

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
301 Gowen Hall
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 18 April 2002

The meeting began at 2:38 p.m.

Introductory Comments – Brad Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate [full text of original statement included]

In my message today I want to talk about budget and, in particular, the Faculty Salary Policy. I sent you an email message outlining the Faculty Salary Policy that the Senate, the Faculty and the President adopted. Let me briefly summarize it.

It states that our highest priority is to be sure that the University provides at least some reward for the continuing faculty who have made this institution the success it is. As the Provost has suggested, this policy is an attempt to stop balancing the budget on the backs of continuing faculty. The priorities are:

- a salary increase for all meritorious faculty;
- a salary increase for all faculty promoted; and
- a salary increase for all faculty below the floor for their rank.

Only after the University had taken care of these priority items would funds be allocated for recruitment of new faculty or funds for retention of faculty or funds for additional merit or funds for unit adjustment and so on.

In determining the level of "guaranteed" funding, a figure of 2 percent for merit and 7.5 percent for promotions was agreed to because it provided a level high enough to have some meaning, but was a level that could be sustained even if no additional funds were available, by using recapture funds from vacant positions or other choices. These figures are part of an Executive Order to provide flexibility for situations where the University faces a budget situation so severe it is not able to fund the full commitment. The question this year, and as you will see, perhaps for the next few years, is: Are we in such a situation?

Let me talk a little bit about the budget and put it into context. Where were we? Last year we made a number of budget decisions increasing investments in different programs by over 28 million dollars. (Sandy Silberstein, in her report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, will talk more about this.) The result, however, was because of these investments, because of increased energy costs, and because of a number of other things, we carried forward a deficit into this year. And that deficit, again, is because of some of the priorities and some of the choices we made.

Where are we now? Well, partly we have to ask what did the state do? The state provided us with an 18 to 19 million dollars per year budget cut. They removed the money for salaries for faculty at four year institutions, while they supplied money for faculty at two year institutions to receive raises. They provided the ability to raise undergraduate tuition 16% -- undergraduate resident tuition by 16%, -- with unlimited authority for one year in all other categories. For individuals, the state has both increased the employee medical premiums and decreased the medical benefits.

What choices does the University have in light of the state action? I'll let Sandy talk more about the possible choices, but the summary of her talk is going to be that we have to decide on our priorities and do the things that are most important to us.

What does the future look like? The projected budget deficit for the next biennium, without any additional programs -- this is the state budget -- is on the order of 2 billion dollars. The forecast for the subsequent biennium is even worse. While these are forecasts, the message is clear: the state is facing a difficult situation for the next three to five years. The conclusion we should draw from this, as the Provost has, is that we need to take actions consistent with our long-term values and priorities, and not take short term sacrifices today, in the hopes that we will get it back tomorrow.

I realize there is not a common voice on what our priorities should be, or actually for that matter, on any other issue when it involves faculty. I have, however, come to believe that our best policy in these difficult times is to adhere to our agreement and the spirit of the existing policy which says that we should put people first.

While equipment, facilities and buildings are important, in determining our priorities for allocating resources we should remember that, in many ways, the faculty *are* the University. We write the grants that generate the research funds that pay for students and staff. We write the books and papers that challenge and change the way we think about and view our world and the issues. We design the curriculum and teach the courses that educate our students. The success of this University is largely due to the efforts of the continuing faculty.

Given that faculty salaries are an average of 15 percent behind our peers; they are on average 25 percent behind our peers (when including cost of living); with the knowledge that come January 1st everyone's paycheck will be reduced because of the increased costs of medical benefits, and finally with a state budget picture that promises continuing hardships for the foreseeable future rather than a one-time blimp; I believe that our first priority should be to the faculty that are responsible for the success of this institution, and that all meritorious faculty should receive the 2 percent merit raise. I might also add that I believe that putting people first also means providing a raise for professional staff and librarians who are invaluable to the success of this institution.

Finally, let me note that all our opinions are just advisory to the President and the Provost, who will make recommendations to the Board of Regents. I believe their choices will be important signals for the future of this University. In one sense, 2 percent is not a lot of money--it certainly won't close the gap with our peer institutions; it probably won't keep people up with the cost of living. But in another sense, 2 percent *is* a lot of money. It provides a signal of the priorities of this institution; it provides a hope that even in the most difficult times to come that efforts will be made to reward the faculty for their success; and it provides the promise that when better times come, the University will attempt to close the gap and properly reward faculty for their efforts. Thank you.

Report from the Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Sandra Silberstein, Chair

Silberstein began by explaining the 2001-2003 supplemental budget in which there was a \$1.543 billion shortfall. Projecting out to the 03-05 biennium, another large deficit is expected. Where has the revenue gone? Silberstein highlighted the cuts that the University has taken in the last ten years. And then, yesterday, we learned that the Legislature buried

a budget provision in which they assumed that we had frozen the budget and recaptured \$600,000 of funds in that fashion when in fact, we had not.

At this point, we need to focus on what will promote the excellence of the University. This should be discussed, however, against the backdrop of the University's budget picture. We operate on a carry forward budget. All of the items in the budget express priorities, and those priorities differ depending upon whom one talks to. The issue this year is where there would be new monies for salaries. The exercise that is now taking place at all three campuses has to do with how to balance the budget given the priorities and wishes of various parts of the University. This will call for setting priorities. In that regard, she called attention to the statement issued by Western Washington University in which the Administration detailed its priorities, including faculty salaries, for the coming year. She also displayed a copy of the different budget topics under discussion to illustrate the shapes of the discussion around campus.

Legislative Report – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig first reviewed the outcome of the legislative session. Measuring our success depends upon "how you look at it." Many legislators feel that higher education did well compared to other social services. Enabling legislation for both TAs and Faculty passed this year. Facilities funding was also a priority and was approved. On the other hand, the higher education retirement plan changes did not get through. And, as we are all aware, there were steep budget cuts.

Ludwig used this year's budget as an opportunity to describe the trend in funding. In 1991-93, the state contributed 73% of the support for higher education while tuition supplied 27%. At this point, 52% of our support comes from the state while 48% comes from tuition. With this funding structure, Ludwig characterized the University as becoming a "private" institution. This growing reversal in revenue sources is an important shift in our funding and Faculty need to discuss the ramifications of this change.

Questions/

1. Ken Bube (Mathematics): What happened to the McDonald amendment in the Faculty Collective Bargaining bill?

The governor vetoed the two offending sections. There is hope that the damage done by the amendment will be corrected in the next session.

2. Norm Wolf (Pathology): Is there a reason for saying that we become a "private" institution?

Ludwig replied that he used this term because it describes our relationship to the state as increasingly the students pay for their education rather than the citizens of the state. This same model, i.e. revenues based on tuition, is found at private universities.

3. Ed Burns (Speech & Hearing Science) How is the state support/tuition trend calculated?

Ludwig explained that this comes from the funding formulas. Lee Huntsman (Provost) added that this formula pertains only to undergraduate education.

4. Warren Guntheroth (Pediatrics) He noted that if graduate student expenditures are added, then the proportion of the budget revenues based on tuition is even larger. Ludwig agreed, and noted that there are three legislative reactions to this: disbelief at the figures, dismay at the trend, and hearty agreement with the trend.

Report of the President – Richard McCormick

Addressing the budget, he noted that there had been one bright spot – a recruitment and retention fund that was unfortunately vetoed by the Governor. McCormick felt that this veto was premature, coming before budget forecasts, and inconsistent with his stated support of higher education. Thus, the results are grim. Conversations are underway all around the University with the widest variety of people possible. There will be a number of opportunities to discuss the situation

We do know that the pain will be very real. A smaller number of students will be admitted next year, although some of this is the result of prior decisions. Sadly, the people of Washington have decided to walk away from providing access to higher education. This year, entrance requirements for the freshman class are a 3.7 grade point average and an SAT combined score 1210. And, if you do get in, it may take longer to graduate because of the loss of faculty positions (He illustrated this point parenthetically by the following hypothetical example: 4% loss would equal 40 faculty and 40 grad assistants.). Added to this is the reality that tuition will be higher for all students. Administrative portions of the University will take higher cuts than departments and schools that fulfill our educational mission. Everyone feels the pressure of these cuts, and there is added stress in the workplace.

Meanwhile, we have a choice about how we take the pain. Should we take deeper cuts so that we can provide faculty and staff salary increases? Should we take deeper cuts to make investments into research infrastructure? Should any portion of the University be exempt from cuts? How high should tuition be? We can raise it up to 16% for one year for undergraduate residents, and we have no limits for other categories of students. We will need to make clear decisions and communicate our reasons for the decisions that we make.

We are in the process of making thoughtful strategic decisions. There will be differential cuts at the same time there will be some investments. And, research funding is going up. Holt and Silberstein have addressed the funding of salaries, but he noted that this would lead to deeper cuts. Should we make deeper cuts so that we could make some strategic investments? Finally, there is a question of how we should set tuition.

There will not be a “one size fits all” solution to this problem. Similarly, we would be foolish to believe that we can recapture these lost funds at a later point. We will have to rely more on federal research support, entrepreneurship, self sustaining programs, and development.

Questions/

1. Mary Hebert (Pharmacy): Is it likely that the legislature will reduce or reverse the tuition increases in the future?

McCormick thought it was unlikely as long as we behave rationally. The more likely scenario, if they disagree with our decisions, is that they may take away the authority to set

tuition locally. There is an expectation that we will take the 16% increase for undergraduates.

2. Anthony Gill (Political Science): Would you provide more specificity as to likely administrative cuts? Has cutting the UIF been discussed?

The UIF decisions were made last July 1st, and those programs will also have to face cuts but we will not pull the plug on the investment. We will need to discuss and decide this fall whether to proceed with new UIF programs.

As to specific administrative cuts, we do not know exactly where those will take place. All of the services with the possible exception of grants and contracts are likely to be diminished. Practically everything that is done centrally will be strained as service becomes slower. The effort will be to protect the academic heartland.

Gil expressed the view that he is concerned not only about the UIF tax, but also the personnel costs of the UIF program. The UIF programs draw faculty away from core programs and leaves the remaining faculty to cover the same core. This causes stress and tension in the departments. McCormick noted that there has never been a complete consensus about this program, but that most feel we need to have some way to fund new programs and initiatives. In his opinion, pulling back money would not be the solution. All UIF programs will face cuts, but the plug will not be pulled on any new programs.

3. Warren Guntheroth (Pediatrics): Noting a statement from Rep. Jacobson, many legislators believe that the Faculty are against giving more control to the Regents, as opposed to the Legislature. He believes that this is not true and sought how we might express the Faculty's opinion on this issue. McCormick stated that there is no particular urgency right now but it might be worth considering a resolution this fall before the 2003-05 budget discussions begin.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:19 and the agenda was approved.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions

These actions are summarized in the agenda.

Announcements

Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn made two announcements. First, we need more Faculty to staff the Adjudication Panels. Senators were asked to suggest senior faculty who are fair and thoughtful for this appointment. Second, at the next meeting, elections for Group Representatives will be held before the formal Senate meeting begins. She reminded senators of the need to arrive early, and also asked senators to consider standing for election for this important post.

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 Assistant Professor John Davison Collins of the School of Medicine, who died on March 16th after having served the University since 1947; Assistant Professor Emily Harris of the School of Social Work, who died on March 19th after having served the University since 1935; Professor Emeritus Hans Neurath of Biochemistry, who died on April 12th after having served the University since 1950. 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 A Legislation – First Consideration: Regular Faculty Conferences, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-57C and D. Charles Haley, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Standing in for Prof. Haley, Kate O'Neill (Law), as the chair of the subcommittee that drafted this legislation, also presented it. About two years ago, the Faculty substantially amended the *Faculty Code* to provide for regular planning conferences. (Holt addressed some perceived problems that had emerged in the last two years.) These are planning conferences and are to be distinguished from merit salary conferences. This distinction is at the core of the problems leading to the amendment. In some departments, there really was not a planning conference but only a salary review. Faculty were surveyed and 164 faculty responded to a very open ended question. 35% said the conferences were working and 48% said that either they were not or were not being held. A final 17% were not really responsive. This information was taken back to the Council and the proposed legislation was developed.

The goal of the changes is to clarify for faculty and chairs that these conferences are to be separate from the merit reviews. The legislation outlines the content of the conversation in goal setting as well as discussing whether the individual's goals are consistent with unit goals. Finally, changes are made to clarify the documentation that must be provided as well as how disagreements about the documentation will proceed.

Discussion/

A senator from Pathology, noting that there are 70 faculty in his department, stated that it does not seem possible for the chair to hold all of these meetings. Holt noted that the yearly requirement applies only to assistant professors and lecturers; other faculty are seen on a less frequent basis. Moreover, these conferences can take place at any time in the year, distinct from the merit reviews. Holt also stressed that these are vitally important meetings because they contribute to faculty development. He noted that there are separate provisions in the *Code* that address merit reviews. Additionally, there are many local variations on how these conferences are held. Because these had been confused with the merit discussions, they had all been taking place in the spring. O'Neill noted, that at the behest of Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, that language providing that the dean or chair's designate can hold these conferences was added.

Jan Spyridakis (Tech. Comm.) noted that while the goal is to make these two types of meetings distinct, the language of the amendment is not quite as clear on this point. Holt commented that part of the point of these conferences is to give people flexibility in their careers. So, for example, if someone wanted to write a book for the next three years, that focus would be considered in the merit review. Thus, you would be held to a mutual agreement rather than other, external criteria. It makes the merit review consistent with

what was agreed to between a unit head and a faculty member. O'Neill pointed out that this is an opportunity for faculty to generate documentation of their workloads. Thus, if there is a modification, it will be documented in the file.

Continuing, Spyridakis asked about identifying duties. She suggested that the proposed language goes against the spirit of collaboration. O'Neill noted that this was softened from the language that was originally proposed. Spyridakis moved that the word "discuss" be substituted for the word "identify" at the end of Sec. 24-57C. Steve Buck, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, noting that he was party to some of the Senate Executive Committee discussions about this, stated that the previous portion of this section does use the word "discuss" and that the second paragraph recognizes the idea that there must be a conclusion to these discussions. Thus, the word "identify" was more appropriate. Tom Engel (Chemistry) said that the objection we heard could also be addressed by inserting "and the faculty member" before "shall identify." This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Craig Sheppard (Music) asked why not say "discuss and identify." This was also accepted as a friendly amendment. Warren Guntheroth (Pediatrics) said that he believed that these changes are helpful because otherwise it sounds like the chair decides the issue and this makes it more equal.

Final Proposed Amendment (additions underlined): *The chair, dean, or his/her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32.*

Vote: The proposed amendment passed on an overwhelming favorable card vote.

In the event resolution is not achieved, a senator said that there should be report regardless. She suggested that we strike the words "In the event resolution is not achieved." O'Neill noted that if resolution is achieved, the chair would rewrite the document so that the proposed amendment may misperceive the dispute resolution process. The senator moved the following amendment: "If the committee reaches a resolution, the chair shall revise the document and resubmit it." O'Neill expressed her opinion that she did not believe that this is necessary, especially since the resolution is between the chair and the faculty member. Sean O'Donnell (Psychology) noted that a prior section covers this and renders the proposed language unnecessary. A senator from Ophthalmology stated that it was not clear what the group would do to facilitate a resolution. O'Neill said that this was discussed in a great degree of detail in the committee. The idea here is to get someone other than the faculty involved for some fact finding and mediation; they are not intended to have power to impose a decision.

Proposed Amendment: *At 24-57D, at the penultimate paragraph, strike the phrase "In the event resolution is not achieved, . . ." and substitute "If the committee reaches a resolution, the chair shall revise the document and resubmit it."*

Vote: With three affirmative votes, the proposed amendment failed on an overwhelmingly negative vote.

Next, one senator proposed an amendment that stated, "If both chair and faculty member agree, the conference may be conducted by email. The results shall be certified by the chair and sent to the faculty member." Responding to this amendment, one senator expressed concerns that these conferences should be confidential and that this confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if e-mail is used. Vaughn, speaking as employment

lawyer, disagreed strongly with the proposed amendment, citing the need for confidentiality in personnel matters and noting that the proposal misunderstands the nature of the conferences as face to face opportunities for a planning discussion. The proposing senator noted that the use of e-mail would be mutually consensual and optional. Another senator suggested that the proposal to do this by e-mail, coming from a chair, might be seen as undue pressure. Charles Haley, Chair, FCFA, said that the purpose of this conference is future oriented, rather than a review of the past. The idea here is that it is highly desirable for the parties to sit down and discuss where they are going. E-mail would be counter to the spirit of these conferences.

Proposed Amendment: (location not identified) *If both the chair and the faculty member agree, the conference may be conducted by e-mail. The results shall be certified by the chair and sent to the faculty member.*

Vote: With only one affirmative vote, the motion failed.

A senator from Ophthalmology raised concerns about the dispute resolution mechanism in small departments, and suggested that the ad hoc committee be composed as adjunct faculty as well. Another senator pointed out that school or college language gives some flexibility on the ad hoc committee's members. Olswang pointed out that the legislative intent of this section was that committee members be regular voting faculty members who know the local conditions and issues. He did agree that this could be a problem, however, in smaller departments. She asked that we develop some language that would recognize and address this situation.

Another senator asked what documents will form the source of assessing the needs of the department. O'Neill stated that all departments are required to have a strategic plan, but they did not want to refer to it specifically so this is something of a fudge factor. This faculty member was concerned that in some cases, the chair might determine goals in a more coercive manner and impose them on the faculty. Holt said that it may be a concern, but pointed out that you do not have to agree with the proposed duties.

Referring to the discussion about small departments, Olswang and Vaughn proposed a small department exception. After the phrase, "superior in rank to the faculty member," they proposed that the following language be inserted "or from members of the Conciliation Board." The Conciliation Board is established to provide this type of service on all three campuses. So moved. The word "faculty" was added before "members" as a friendly amendment.

Proposed amendment (addition underlined) : *In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference document, the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior (or in the case of full professors, equal) in rank to the faculty member, or faculty members from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner. At 24.57D, fourth paragraph.*

Vote: Approved by an overwhelming card vote.

Paul Tseng (Mathematics) asked a question about the identification of the duties for faculty. Does the word "identify" mean that there is a requirement that these be specified. O'Neill said that the intention of the drafters was to be specific because ultimately one might be evaluated as to whether the duties were performed. Could the word "identify" be removed,

he asked. Holt pointed out that the word "identify" still provides a great deal of latitude. Local culture will develop how specific these agreements need to be and there will be some differences depending upon the rank of the faculty. Buck pointed out that this document is for the protection of the faculty and that faculty benefit from identification of duties and expectations.

Proposed amendment (addition underlined): *The chair, dean, or his/her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32.*

Vote: The motion easily carried on a card vote.

Susan Nolen (Education) pointed out that the last piece of the amended language draws attention to the promotion and tenure guidelines. This has come up in her department. The question was whether merit was removed from promotion and tenure. If assistant professors meet all of these goals, should this be a guarantee that tenure will be achievable? What is the connection between these reports and tenure? Holt replied that there is a connection with the merit review documents. The faculty input during the merit process will tell junior faculty that they are on track. Colleagues voting on merit would be the safeguard for learning of the expectations for tenure. Vaughn explained that this does not allow assistant professors to negotiate a change from the *Code* requirements for promotion and tenure. Olswang added that it is needed to be clear for both faculty and chairs that they could not agree to expectations that are inconsistent with the *Faculty Code*. Another senator asked whether it would be clearer if the following language were to be included: "Shall supercede any agreement made under Section 24-57." O'Neill said that this is intended for a reasonable world and is a way to document what was reasonably expected of a person. She opined that the proposed amendment would undermine the intent of the provision. Moved: Section 24-57 is intended to be consistent with the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24. Buck stated that he felt this gave even less warning to faculty. Thomas Lumley (Biostatistics) supported the original wording because this might lead to greater misunderstanding down the road at tenure. Dan Jacoby (Bothell) said that part of the point is to cut down uncertainty. Promotion and tenure will be assessing quality of performance over a long period of time while these may be focused on a one year period.

Proposed amendment: Strike "*Nothing in Section 24-57 is intended to alter the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.*" (at the end of Ch. 24-57D) and replace it with "*Section 24-57 is intended to be consistent with the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.*"

Vote: The proposed amendment failed on overwhelming card vote.

Philip Spiers (Pediatrics) stated that the phrase "at its earliest convenience," may mischaracterize the types of disagreements that occur. It appears they look at just the records of what was said but most disagreements will be about the reasonableness of the duties assigned. O'Neill said that the intent is the more limited goal of making sure that the conference document reflect the content of the document; it is not intended to mediate the duties. No one would be willing to serve on such a committee.

Finally, one senator wanted language about the conference document that assures faculty that they will not be involved with something that is going to be inconsistent with

institutional standards for promotion and tenure. It was suggested that the phrase "and how these are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24" be inserted after "The conference documents shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and responsibilities of the faculty. . . ." A friendly amendment added the following: "and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent."

Proposed Amendment: *After "This conference document shall also articulate . . .," insert ", and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24."*

Vote: Amendment carries.

Vote on main motion as amended: Passes with an overwhelmingly affirmative card vote.

Class A Legislation – Lecturer Titles and Duration of Appointments. Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Sections 24-34 and 24-41. Charles Haley, Chair, FCFA.

This legislation, Haley explained, would provide more job security for lecturers and to recognize their contributions. It recognizes that for some members of our community, the choice to be a lecturer is an intentional one and should be honored. This legislation recognizes this decision and rewards lecturers who are outstanding in this capacity. He also highlighted the standards for an appointment as principal lecturer.

A motion to change the term of the appointment failed.

The main motion, without further amendments, passed unanimously.

New Business

None.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 pm.

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