

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Gowen Hall, Room 301
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 11 March 2004

The meeting began at 2:37 p.m.

Introductory Comments – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate

The first sessions of the Tricampus Task Force have taken place, Wadden announced. This effort will be spread out into fall quarter so that the taskforce can do a very broad analysis of the impact of a three campus University, and consult the widest range of people. The first phase will be completed by early June, and the second phase will await October. Fred Campbell and Ross Heath are chairing this effort, and the discussion so far has been good.

Second, Wadden suggested that part of the spring Senate agenda be devoted to discussion of intercollegiate athletics. To further discussion, a website location has been added to the Faculty Senate homepage to provide more information about this issue. For example, it outlines “best practices” as well as some proposals that the NCAA supports. Reform of intercollegiate athletics has received widespread support at a number of major universities, including Michigan, WSU, Stanford, and Oregon. There will be presentations from people in the department, and Wadden predicted that a thoughtful discussion of this on our part will take some time and attention. He emphasized, additionally, that this is a national issue that has arisen apart from local incidents.

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

There have been three meetings since the last Senate meeting. The SCPB has reviewed a brief RCEP for the School of Dentistry, which was approved. Discussions have continued regarding the faculty retirement recapture budget shortfall, as well as of the 2003-2005 budget and budget preparation for the next biennium. Tricampus has also been an issue. Another topic of conversation has been tuition policy development, especially as we gain more tuition setting authority. Tuition policy involves a number of issues: access, balance, financial aid, debt load, program costs, program value, demand, and predictability of demand. Legislation proposing changes to Ch. 26: Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) has been presented for discussion to the body. This will be a complicated piece of legislation and may take some time. Another discussion has focused on a report presented by Julie Stein regarding building renovation that involves plans through 2017. One new legislative change that has provoked discussion involves changing multiple capital requests to one list. Civil Service reform and the effects of collective bargaining on the campus have been the final topic of discussion.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

Stygall summarized the developments of the recently concluded legislative session, referring to the budget negotiations with reference to two handouts (included with the archived copy). There was some movement on the allocation of student slots but the money allocated was not enough to cover the actual costs. A new feature permits private colleges to bid on the high demand slots. There has been a 10% cut in services, travel and equipment. The good news is that health care benefit costs have gone down and we were able to hold the line on this. On the other hand, we did not get funding for the Harry Bridges Center, Korean studies, or raises. Both higher education performance contract bills

died but shortened versions of the proposal appeared in the budget bill. Many of the fine details that had been negotiated in the original performance contract bills were lost in the budget version. This issue will be re-visited in the fall with student and faculty involvement. The diversity in enrollment bill died. The HEC Board changes will result in a faculty member being appointed to the HEC Board Advisory Board. UW-Bothell reappeared in the budget but in the form of a study bill as well as a WSU-Vancouver study bill. These may lead to a proposal for one or two four-year colleges. Stygall ended by asking for volunteers for deputy legislative representative.

Report of the President and Opportunity for Questions – Lee Huntsman

Following on Stygall's remarks, Huntsman opined that the Legislative session was more positive than expected. There was more money put into enrollment, and he believes that the \$5500 allocated for extra student slots is a real advance. In the budget bill are a series of provisos, one of which is a directive to the HEC Board to do some planning that would promote debate about the future of higher education in this state. This could be a very positive development. Noting that he is an advocate of the performance contract, he stated that he does not believe it will change many of the faculty's rights but that it will lead to an engaged discussion about the shared spheres of responsibility for education between the University and the Legislature. There was some money spent on capital; we will finally get the design money for the freeway off-ramp in Bothell that will allow for growth of that campus. There was also money allocated for classroom improvement as well as for some incremental design projects.

Turning to the big picture, Huntsman focused on the nature of our relationship with the state and the legislature regarding the future of higher education. This, in turn, is tied to the state's economic prospects. Concerns about the economy have been to our advantage, allowing us to raise ways in which the University contributes to growth. Similarly, discussions about the League of Education Voters Initiative raise many of the same issues. As public employees, we must be careful in our discussions and efforts regarding this initiative, and cannot use any state resources to lobby for this bill.

On campus, there are three searches under way: Athletic Director, Dean of the Graduate School and the Chancellor of Tacoma. There are no pre-ordained results in any of these searches; they are wide-open, national searches. Collective bargaining discussions with the unions pursuant to the new civil service reforms have started. This is a new experience for both the University and the unions, and both sides have taken extra efforts to get these conversations off on the right foot. Huntsman urged us, as Faculty, to be affirming about all employees at the University.

On the intercollegiate athletic front, he has recruited a new faculty athletic representative, or "FAR". This person will replace Rob Aronson (Law), after his long term of valued service. Patrick Dobel, a professor in the Evans School of Public Affairs, will succeed him. This is a terrific choice, Huntsman added, because Dobel is steeped in experience in organizations, organizational theory and ethics as well as liking athletics. It was also cheering news that there were no additional penalties in the football matter. The University believes that the lack of institutional control charge is wrong, and we will be vigorous in defending ourselves against it.

The campaign is going incredibly well, and we have reached, as of 31 December 2003, the half-way mark. There will be a big event on 15 October 2004 regarding the campaign.

Questions/

In response to a question about the funding status of the two campuses, Bothell and Tacoma, Huntsman responded at length, noting how the University responded to legislative inquiries on research issues. These inquiries raised the question of whether they should be funded as regional universities or as research universities. Huntsman feels that the appropriate funding levels should reflect the portfolio of what these campuses do. For example, we are cheaper than Central for freshman and sophomores but more expensive for juniors and seniors. Similarly, we are the only provider of certain majors. Therefore, the discussion about funding needs to be more nuanced and injected with some realism, rather than driven by a series of arbitrary decisions about categories.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

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

Summary of Executive Committee Actions

Wadden referred senators to the summary of actions in the agenda.

Announcements

The Committee on Annual Faculty Lectureships is currently accepting nominations for the award. The due date is Friday, 12 March 2004.

Requests for Information

1. Wadden directed attention to Agenda Item 8 at which the website address he described earlier, regarding athletics, is noted.

2. Journal Licensing. Seelye Martin, Chair, FCUL, introduced Betsy A. Wilson, Director of University Libraries, Joyce L. Ogburn, Associate Director of Libraries for Resources & Collection Management Services, and Sherrilynn Fuller, Director of Health Sciences Libraries. This is an informational presentation although it may lead to legislation at a later point. Wilson presented the following remarks (the text of her remarks follows, edited in format):

Thank you for the opportunity to address you this afternoon on journal licensing issues. This is a topic that affects all of us, regardless of one's discipline or area of scholarship. It cuts to the heart of the academic enterprise, the open exchange of research, and the advancement of knowledge. Today, I would like to outline the problem, share the Libraries strategy and implications, and ask for your help. We should have some time for questions at the end of my presentation.

PROBLEM

For many years, increases in the prices of library materials have exceeded increases in library acquisitions budget, at the University of Washington and beyond. Over the last decade annual journal price increases have regularly been over 10%. But this is probably not news to you.

One significant reason for this is the growing commercialization of scholarly publishing, especially in the sciences and social sciences. We have seen the merger and consolidation of publishers. While much scientific research is funded by US tax dollars through federal grants, most of the publishers of scientific journals are not located in the United States.

Statistics from the Association of Research Libraries (<http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/graphs/2002/2002t2.html>) show that from 1986 to 2001 the prices of serials generally increased by 215%. The Consumer Price Index during the same period increased by only 62%.

At the UW, we have experienced a steady decline in our ability to subscribe to the journal titles that are needed for your research and teaching at a time when more and more information is being published, and the breadth and depth of our research programs have increased.

The increased cost of journals combined with budget reductions have resulted in the cancellation of 6,000 journals over the last decade.

Commercial publishers charge more for their materials than scholarly societies or university presses do. The Dutch company Elsevier, which publishes primarily science, technology, and medicine journals, is the best example, and our case in point today.

ELSEVIER: CASE IN POINT

We subscribe to approximately 800 Elsevier titles through a package called ScienceDirect at a cost of \$1.3 million dollars per year. We also share the titles and package with Washington State University.

Here are some representative Elsevier titles and annual individual costs to give you a sense of scope.

Physica Sections A, B, C	\$17,311
Materials Science and Engineering	\$11,179
Mutation Research	\$8,900
Journal of Crystal Growth	\$8,579
Neuroscience Letters	\$5,300
Polymer	\$4,835
Chemosphere	\$3,445
Plant Science	\$3,083
Applied Mathematics and Computation	\$2,565
International Pharmacology	\$1,751
Progress in Aerospace Sciences	\$1,351
Trends in Pharmaceutical Sciences	\$962
Journal of Memory and Language	\$634

Overall, the Libraries subscribes to 20,000 journal titles. The Elsevier titles represent 4% of our journal subscriptions, but 21% of our journal budget.

LIBRARIES STRATEGIES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FACULTY

Over the past few years, libraries across the country have contracted with Elsevier for a package of journals and electronic services. The package has been priced as a "bundle." We refer to this as "journal bundling." With bundling, the library loses the ability to cancel titles that are lower use or no longer needed. Restrictions on sharing titles through interlibrary loan are often part of the contracts.

While "bundling" offers little flexibility in selecting and canceling titles, it has provided us with short term cost savings. However, we believe that now is the time to move away from license agreements that bundle titles and restrict our ability to select or cancel on a title-by-title basis. This practice has hamstrung our ability to effectively manage our collections, especially during times of serial cancellations.

We need to return to a title-by-title purchase mode or find another model that gives us the flexibility we need for the good of the University and access to scholarly information. Our current three-year contract with Elsevier expires at the end of 2005, and we are beginning to plan for a new contract now. That is why we are here today. The title by title approach will enable us to retain the most important Elsevier titles without drastically impacting journal collections and our ability to acquire non-Elsevier journals and books.

One would hope that this action might engender change in license agreements and pricing practices. However, we may lose access to some of our current journals, including past years. We will need your help in deciding what to select and cancel.

We are not alone in choosing to move away from bundling. There is growing dissatisfaction with Elsevier's prices and practices. Over the past few months, Harvard, Cornell, Duke, North Carolina State, Indiana University, University of North Carolina, and others have initiated similar efforts. On the web site listed on your handout, you can learn more about what is happening at other universities.

HOW CAN YOU HELP?

What are we asking you to do? First, support the efforts of the Libraries and the Faculty Council on University Libraries to maintain and enhance the outstanding quality of our library collections for teaching and research. Second, support our efforts to bring serials costs under control. Third, recognize that the increasing control by large commercial publishers over the publication and distribution of your research threatens to undermine its wide dissemination. Fourth, become informed about issues in scholarly communication. Consult the Libraries' scholarly communication web site (<http://www.lib.washington.edu/ScholComm/>).

Fifth, publish in journals that are reasonably priced and those that adhere to open access, such as the Public Library of Science. Sixth, refuse to serve on editorial boards for journals that have terms that restrict access and have unreasonable prices. Seventh, retain the copyright of your research. Eighth, talk to the colleagues in your department, including your graduate students. Ninth, invite us to come and make a presentation at a departmental meeting.

And, finally, provide support and feedback to the Libraries as we work for the most favorable and flexible licensing agreements, and toward a scholarly communication system that is both affordable and sustainable. Thank you.

Discussion and Questions/

A wide-ranging discussion began after Wilson's remarks. Several faculty inquired about efforts to form a consortium of universities for the purpose of bargaining with publishers, although Wilson noted that Elsevier has been resistant to this; currently, we are in a consortium with WSU. Similar problems exist with other publishers such as Wiley, but the landscape changes as a result of mergers and acquisitions. One faculty member urged colleagues to explore new forms of publishing, such as web-based, peer reviewed journals and asked for library support of these new approaches. President Huntsman joined the conversation at this point, noting that he has been dealing with this difficult and very important situation for eight years. The library is constrained by a number of circumstances including a number of laws. Elsevier, he noted, is characterized as an "evil empire." Opining that academic publishing is in the midst of a real "sea change," he urged faculty to get involved because the old system is unlikely to endure.

While several faculty identified individual actions that could be taken, such as refusing to review for such journals, one person noted the growing trend of faculty to drop their increasingly costly personal subscriptions to take advantage of campus-wide licenses. Wilson agreed that this is a trend but it has led to higher costs as publishers require a high fee for more readers, citing the Chronicle of Higher Education as an example. Finally, one senator suggested that another sea change that needs to occur is that college councils need to give people tenure and promotion credit for publishing in new forms of publication if some of these proposals are to gain traction.

Nominations and Appointments

None.

Memorial Resolution

Be it resolved that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues: Professor Emeritus George Willard Brown of Fisheries, who died on January 9, 2004, after having served the University since 1967. Professor Emeritus Robert A. Bruce of Medicine, who died on February 12, 2004, after having served the University since 1950. Professor Emeritus Morton Kroll of Public Affairs and Political Science and Ombudsman Emeritus, who died on February 11, 2004, after having served the University since 1975. Associate Professor Emeritus James W. Leigh of Social Work, who died on January 2, 2004, after having served the University since 1967. Professor Emeritus William F. Royce of Fisheries, who died on January 26, 2004, after having served the University since 1958. Professor Kenneth Allan Sirotnik of Education, who died on January 29, 2004, after having served the University since 1985. Professor Emeritus James R. Townsend of Political Science and International Studies, who died on January 17, 2004, after having served the University since 1968. 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.

Note: The following three pieces of legislation are part of a package of changes.

Class A Legislation: First Consideration – Policy regarding the Terms of Faculty Senate Officers; Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-53 Election of Senate Officers.

Wadden explained the rationale for the legislation. In discussions with recent chairs, he explored changes to the *Faculty Code* that would make the Faculty Senate more effective. This particular piece of legislation shifts the beginning of the term from September 16 to August 1, and allows the new chair to become engaged with the Regents and come up to speed on Faculty Senate issues. This would avoid trying to do business while one is simultaneously trying to get set up. **Approved, unanimously.**

Class A Legislation: First Consideration – 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

Similarly, this proposal is the result of ways to make the senate leadership more effective. Wadden pointed out that the chair and vice chair sit on the University Budget Committee (UBC) and SCPB. These two committees conduct the heart of University budgeting, and it takes a fair amount of time to get up to speed. Currently, the incoming vice chair serves as the chair of this committee at a time when the person is new to Senate business. The outgoing chair serves on this council also so that this proposal results in someone with two prior years of experience chairing SCPB. This would extend the functional life of the term of the chair, and Wadden believes that this would be a good development. **Approved, with two objections.**

Class B Legislation: Policy Regarding the term of Deputy Legislative Representative; Volume Two, Part IV, Chapter 44, Section 44-31 Faculty Legislative and Deputy Representative

Wadden explained that our past practice was to have both a deputy and legislative representative. This year, we tried making do with one person in response to budget cuts because this was an off-year, non-budget session. Generally, the deputy representative becomes the legislative representative, and the deputy would be appointed to help during the budget years both to help and to act as a training ground. This would give us flexibility. Stygall spoke also to this proposal.

During the brief discussion, questions were raised about whether this would require a three year commitment from interested faculty, one as deputy representative and then two as the representative. It was concluded that this would be the typical commitment. Concerns were raised about the part of the decision that was driven by budgetary concerns, but Stygall and Wadden pointed out that other concerns also led to this proposal.

Approved, with four to five objections.

New Business

a. Presentation, Class C Business: Jim Gregory (History): Wadden explained that he continued the meeting last time, even in the face of lack of quorum, because he wanted the discussion to continue. The vote revealed the lack of quorum which is not debatable or waivable.

Gregory, in the course of introducing the motion, noted the change to schools, college units, and campuses as part of the motion. Seconded. The resolution states as follows:

Resolved: The Faculty Senate endorses the following letter to the Board of Regents regarding the presidential search:

Dear President Gerald Grinstein and members of the Board of Regents:

At the February 2004 Regent's meeting AAUP presented a letter signed by 350 faculty members requesting that finalist candidates in the presidential search be invited to campus to address the UW community. The request was endorsed by the Graduate and Professional Student Senate and by the ASUW. In response, President Grinstein stated that he sympathized with the principles behind the request, but maintained that disclosure of presidential candidate names prior to a candidate's acceptance of the position would discourage excellent candidates from seriously considering the UW Presidency.

In recognition of the Regents' concerns about confidentiality, and as an alternative to the initial proposal, AAUP requests that a group of 20-30 departmental chairpersons selected by the presidential search committee to represent all of the schools and college units have the opportunity to meet the finalists once the list narrows to four or fewer candidates. The University already entrusts department chairs with responsibility for sensitive and confidential matters; and the selected chairpersons would agree to keep all candidate names strictly confidential in accordance with the rules of the search committee.

We believe that an interactive meeting between presidential candidates and chairpersons, together with feedback from chairs to the search committee, will provide a critical opportunity for the Regents and search committee to better evaluate how individual candidates would deal with major issues facing the University. As such, this process will increase the likelihood of identifying a truly exceptional UW President and increase the faculty's confidence and trust in the new President. [This is the final text with all amendments included, as voted on.]

Last time, Gregory noted that the Senate considered a resolution put forward by the AAUP, pursuant to a 350 person petition, that had a respectful hearing before the Regents who nonetheless decided to maintain the presidential search status as confidential. This new version of the resolution, he believes, provides for additional faculty input while maintaining confidentiality. The predicate of this proposal is shared governance; he characterized the search committee as having only two faculty out of fifteen members, a smaller number than in past searches. While this resolution is not intended to undermine or criticize the role of current faculty members on the committee, the problem is that we should not have to hope that the faculty get a candidate that is responsive to their interests. A second reason for this resolution is that the Regents need to understand that we have expectations that are not being met; shared governance exists only to the extent we are willing to exercise it. It is particularly important that the Faculty be visible at this important moment because it signals to the candidate that the Faculty expect to play an important role in the operation of

this campus. Otherwise, we risk having a new president that does not respect shared governance.

A lengthy discussion ensued. One senator asked how this resolution, with its focus on secrecy, would make a difference in the selection process. Gregory responded that secrecy is not the central element but rather the focus is on additional faculty input and oversight. This type of involvement should be routine and could have a salutary outcome on this search.

Wadden, who sits on the search committee, noted that going into this, he had certain assumptions that have changed since beginning his involvement. Citing the examples of Michigan, Duke and Ohio, he stated that most universities now announce a single candidate at the end of a confidential search. Gregory's example of Florida, then, represents the exception rather than the rule. Florida brought in eleven candidates who made 45 minute videotaped presentations, and then selected three candidates. Those three candidates made presentations in campus forums. The Board of Trustees then announced the winner. Even in this format, it was not clear the amount of input faculty really had. He also stated that there are five faculty members, not two, sitting on the search committee. After 1½ years of involvement, he does not believe the proposed process will add anything. The individuals who have applied were promised confidentiality. It is especially important for sitting presidents that it be kept confidential. While being part of a pool can be a real achievement for deans and provosts, for sitting presidents, a lack of confidentiality can be very troublesome and they will not apply if there is not a promise of confidentiality. During debate, some of the speakers agreed with Wadden, questioning whether this would really change the process or pointing out that the most important goal was the widest possible group of highly qualified candidates. One speaker, although agreeing in principle with the resolution, pointed out that this asks chairs to take on a very difficult task, especially since it is not clear that they can affect the outcome at this point.

Other speakers supported the resolution. Opining that the Florida example is germane, Kate O'Neill (Law) stated that it is hard to believe that a person who wants to be president would not want to speak to a wide range of faculty, if only for more information. This is an important measure of shared governance. Obviously, the Regents can reject this if they think it will jeopardize the process, but in the meantime we should stand up for a broader faculty role, she concluded. Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke about shared governance. This term in Olympia she has spent an inordinate amount of time explaining what faculty governance is and what is important about it. She can imagine that shared governance is not as important in other states or institutions, but it is important here. Greater faculty involvement will give the candidate a sense of our stand on faculty governance.

In the course of discussion, several friendly amendments were offered and accepted before the question was called.

Vote: Approved, with 10 objections.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate