronson noted that this is a good point. Two sports historically have had academic problems, although the major issues revolved around football. The second is men's basketball. Because of this pattern, which is common to most universities, the NCAA has targeted special rules for football and basketball. This suggests the importance of targeting our efforts.
2. A senator from the performing arts pointed out that he has students who are practicing many hours a day, yet the Senate is not talking about these students, who also devote a great deal of their time to perfect their skills. Why, then, are we focusing on 2% of the students? Where does the money come from? Thompson responded that the athletic department pays for academic services and those funds come from gate, publicity, or private sources. Heath noted that the search committee for AD has met with the student athletes about why they chose the UW. All of these students noted that the academic support reputation here is not common at other universities and is a big draw.
3. Clark Pace, Co-chair, FCSA stated that today there was a lot of talk about compliance and he knows it is a large part of the job. He asked whether compliance is enough or whether we should do other things, such as setting the bar higher. Thompson said compliance is a matter of culture, not just rules. It needs to be instinctive. The issue of raising the bar is an interesting issue, especially in recruiting. The coaches are competitors and they do worry about creating an uneven playing field that may affect our ability to recruit so that this becomes an issue of raising the bar for everyone at all universities, not just UW. Aronson added that he had just come from NCAA meetings where there was a

greater will to create a change regarding expectations that will apply to everyone. People are talking about taking away the current view of recruiting as a “winning and dining” experience to a model where student athletes have an opportunity to see what the school is really like on recruiting visits. These are the beginnings of cultural changes that will apply to everyone. Dobel added that the word “compliance” covers a wide range of behaviors. There is a need to look at which rules we are talking about – coaches’ behavior, the numbers of games, the quality of medical care, the hours devoted to practice, etc. We have to think about where we want to put our efforts and he suggested focusing on the quality of the opportunity we want to provide our students and working from there. Referring to the complexity of the Tax Code, Thompson also noted that many of the compliance rules are not intuitive so it is important to look at the nature of the violation and whether there was a willful intent to violate the rule.

5. Noting that most of the questions have focused on the students, a senator from UWT stated that many of our problems have come from the coaches and other administrative positions in the program, and asked what efforts are being directed to this part of the program. Aronson replied that faculty need to get involved in these efforts, and ask hard questions of people in searches for coaches or other athletic personnel. The FAR has a role in who we select and then in educating new hires to the expectations of the University so that they understand their role as educators. Dobel said that there are several issues and that we need to listen to coaches. We hire them to win and yet tell them to graduate students and fire them if they do not win; we send inconsistent and confusing messages. We need to listen to what the coaches think their role is and what constraints they have. Once we understand that, then we can work together towards some solutions. For example, this may mean we need an AD who gives coaches time to develop their program. The coaches would like to be consistent with both expectations – grades and wins - but feel trapped by the demand to be successful in sports or risk being fired.

Wadden asked that any additional questions be submitted to the Senate.

Nominations and Appointments – Election of Faculty Legislative Representatives

1. Gail Stygall (English) was **Approved** unanimously for a second term as Legislative Representative, running from 16 September 2004 to 15 September 2005.

2. Jennifer Souders (Anesthesiology) was nominated for the position of Deputy Legislative Representative, for a term to run from 16 September 2004 to 15 September 2005. Wadden provided some background about Souders and her interest in the position. Souders addressed the body, noting how much she has enjoyed being a senator over the last four years. She sees this as an opportunity to have individuals from both upper and lower campus working together with the legislature. She believes that we can be very effective. This may show the legislature that the face of the faculty is more varied than is thought. Her chair has approved this, and she is very committed to serving the Faculty. She addressed a question regarding her status as an assistant professor, noting that service is very highly valued by her department.

Approved Unanimously.

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: Senior Lecturer James Clowes of the Jackson School of International Studies who died on March 1, 2004 after having served the

University since 1996. Professor Emeritus Margot Edith Heinemann of Psychosocial and Community Health who died on January 28, 2004 after having served the University since 1954. Professor James Reed Holton of Atmospheric Sciences who died on March 3, 2004, after having served the University since 1969. Professor Emeritus Howard Lee Nostrand of Romance Languages and Literature who died on March 13 2004 after having served the University since 1939. Associate Professor Emeritus Clifford Laverne Peek of Physical and Health Education who died on April 9, 2004 after having served the University since 1938. Clinical Associate Professor Emeritus William H. Stimson of Medicine who died on March 30, 2004 after having served the University since 1957. Clinical Assistant Charles Otmar Joseph Veranth of Dentistry who died on April 8, 2004 after having served the University since 1955. 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

a. Policy Regarding the Terms of Faculty Senate Officers. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-53 – Election of Senate Officers.

After explaining the procedural process, Wadden opened it for discussion, explaining that this is an up or down vote. The legislation has been approved with just a minor editorial change by the Advisory Committee on the Code. Unanimously **Approved** for submission to the faculty.

b. Policy regarding the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-91 – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Unanimously **Approved** for submission to the faculty.

New Business

Norman Wolf introduced a Class C motion regarding the increase in parking fees. Noting the high remuneration for administrative personnel and the lack of faculty salary increases, the faculty once again face a salary pay cut in the form of raising parking fees. The text of the resolution, which was seconded, is as follows:

Class C Resolution on Proposed Increases in Transportation Fees

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the proposed three-year staggered increase in all levels of parking fees plus an increase in U-PASS charges for use of public transportation represents an unwarranted reduction in salary for nearly all U.W. faculty and staff at a time when no increases in state-supported salaries have been or are forthcoming.

Since 1996, parking fees for faculty and staff driving a single occupancy vehicle to campus have risen 75%, as compounded. On May 21, 2004, the University Transportation Committee and Transportation Services will present a new three-year transportation fees schedule to the Board of Regents for their approval. This proposed fee schedule includes a 41% increase in fees, again as compounded, for a single occupancy vehicle and increases in every other transportation charge.

For the past several years, austerity budgets have prevailed at the University of Washington. In the current biennium, there were no state-funded raises for either faculty or staff. Faculty and staff at the U.W. have already experienced an actual pay cut through

sharply rising health care costs paid by faculty and staff. An increase in the cost of transportation is an additional pay cut.

The Faculty Senate requests that the proposed increases be held to the same percentage as any general salary increases.

The Faculty Senate also requests that the University Transportation Committee and Transportation Services be directed to develop a plan to mitigate existing parking costs for faculty and staff with hardship, medical and disability circumstances who must drive to campus.

Stygall (English) noted that what most troubles her about this proposed fee increase is that it was advanced without any discussion of the financial circumstances of faculty, staff and students. This is a traffic management plan, not an environmental plan. Because of the U Pass program, a large number of faculty and staff use public transportation. Acknowledging that this is a tangled set of problems, she believes that there needs to be greater thought given to the dimensions of this issue and the current austerity under which we leave.

A discussion ensued in which Jerry McCray, Associate Vice President, Facilities Services and Peter Dewey Assistant Director of Transportation Services, appeared from Transportation Services. Dewey explained why the fees are being proposed. These are being driven by an increase in transit costs as ridership increases. There is also a capital program for new parking, but this is minor. U Pass fees are going up the most because the University needs to cover these increased costs and the need to cover increased costs of transit. Overall, Dewey said this would generate about \$7 million a year more for transportation. Stygall noted the part of the Washington Administrative Code that sets up the transportation code allows for discounting for the disabled, and Dewey noted that while some product classes exist, the Transportation Office does not discount for disability or children or financial need. Rather, they try to collect revenue from as many revenue classes as possible to keep down costs. If we gave discounts, the increase would need to come from some other place as well as the added administrative cost to determine who these individuals are.

Tony Geist (Spanish) asked how the extra \$7 million is needed. The largest part of that, Dewey stated, will be transit cost. Currently we pay \$10 million a year for transit and we expect trips to increase so we will need to pay more to Metro. Also, we are expecting a fare increase during the next three years that will also increase costs. The last fare increase was in 2000 for Community Transit and 2001 for Metro so we expect a significant increase. Dewey stated that traffic is a self-sustaining unit and 58% of expenses go for transit contracts.

Herndon (Pediatrics) asked about administrative overhead and Dewey said they pay about 10% overhead. Parking services pays for the physical plant it operates. The money collected pays construction, maintenance of parking, as well as transportation. Herndon requested salary costs as a proportion of the overhead. Dewey stated that salaries paid are 9% of the total cost of operations, and will remain at about that level over the next three years. Dewey noted that this is a significant increase and because of this, the office has limited administrative overhead in the next three years to minimize the cost increase.

One senator asked about revenues from single occupancy vehicles. Dewey guessed, although he can get the exact number, said that total revenue is \$17 million: \$5 million for U Pass, \$1 mill from indirect costs and \$600,000 from parking fines and rest from sale of parking permits. Students provide 35% of total revenue, staff 25%, faculty about 10%,

and departmental budgets about 5%. The rest comes from patients and visitors. Another senator asked about estimates on mass transit usage. Dewey said that they estimate there will be about 3% more transit trips per year. There is additional information on their webpage, and a Public Hearing will be held on April 29 at HUB 309 at 1:00 pm. A final proposal will be presented to the Regents at their May meeting.

Vote: **Approved** with about 10 objections and 4 abstentions.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 pm.

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

APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate