

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**301 Gowen Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 25 October 2001**

**Introductory Comments of Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt**

Brad Holt began his remarks by noting how many positive, good things are happening at the University. We have an overabundance of students who have applied and are attending the University because of its excellence in teaching, research and service. He also highlighted excellence in grants campus-wide and in the medical center. But, he stated, there are some problems; given the projections about the budget, it is likely that there will be budget cuts and that they may well be more severe than in the past. At the same time, state support for the University has been dwindling. This budgetary crisis, however, is also an opportunity to talk about our values, and he invited Faculty to be involved in those discussions.

Another activity that Holt spotlighted was the Faculty Councils. While all Councils can recommend legislation, their role is actually far broader and he plans to feature different Councils over the course of the year. To that end, he introduced Steve Buck, Chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach (FCEO). This Council's jurisdiction includes policy oversight of distance learning, extension and summer school. Then, he introduced Doug Wadden, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). FCAS is charged with oversight of the academic affairs of the University and covers just about every undergraduate academic issue such as new programs, course approvals, etc. One issue that FCAS will review this year is a new admissions policy.

Next introduced was Christina Emerick, Chair, Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR). FCUR has been working on standards for the award of honorary degrees and will be bringing this issue forward soon. Charles "Chip" Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) was the last person introduced. This Council, in short, addresses matters pertaining to the Faculty employment relationship. One issue to be reviewed this year is a revision of Chapter 24 in light of recent experience. Another issue that FCFA is considering is the status of instructors and lecturers. Finally, the Council may consider the salary policy. One element of that policy includes unit adjustments that are made across the board to the salaries of departments whose salaries are out of line for their ranking. A new policy might suggest reviews on a more regular basis.

Last, Holt addressed the issue of communication. He will stress the role of communication this year, and encourages people to talk to one another. A list serve has been set up for legislative groups, and the "glitches" are being fixed. Greater use will also be made of the Senate web page for posting information. Senators should also contact their group representatives about issues. At the same time, Senators should also be contacting faculty in their voting unit. Senators should, for example, ask for some time at faculty meetings to let their colleagues know what issues are under discussion at Senate meetings. Holt and Vice Chair Sandra Silberstein have let every dean know that they would be glad to attend departmental faculty meetings. He concluded by saying that the Faculty is better served when there is open communication flowing between the Senate and the Faculty.

**Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting - Sandra Silberstein, Vice Chair**

Silberstein, alluding to the events of 11 September 2001, began by saying that the budgetary issues have taken on new urgency as state budget forecasts have changed for the worse. The Governor has asked all of his division heads to prepare plans for 15% cuts although the University has not been asked to do this. But, this does not mean that the University will escape and it might face cuts as high as 10%. This is largely because the Governor will not raise taxes nor go into reserves, and must protect certain constitutionally and statutorily protected parts of the budget such as K-12.

It is in this context that SCPB is performing its work. Initial discussions have focused on different models of budgeting that the University might adopt. At the same time, new forecasts and budgets will be available at the end of November. Asking that the messenger not be blamed, she noted that deans have been advised to look at Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) regulations in Chapter 26 of the *Faculty Code*. She expressed her hope that the Administration will be listening to the Faculty as these difficult decisions are made. In answer to a question, Silberstein said that the budget cuts would be prospective.

**Legislative Report – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative**

Ludwig addressed upcoming plans for Enabling Legislation. He reminded the senators that this body has endorsed the idea of collective bargaining on several occasions. This became a live issue when the WEA presented a collective bargaining bill that purported to include the University. We opposed that bill because of problems in the bill and the fact it was prepared without our consultation. Another big problem is that it did not protect our shared governance tradition. But, as a result of the legislation, Senate leadership realized that we need to take more pro-active steps in regards to legislation, and ultimately a Class C resolution, containing four principles regarding Collective Bargaining Enabling legislation was approved. Using an overhead, he discussed the four principles that pertained to one bargaining unit, preserving shared governance, impasse/grievance resolution, and a no strike/no lockout provision. With these in mind, a small subcommittee began drafting legislation last year. The timing was not ideal, however, because of pending legislation regarding teaching assistants. Therefore, an agreement was reached with the Administration on development of a joint collective bargaining bill. From there, the joint group has gone forward to develop a bill for submission to the next session of the legislature.

Stephen Schwarz (Pathology) asked why the right to strike was not included in the legislation. Ludwig responded that it was highly unlikely that, as public employees, we would get that right since it is not typically given. He pointed out that there are other ways to bring pressure. Schwarz had a follow-up question regarding the complexity of the campus, posing a hypothetical involving the Bothell campus. Ludwig replied that all three campuses act together as one unit under the Class C resolution.

**Report of the President**

McCormick welcomed the opportunity to address the Senate and reaffirmed the Administration's commitment to shared governance. It is the only way we can work together to achieve University excellence.

September 11<sup>th</sup>, he remarked, has changed all of our lives, each in a different way. Our culture will certainly be different and we cannot predict what all of the changes will be. This has, however, made clear our responsibility as a University to present information about the crisis to the public. All of the lectures, so far, have been given to overflowing crowds. On 11 October 2001 the University also spent a day in reflection and engagement. This crisis underscores our obligation to prepare our students for global citizenship. We need to think more earnestly about what that means in a deep and abiding way. A second responsibility is to focus our expertise on global human challenges: medical, economic, and those of the human spirit.

Unfortunately, given the budgetary picture, doing so will be difficult. September 11<sup>th</sup> only made the budget picture worse. The budget will not be cut this year but that may mean that the July 1, 2002 budget cut will be twice as large. We will all have to work together on what measures we should take. He promised that while we may not all agree on the results, he will make these decisions "in the sunshine." There will be full campus wide conversations about these issues. Yesterday, he had the opportunity to speak with Governor Locke and expressed his gratitude for protecting the University. Locke acknowledged this expression of gratitude but said he was "protecting, not exempting." This is unfortunate because many departments are as much as 26% behind their national peers, and this is before the cost of living in Seattle is considered. Therefore, we need to develop other revenue streams. We may need to move to a high tuition, high financial aid model like that of the University of Michigan. Summarizing, he said that we have a duty to preserve the excellence of the University in a way that preserves access and excellence.

Another issue he addressed was the TA situation. Provost Huntsman sent out a message on 19 October 2001 regarding where we are on these issues. McCormick stated that he feels we have made a lot of progress on the TA issues, particularly on health care and childcare. The crux, however, has been the issue of recognition. McCormick stated that the University cannot recognize the Union, legally, as the exclusive representative of the graduate students. They can be recognized, however, as the representative of those students who wish for that representation. The Administration will go down to Olympia again in January 2002 to seek this legislation. The Attorney General has opined that there must be enabling legislation before there is exclusive recognition. McCormick fears that in denial of that legal reality, there will be a strike of some type that will disrupt operations. Its effects will most likely be concentrated in certain departments, and many angry undergraduates have complained about the grade of "credit" they got rather than a numerical grade last spring. He expressed the hope that a strike could be averted.

McCormick concluded by drawing attention to Lee Hartwell's Nobel Prize award as standing at the top of the list of achievements recently garnered by University Faculty. His research on yeast genetics sheds light on human cell behavior that may aid in the development of cures and treatments for cancer.

#### Questions for the President

1. Wolf (Pathology) asked if the twenty other recognized unions did so pursuant to legislation. McCormick responded that all of those relationships are governed by legislation.
2. O'Donnell (Psychology) followed this up by asking what harm would occur to the University if we recognized the Union. McCormick responded that we would be breaking the law for starters. Also, such recognition would start us on a path of great peril as to

those who do not or have not consented to representation. Also, there are also no legal guidelines for the conduct of the relationship.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:24 p.m. The agenda, as printed, was approved. If business cannot be concluded today, a continuation meeting will be held next Thursday, 1 November 2001.

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

There was a special meeting on 1 October 2001 at which two special committees regarding the TA situation were formed. Both will be preparing reports for submission to the SEC.

### **Announcements**

1. Nominations for position of Senate Vice Chair are open, and Holt urged people to consider applying.
2. Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn announced that Group Rep elections for a second representative for Group VII would be held electronically before the next SEC meeting.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

Holt directed the attention of the body to agenda item 9. Silberstein presented the motion. Additional nominations were presented from the Librarians. All were Approved.

### **Memorial Resolution**

Silberstein presented the Memorial Resolution.

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues: Clinical Associate Professor Richard M. Briggs of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on June 2nd after having served the University since 1971. Professor Emeritus Harry Cross of School of Law, who died on October 10th after having served the University since 1943. Professor (wot) Charles C. Gale of Physiology and Biophysics, who died on May 26th after having served the University since 1964. Clinical Associate Professor George Lawrence of Surgery, who died on October 13th after having served the University since 1958. Professor Emeritus Richard Meese of Civil Engineering, who died on October 10th after having served the University since 1946. Assistant Professor Emeritus T. Gervais Reed of School of Art, who died on September 24th after having served the University since 1950. Professor Emeritus Robert Rushmer of Bioengineering, who died on July 13th after having served the University since 1947. Professor Emeritus John Streib of Physics, who died on October 5th after having served the University since 1947. Professor Emeritus Paul E. Strandjord of Laboratory Medicine, who died on June 29th after having served the University since 1969. Professor Emeritus Morgan D. Thomas of Geography, who died on August 6th after having served the University since 1959. Professor Kent Ueland of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on June 1st after having served the University since 1960. 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.

Class B Action: Review of Legislation Pertaining to Distance Learning – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards and Steve Buck, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Outreach

Holt began discussion of this issue by explaining the different classes of legislation. As Class B legislation, if it is approved by the Senate, the legislation is sent to the President for his approval. Within ten days of that approval, it is sent to the Faculty. If five percent of the Faculty at the Seattle campus should object, or 2/3 of the Bothell or Tacoma Faculty object, it is sent back to the Senate Executive Committee. Finally, he noted that this legislation was developed jointly by two councils, as he introduced their chairs.

Wadden explained the two year process by which this legislation was developed. Last spring, an informational presentation was made to the Senate in which the current legislation and the proposed legislation were explained. Currently, distance courses may have a "C" prefix and there are residency requirements, etc. Why new legislation? Their goal was to assure that distance courses would be fully comparable to regular courses and provide guidance to faculty on the use of these courses. We need this legislation to assure that Faculty are a part of the course approval process for distance learning, to assure quality of these courses, and to bring the University up to date. Otherwise, these courses can be introduced with no standards at all.

Buck explained that the legislation has four principle features: (1) A new set of classes notated by a "DL" suffix; (2) A review process for both courses and programs, (3) Grades would count towards the undergraduate GPA; and (4) assignment of faculty responsibility for the staffing and content of the courses. It would make changes in several portions of the handbook, including the 45-credit campus residence requirement. Using a computer presentation, he highlighted the provisions of the legislation.

### **Debate**

Mark McDermott (Physics) complimented the Councils for arriving at this legislation. He wondered what the reaction to this legislation would be since there is no clear definition of what *is* a DL course in the legislation. Buck explained that the FCEO would develop a set of guidelines that will provide guidance to Faculty and Departments. These would be "best practices." Student motives taking these classes vary, and Faculty will probably respond to these. Wadden added that they initially looked for definitions of what a course is and discovered that most of this definitional material appears in the Operations Manual. Moreover, in the course of writing this legislation, there was great, and widespread resistance to trying to arrive at a one size fits all definition of these courses. Hebert (Pharmacy) asked for a clarification: Does this include professional school students? Wadden said that the Graduate School programs do not come under this. This is only for bachelor's degree programs. Another senator endorsed this legislation because of the number of students who do not live in the I-5 corridor. Guntheroth (Pediatrics) asked whether anything in this legislation addresses the taking of examinations, because there is a danger of paying someone to take a student's examination in the distance learning format. How can we be sure, he asked, that the person who receives credit is the one who took the examination. Buck explained that UW Outreach has a system for proctored exams that requires students to go to a location and take the examination. Wadden said that we are not the first to do this and that the Councils did look at other places that have developed policies and identified what the problems are. We are, in fact, behind the curve on this. O'Donnell (Psychology) asked about the 90 credit figure. Buck responded that it was based on what was already there for a category of courses that had the same type of idea.

Wadden said there are a variety of practices on this. This is the current policy, and they tried to find a middle ground.

Sheppard (Music) asked why distance learning grades were not included in GPA in old system. Buck answered because the courses were not faculty reviewed, but under the new one, they will be. Another senator asked that given that we are discouraged from grading on attendance and encouraged to do web contact, what makes distance learning different from a regular class? Buck replied that the HEC Board has a definition of a DL course in which they list five methods of content delivery and say if the content is 51% or more of these five methods, then it is DL. But this is an area that we need to talk about, he continued, and there will be interesting boundary questions. Finally, he suggested that the Handbook is not the place to define this difference. Keith Holsapple (Aeronautics and Astronautics) asked about the reference to degree programs, and asked for a clarification of that language. Buck replied that currently, there are no DL degrees but there are units that are contemplating such programs. This would provide guidance for those departments and demonstrates the need for some legislation now. This would not be any different than any other degree approval; it would go through the same process as regular degrees. We can always modify later if it does not work.

Anthony Gill (Political Science) asked for a long term estimate, based on what is going on in peer institutions, of what expected student demand for DL to be. He also asked whether Buck foresees any move by administration that departments offer a certain percentage of DL courses. Replying, Buck stated that students have mixed feelings about DL, but that the bottom line is that they do not like to be surprised – they want to know up front if a course is a regular one or DL. That said, it is hard to say what the mix is. This legislation is not intended to open the door to rampant DL use. On the second question, McCormick added that the University has no requirement of imposing any requirement of a percentage of DL courses. This is a local decision. Engle (Chemistry) explored the extent to which a DL instructor be integrated into a department. For example, in his dept, these courses do not originate in the department. How is coordination achieved? Buck noted that there are about seven courses in his department. For the last decade, they have made an effort to have regular departmental staff teach these courses along with their regular classes. Part of the point of this legislation is to get away from the model that Engle described. This means that the department will have more responsibility for these courses. Wadden pointed out that the department must approve staffing arrangements.

At this point in the debate, there was a motion to call the question. Holt pointed out that a 2/3 vote was required for this non-debatable motion. The motion to call the question passed.

**Vote: Approved with only two or three dissenting votes. No abstentions.**

### **New Business**

None.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty  
APPROVED BY: Bradley R. Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate