

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Gowen Hall, Room 301
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 4 December 2003

The meeting began at 2:36 p.m.

Introductory Comments – Doug Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate

I want to take this opportunity to share with you some observations I made to the Board of Regents about one of the central issues facing the University, namely the question of a Tri-campus vision. Earlier I made reference to the accreditation report that reminded all of us of a critical need for greater clarity of institutional mission and organization. Now that I have spent nearly two months discussing these and other questions across our three campuses it is quite evident that consensus exists in all quarters, namely, that we need a new and robust examination of who we are, what we wish to be and how best to get there.

A new executive order on Tri-campus matters is out for comment and will be discussed at today's meeting and also the Provost and Executive Vice President are preparing a draft document on Tri-campus management. Nonetheless, it is worth observing that an analysis of several earlier reports would suggest that we have visited these questions before, with different definitions, expectations and assumptions. For example, in a 1998 review of tri-campus relations and concerns, Sue Hegyvary, then Dean of the School of Nursing wrote, "Low or fuzzy autonomy means frustration of individuals and groups and problems of management across ill-defined boundaries--it becomes difficult or impossible to site responsibility, authority and accountability." She additionally observed, "With more assumed than said, and leaving processes and outcomes to our collective goodwill, negativity can all too easily ooze in..."

Five years later in the young life of this three-campus university we have an opportunity to build on our strengths and translate ambiguities into more focused understandings.

Given this recent history, typical questions on issues of faculty concern resemble the following:

On Academic Programs

- What is the character of new academic programs; should they duplicate existing programs or should they be complementary? Or some of each?
- What are the impacts of new programs on resources, revenues, costs and enrollments?
- What is the nature of quality control in the development and ongoing assessment of new and existing programs with particular attention to appointments, curriculum and admissions?
- Accreditation, Certification and Licensing requirements carry challenges and risks in developing and positioning linked programs across three campuses where there is no single designated academic authority.
- Similarly, how is Educational Outreach to be implemented within a three-campus network; coordinated or fully independent or somewhere in between?

On Mission and Structure

- How will our institutional vision evolve? Is it towards a single university with three locations, or a system of three largely autonomous universities, or is it a more nuanced institution built on distinct characteristics and missions?
- How do we establish greater clarity of administrative structure that will determine accountability, planning and budgeting? Which offices and officers are campus specific and which, if any, are university wide?
- What are the implications for faculty governance? Should it be a shared system or three parallel organizations? Is there a need for a separate system-wide body?
- How does this vision impact the larger university response to concerns by many citizens of the State over access to higher education...for how many? By when? And how do we engage Olympia to ensure that they recognize and support this vision?

How then do we determine our true capabilities as well as the capacity to meet our aspirations and those of our many constituents?

At this time, we are working with the administration to identify the most effective way to establish a common approach to these complex issues and we are actively engaged in discussions about Intercollegiate Athletics, House bills on performance measures and a host of issues facing the University.

I will continue to update you on our progress and on those aspects of shared governance of greatest concern to all of us.

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

SCPb has met three times since the last Senate meeting, and continues its discussions about University funding options. Another issue addressed is the hiring of an Investment Officer to improve the performance of our invested funds. The SCPb has reviewed the Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) process for the College of Forest Resources, and has reviewed an interim report on graduate tuition policy (Chaired by Dean Marsha Landholt with wide participation from all constituents on campus, including faculty). Finally, SCPb has considered an executive order on tri-campus structure, and the HEC Board Master Plan, which proposes additional student enrollments that would have a real impact on this campus. Regarding the master plan, it is not obvious where the resources for these additional students will come from. On a positive note, he ironically noted, the report emphasized that Washington spends very little per capita on college students, and rates towards the very bottom nationally on this measure. It is unclear, however, who will coordinate a response to HECB proposals. He pointed out that one of our challenges will be a long term plan for responding to anticipated bulges and declines in enrollment.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Faculty Legislative Representative

Preparations are beginning for the upcoming short legislative session, and she recently attended task force workgroups for HR 2111 and 2076 as well as HEC Board meetings. At this point, there is no talk of a budget cut since current expenditures were all anticipated. More worrisome was a HEC Board proposal to put governance of all colleges, technical colleges, and higher education institutions under one governing body. Fortunately, reaction to this proposal was generally negative. The proposed master plan also sets priorities,

leading first with access and listing additional revenues fourth, an order that many people have questioned. At the task force meeting on performance contracts, some doubts were expressed about whether performance contracts would be a good idea. On the other hand, the Republicans seem willing to support higher education if they can have some kind of performance measures in place. By the end of meeting, it was agreed that there should be a pilot project. January 8th is the deadline for proposals from interested colleges and universities, and it is her understanding the University will submit a proposal.

Two information items: (1) The Faculty Council on Legislative Affairs will be meeting with her to develop the legislative agenda and contact protocols. (2) On Martin Luther King Day, college legislative representatives are working with the community colleges to have a day in which faculty go to Olympia.

Report of the President – Opportunity for Questions: David Thorud, Interim Provost (for Lee Huntsman)

Thorud first addressed the status of Interim President's Huntsman's appointment. The Regents and Huntsman are now in accord; Huntsman has agreed to stay at the University through November 30, 2005 and he has been appointed President. This arrangement is good because a new president can benefit from his experience, and protects us in the event that there is not a new president in the fall of 2004. Huntsman has asked Thorud to stay as acting provost and he has agreed to do so.

This said, there are some actions that need to be taken now while other issues need to be preserved for the incoming president. Immediate actions include the need to hire a new Director of Gov't Relations in Olympia since Dick Thompson is retiring at the end of January. Vicky Carwein has announced she will be president of Westfield College in Massachusetts, and that will necessitate the appointment of an interim chancellor. He and Huntsman will be meeting with the faculty and staff at the Tacoma campus, and will be starting a hiring process for a permanent replacement.

Tri-campus policies and relationships are also an issue that concerns the administration. Bothell and Tacoma are now thirteen years old, and a lot of growth has occurred in that period. It is time to look at where we are going operationally with that arrangement. First, the President has addressed this in an Executive Order about the campuses, consistent with the *Code*. Second, former Pres. McCormick appointed a working group to look at the administrative relationships and make recommendations. This group is now producing proposals – the big issue is what needs to be managed centrally and what can be delegated to the campuses. The campuses have been eager to have more delegated to them. Each of the three campuses has distinct missions and goals. As discussions continue about the relationship, the administration is trying to work from an underlying philosophy grounded in providing each campus the opportunity to flourish, recognizing that each is different. For example, Bothell and Tacoma have a legislative mandate to focus on local economic development. The Regents will soon be engaging in these matters and playing the key role. There will probably be a presentation to them in January to start the discussion. The Regental review will include relevant constituencies, including the Faculty Senate. Finally, the administration will share new degree proposals from all three campuses with the Faculty Senate and you will have an opportunity to react to this. This will no doubt be a major issue for the next administration.

Thorud remarked that at the last meeting, he addressed the siting and delayed removal of Annex 7, a temporary building adjacent to the Engineering School. The delay in removal

was driven by (1) the College of Engineering's need for as much space as possible in Sieg Hall, and (2) the urgent need to increase the interdisciplinary needs, including space, of the photonics program. This necessitated the displacement of a program in Bailey Hall to Sieg Hall, which was the only viable option. This also benefited Engineering. The last factor was that as the decisions were made this summer, it became clear that if the needs of these programs were not addressed, particularly for photonics, it would compromise the availability of federal funds. Given these urgent needs, there was an abbreviated consultation with the Faculty Senate.

Last, Thorud acknowledged that we have some issues in our athletics program. He assured members that Pres. Huntsman is acutely aware of these issues, and reminded people that Huntsman is a scientist and will not operate on anecdote but only on the basis of hard information and investigation, especially pertaining to women's softball. On a broader level, they are considering bringing in a retired university president and a retired athletic director to review our intercollegiate program. He then announced that Prof. Robert Aronson (Law), who has served very well for a number of years as Faculty Athletic Representative, has asked to step out of that role and the University is now engaged in a search process to find his replacement.

In the only question after the remarks, one senator asked how Regent Grinstein would continue his duties given his assumption of the presidency of Delta Airlines in Atlanta, Georgia. Thorud replied that Grinstein will continue to be a Regent, will retain his home in Medina and will commute between Atlanta and Seattle. He will continue to be the lead person in the search process and Thorud has confidence that he will "pull this off."

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m. There was a change to agenda item number 12. It should read, "Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 21, Section 21-32. The agenda was **approved**.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions

Wadden directed attention to comments listed at this part of the agenda.

Announcements

None.

Requests for Information

a. NIH Grant Reviews – Barbara Perry, Asso. Vice President/Director of Federal Relations – Invited Guest

After Wadden introduced both Ms. Perry and the issue, Ms. Perry thanked the Senate for the invitation to speak on this issue. She briefly summarized the electoral politics that led to the legislative targeting of particular NIH grants. As a result of these machinations, an amendment was introduced regarding NIH grants without, as is typical, sharing it with any of the affected groups in the higher education community. The amendment failed by one vote, largely due to the efforts of higher education supporters.

This narrow victory mobilized the American Association of Universities and the scientific community to develop a strategy. From the beginning, the group realized that a grant-by-grant approach would not be successful, and that instead the attention should be focused on the success of the traditional peer review process. Simultaneously, in case it was necessary, she worked with individual faculty to understand issues about the targeted grants. Some of these grants became a "hot issue" in the conservative movement, and it was "nasty and ugly." The academic community decided this could not be defended on the basis of individual grants because talk radio, where most of the battle was being waged, does not permit a level of detail for nuanced discussion.

Nonetheless, lobbyists were able to get action at a joint House/Senate committee meeting at which the NIH director and Harold Shapiro, former President of Princeton University, who had just chaired a review of NIH structure, spoke. The hearing went well, focusing on interdisciplinary issues, until the "hot button" grants came up and certain representatives "lit into" the panel. These representatives explained that while they supported funded research, they could not defend these grants to their constituents. As an example, she cited a grant that studied the relationship of alcohol use and pornography. Despite this, they were able to get representatives to understand that the review process is sound and that this should be the focus, not individual grants. Representatives asked that these decisions be made more transparent to the American public.

Now that this over, the main arena of action will be between NIH and the scientific community to make sure that the purposes of sponsored research are more transparent. NIH is now calling investigators. At the same time, a group that calls itself the Traditional Values Coalition has become involved, and they have circulated a 190 item "hit list" that was forwarded to a legislative staffer who then sent it on to NIH. When this was communicated to scientific community, there was a maelstrom in which Congress heard from scientists and the Coalition.

The strategy remains, however, to keep this between the scientists and NIH, recognizing that we have supporters on the Hill. She emphasized that it would be very counterproductive to have this issue kept alive "on the Hill." She noted that there are 60 research universities but 435 districts in Congress; the math suggests we cannot win that battle. Similarly, the media does not have the patience to describe this issue in detail.

Vice Provost Olswang added that Vice Provost for Research, Craig Hogan and Associate Vice Provost for Research Malcolm Parks have prepared an op-ed piece regarding the academic issues. We are focused on making sure that academic freedom and peer review remain values in this process.

After a couple of informational questions, Wadden ended this discussion by noting that the Senate Executive Committee has been attentive to hearing about federal legislative developments, citing Olswang's presentation on Patriot Act.

b. Executive Order Revising Tri-campus Policy

Wadden introduced the issue, noting that it came out of discussions in the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (FCTCP), and explained the executive order approval process in which all campus constituents are invited to comment on the Order. Wadden expressed his delight that Thorud affirmed the President's commitment, during this transitional period in campus relationships to communicate and share with the Senate what is being planned on each campus.

Olswang then commented on the text of the Order. FCTCP has been working for almost two years to reconcile issues in the *Code*. Oddly, there are no references to Tacoma and Bothell in the *Code* despite their thirteen-year existence and the *Code*-guided development and governance on these campuses. During discussions, FCTCP wanted to be sure that the Code applied equally to each campus but to also recognize that we are in a transitional period and must ultimately deal with the actual profile of each campus. It was agreed that we needed to do some kind of fix in the *Code* to reflect a three-campus university. There were basic parameters: The Senate is the senate of the entire University for all three campuses, and the fact that while there are three campuses, the *Faculty Code* applies equally on all three campuses on hiring, promotion and tenure.

Matters came to a head at end of last year when Tacoma got \$15 million gift to create the Milgard School of Business. But there was not final designation on what "school" meant. This Order recognizes that we may have different structures on all three campuses, but that the *Code* is sufficiently flexible to apply to all and deal with these different structures, whether through programs, schools, etc. The *Code* is composed of Executive Orders and Class A legislation, although sections detailing the structure of a campus are all Executive Orders. The Order was approved after consultation with Senate, and other interested parties.

Questions/

1. A Tacoma senator asked when the Order was put forward and about the meaning of section 13-23.C. Olswang replied that the Tacoma faculty participated in the review process. The proposed order was sent out in October to Chancellor Carwein, and Prof. Kalton, head of the Tacoma faculty organization, for distribution and comment from Tacoma. A similar process was used in Bothell and with the Senate. As to 13-23C, this order recognizes that there is a chancellor at Tacoma and Bothell, and that certain matters go through chancellor first and then to the President. It was worded in this fashion, added Wadden, to avoid having to revise the entire *Code* so substitutions can be made.

There are two definitions of college at Tacoma, Olswang continued. Tacoma views itself as a college yet may create a college or school within it. Currently, college decisions do not go through a chancellor. The reality is that Bothell and Tacoma have operated as a "college plus." After using an example involving the College of Arts and Sciences in Seattle as an example of the chain of command, this new Order recognizes that a chancellor is player for Bothell and Tacoma before going to the President while in Seattle decisions go through a dean straight to president. If there should be a decanally organized unit at Bothell or Tacoma, it will go from dean to chancellor to President, recognizing that chancellor is the senior executive officer at that campus while deans are the senior officer in Seattle.

Wadden welcomed comments from senators to the Senate leadership regarding any issues about the proposed order. He noted the short time line, however, for response.

c. "The Next Wave" – Article by Daniel J. Evans

Wadden drew attention to this editorial article in the *Seattle Post Intelligencer*. It is an excellent argument for economic support for the University, by comparing the support for Boeing and the benefit of similarly supporting the University.

Nominations and Appointments

William Erdly, Computing & Software Systems, UW Bothell, to the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, for a term ending September 15, 2006

William Erdly, Computing & Software Systems, UW Bothell, as chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Technology, for a term ending September 15, 2004

Constantin Behler, Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, UW Bothell, to the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy, for a term ending September 15, 2006

Nominated, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, PSO representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2004:

Suzette Ashby-Larrabee, Management Accounting and Analysis, Faculty Council on Research

Brian E. Geppert, Business Manager Kirsten Wind Tunnel; Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services

Marilyn Gray, The Graduate School, Special Committee on Faculty Women, for a term ending September 15, 2004

Christene James, Virginia Merrill Bloedel Hearing Research Center; Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

Bobbe Miller-Murray, Student Affairs – Tacoma, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy

Jeanette C. Mills, School of Art, Faculty Council on University Libraries

Kay Pilcher, Computing and Communications, Faculty Council on Educational Technology

Nominated for Senate appointment, effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2006, members of the Adjudication Panel:

Arnie Berger	CSE – Bothell	Bothell
Lisa Coutu	Communication	Group 2
Christine Distefano	Political Science	Group 4
Charles Haley	Business	Group 5
Peter May	Political Science	Group 4
Jack Meszaros	Business	Bothell
Clare Ryan	Forest Resources	Group 6
Jan Sjøvik	Scandinavian Studies	Group 1
Marcy Stein	Education – Tacoma	Tacoma
Miceal Vaughan	English	Group 1
Barry Witham	Drama	Group 2

Nominations from the floor were: GPSS Representatives for a term ending September 15, 2004 :

Theresa Barker to the Faculty Council on Research
Siri Erickson-Brown to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards

Approved, as amended from the floor.

Statements from Candidates for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate

Steven L. Buck
Professor, Department of Psychology

Fellow Senators and esteemed guests, it is indeed an honor to be nominated for the position of Senate Vice Chair. I agreed to stand for election as Senate Vice Chair because I see this as a time of great opportunity to make genuine improvements in the faculty role in shared governance, and I am eager to help lead this effort.

Let me give you a bit of background about me. I have been in the UW Psychology Department since 1976. Psychology is a highly diverse department with strong interdisciplinary ties to both the social and biological sciences, providing both professional clinical training and academic research training. We are among the top UW departments in the size of our graduate, undergraduate, and research programs. I have served two extended stints as Acting Chair and 13 years as Associate Chair. During this time, I have been centrally involved with all of Psychology's efforts to revise and improve our undergraduate and graduate curricula and have driven our department's efforts to articulate long-term plans and promote development and outreach. I believe that this experience in Psychology has provided me with a particularly broad understanding of the major domains of issues and goals of the wide variety of individual UW units.

I have also been privileged to participate in the faculty senate and faculty councils in a variety of capacities over the past few years. I served 5 years on the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, including 2 years as Chair. During this time, I worked with Doug Wadden, Roger Simpson, and others to draft legislation to regularize the status and approval process for distance-learning courses. This effort had stretched over the better part of a decade but working with faculty, administrators, staff, and students, we crafted legislation that finally let us move forward. Since then we have worked with the University Curriculum Office, UW Educational Outreach, and the College of A&S, among others, to help design and fine-tune the institutional approval process for DL courses.

I've also served the past three years on the Senate Executive Committee, first as FCEO chair and now as Group 4 representative and have served on Faculty Senate task forces including, most recently, one on Faculty Council reorganization, which I co-chair with Ross Heath. The focus of this group has been to promote faculty participation and influence in shared governance by ensuring that issues are at the outset brought to councils or groups that have faculty representation and that faculty have continued voice - along with administration, staff, and students - in the resolution or development of those issues. We are continuing to work on developing council structures, communication, and goodwill to promote joint administration-faculty deliberation and action. For example, I have been a member of the advisory council to the Dean of Undergraduate Education since 1997 and now co-chair it with Dean George Bridges. Beginning last year, we improved communication and coordination between George's office and the Faculty Senate and faculty councils by adding the chairs of key faculty councils and adding students and additional faculty endorsed by the Faculty Senate leadership. My vision for the renewed UAC is that we work proactively to make sure that issues of importance to undergraduate education are

being addressed in a coordinated and effective manner and with representation by faculty from start to finish.

I've taken some key lessons from my experience with the Senate and Councils that I would seek to apply as Vice Chair and Chair. First, we must keep the focus on the most important issues facing faculty and the university. Yes, we have to do some routine housekeeping but we trivialize the Senate not to educate our colleagues about the most important issues and work aggressively and proactively to help address them. Second, we need to foster communication and effective joint action with the administration, not just confrontation. To do this, we must work to ensure that all sides (admin, faculty, students, and staff) sit at the table where decisions will be made, and we must educate the larger university community about the issues in addition to presenting proposed actions.

We all know that we face major challenges this year and for the foreseeable future. Some of the more important issues we face now are as follows.

- Tri-campus policies and relations. We need a long-term vision for the future relationship among the campuses and a coherent plan of how to get there. But we also need immediate attention to our working relationships in key areas such as program and course review, parallel degree offerings, and representation on shared governance bodies.
- Serving the higher education needs of WA over the near and distant future. Erosion of state support is pushing us to find a new funding model at the same time that we are entering a cycle of historic increases in demand for enrollment capacity. We must educate the Legislature and the state populace about the complex of inter-related issues that include capacity, tuition, financial aid, diversity of access, and admissions criteria, among others..
- Maintaining quality in the face of relentless rounds of budget cuts. How shall we cope with the situation we're already in? What shall we do in the future?
- Compensation package for faculty. Maybe we'll be assured of 2% raises this coming year that's hardly an increment in the face of rising out-of-pocket costs for benefits and rising living costs. A comprehensive compensation plan needs to address the full range of issues such as unit adjustments, salary compression, retention funding, and retirement partial re-hire. We have to provide meaningful increases for all of us and stop the exodus of our brightest stars. Ultimately our institutional reputation and our ability to serve the people of Washington depend on both.

My goals for serving the faculty as Senate Vice Chair are three-fold.

- I want to strengthen the faculty role in shared governance, to make sure that faculty are at the table at the initial stages and throughout deliberations on all issues important to us and UW.
- I want to help build a long-term agenda and vision for the faculty Senate that will increase our effectiveness by ensuring continuity across 1-year Chair terms. Chair Doug Wadden and Vice Chair Ross Heath have done an outstanding job of beginning a long-term agenda for the Faculty Senate through exhaustive consultations with groups and individuals throughout the three campuses and by focusing and spreading this initial agenda by tying it to the issues brought up in the NASCU accreditation report.

- I want to help you and your colleagues give voice to your concerns, to identify your issues, and to let you address the biggest issues we face. I've identified a number of challenges facing us today but, as Vice Chair, I look forward to learning from you about additional issues and your perspectives on all of them.

I believe that we have the opportunity this year to make real progress on some issues, to shape the landscape, and to formulate positions for the next President. Over the ensuing couple years, I look forward to helping to work with the new President and administration leadership, and to ensure a strong faculty voice in shaping our course through the challenging decade ahead. It would be a great privilege to be selected to serve the Faculty Senate in these efforts as Vice Chair and then as Chair.

Thank you.

Ashley Emery
Professor, College of Engineering (Mechanical Engineering)

A few words about me. I have been a department chair, associate dean, chair of the University Council, NSF program director, and now in the best job of all, a professor and a very happy and contented teacher and researcher.

Why, at this moment in my career, do I want to be Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate?

In a nutshell, I believe that changes that faculty want are seldom initiated by the administration, but are most often the result of faculty working through the Senate.

For example when I was a young untenured professor hoping to be promoted you picked up the Sunday newspaper in late April and saw the headlines "220 Faculty Promoted at the UW." If your name was there, you were promoted, if it wasn't you weren't and you had no way of knowing why you weren't. Faculty hired on state support had a vote to affect the faculty code, but research faculty didn't. When raises were "granted," how they were decided was a dark process that junior faculty had little influence on.

Now, because of faculty/Senate actions, faculty can now respond to questions raised during the promotion process. In fact, in my department you can write a position paper to be forwarded with your department's requests for external review for promotion. Research faculty can now vote and are involved in departmental and university governance – actions that are critical to their careers. The new salary policy was the result of Senate negotiations with the administration and now follows the university handbook

All of these changes and many more are the direct result of faculty acting through their Senate. Who wouldn't want to be an integral part of this body's leadership?

The University is at a critical point. Our stature as a major research center is unrivaled and I feel secure that it is likely to continue at this level as long as we can retain our faculty and maintain our facilities. I am less sanguine about our capacity to educate our students and to ensure continued high morale among the faculty. Financial insecurity is evident throughout the state. We have only to witness the saga of how an inadequate transportation system affects the business climate. Increased foreign competition for our products is likely to result in continued high level of unemployment and dissatisfaction among our citizens. One

result that we can expect is a continued diminution of state financial support and enthusiasm of the citizenry for the university.

These effects will play out during the establishment of a new administration – a process in which we have had little impact and which has been conducted in secrecy and, even though we now have a president, is still in a state of confusion about when the next president will be chosen. Yet do we as faculty have any idea of what the regents' criteria are for the next president? I have no doubt that the process will eventually succeed, but there is bound to be uncertainty and confusion during the first few years of a new administration. This new president will be faced with appointing a new provost, dealing with an unresponsive legislature and heightened student demands and expectations. All of these will compete with national and local events, and if they are coupled with possible wrenching changes in the athletic program, we should not be surprised if the needs of the faculty are lost in the shuffle.

Over the last several years we have experienced effective salary reductions which when coupled with retrenchment in the academic programs have disheartened many faculty. Although we have been able to hire outstanding new faculty, and in many cases to offer them attractive startup packages, I am particularly concerned about our mid-career faculty who are often ignored and who see no immediate relief, either personally or for the programs they care so much about. Can we retain these people upon whom we depend upon so much?

The only effective voice of the faculty is our Senate. Yet, when the chips are down this voice can be and is ignored as it was in the last budget negotiations. What is clear is that confrontation is not the way to go – negotiation and understanding are the only tactics that will ensure that we will be able to improve our situation, both as faculty members and as a university. Our Senate leaders have trod the thorny path of recent years with care and have resolved some issues with success. On other issues progress was limited or ephemeral. and we must continue to press for an effective faculty role and to ensure that the administration not only solves the problems of today but anticipates those of the future, some of whose solutions will not only be expensive but may call for substantial changes in how faculty perform their tasks. Web based distance learning is an example of one that is likely to markedly affect all aspects of university life. What is the UW's position? What is the faculty's position? Who can articulate it better than the Senate?

Let me be clear that this is a great university in spite of our problems. I sit in on a freshman music theory class. I am impressed by the students, their scholarship, work ethic, interactions in class, and I am embarrassed when I compare my knowledge and particularly my articulateness with theirs. Sure, this university spawns start-ups and our research brings much to the area, but we are not simply just a business. The value of our liberal arts program must be made evident to the state and appropriate levels of support must be forthcoming.

What can be done? How about the chair of the faculty Senate having a seat on the Board of Regents? Certainly the faculty is a major stakeholder and with the Senate's knowledge and experience, think of what we could offer them.

As a Senator, I was often called upon to approve council recommendations. Often I had questions and concerns, but frequently there wasn't time for me to benefit from my colleagues' points of view by having extended discussions during senate meetings. I would

like to see an aggressive mechanism by which more senators would participate in the councils so that our collective voice is heard early, before positions are calcified?

Tuesday's Seattle Times editorial supported the regents' decision to limit admission because of inadequate state funding, thus further restricting accessibility. In my situation I have always been able to approve a course overload. Others may not be able to. What is the faculty position? the Senate's position? Last year, in his speech, Ross Heath proposed an innovative plan to catch the legislature's attention, pointing out clearly the relationship between budget decisions and educational consequences. More efforts along this line are still needed.

Do I have the answers to all our problems, no (but many ideas). Do we as a Senate have the answers, I believe that we do! Let me repeat, "Who wouldn't want to be an integral part of this body's leadership"? Shortly after I finished the draft of my application for this position, the AAUP report came out excoriating the university. One of the only two passing grades was given to our senate, but even there recommendations for improvements were noted.

I have devoted over 40 years to this university and I want to see it remain strong and vibrant. The U has been marvelously good to me and I can think of no better way to reciprocate than by serving as vice chair of the Senate.

I look forward to being part of the Senate leadership and helping to ensure that the faculty play an effective role and I would appreciate your support.

Questions/

When asked there positions about faculty unionization, Buck replied that his preference is to work with Senate to strengthen shared governance and issues like salary. If those efforts are not successful, many of us will be eager to explore other alternatives. It is an open question, he continued, what role the Senate should play in unionization and many unresolved issues about what governance would look like; it is not his first choice but there if we need it. Emery reiterated these views and added that he sees himself as a professional, noting that he prefers relationships on that basis. He concluded that he would hate to see it come to this and believes that we can negotiate with administration and achieve results, and without unionization.

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 Louise Mansfield of Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, who died on October 19, 2003, after having served the University since 1951. Professor Emeritus Robert Rodieck of Ophthalmology, who died on September 30, 2003 after having served the University since 1978. Associate Professor Emeritus Sidney S. Culbert of Psychology, who died on October 28, 2003 after having served the University since 1947. 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.

**First Consideration – Class A Legislation, Extending Voting Membership in the Faculty for Long-term Part-time Lecturers
Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 21, Section 21-32
Kate O’Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)**

Wadden explained the legislative process, and introduced O’Neill to explain the substance of the proposed amendment to the *Faculty Code*.

O’Neill explained that this legislation has been under development for two years, and was originally part of a package adopted regarding lecturers. At that time, the SEC had expressed concerns about the operation of the legislation as it pertains to part-time lecturers. In the meantime, a subcommittee of FCFA pursued this issue, seeking to address all of the concerns that had been raised about the practical effects of the legislation.

The intent of the legislation is to provide the vote to long-term, part-time faculty who provide service at a 50% level or more. Many of these people are deeply committed to their departments, are reviewed on a regular basis, and provide a great deal of our teaching. Because of the nature of their appointments, they are not always on campus but the Senate has been committed to a policy of extending the franchise to a wide group of faculty.

O’Neill then addressed concerns that have been raised about this proposal. Pointing to a chart appended to the legislation, she noted that the number of total faculty affected would be small and the most affected departments would be Psychology, Business, Nursing and Medicine. Also, Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn assures us that affected departments can adopt mailing procedures that address quorum issues. Given their numbers, block voting would not be a problem and as it pertains to promotion and tenure, because one votes for those junior or equivalent; part-time lecturers would not be involved in most of those decisions. Vaughn has also assured the council that they would be able to identify the people who eligible to vote. Some concerns were raised about the nature of their involvement in the community and O’Neill pointed to the long-term relationships that this group has had with the University. It also addresses the chicken and egg problems that our failure to enfranchise them provides a reason not to be involved; enfranchisement will provide an incentive to be involved.

Questions and Discussion/

1. Harris (Medicine): Does this include clinical faculty? It applies only to clinicians who hold the title of lecturer.
2. Rogers (Speech and Hearing): This senator opined that two years does not reflect the commitment desired. O’Neill responded that there was not an algorithm; the council’s considered opinion was that two years would be evidence of a commitment to the University.
3. Beame (CSE): In response to questions about the effect of this legislation on graduate students who teach, O’Neill said that graduate students should be teaching associates, not a title covered by this legislation. Olswang added that there are a number of lecturers who have only a masters, but said that graduate students cannot have this title unless they drop out of the program.

4. Buck (Psychology): Explaining that he feels conflicted about this issue, he said that in Psychology, as the person in the last thirteen years who hired these people, their programs depend on these people, and his department would be strongly affected by this legislation. He has worked to integrate these people into the department, and to work on their compensation, health care benefit issues and long-term security. But, he is afraid that this proposal might unintentionally make the situation worse for part-timers. It will change the quorum requirements within the department significantly and could lead to different outcomes in voting. Also, the interest in participation varies widely within this body. For example, some have jobs at other colleges and do not want to participate. Also, because they are not compensated for departmental service on committees, they feel that there are being taken advantage of. He is concerned that in addition to making it more difficult for departments with a high proportion of these people, it may lead to a high degree of turnover in this category as departments seek to avoid the effects of this legislation. These issues are not apparent from the legislation and could serve to make things more difficult for part time lecturers.

5. Coutu (Communication) sought to respond to Buck's comments. First, she wanted to re-focus the discussion on the tension between not making things worse for lecturers and not being patronizing towards this group. These people should be able to make a choice for involvement. While this may cause people to reconsider the hiring practices regarding part timers, that consideration may be salutary and lead to a more thoughtful discussion about the use of part-time faculty, whose use in teaching is growing.

6. Swanson (Earth & Space Sciences): In response to his question regarding part-time faculty input and review of this legislation, O'Neill said that this proposal came out of a Year 2000 study on the status of lecturers. Coutu added that there were several meetings with this group, and it also resulted from a survey of all lecturers. After this survey and meetings, it became apparent that there was a sense of disenfranchisement, and no ability to speak to how their lives are structured.

7. Haley (Finance): Responding also to the question about lecturer input into this legislation, he noted that he was a member of FCFA at the time, and that the Business School was one of the heaviest users of this category of instructor. He talked to numbers of the part-time lecturers in the school, and confirmed there were lots of discussions with lecturers.

8. Beame(CSE): Within his department, he has a few who are highly integrated and it makes good sense to them. But there are also people who are not so committed or integrated into the department. Given this, it would be great if we could provide some kind of mechanism to distinguish between these two groups.

9. Rogers (Speech and Hearing): In her department, there would be a significant impact from this legislation, and while she supports their contribution, she stated that two years is too short a time period and suggested that four or five years would be better.

In response to a motion to postpone consideration of this motion to the next meeting, the Senate voted in favor of postponement.

New Business

1. David Lovell (Group 8: Psychosocial) proposes a Class C resolution that addresses the NIH Grant issue:

Class C Resolution on NIH Funding and Academic Freedom

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.

--Submitted by David Lovell, Psychosocial & Community Health, Group VIII Representative

Noting that he is willing to entertain motion to postpone, Lovell explained the rationale for the proposal, noting that it does not address the political motivation but makes normative statements of support. He understands that some may not wish to support this because of the way in which it may act as a red flag to those who object to these grants, but stated that it is important to show our support for our colleagues in these circumstances.

As discussion began, there was a request for a quorum count. There was not a quorum, and the discussion was ended.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate