

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Gowen Hall, Room 301
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 13 March 2003

The meeting began at 2:38 p.m.

Introductory Comments – Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate

Yesterday I attended a really remarkable meeting. A group of faculty and administrators got together and had a conversation. That shouldn't seem remarkable, but I'm a linguist. One of the things we study is conversation. I can tell you from a technical and scholarly perspective, that we're not always terrific in this institution at having conversations. We speechify well. We know how to keep our counsel. But real dialogue is not always our strong suit. However, yesterday was different. A group of faculty met to request a Day of Learning about the developing international crisis. It became clear right away that everyone at that table wanted something of consequence to happen--that everyone believed in the role of the university to develop and share knowledge and to create for a for real debate. People rolled up their sleeves and worked together. People changed their minds, credited good ideas, and indeed talked. Regardless of how you feel about the ultimate result of that conversation—and you'll have plenty of time to debate that later in this meeting—I hope that the habit of conversation can be sustained.

Another place where attempts are being made at conversation is around the budget. Most of you have seen Provost Huntsman's message indicating "We have every expectation that there will be salary adjustments for faculty librarians and professional staff in July 2003." The SCPB has approved a new kind of document—stating our long-term goals and making modest proposals for implementation. I had hoped to bring that to you today, but for the first time we're in conversation with the Board of Deans. I want to preserve the option that for the first time the Faculty and the Deans might come together with a recommendation. So, hoping that wordsmithing might bring us to agreement, I will, presumably one way or the other, bring an overall salary statement to the Senate at the next meeting. We have also drafted a more general statement concerning salaries across the institution. And this, too, will be brought here.

Be aware, however, that all the auguries point to increasingly negative budget forecasts from the state. In this context, compensation packages will be challenging to fund, and faculty must be weighing in on these issues in each college. Doug Wadden and I will be visiting the college councils in the weeks to come to bring home this message. And Doug will be telling you what else we've been working on in SCPB.

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

The SCPB has one last meeting before the end of the quarter, and has been trying to coordinate its work with the Board of Deans. There has been an agreement on the new tuition rates. An outgrowth of this is the creation of a new committee that will look at graduate and professional school tuition. The committee has a deadline of the end of spring quarter for a preliminary report, and a deadline of 31 December 2003 for their final report. There is also an enrollment subcommittee that will study the cap on undergraduate credit hours. At this point, discussion of resource investment policies is just beginning. The SCPB is looking at fairly detailed unit budget reports, and salary is an on-going topic. Finally, Wadden suspects that we will need to revisit the reorganization, consolidation and

elimination of programs (RCEP) policy. For example, what triggers RCEP? When? These questions are particularly acute when the initiative for change comes from the unit faculty rather than a budget cut or other financial emergency.

Legislative Report – Jan Sjøvik, Legislative Representative

Sjøvik began his report by relating an old Norwegian adage: "It hurts no matter which finger you cut." He and Gail Stygall, the deputy legislative representative, have been working with faculty representatives from across the state through the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR). As a result, they have been able to see legislators who sit on the various education committees, as well as on the appropriations committees. While all legislators appreciate the job we do, they also state that there is no money in the budget. The newest revenue forecast will be made on 19 March 2003, and it is likely that the budget situation will have worsened. The legislative representatives have argued that it is necessary to protect higher education, and they have described what happens as faculty leave and the impacts of budget cuts on students as classes become larger. The legislators understand this, he related, but their concern is the whole budgetary reality. He and Prof. Stygall have particularly argued for the need to have retention and recruitment funds, as well as spoken favorably about the Evans-Gardner Initiative. The University's needs are made more urgent by the soon-to-arrive baby boomlet bulge in the 2006-2008 period.

The next big event in Olympia will be when the House budget proposal is made public. This is likely to occur about 10 days after the revenue forecast, or towards the end of March. The Senate's budget will follow thereafter.

Report of the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President

Huntsman began with reporting his perspective on Olympia, which he characterized as close to Sjøvik's. Despite this, we are also getting a lot of affirmation for the work we do, and he feels that these sentiments do signal some movement. Huntsman also updated the Senate on the Capitol Campaign which, despite the difficult economic times, is on target. We are at \$650 million dollars with a goal of \$2 billion. This is a very unusual level of support in this economy, as most other non-profits suffered a downturn in funding and donations.

While Huntsman, like Sjøvik is worried, there are signs for optimism. Alluding to the enjoyable nature of his visits to departments, he reported how impressed he has been by the hard work, creativity and ideas of faculty and staff on all three campuses: Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma.

UW needs two things with respect to its relationship to the state. We need more money, and we need a new form of the relationship. The current relationship has been one of micromanagement. Increasingly across the globe, states and countries have been revisiting the nature of their relationship to higher education and its financial footing. Some people in the legislature have been looking into this. In this new relationship, the state would be clear about what it wants from higher education and what it is willing to pay for. In return, universities would get greater autonomy to meet agreed upon metrics of expectations. Huntsman said he is very encouraged by the degree of openness he has heard towards these ideas. If we are able to achieve a new legislative-university relationship, then this institution will be able to thrive and able to outperform anyone.

Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. Silberstein noted that there is one addition to the agenda at New Business for the provision of a Class C resolution regarding a Day of Learning. The agenda, as amended, was **approved**.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions

A progress report from the Special Committee on Faculty Council Organization was presented. The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality presented recommendations for the use of student evaluations in merit and promotion decisions. The Class A resolution, made by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, clarifying that Faculty who resign prior to age 62 are eligible for emeritus designation, was approved.

Announcements

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn made two announcements. The first announcement reminded senators about their roles in the upcoming elections. She also noted that several voting units have been re-apportioned. The second asked senators to nominate colleagues for the Adjudication Panel, which has a need for new members.

Requests for Information

None.

Memorial Resolution

Be it resolved that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues: Assistant Professor Jerome Block of the School of Medicine, who died on January 29, 2003 after having served the University since July 1, 1959. Senior Engineer Edward William Early of the Applied Physics Laboratory, who died on January 21, 2003 after having served the University since October 1, 1953. Professor Emeritus Merle Lafette Meacham of Educational Psychology, who died on January 28, 2003 after having served the University since January 1955. Professor Emeritus George I. Quimby of Anthropology, who died on February 17, 2003 after having served the University since September 1, 1965. Professor Robert Ayres Schelling of Naval Science, who died on February 14, 2003 after having served the University since September 10, 1963. Professor Emeritus George Stenzel of Forest Resources, who died on February 12, 2003 after having served the University since March 15, 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

I. Nominated for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees ***with voting rights to be determined by the SEC***, for terms ending September 15, 2003:

A. Representatives of Associated Students of the University of Washington:

Faculty Councils:

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Academic Standards | Cammie Croft |
| Educational Outreach | Else Washines |
| Educational Technology | Jay Kealey |
| Faculty Affairs | Cammie Croft |
| Instructional Quality | Cammie Croft |
| Research | Sun Hahm |
| Retirement, Insurance and Benefits | Oscar Rosales |
| Student Affairs | Cammie Croft |
| Tri-Campus Policy | Luke Swinney |
| University Facilities and Services | Else Washines |
| University Libraries | Else Washines |
| University Relations | Else Washines |

Special Committees:

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Minority Affairs | Ane Phillips |
| Faculty Women | Jenna Huntsberger |

Approved as listed in the agenda.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Policy Regarding Designation of Emeriti Faculty. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-34.B.10.

Vice Chair Doug Wadden presented the motion introducing this legislation, and Kate O'Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs explained the rationale for it. The legislation was proposed to cover a difference between the state statutory retirement requirements and the *Faculty Code*. This amendment allows one to retire under any state plan, and be eligible for the emeritus status.

Discussion/

1. One senator pointed out that he has about 150 colleagues enrolled in the TIAA-CREF plan and he expressed concerns that people in this private plan would not be covered under this new legislation. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, pointed out that the same situation existed under the prior legislation. This new legislation says that you can retire in many different ways, and added that the Provost's office has always treated faculty at Children's Hospital as faculty. Those who retire under related plans, including those at Children's, would fall under this legislation.
2. Gerald Seidler (Physics): In reference to the senator's question about the effective date of the legislation, Vaughn pointed out that Class A legislation is effective when signed by

the President; all legislation is prospective. Olswang pointed out that the informal practice in the last ten years was to arrange for emeritus status for faculty if they had prior state service. Thus, the approach was flexible.

3. William Wilson (Eng.): Prof. Wilson expressed puzzlement about why the emeritus title appears to be tied to the source of retirement funding in this legislation. O'Neill stated that she does not see this as tied to a particular level of salary or a plan, but rather it is tied to retirement qualifications. She pointed out that the current legislation limits the emeritus title to those who retire at an age greater or equal to 62. The point of this legislation is to give more flexibility. Olswang pointed out that the retirement plan is controlled by a statute that establishes a minimum retirement age of 62. Currently, if you leave before age 62, you are resigning. Thus, you could leave after 30 years of service at age 60 and not be entitled to the emeritus status. The goal here is to provide the possibility of an emeritus status for those who leave before the state minimum retirement age of 62, and have a distinguished career that their colleagues wish to recognize.

Vote: The legislation passed with a nearly unanimous vote.

New Business: Class C Resolution establishing a "Day of Learning" about the War in Iraq

Silberstein explained the background for this proposal, and Gail Stygall presented more information. Stygall began by noting that this is an extraordinary moment in our history. It would be highly unusual for an institution of higher education to let this moment pass without comment given the wide variety of expertise on the faculty. Why do we need this? Reading from Molly Ivans, she noted that 42% of Americans incorrectly believe that Saddam Hussein is responsible for the 9/11 bombing. She quoted Ambrose Bierce that war is a way of teaching Americans geography. There is a great deal of misinformation about the issues surrounding the impending involvement of the United States in a war with Iraq. The text of the resolution is as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate urges President Huntsman to declare a Day of Learning about the unfolding world crisis. On this day early in Spring Quarter, classes would not be suspended. Rather, faculty would be encouraged to use class time to explore the current situation. The format should provide an opportunity for the widest possible range of opinions and perspectives while drawing on the broad expertise of the faculty.

Seconded. This resolution began when Mark Jenkins (Drama) sent an e-mail to about ten colleagues commenting on the lack of conversation about the war. It "snowballed" from there, and about 800 faculty have signed on to the idea of having a "Day of Learning." This group of people wants to address the impending war by engaging in critical discussions with our students, particularly with our undergraduates. The proposing faculty discussed this resolution with the Provost yesterday. It does not require that a faculty member use class time to conduct these discussions, but would allow them the freedom to do so if they so choose. Silberstein observed that during last year's Day of Reflection, there were only about 2000 undergraduates attending the events. This program, in contrast, was designed so that students would not take the day off. While there would be campus wide events, there would be an opportunity for focused discussion with students.

Discussion/

The ensuing discussion raised a number of considerations, summarized here:

1. Some were concerned about faculty competence to address this issue in class, especially if the instructor is in a non-related area. On the other hand, some faculty felt that even for faculty not teaching in this area, this would be an opportunity for all faculty to encourage students to engage in critical discussion and to show that all thinking people worry about these difficult issues and materials can be made available.
2. A few people expressed concerns that untenured faculty and students might be afraid to express their opinions, believing that an opinion contrary to those of their colleagues or instructors could have negative consequences.
3. Some senators cautioned that events are moving so swiftly that some of the discussion could be rendered "obsolete" by events. Others countered that while this is a valid concern, many of the issues will transcend particular events.
4. Several senators expressed their hope that centrally planned events would take place on this day. This would ensure that students and faculty would have an opportunity to hear a balanced set of opinions based on faculty expertise.

At this point in the discussion, Norman Wolf (Pathology) introduced an amendment to the resolution. Noting that the University cannot take a position for or against the war, and that some areas of the University will not hold these discussions, he proposed an amendment to the proposal, designed to strengthen it. Jack Lee (Math), a member of the committee that drafted the original resolution, said that much of the amendment was in keeping with the original proposal and felt that it would be "cleaner" to pass the original amendment. Others pointed out some refinements to the proposed amendment.

Vote on the Amendment: Passes.

Vote on the Main Motion, as amended: Passes overwhelmingly.

The final text reads:

Be it Resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges President Huntsman to declare a Day of Learning about the unfolding world crisis. On this day early in spring quarter, faculty would be encouraged to use class time to explore the current situation. The format should provide an opportunity for the widest possible range of opinions and perspectives while drawing on the broad expertise of the faculty.

That, in conjunction with the "Iraq day" proposal, a committee will be appointed, using the expertise and contacts of the faculty, to invite speakers with varying positions on Iraq affairs. This coverage will include all viewpoints concerning the history of the problem, the United States versus UN positions, and the probably consequences of an invasion by the United States, regardless of whether it has already occurred by that time.

That, these presentations will take place on the afternoon and evening of the day designated by the University for University-wide discussions in classrooms. They will be held in Kane Hall or other suitable site(s) on campus.

That, those professors who feel that their students would benefit most from the afternoon discussions and presentations should feel free to dismiss their classes, if scheduled during that afternoon.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21pm

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

APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate