

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
301 Gowen Hall
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 5 December 2002

Introductory Comments – Sandra Silberstein, Chair

Sandra Silberstein began with some quick announcements regarding the conduct of the meeting. She also introduced our new Parliamentarian, Joseph "Joe" Janes (Information School). The remarks below are the actual text of her address.

Speaking to the Faculty Senate, I'm going to preach to the converted. As you know "shared governance" is one of two issues (along with salaries) that will take center stage this year. We'll talk about salaries at a later meeting. For the first time, this year, we're trying to model salaries over time, to see what it will take in real dollars for us to catch up with our peers. Then we will need to talk about priorities and values. Compensation issues will come to the Senate later in the year.

Today, I'll be focusing on joint governance. I'll begin by sharing the gist of remarks I delivered to the Regents last month in Spokane.

The university is inherently a paradoxical institution. It is arguably one of only two institutions surviving from the Middle Ages. (None will doubt this legacy who saw us running around in our Harry Potter robes at the recent dedication of Suzzallo Library.) The institution is paradoxical because on the one hand, our Medieval legacy makes us a remarkably hierarchical institution. In the end it is not even the President, but the Regents who approve policies and decisions. On the other hand, just as in Medieval times, most of us share the sense that all we need to make a fine institution is a group of faculty (hopefully not too itinerant) with students clustered around them. The overlay that makes this paradoxical system work is the genius of North American higher education: Shared Governance. At every level people are working together.

I shared some of the Faculty Code with the Regents. Section 13-20 sets out General Policy:

A university is a community of scholars contributing, each according to his own talents and interests, to the transmission and advancement of knowledge.

Because of its diversity of interests a university is a complex organization not quite like any other in its management, which requires the understanding and good faith of people dedicated to a common purpose. A university administration must seek wisely and diligently to advance the common effort, and the strength of a university is greatest when its faculty and administration join for the advancement of common objectives.

Much of the faculty-administration relationship has been established through long experience, and has the weight and good sense of academic form and tradition. But the terms of this relationship are essentially those of spirit, mutual respect, and good faith, and thus must be flexible to meet changing needs. Some of the traditions of the University of Washington are given expression in the pages that follow. Yet these and other common understandings have meaning only to the extent that they reflect the integrity and faith of administration and faculty in the day by day accomplishment of their joint effort.

Section 13-23. A. provides the Legislative Authority of the Faculty:

Subject to the provisions of paragraphs B and C of this Section, the President authorizes the University faculty to formulate regulations for the immediate government of the University and to share responsibility with him and the academic deans in such matters as:

1. educational policy and general welfare;
2. policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities;
3. scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors;
4. approval of candidates for degrees;
5. criteria for faculty tenure, appointment, and promotion;
6. recommendations concerning the University budget;
7. formulation of procedures to carry out the policies and regulation thus established.

That authority is exercised (according to Section 13-31) through the Faculty Senate, and in the Colleges [Campuses], Schools, and Departments.

The responsibilities of the faculty under shared governance differ from those of other constituents; that is, unlike students, for example, we are not to think of ourselves as a constituent putting forth our own interests. Rather, our recommendations are required to be on the basis of the best interests of the entire institution in those areas in which we consult. Last year, for example, when the administration and the faculty disagreed on whether or not to give a pay increase, we disagreed in terms of the best interests of the institution. We did not argue that the administration acted out of self-interest, nor did they suggest that of us. We disagreed honorably on what the budget would sustain, on the intent and reaction of the legislature and public, on issues of fairness and values, and on predictions for this year. The level of discussion was always the best interests of the University of Washington.

This is the system that must be preserved in challenging times. There are remarkable signs of health. We have stunning Vice Chair candidates this year in Ross Heath and Bob Holzworth. All of you who have come into the Senate create an invigorated institution. We also need to make shared governance work at the College level, and I urge faculty to get involved in those elected councils.

Currently we see encouraging joint governance initiatives. The faculty through the Senate has been brought in early to discuss implementing the university's tuition residency policy. Recall that the faculty weighs in on policy, the administration does implementation. The new academic calendar proposal came to us early and was broadly discussed in Senate councils and several other faculty venues. We have a committee working to develop prototypes of joint councils, jointly appointed by the administration and faculty. And we have appointed our first joint committee: a committee on accountability. All of these are examples of strengthening shared governance.

One area in which we need to participate is the presidential search. Choosing a university president is arguably the most important responsibility of the Board of Regents. The President of the Board of Regents asked for names from "constituencies," and the board appointed the search committee. In order to create a Senate voice in the process, I have appointed a Council of Former Chairs of the Faculty Senate. This is an impressive group with considerable accumulated wisdom. I have asked them to deliberate in three areas: the necessary characteristics of our next president, the central mission and values of our

institution, and the particular challenges facing its next president. Their counsel on the [characteristics of a president](#) can be found on the Faculty Senate webpage. Later this year, we will host a forum on the other issues. In meeting with Regent President Grinstein, he assures me that he seeks an outstanding scholar, with a track record in higher education administration, and is a leader. The Regents, too, will be sponsoring university-wide forums. It is important that we take every opportunity to participate in this most critical process.

Legislative Report – Jan Sjøvik, Legislative Representative

In his brief remarks, he noted that the state Senate now has a Republican majority while the Democrats increased their majority in the House. Thus, we once again face a period of divided government in which it will be easy to stop things but not get things done. The financial condition of the state has not improved; the projected shortfall is \$2.1 billion, and there is also a shortfall in the health services account. Similarly, the recent caseload forecast and revenue forecast have not changed. The Governor's 17 December 2002 budget will be based on these figures. Despite this, there will still be many months that pass before we reach a final compromise budget. The prospects for the University's budget, therefore, are not rosy.

Report of the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President

After congratulating Sjøvik on his "optimism," he proceeded to make three brief announcements about the administrative transition. He feels that the transition is being made fairly smoothly and a great team is in place. The academic agenda was pretty well shaped before Pres. McCormick decided to leave so the point now is to execute the plan. He also announced, with pleasure, the appointment of David Thorud as acting provost.

There is also an external piece to our future plans. We have made a sharp decision to focus our budget discussion on the effect of falling budgetary support for the education of the sons and daughters of Washington citizens. Washington State University is in the same position and the two Universities have decided to form an alliance on this issue to send a coordinated message about our falling budgetary standing. A similar message is being sent in regards to the capitol budget. For this stage, Huntsman believes that we are in a good position. University officials have consulted with some of our supporters in business, government and elsewhere, and we are not being pushed back from our argument and position.

Internally, we have a fairly elaborate process sketched to develop a budget in coordination with the Faculty Senate and the Board of Deans. This seven-month plan lays out a number of decisions and agenda items we must consider as we finalize the budget. A component related to this is tuition and tuition setting authority. We are asking that the last year's tuition setting authority for graduate students and non-residents be made permanent. There will be no proposal regarding undergraduate tuition at this time.

In the next few weeks, several key events will take place. Next Tuesday, former Govs. Gardner and Evans will announce a set of initiatives designed to identify funding for capital projects. The HEC Board will soon be holding a summit on higher education and its support. In the last couple of years, the HEC Board has changed its outlook from that of a regulatory agency to an advocate for higher education.

On 17 December, the Governor will submit his budget proposal. He is required by statute to produce a "Book One" budget based on normal revenues as opposed to a second one that would assume different revenue pictures. Huntsman understands that the proposed budget will be quite "draconian," and the Governor has said that he was doing this to raise an alarm. The nuance will be how higher education is treated as compared to other categories in the budget. Huntsman questioned this strategy because of the effect that it may have on morale. Therefore, he has decided to give us the converse message: Do not take the Governor's budget too much to heart. This is a very early point in the budget cycle, and he believes there is reason for optimism. He believes that our budget campaign is getting real traction and that this will be beneficial in the long run.

Questions and Answers/

1. Sean O'Donnell (Psychology) asked about the Governor's motivation regarding the intent to submit a draconian budget. Huntsman, declining to speak for the Governor, said that Gov. Locke believes that band-aid solutions are not going to work and that something drastic will need to be done with very difficult choices. For example, the Governor believes that there may need to be significant reductions in the healthcare program for the indigent. Another piece of this is that we have begun to say that maybe higher education is too big and maybe we will have to have less of it. Along these lines, a truly historic event occurred ten days ago when UW and WSU regents met and issued a joint proposal that stated that only if there are budget enhancements should there be student enrollment increases. Similarly, if there are budget reductions, there should be a reduction in student enrollments. This is a statement of the realities of our situation and sharing of consequences with the citizens of higher education funding.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. The proposed agenda changes were **approved**.

Summary of other Executive Committee Actions

Executive Committee actions were summarized at item 6 of the agenda.

Announcements

None.

Requests for Information

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn introduced the question that had been forwarded to Athletic Director Barbara Hedges:

At a time when the University faces profound budget cuts, and the University faculty and staff did not receive salary increases, how can the salary increase for Rich Neuheisel, the football coach, be justified, especially when his salary is already vastly larger than that of any faculty or staff?

Ms. Hedges addressed the Senate, and stated that Coach Neuheisel's increase was not an increase but rather was in the form of a \$1.5 million loan for housing. The purpose of this

loan was to extend his longevity at this University. The terms of the loan require that he stay through the year 2008. If he does this, the loan will be forgiven; otherwise it comes due. He is making two yearly interest payments on this loan.

Hedges acknowledged that this is a large loan but noted the very competitive market for football coaches as well as the uncertain tenure that coaches face. Neuheisal has done everything that has been asked of him, and our football players are meeting the academic goals that have been set. A decision was made many years ago to have a high profile athletic program. If this is not done, research shows that alumni fund giving declines. This has been documented by numerous e-mails that she receives. It also supports other men and women's sports programs. The athletic program does not take funds from the University or from the state; it is entirely self-sustaining. Her department works very hard to ensure that the department maintains its self-sustaining status.

Questions/

1. Robert Franza (Bioengineering): You have described a self-sustaining program in which someone is paid an absolute fortune. What lessons should the rest of the University take away from this? Maybe the University should be a self-sustaining operation? Maybe the biggest cost is the cost of doing business with the state? How would you run the University of Washington? Franza emphasized that these are serious questions; he was not attempting to make a joke.

Hedges replied that her job is the Director of Athletics, and the most important thing to her is doing what the President expects the department to do; she declined to address how she might run the University. She acknowledged that there are "blips on the screen" but they work their utmost to avoid these. She knows that she has a huge responsibility and works hard to fulfill it.

2. Clark Pace (Group II Representative): Prefacing his remarks by noting the support of donors for athletic scholarships, and that he benefited from these when a student, he commented that he feels that some portion of these donations should go for academic scholarships.

Hedges responded by describing the way in which the \$5.3 million in donations goes to academic scholarships. Also, \$1.3 million is used for academic support for student athletes in tutoring, counseling and other services. This is reflected in success in the classroom, and the athletic program has made donations to other parts of the University undergraduate program. In this regard, she cited support given to the EOP program and the library. She would like the program to be more involved in the academic program but as expenses have gone up, it has become more difficult to maintain the bottom line of a 23 sport program that provides equal opportunities for men and women. Not every institution does that, but she believes strongly in equal support for women and men's programs.

Finally, she noted that the new buildings and renovations were paid through athletic department resources or donations. No state funds were used for these buildings.

She expressed the hope that she has cleared up any misperceptions about the program and welcomed any inquiries in the future. She works very hard with George Bridges (Dean and Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education) and Norm Arkans (Assoc. Vice President and Executive Director, University Relations) to ensure a successful program that is responsive to the needs of the undergraduate program.

Nominations and Appointments

The following nominations were made: Geoff Sauer (Technical Communication, VI) as chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2003; Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, (English) as chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Technology, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2003.

Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2003 *with voting rights left to the discretion of the council/committee:*

Representatives of the Professional Staff Association: Faculty Councils: Kirk Wolden-Hanson, Educational Technical; Melissa Johnson, Faculty Affairs; Michelle Trudeau and, Judi Clark, alternate, Instructional Quality; Peggy Hartman, Research; Special Committees: Sinh Simmons, Minority Faculty Affairs

All were **approved**.

Statements from Candidates for the Office of Faculty Senate Vice Chair

Silberstein explained that the text of the statements have been provided to all members of the Senate. At the 30 January meeting, the candidates will make remarks and answer questions.

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 Robert Alexander Bass Sr. of Education, who died on November 24, 2002 after having served the University since 1970; Clinical Associate Professor John Berberich of Psychology, who died on June 19, 2002 after having served the University since 1969; Lecturer Harold C. Cole of Nursing, who died on June 2, 2002 after having served the University since 1954; Lecturer Barbara Gunter Flynn of Medical Education, who died on September 1, 2002 after having served the University since 1994.; Professor Paul S Hostetler of Drama, who died on June 22,2002 after having served the University since 1974;Professor Emertius Jack R. Parsons of Social Work, who died on July 22, 2002 after having served the University since 1955.; Clinical Instructor Glenn E Talboy of Surgery, who died on September 24, 2002 after having served the University since 1995.

Be it 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.

Class C Information Item: Calendar Changes

Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn introduced Tim Washburn, Director of Admissions and Records, to explain the proposal. She also noted that this change is not one that requires faculty legislative action, but that the Senate was consulted early this fall for their input through the various councils.

The impetus for this change, Washburn began, came from complaints about the timing of the exam period and the holidays. Washburn discovered that it would be possible to start a calendar on Wednesday rather than on a Monday. He illustrated his proposal by

demonstrating how it would have affected the calendar this year. Additionally, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education George Bridges stated that he could use the preceding Monday and Tuesday for freshman orientation. Washburn showed another example based on fall quarter, 2004 in which there will be no compression. In both cases, we get a Monday through Friday exam schedule without any compression before the holidays.

The one impact may be that it may require that TAs be brought back a little early for training. The affected departments are working with the deans about the impact of this change.

Comments/Questions/

1. Bill Rohrback (History): Expressing his surprise about this proposed change, he recalled that Laurel Wilkening had unilaterally changed the calendar. While he liked the Monday - Friday exam period, he was concerned about the loss of a week in September in three out of the six year rotation period. He questioned whether this would be useful for people who travel to do research, although the tradeoff was a longer break. This calendar has worked since 1946, he claimed. His one suggestion was that if the proposal goes forward, that it not start in Fall, 2003 and rather, wait until Fall, 2004 since people have already scheduled events out that far.

Washburn asked about people's reaction to this since he is holding off on the printing of the wall calendars. The reason to do this next year would be to respond to the undergraduate program orientation changes. If we do not make this change, the orientation will have to take place on the weekend.

2. Comments from Carolyn Plumb (Chair, FCAS): Plumb noted that this was discussed at three different meetings, and most of the issues raised so far were discussed at length at these meetings. The Council passed unanimously.

3. Tina Emmerick (Chair, FCUR) made one comment: that she asked to have the lead-time and raised the point that it would overlap with Rosh Hashanah. The guidance they have been given is to avoid situations when the first day of the holiday and the first day of the quarter coincide. This was the arrangement with the rabbi that was consulted.

4. Margaret Rogers (Speech and Hearing Sciences): She discovered that that there are going to be discovery seminars this summer running from August 15th to September 15th and that because of the shortness of the break, she might reconsider participating in this program. In response, Washburn noted that these early fall classes would end on the Friday and then regular classes would begin again on the following Wednesday.

5. Steve Pfaff (Sociology): He commented that if you spend time doing fieldwork, this proposal is not so terrific since it cuts down the time you can be out in the field. You lose five days but over the entire period, there is a net loss of seven days in September which is a great disadvantage to scholars and to surrender it to instructional time might not be a great idea.

6. Sue Ellen Jacobs (Women Studies): She did a survey of the faculty she represents and everyone said that they did not like this proposal because of the fieldwork that they do and the summer grants that they hold. They have expectations based on the published calendar through 2007, and that any change should not be made before the 2004-2005 school year.

7. Katherine Cummings (English): She noted that the major convention in her field, the MLA, is at the end of December and that to her and her colleagues, the quarter that is a nightmare is winter quarter. Thus, she asked, why the focus here when the real problem are those first few days of January. Washburn noted that one of the proposed changes included is a winter quarter schedule change when January 1 falls on a Sunday and then classes begin on Monday. He proposes that we always leave one travel day between January 1 and the first day of classes.

Action

Jim Gregory (History) proposed that the body take an advisory or "straw" vote on the proposed fall quarter calendar changes. A "Yes" would be in favor of starting the changes in 2003, and a "No" would mean the changes should begin in 2004.

Vote: Yes - About 25% No – About 75%

A straw vote on the proposed winter quarter calendar changes yielded near unanimous approval on making those changes effective immediately.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Chair

There have been five meetings since the last Senate meeting and a number of topics have been covered. The SCPB has looked at budget allocation summaries, tuition, admission targets, and residency policies. Additionally, they will consider 2004 investments. Also, they continue to discuss workings of the *Faculty Code* sections on the reorganization, consolidation and elimination of programs in Chapter 26. The Committee has also provided information to interested departments and units.

The Board of Deans and University Budget Committee, which both advise the President, set the pacing of budget discussions. The last meeting of the quarter will be Monday, 9 December 2002.

New Business

a. Class C Resolution submitted by Senator Norman Wolf (Pathology)

The text of the resolution stated:

Be it resolved that the University of Washington Senate expresses a sense of disappointment and protest that the 15 member committee to pursue the choice of a new President for this great University includes only 2 faculty members. Since it is the faculty who will be most affected in their daily efforts in teaching and research by the choice made, the new President should be chosen only after major input from several delegates chosen by the faculty.

Wolf noted that he submits this resolution not meaning to derogate the faculty members appointed to the committee but to enhance representation from various parts of the University such as Arts and Sciences. Wadden noted that there are some deans that are involved in the committee. Historically, the committee has not had representation by

discipline. Wolf responded that he does not consider deans to be representative of the faculty as such.

Vote: The motion carried with the overwhelming majority of senators voting in favor of the proposal; about 10-15 senators voted no.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate