

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**Gowen Hall, Room 301**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 29 January 2004**

The meeting began at 2:36 p.m.

**Introductory Comments – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate**

Last week, the Administration and the Faculty Senate established a tri-campus task force. Reading from the statement that establishes the task force, Wadden stated that this group will be charged with examining all aspects of tri-campus relations and structure.

**Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force**

The time appears right for an extensive appraisal of the current state of and future possibilities for our three-campus university. We have arrived at an interesting intersection of circumstances and issues that argue for a broad and inclusive exploration of academic ambitions and administrative structures.

What models can we learn from and what unique attributes, resources and conditions will impact our growth and behavior? How can we best anticipate change and plan for the evolving relationships among the Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses? What are those ambitions and challenges facing our students, faculty, staff and the communities that support us?

The administration, working together with the Faculty Senate, has developed a proposal that will establish a task force to carefully examine all aspects of the state of tri-campus relations, governance, planning and operations. The decisions that regularly face us often require a journey across emerging and sometimes ill-defined boundaries. The more we understand the spectrum of options available, the more we are likely to develop decisions that best serve the University. We expect that this examination will effectively broaden communications and participation across all sectors of the University.

Therefore, we think it is essential to involve the widest array of participants that represent the numerous stakeholders who have an investment in the intellectual, academic, research, administrative and fiscal health of the University.

The task force will begin with a steering committee representing the three campuses that will develop the membership, agenda, process and a timetable. We anticipate that the steering committee will present the Administration and the Regents with a strategy proposal prior to implementation of the full task force and that the steering committee will return to the Administration and the Regents with a draft analysis of the deliberations, prior to a final report in early June of this year.

We approach these issues and questions with enthusiasm and some sense of urgency, aware that the time is indeed right for a thoughtful and extensive examination of what kind of institution we might aspire to become a decade or so from now.

This task force will involve the widest array possible of all stakeholders, and will begin with a nine-member steering committee, chaired by Fred Campbell, that will develop a three-campus membership and a proposed agenda with reporting deadlines to the Board of

Regents. This will allow us to respond in a thoughtful manner to concerns raised in the accreditation report, and inform the new president of the scope of issues involved. Wadden noted that this is not linked to, or precipitated by, the recent legislative proposal for a Cascadia College, although the issues are related. Work for developing the taskforce proposal began in September as the Senate leadership reviewed the NASC Accreditation Report.

The Faculty Senate leadership has also been responding to issues in the athletic program. The Advisory Committee, chaired by Prof. Pete Dukes (Business), will report to the SEC and the Senate, and the Senate and the Administration will jointly appoint its membership. The two on-going investigations should be concluded shortly, and there will be an Intercollegiate Athletics compliance monitor. There will be a Presidential review of the athletic department by a respected, retired college president and athletic director. Prof. Patrick Dobel (Public Affairs) will chair the regularly scheduled NCAA re-certification process, and faculty will chair the required three subcommittees in that process. Finally, after eleven years of yeoman service, Prof. Rob Aronson will be stepping down as Faculty Athletic Representative and the search for his replacement is well under way. Similarly, Dick Thompson is interim Athletic Director, after the retirement of Barbara Hedges, and a search is underway to fill that position. Wadden has also been communicating with Faculty Senate leadership at other universities about different ways to structure athletic program oversight, especially the academic components. It will be crucial to develop effective means to solicit faculty opinions and to involve the relevant Faculty Councils.

Wadden has submitted comments regarding the President's proposed Executive Order (E.O.) on tri-campus relationships. Wadden directed attention to handouts regarding the legislative proposals from the President and the Faculty Legislative Representative.

#### Questions/

1. Steven Rumph (Music) asked why the athletic program garners so much Faculty Senate attention when the program is privately funded. Wadden noted that we should be supporting student athletes and attentive to their problems. The athletic program, given the media coverage and exposure, reflects on all of us and thus attention to that program is essential. At this point, we are the only Faculty Senate that has not weighed in on these issues with our sister schools. It is overdue for us to contribute our ideas in this nationwide process. We are not going to be able to turn back the clock, and must come to grips with current athletic culture and weigh in with our views about its future.

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

In its last several meetings, the body has studied tuition proposals [especially with regard to the role of peer comparisons], the innovation fund, and performance compacts. They have also discussed the formation of a new advisory committee that would replace the University Budget Committee, which all concede is no longer working. A new budget issue is the partial retirement/faculty recapture program. The reality is that the 60% recapture from a partially retired senior faculty member is not enough to pay for a junior faculty line, and the administration has suggested that the 40% program be funded from an independent source. Finally, the body has addressed legislative issues that will be discussed in more detail by Prof. Stygall.

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

Stygall directed attention to a handout titled "Short Session 2004: Bills for Faculty to Watch." (Attachment 1) In her presentation, she outlined the issues and strategy for each proposed bill. The Compact bill has had faculty involved from the beginning, while she noted the bill to amend I-200, and permit some forms of affirmative action, has been quite controversial. The bill creating Cascadia State University led to a well-attended hearing with many University of Washington administrators and stakeholders. Rep. Sommers, who has been a friend to higher education in past sessions, has proposed a new regional college because of the expected shortfall in college slots as the baby boomlet moves through the pipeline. She suggested this location because there is an existing combined site, and HECB studies suggest that north of Seattle is the vector of growth most needing a new campus. It is not clear whether this bill will pass.

Briefly, she noted that two bills involve articulation with community colleges while two others respond to concerns about research. On February 5, she expects to hear a presentation from the League of Education Voters on their legislative proposal for funding education, higher education in particular. Most likely, they will propose a 1-cent increase in the sales tax to fund K-20 education. She does not expect this bill to be "voted out" of the legislature in an election year, although it does demonstrate interest in higher education funding.

**Report of the President/Opportunity for Questions – Lee Huntsman, President**

[Provost David Thorud made remarks in the absence of the President.]

Thorud began by noting that there are three major searches underway: Athletic Director (chaired by Mike Eisenberg, Information School), UWT Chancellor, and Dean of the Graduate School. In this latter, Associate Dean Elizabeth Feetham will be interim dean and A&S Dean David Hodge will be chair of the search committee. Second, he endorsed Wadden's comments regarding the need for a tri-campus task force, and he is hopeful that the steering committee will meet the short time frame that has been imposed on this process, and promised adequate staff support. Its job will be to describe options for the tri-campus arrangement, and this report will be widely shared in the University community.

As to developments in Olympia, he noted that the Cascadia bill caused quite a "jolt" and caught many people off-guard. He hopes to turn "adversity into advantage" here because of the way in which it focuses attention on the issues of access, and to strengthen the belief that the University of Washington is the best place to address these issues.

The performance contract bills have also engaged the attention of the University because of the belief that change is needed in the relationship between the University and the legislature. This is a structured conversation between the legislature and the University; it is not a "free fall" conversation. The talking points involve the way in which funding cuts have hurt the University, and the need for access. The Administration has pointed out that other states have faced these same problems and come up with better solutions. Our solution, they argue, needs to be by design rather than be default. This conversation suggests that there should be a conversation, first, about what this state needs, i.e., affordable access to quality higher education, and a university system that contributes to the economic vitality and future of the state. This University is a great economic engine for the state in terms of providing research, ideas and talented students. The next question is what resources institutions need to develop this access and quality. There should be clear

and reasonable expectations and metrics that are appropriate to our mission; they are proposing outcome-based metrics – what kind of graduates are you producing, etc. Part of the discussion is that there must be adequate financial resources. Performance contracts, he opined, should not be “scary.” That is, these contracts should not be a way for the legislature to avoid responsibility nor is it unlimited institutional freedom. Performance contracts will vary from institution to institution, and they are not irreversible; they can be revised if they do not work. This is a way for the legislature and the University to exercise their shared responsibility to the citizens of the state for higher education.

Last, he believes that the League of Education Voters’ Initiative has some real potential. The governor may be proposing something for higher education, and the University should be attentive to the short session proposals.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. The agenda was **approved**.

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

Please see the summary included in the agenda for this meeting.

### **Announcements**

Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn explained the new electronic format for preference forms and elections. The new preference form will now also seek interest areas from faculty for short-term and one time appointments.

### **Requests for Information**

None.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Nominated, effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2004, Kate Quinn, GPSS representative member of the Special Committee on Faculty Women.

**Approved.**

### **Election of the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate**

Ashley Emery (Mechanical Engineering) was elected to the office of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for the 2004-2005 academic year, with a term to begin 16 September 2004.

### **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 Emeritus Warren Bierman of Pediatrics, who died on January 4, 2004, after having served the University since 1958. Research Associate Professor Emeritus Lawrence Harold Larsen of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, who died on January 19, 2004, after having served the University

since 1966. Professor August G. Swanson of the School of Medicine, who died on December 19, 2003, after having served the University since 1970. Marsha Lamerle Landolt, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost and Professor of Fisheries, who died on January 2, 2004 after having served the University since 1975.

Vice Chair Heath made special remarks on the passing of his former colleague, Dean Marsha Landholt:

It is not usual for the Vice Chair to draw attention to specific individuals on this list; we mourn them all. Today, however, I request your indulgence to deviate from convention.

I had the pleasure and privilege of working with Marsha Landolt for 20 years in her roles as a faculty member, as my associate dean, as Director of the School of Fisheries, and as a remarkable insightful Dean of the Graduate School.

Her personal philosophy is captured by a quote from "The Notebook of Lazarus Long" that she had taped to her computer for many years:

"A human being should be able to change a diaper, plan an invasion, butcher a hog, conn a ship, design a building, write a sonnet, balance accounts, build a wall, set a bone, comfort the dying, take orders, give orders, cooperate, act alone, solve equations, analyze a new problem, pitch manure, program a computer, cook a tasty meal, fight efficiently, die gallantly. Specialization is for insects."

Marsha, more than anyone I have known, lived that credo with gusto and good humor. Her death is a tragic loss for her family, friends, and colleagues, and for the University of Washington.

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.

## **Unfinished Business**

### **Class C Resolution: NIH Funding and Academic Freedom**

The proponent of the motion, David Lovell (Psychosocial & Community Health), Group VIII Representative, reminded the body of the rationale for the resolution.

The Senate strongly disapproves of attempts to subvert the independence and scientific integrity of the National Institutes of Health's peer review process for research grants. The Senate commends the UW administration for its forthright defense of grants awarded to UW faculty members. The Senate endorses contacts with Washington's Congressional delegation, and collaboration with other universities and national research groups, to defend the right of researchers to investigate critical public health topics that may strike some citizens as controversial. The Senate strongly supports members of the UW community whose grants have been subjected to political attack, and encourages them and other colleagues to continue their good work.

The Senate is concerned that recent pressure tactics against public health grants have been accompanied by other attempts to intimidate students and professors and to restrict

freedom of inquiry and expression. The Senate urges members of the university community to protect and continue to exercise their fundamental rights as citizens and scholars.

There was no further discussion. **Approved, with two abstentions.**

**b. Class A Legislation: Voting Membership in the Faculty, extending voting rights to long-term part-time lecturers. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 21, Section 21-32. Presented by Kate O'Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.**

O'Neill reviewed the content of the legislation and its rationale.

Ana Mari Cauce (Chair, Psychology) appeared as a guest to speak against the bill. Acknowledging the importance of part-time faculty for their contribution to teaching, she noted that her department has about ten faculty in this category. She believes this legislation is bad for the affected departments and the part-time faculty. In passing, she noted recent legislation that extends the voting franchise to other faculty members: 40% retired faculty, and research faculty (some of whom may not even be on campus). In her department, these previously approved voting members as well as the proposed part time lecturers, would increase the number of voting faculty by one-third, and would have an impact on close votes and on obtaining a quorum. She also believes the previous extension of voting rights to research faculty and others has been harmful for these categories. For example, her department has decided that they will no longer add research faculty to their ranks because of the problems presented by the extension of voting rights to this category of faculty. This is in light of the fact that research faculty are more stable in their appointments than part-time lecturers. In her department, they show respect for these lecturers by trying to provide for 50% appointments that guarantee benefits. She is afraid if this legislation passes, they will not be willing to appoint faculty at this level and that many lecturers who depend upon benefit-eligible appointments will be denied benefits. Many of their part-time lecturers are unable to attend faculty meetings. What lecturers really need is stability of pay, and this legislation does not address that need.

Don Janssen (Engineering) asked for some clarification of the proposal. He described a hypothetical appointment and asked whether this would meet the legislation. Olswang explained that the average is reached by measuring the contribution each year, independently. Margaret Rogers (Speech and Hearing) addressed her objections to this legislation. Seeking to explain her objections in the context of their program's requirements for clinical supervisors, she noted that some of these clinical supervisors are not on site, and rarely come to the Seattle campus. These faculty would not be able to play a meaningful role in faculty hiring because of their absence from campus. Her department opposes this legislation.

Sean O'Donnell (Psychology) followed up on the points made by his departmental chair, noting that his department is strongly opposed to this legislation. As he pointed out when we considered research faculty, while they recognize the value of their contributions and input, his department believes that this is the wrong way to address lecturers' needs. He stated that he does not view them as "dis-enfranchised" given the differing expectations of them in their role as part-time teaching faculty. David Lovell (Psychosocial and Community Health) noted that he does not understand the objections raised this far. It appears to him that the objection is a failure to get people to quorum.

Cauce replied that it is not just a matter of quorum, but the need to attend meetings and presentations other than faculty meetings that provide the background for the informed

judgment that is exercised at faculty meetings. Lisa Coutu, a member of FCFA, noted that this legislation is the product of several years of conversations with lecturers and survey data; it is not a top-down or "feel good" proposal but came from the lecturers themselves. The issues concerning research faculty are separate and discrete. Marcia Killien (Nursing) asked whether lecturers expected to be paid additional funds regarding their attendance at faculty meetings. In response to a question whether this legislation endorses or addresses a nation-wide trend to using more part-time faculty, O'Neill stated that they are not endorsing the trend but acknowledging the need to empower all faculty who have concerns about that trend regardless of what side of the tenure line they are on. To the extent the committee had a view, she felt that giving people a vote gives them an incentive to attend faculty meetings. The committee has that sense that for those who are able to attend, their apparent indifference comes from the sense that they are not allowed to participate rather than lack of interest.

David Layton (Public Affairs) stated that his faculty is uniformly against this legislation, and noted that these people have not been hired to participate in faculty hiring and other voting issues. It would require a re-examination of the way in which "these people" are hired, although they do value them for the role they play now. Don Janssen (Civil Eng) had asked how voting members in his department are selected, and noted that voting faculty are selected as the result of a search process while lecturers may be hired with a very truncated or attenuated search and hiring process. Some people have gotten in their teaching circuit by "accident" and then just "hung around." Ia Dubois, Chair of the Part-time Lecturer Committee (Scandinavian Studies) noted that as a lecturer, she was interested in hearing the descriptions of "these people" during this debate. The number of lecturers is growing, she pointed out, and the debate seems to indicate an interest in punishing these people rather than rewarding them. If these people, who have been "dug up" are doing an excellent job and have demonstrated their interest, then they should be able to vote. Full time faculty often fail to attend a meeting, or send in a proxy. Arguments about varying levels of interest hold across all types of faculty. Terry Swanson (Earth and Space Sciences) noted he has concerns about departments who refuse to hire certain categories of faculty because of voting rights; this puts the interest of students and academics behind concerns about voting, and this seems to be the wrong set of priorities. The second issue regarding casual hiring of faculty he also found disturbing; this seems to be a casual attitude towards the teaching and prioritizing research. These lecturers, who focus on teaching, may have something to contribute to discussions about teaching.

Question called. **Passes.**

Question presented: **Vote: Yes - 46      No- 53      Abstain - 5**

**The proposal FAILS.**

### **New Business**

#### **a. Class C Resolution: Endorsement of Student Lobbying Day – Presented by Ross Heath, Vice Chair, on behalf of the ASUW.**

The Faculty Senate was asked to endorse an Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) Lobbying Day, and to advise the Faculty that students may not be in attendance at classes on that day. A copy of the original ASUW resolution is attached as Attachment 2. **Approved.**

**b. Class C Resolution: The Presidential Search - Jim Gregory (History)**

This resolution, already signed by the ASUW and GPSS, and circulated by the UW chapter of the American Association University Professors, seeks some transparency and openness in the presidential search process. A copy of the original resolution is attached as Attachment 3. Gregory invoked the example of Boston University, which is now liable for a million dollar plus severance package because of the lack of openness in their presidential hiring process. He noted that the resolution is fairly loose, and addresses the end point of the process, seeking to have the candidate available to the faculty before a final appointment is made.

Wadden, who is on the search committee, spoke neither for nor against the proposal nor on behalf of anyone of the committee. This proposal may have some impact on the Regents, he stated, but he does want to share some thoughts. He came into this process with some expectations about the search, based, like many of us, on participation in other academic searches. Having sat through endless hours of meetings, he soon learned that this is not how searches work for university presidents. The job is different; the search process is different. While he is disappointed to some degree that it does not work the way we feel it should, the candidates are uniformly against having an open search. The salaries that are at stake now approach or top one million dollars. Many candidates will not participate unless there is a promise of strict confidentiality in the search process. Listing a long number of searches, they have all shared the common feature of announcing only one finalist at the end of the search. There has been an on-going discussion about the difficulties caused by the modern search process. The stakes have gotten too high, and people do not want to be engaged in a sham search. This proposal would change the rules under which candidates have submitted their candidacy.

Stygall asked whether the candidates are unwilling to be public. Wadden said, "Yes, unequivocally." One senator noted that there is a perception that this position is being held open for the governor, that this is all being conducted at a level above the faculty and without a concern about their interests. Doug Conrad (Health Services) asked whether there are universities that have successfully conducted open searches. Wadden said Florida conducted an open search. He added that the committee spoke to many people about this and the search firm, Korn Ferry, is well experienced in searches of this type. There is progress being made, and it is a very good pool.

**Vote: Yes - 39                      No - 26                      Abstain - 13**

**Because the vote revealed the lack of a quorum, this resolution will not become an official resolution of the Faculty Senate. The movant has been advised that this resolution can be reheard under the heading of unfinished business at the next Faculty Senate meeting.**

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Submitted by Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty  
Approved by Douglas Wadden, Chair Faculty Senate

**Attachment #1**  
**Washington State Legislature Short Session 2004**  
**Bills for Faculty to Watch**

**SB 6332/HB 2681** Higher Education Performance Contracts

Faculty Issues: Including the *Faculty Code* under the exclusions in Section 5 (3); including a faculty member, selected by university Faculty Senates, in the negotiating team.

Status: Moving through committee hearings.

**SB6268/HB 2700** Diversity in Admissions

Faculty Issues: Affects UW comprehensive review for admissions; allows the consideration of race, ethnicity, national origin in admission decisions (under Supreme Court guidelines).

Status: Heard by Senate Committee on Higher Education; will move to Senate Judiciary after leaving Higher Ed (very unusual); may "die" in Senate Judiciary; will be heard by House Committee on Higher Education this week; likely to make it through the House.

**SB 6129** Changing composition of the HECB; shifts from pure citizen board to mixed board of citizens and representatives of higher education community.

Faculty Issues: Adds 2 faculty members to HECB, one chosen by the Council of Faculty Representatives, one chosen by SBCTC.

Status: Passed by Senate Higher Education Committee; moved to Rules. May need help to move out of Rules.

**HB 2843** Creating Cascadia State University from UW-Bothell/Cascadia Community College.

Faculty Issues: UW-Bothell faculty lose UW faculty status.

Status: Hearing in House Higher Education on Tuesday, January 27, 10:00 a.m.

**HB 2382** Articulation bill; establishes work groups for transfer to specific majors; directs HECB to establish course equivalency/common course numbering; directs HECB to study upper division capacity.

Faculty Issues: Faculty are made members of work groups on specific majors; bill amended from common course numbering system to course equivalency; faculty also made members of this work group.

Status: On second reading; referred to appropriations.

**HB 2707** Branch campuses: original mission confirmed; financing to be pegged to comprehensive rather than research rates; HECB directed to recommend appropriate funding after study.

Faculty Issues: Level of funding; level of funding for high-expense programs.

Status: Hearing in House Higher Education on Tuesday, January 27, 10:00 a.m.

**Other Bills to Watch:**

**HB 2405** Requiring personal service, purchased service, and civil service contracts to be performed by citizens of the United States or persons authorized by federal law to work in the United States.

**HB 2768** Requiring state contracts be performed by citizens.

**HB 2437** Treat transfer credit from community colleges in the same way as transfer credit from other four-year schools.

**HB 2443** Create common course numbering system across all higher education sectors. This one may be superseded by the amended version of HB 2382.

**HB 2956/SB 6561** Encourages more dual enrollment programs. Requires institutions to report to legislature on progress.

**HB 2827/SB6532** Allows within academic term time payments for tuition.

**HB 2807** Requires on-campus sanctioning of off-campus disruptive conduct of students.

**HB 2747** Creates study of internet filtering, including in libraries of higher education institutions.

**Attachment #2****C Resolution: Endorsement of Student Lobbying Day**

The Faculty Senate endorses this resolution supporting student involvement in Lobby Day as stated below.\*

WHEREAS Lobby Day will be held February 18th 2004, and  
WHEREAS this is an opportunity for all University of Washington students to present their opinions regarding higher education to their legislators, and  
WHEREAS February 18th, 2004 is a scheduled class day,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERISTY OF WASHINGTON:

THAT the Faculty of the University of Washington make every effort to facilitate student involvement in Lobby Day by excusing them from class on February 18th, 2004, except in the case of an exam, lab or other important class related event, and

THAT in the case of such important class events every effort be made by the Faculty of the University of Washington to accommodate student involvement with Lobby Day by rescheduling said event, and

THAT ASUW Senators urge their constituents to attend and volunteer in the organization of Lobby Day.

**Attachment #3****Class C Resolution - The Presidential Search**

WHEREAS hundreds of individual faculty members have signed AAUP's open letter asking the Board of Regents to clarify procedures for the presidential search.

WHEREAS the open letter has been endorsed by the Associated Students of University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Students Senate.

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the following open letter to the Board of Regents regarding the presidential search.

**OPEN LETTER TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS: THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH**

The search for a new president of the University of Washington is now well into its second year with no results and no sign of a conclusion any time soon. The campus community is awash in rumors about what happened last year and why the search is taking so long. There is much concern as well about the strict secrecy surrounding the process. We understand the need for confidentiality in personnel matters, especially in the early stages of a search when those being considered may not wish to publicize their candidacy. However, the Board of Regents has not yet clarified when and how it intends to lift the veil of secrecy.

We urge you to conduct the search for a new university president in a manner consistent with the spirit of openness that is a central value of a public university. We urge you to take steps to make information about the final slate of candidates available in a timely fashion to the university's faculty, staff, and students and to include the broader campus community in the search process.

University presidential searches *can* be conducted in a more open manner. Witness the successful presidential search recently concluded by the Trustees of the University of Florida. In that search, after a short list was agreed upon, the three finalists spent time on campus meeting faculty, students, and staff.

The benefits of that final step should be obvious. The search committee will have a chance to observe the candidates' interactions with diverse members of the University community. The candidates will learn first hand about the concerns of the campus. And the traditions of openness and consultation that are key parts of the University of Washington culture will have been honored.