

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**Gowen Hall, Room 301**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 15 May 2003**

The election of Group Representatives to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was conducted before the regular meeting.

The following people were elected to a one year term on the SEC: Marianne Stecher-Hansen (Group I), Clark Pace (Group II), Joe Norman (Group III), Steve Buck (Group IV), Richard Gile (Group V), Todd Scheuer and Kurt Johnson (Group VII), and David Lovell (Group VIII). An e-mail ballot will be held for Group VI.

**Farewell Remarks from the Chair – Sandra Silberstein, Chair**

The Chair's final address to the Senate is termed her "Farewell" remarks. It's hardly a swansong. One has the job for another three months, the budget isn't yet in, and any manner of crises can yet befall us. But in another sense the term "Farewell" is eminently appropriate: This is the chair's wish for well-being.

This time last year, I daresay we anticipated this year with trepidation. A special meeting of the Faculty Senate last spring recommended compensation increases virtually unanimously. None were forthcoming. Then-President McCormick termed the event "a train wreck." To my eye, morale was at an all-time low. Then came the events of the summer and fall. A distinguished member of the Medical School left under a cloud. (If one learns nothing else in this job, it's the art of euphemism.) Our President went East leaving the institution with an Acting Provost and an Interim President. The economy continued to worsen, and the nation prepared for (then went) to war. How many units in the institution could have been termed clinically depressed by the time the rains set in?

But in many ways we have fared well (not only as a result of diminished horizons, though that's certainly part of it—it takes so little to make us happy). But some things are going better than they might have. At the state level, if the budget for higher education lands between the proposals of the Senate and the House, we will have fared better than we fear. At the institutional level, currently all discussions and draft budgets show compensation increases for eligible employees.

Our Acting Provost and Interim President have acted in the best sense of their roles. When confronting pressing issues they've tended to think and act as though every detail of the issue is one they will live with and be responsible for forever. For issues of longer scope they've created spaces for creative action should others hold their posts. I'm grateful to them for their grace this year.

I'm particularly grateful to this body. The Senate has addressed important legislation this year from electronic balloting, to the recognition of student excellence, and debated with real integrity the scholarly response to the War in Iraq.

The Senate Executive Committee debated all these and more. The legislation we debate here is refined by that body. Additionally, you've just received (electronically) their thinking on the use of student evaluations. And their representatives continue to work on pressing issues independent of who sits in the Chair's seat, as committees explore collective

bargaining, and creative structures of joint governance. If you were elected a group rep. in the past half hour, a special thanks to you.

Even as task forces work on the formal structures of upcoming joint endeavors, I daresay we've had more joint initiatives this year than ever before. We're experimenting with a joint Administration/Faculty council on undergraduate education, and joint committees on enrollment and accountability. This quarter Provost Thorud and I are jointly convening a group to think about protecting institutional quality, particularly in times of economic stress. We want to begin to develop guiding principles by which institutional decisions can be made and assure ourselves that the institution is asking the right questions. We are faring well when we ask the right questions and locate points of convergent thinking.

The faculty groups that do the lion's share of the work for Faculty are the Faculty Councils. In the code, the Faculty has responsibilities with respect to who comes here, what they study, who teaches them, and weighing in on the distribution of resources of the institution. Issues including facilities, curriculum, students, faculty, research, libraries, educational technology, retirement, and more, are addressed daily through the enormously hard work of the councils. Most of the legislative action that we take in this room is initiated by and comes from the tireless efforts of the Faculty Councils.

Our Vice Chair has done a remarkable job this year. He's served and served and served. He not only chairs SCPB, but also sits on the tri-campus council, on a graduate tuition group, the accountability committee, and of course, the presidential search.

Our legislative representatives were amazing this year. You should have seen them addressing our Regents, sharing with them information that had never before been compiled in that format, and sharing faculty profiles that they've used to explain the Faculty to the Legislature.

The Secretary of the Faculty does amazing work. Far beyond the minutes we watch her take, she works on behalf of the Faculty from the adjudications that win Faculty their rights, to the information she manages, to the office she manages. Her electronic initiative (which you passed last month) will save the thousands of dollars which we assume will allow the Faculty Senate to continue to function at the level it needs to.

Having watched us make almost every possible parliamentary slip, our parliamentarian Joe Janes has assured that we get anything done—officially.

And, finally, we acknowledge the remarkable staff of the Faculty Senate: Assistant to the Chair, Nancy Bradshaw; Assistant to the Secretary Tasha Taylor; and the recorders, who create and maintain the institutional memory of university governance: Linda Fullerton and Brian Taylor.

Along with the hard work of the faculty what do we need to fare well? I don't think there's anything subtle here. I'll just mention three things.

First, we've made real progress this year, but we have got to become more successful in bringing our case to the state. The fact that we say this each year, does not make it any less so. I'm sure Gail Stygall will be contacting us again to step up to the plate and help her work on this issue.

We need to plan. Our salary documents this year are an important step in the process of setting principles and goals. The financial challenges facing the institution are predictable in character if not in scope. We need to continue long-range planning if we are to maintain the caliber of institution that brought us here. We need people to be able to plan to stay here.

And planning requires conversation. I hope that conversations will continue across the institution at all levels as we address the challenges from which we cannot hide. A first step is to attend the Faculty Senate reception after this meeting, where conversation will be accompanied by food and libations as we plan to fare well.

### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) – Douglas Wadden, Chair**

Budgetary matters are now coming into sharper focus, commented Wadden, and it is time to refine our debate of these issues. Current issues before the SCPB include campus labor relations, whether any unit should be exempt from cuts, how should the enrollment funds be used, whether and how unspent UIF funds should be used, recruitment and retention, and unit adjustments. Resolution of these issues will depend upon the compromise that is reached between the State House and Senate budget. There are also questions relating to the capitol budget and expenditures for equipment and other support.

### **Legislative Report – Jan Sjøvik, Legislative Representative**

Sjøvik reviewed this year's budgetary history, beginning with the Governor's proposal in December 2002, which proposed no new revenues and drastic cuts. Once the session began, the Faculty Representatives were met by a great deal of good will, but were told that there is no money for the University. On April 4th, the Senate budget proposal was approved, and this proposal was far worse for higher education than the Governor's budget. The House budget, which was better, came out somewhat later but the two chambers were not able to reach a compromise budget, necessitating a special session that began 12 May 2003. There are numerous rumors about the shape of the final budget, including a rumor that there will be funds for raises in both years of the biennium. Silberstein added that the University, if possible, is permitted to find funds through internal reallocation for salary increases.

### **Report of the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President**

Huntsman began by making observations about the nature of the modern University presidency, and the wealth of experiences he has had this year. It is, he said, an immense privilege to be in this position, and it is a joy to be part of such a worthwhile enterprise.

In this season of retrenchment, a number of important achievements should be noted. Our legislative defense was very successful, and, on a positive note, we received authority to set graduate and professional school tuition for the next six years. The Governor signed a bill popularly called the "Compact Bill" which will set up a taskforce to examine new ways to think about higher education funding and management. At the very least, this will educate a group of legislators about our plight. On the issue of students who take "excess" credits, the legislature agreed to let the Regents devise a policy to address the differing types of students for whom this is a concern. The legislature was also able to provide additional funding for trauma care at Harborview Hospital, and to adjust some bills that could have been quite costly e.g. elevator maintenance. On the capitol side, we have new powers to

fund building maintenance. These changes, as well as improved relations in Olympia, should not be ignored.

On other fronts, the HEC Board is about to approve changes in the residency rules. This, coupled with tuition setting authority for graduate and professional students, allows us to do more planning and to give advance notice to students of University policies.

Noting that his office faces Red Square, Huntsman uses this to gain a unique view of the University Community. One of the things that has been apparent is an improvement in diversity on the campus, citing the recent Pow Wow event. The EOP Banquet and the Cinco de Mayo celebrations are other signs of the increasing vibrancy of our community. During this same period, we received a stunning gift of \$70 million from the Gates Foundation. This sends a very strong message about the ability of this University to shape future directions in research and excellence. Thus, there are many reasons to celebrate even as we face a difficult budgetary situation.

Finally, Huntsman urged everyone to attend the University Recognition Awards ceremony on June 3rd. This is an occasion on which we celebrate the achievements of everyone in the community, from senior professor to gardener. It is a moment to recognize the commitment, contribution and achievements of everyone who works here.

He concluded by thanking Sandra Silberstein on her contributions to the Faculty in her role as Chair of the Faculty Senate.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m. and the Agenda was **approved**.

### **Summary of Executive Committee Actions**

Membership on the review committees for the Arts and Sciences, Biology RCEP and the RCEP in Forest Resources were ratified. The RCEP Education PIC committee has asked for an extension on their report. Therefore, ratification of members on that review committee will be postponed until fall quarter. A legislative update was presented by Interim President Huntsman. There is still no agreement on the final biennial operating or capital construction budget. The Washington State Legislature will go into special session on May 12 to resolve these differences. A report was presented on Recommendations for Use of Student Evaluations in Merit and Promotion Decisions, and an update regarding possible effects of collective bargaining on faculty at the UW was presented by the Working Group on Collective Bargaining. The 2003-2004 Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings was approved; the Class A legislation on the Electronic Initiative was approved with a minor revision recommended by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

### **Announcements**

The Faculty Senate Open House will be held today immediately following the meeting.

### **Requests for Information**

1. Don Janssen (C & E Eng) asked for a status report about a temporary building that had been the subject of a Senate meeting approximately two years ago. The Administration agreed to remove the building when the Computer Science building was completed, and the Senate passed a Class C resolution in this regard. John Schaufelberger, Chair, FCUFS provided an update. He consulted Marilyn Cox, Director, Capital and Space Planning, and Weldon Ihrig, Executive Vice President. When the Computer Science building is completed, and the arrangements are made for moving between the old and new building are completed, the personnel move will take place. Then, the temporary building can be removed. This will occur no later than the summer of 2004 and the temporary building site will be landscaped.

### **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: Associate Professor Emeritus David C. Botting, Jr. of Humanistic Social Studies, who died on May 2, 2003 after having served the University since 1953. Professor Emeritus Luvern V. Rieke of Law, who died on May 9, 2003 after having served the University since 1949. Be it further resolved, that the senate chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Wadden presented the motion of the Senate Executive Committee which appears as Appendix A to the agenda. Clark Pace was nominated from the floor to be on the Faculty Council on Student Affairs. **Approved.**

### **Class A Legislation - Final Consideration**

**Title: Provisions Relating to Voting and Elections – Electronic Initiative**

**Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 21, Section 21-71; Chapter 22, Sections 22-47 to 48, and Chapter 29, Section 29-36**

**Presented by: Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, Kate O'Neill, Chair**

The Advisory Committee on the Code made one change to the legislation which substitutes the phrase "are verified" in Section 22-47 rather than "are counted." This change also responds to comments that were made at the last Senate meeting.

Approved Unanimously.

### **Class B Legislation**

**Title: Award of Honors for All Three Campuses**

**Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, Section 3: Grades, Honors and Scholarship**

**Presented by: Faculty Council on Academic Standards, Carolyn Plumb, Chair**

This legislation had been presented at the last meeting, and was postponed for final consideration to this meeting. Present to discuss the legislation were Carolyn Plumb, Chair, FCAS; Laura Newell, Subcommittee on Student Awards; and Tim Washburn, Executive Director, Admissions and Records. Plumb began the discussion by quickly reviewing the legislation and its drafting process.

Newell explained the system by which the awards are granted. Students need 180 credits to graduate, hopefully accumulating them at the approximate rate of 45 credits per year. But not all students come to graduation this way, and she urged senators to level the playing field for consideration of awards and honors. For example, some graduating students may have only accumulated 45 of their 180 credits in residence here. Most of us, as demonstrated by a straw vote, are not comfortable awarding a student a medal on the basis of so few credits in residence. The first medal is intended to go to a student who has spent the majority (three-fourths) of their career here. This is a philosophical stance regarding the message we want to send about the value of the award, and the value of being a resident student for most of their college career.

Washburn addressed the number of credits required for the transfer medal and the resident President's medal. Washburn explained this by reference to an overhead depicting eight students, each with a variety of credits. Showing that there are three students who fall in overlapping categories, he pointed out that this will never be an easy determination and that there will always be an overlap.

#### Discussion/

Paul Beame (Computer Science) asked whether the decision should be based on the number of credits. Washburn said that it would be difficult to choose which credits should be considered. He also noted that the pool is narrowed in two ways. First, only students who are eligible for summa cum laude are eligible, and then the committee carefully considers the types of classes taken and student performance. Beame focused the issue on the one quarter gap between the differing groups of students. Washburn responded that the committee concluded that anything less than 60 credits from the community college would not have represented the community college, and would also have forced issues with the number of UW credit hours required. If there is a change in the proposal, he suggested that the level be set at two-thirds rather than three-fourths. **Moved and seconded.**

Guntheroth (Pediatrics) emphasized the point Newell made about the importance of students being here. This point was raised in earlier discussions about distance learning, and our concerns regarding the need for a student's physical presence on campus. He asked that we not dilute the requirement. Clarence Braddock (Medicine) pointed out that whenever a line has to be drawn, there will always be a question as to where to draw it. He also asked whether this is a theoretical question, or whether it is a question that occurs every year. Given how arbitrary this decision is, he supports the place at which the committee draws it given their familiarity with the issue. Another senator remarked that the problem appears to be one of recognizing transfer students. He surveyed his faculty, and 90% of them were against having two president's medals, believing it dilutes the value of the award. Although this was not addressed to the amendment on the floor, Newell pointed out that over 50% of our eligible students come from the community colleges. The committee debated this fact as well as giving different names to the medals.

#### **Question called.**

Vote: The Motion to amend the proposal does not carry.

Responding to a question about the number of credits, Washburn said it means 135 credits. David Lovell (Psych) asked a question about possible dilution of the medal if there are students who qualify for both medals. Washburn pointed out that this is unavoidable because we cannot control the number of credits a person could earn. But he pointed out

that the committee reviews this very carefully, and that there are a number of considerations that narrow the pool. Tina Emerick (Oceanography) stated that she disagreed with the rationale that limits the medal to state community college students, and would open it to any transfer student, no matter where they come from. The President's Medal should honor students, and we need to find another way to honor our relation to the community colleges, she remarked. Washburn responded that we do have a partnership with the community colleges, and half of our students come to us through that route. Thus, it seemed appropriate to recognize that partnership to members of the committee.

**Question called. Vote: Yes: 45 No: 25 The legislation Passes.**

### **New Business**

**None.**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate