

**MINUETS OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**Gowen Hall, Room 301**  
**2:30 P.M., Thursday, 14 March 2002**

The meeting began at 2:40 p.m.

**Introductory Comments – Brad Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate**

Holt noted a number of upcoming events. First, Senators were urged to ask their colleagues to fill out and return the Faculty Council preference form. Next, there may be a number of pieces of legislation presented spring quarter. Because there will not be a discussion prior to the presentation of this legislation, Holt asked senators to review the legislation on the Senate webpage prior to the meeting.

Shifting to today's meeting, he noted that much of the focus will be on the budget. Faculty governance provides numerous opportunities for Faculty to be involved in budget decisions. The Senate does this largely through the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Similarly, each unit should have an Executive Council composed of faculty members that address budget issues at the local level.

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

Silberstein presented a two-part report regarding the passage last night of a state budget. Reading from an overhead, Silberstein noted that there will be a 5% cut, no general salary increase, and increased health care costs for employees. Additionally, the University may raise tuition for resident undergraduates up to 16%.

Silberstein's second focus was on issues pending before the SCPB. First, one item under discussion is the mix of resident and nonresident students. Having more non-resident students would add diversity to the student population as well as enhance tuition revenues. Another issue before the body is charging differential tuition for professional and terminal masters' degrees. A continuing item of discussion has been whether or not the University should adopt a high tuition/high aid model of funding. Obviously the University does not have total control over this issue; part of the decision is made by the legislature. Last, but not least, is the salary issue. The state has not funded salary increases yet the *Faculty Code* provides for 2% merit increases each year. This presents a stark issue: If the state has not funded increases, is the University required to pay the *Code* required 2% increase?

Mark McDermott (Physics) asked if there are other sources of funds that could be used for salary even if it is not earmarked for salary. Silberstein stated that it may be possible to use other sources, noting that the granted retention funds might be a source of salary increases. Jokingly, she noted, many of us will not be retained if we get no salary increase.

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

Passing on the budget because of Silberstein's and McCormick's presentations, Sjøvik noted that three bills related to collective bargaining were approved by the legislature this session. The first to pass allows recognition of GSEAC/UAW. A second bill that passed changed certain civil service requirements and will affect staff at the University. It will also allow bargaining over wages.

Last, the Faculty Collective Bargaining bill passed late the prior night. Quickly reviewing the legislative history to date, Sjøvik noted that a last minute amendment was added by Rep. McDonald that provided that if faculty chose to form a union, they would have to give up faculty governance. Preserving faculty governance, however, was one of the four points in the Faculty's Class C resolution last spring. The only resolution at this point is to ask the Governor to veto the offending sections, but this could be tricky. Although people have studied the bill today, we do not yet fully understand the implications of asking for an amendment. A preliminary assessment suggests that vetoing these two sections would still preserve faculty governance. If this opinion changes, and we do not believe that governance could be maintained, we would have to seek a veto of the entire bill.

Sjøvik yielded the floor to Holt who reviewed a handout of the Senate's Class C resolution of 30 November 2002 and the relevant sections of the bargaining bill. (Handout attached to archived copy.) He then noted that despite these amendments, McDonald did not strike the definition of Faculty Governance in Section 3 at parts (1) and (5). These sections might be used to suggest that faculty governance is preserved. Especially worth noting is Section 3.6 which suggests that a union and faculty governance can co-exist. The governor has three options: let the bill stand, veto the entire bill, or veto sections 2 and 5 in their entirety. No one, he noted, is worried about section 5 of the bill; the concern focuses on the effect of deleting section 2 of the bill.

#### Questions - Comments/

1. Gail Stygall (English) asked what the Faculty could do to encourage the Governor to take action. Holt replied that it would not hurt to write the Governor, and that the Governor has 21 days in which to make this decision. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, pointed out that state Ethics laws govern any contact with the Governor or the Legislature; state resources cannot be used to lobby.
2. A senator from Electrical Engineering: It appears that the proponent of the amendment knew that this would be a poison pill. So, in his opinion, it is a kind of "union busting" amendment. The irony is that McDonald used a factory model of collective bargaining in writing this amendment that does not pertain to the University.
3. McDermott (Physics) pointed out that McDonald did this same thing in 1983 at the last minute with the same hope of killing the bill.
4. Silberstein added that there is not a statutory right to Faculty Senate but we do have it and it has continued to work well.
5. A senator from the School of Fisheries sought to determine whether any decisions about the bill had been finally determined.

#### **Report of the President – Richard McCormick**

McCormick directed attention to the handout on the 2002 supplemental session, a comparison of budget proposals that had been prepared by JoAnn Taricani. "This is not a good budget for anyone," he began. For the University, this is a better budget than that proposed last week by the Senate but not as good as the House budget. The five percent budget is a big cut; it will be felt. To make matters worse, there are no funds provided for salary increases and McCormick agreed that the retention funds as well as tuition revenues could be used as a source for salaries. Whether salary is increased or not, health care costs will be increased. If there are no salary increases, then this will represent a cut in salaries. Finally, tuition setting authority was given in a much larger degree than previously,

although only for a year. McCormick remains confident that whatever the final tuition figure, there will be adequate funds for financial aid.

This budget, though, will bring real pain to the University. This will have an effect; the last time there was as great an impact was in 1981-82. The first effect of the pain will be that there will not be as much access to the University. All of the universities are over-enrolled. The freshman class will have only 4900 students rather than last year's class of 5400. Automatic admits are now based on a GPA of 3.7 and an SAT score of 1210. The next impact will be on transfer students.

Beyond the impact on those who will not be admitted, it will affect class size, the number of classes offered, and the mix of faculty who are teaching. The increases will also affect diversity. Administrative support services will be cut more than instructional services. All classes of employees will feel the pain of the budget cut. This is regrettable since all employee groups are under stress now – everyone is under compensated. We have seen an increase in tension at the workplace as a fewer number of employees do the same amount of work. The discussions will continue as to how to manage these cuts. The bottom line, sadly, is that the people of the state of Washington are not interested in investing in education. While we will try to turn this around, McCormick characterized it as a "tragedy," not just for education, but also for social welfare generally.

There is a bit of good news. For the first time, we will have authority to issue bonds for research facilities so we will be able to build more cheaply. McCormick was pleased to note that the TA legislation has passed, although there were several close calls. At this point, there will be a poll of GSEAC members. Assuming that the vote is favorable, then the University will proceed to bargain. Turning to the Faculty collective bargaining legislation, he noted that it has been passed in a form that requires a choice between shared governance and a union. This is an absurd result because Faculty are intimately involved in governance decisions affecting the University. To be perfectly clear, he stated that the University administration opposes the bill as passed. As for the idea of vetoing the two sections, we need to be assured that shared governance would be preserved. He and his staff need more time to study this as well as to consult with the Regents.

Finally, he noted that I-200 passed three years ago, requiring a substantial change in outreach, recruitment and aid. Although there was a decline the first year, there has been a steady climb in minority enrollments each year since then. This year, there has been a dramatic increase in black and more modest increase in Hispanic applicants. This is the result of joint efforts of faculty, administration and students. While we have not completed our work in this area, there is reason to be proud.

Finally, he closed with a story about a recent dinner at his home with the new Mayor of Seattle, Greg Nickels, his staff and six faculty. The Mayor stated that the University is central to economic development in the city, speaking with Faculty from the sciences and business. It was an extraordinary evening in which Faculty spoke about their research as well as their commitment and vision to education and the community.

#### Questions - Comments/

1. O'Donnell – Psychology: Noting that for those of us living in Seattle, it is easy to forget that we live in "the West" and that populism is the underlying political philosophy here. He suggested, tongue in cheek, that perhaps tarring and feathering, an old west custom, was worth thinking about. McCormick declined to comment directly on this observation.

But, continuing, O'Donnell asked, if the Governor signs this bill, will it be the only form of legislation that authorizes collective bargaining? Can we do something in the future? McCormick answered that yes, this would be the only legislation that authorizes collective bargaining and that amendments could be introduced in the future.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

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

Included in the agenda.

### **Announcements**

Elections for Senators will be held spring quarter. Notices will be sent to departments about the upcoming elections.

Tina Emerick, Chair, Faculty Council on University Relations, announced that the first person selected for an honorary degree, pending the Regents vote on Friday, is Desmond Tutu, who will make a presentation on 7 May 2002. The focus of his presentation will be on improving the health care of children in developing nations. There will be a convocation in his honor with a very interesting program in Meany Hall.

### **Requests for Information**

None.

### **Memorial Resolution.**

None.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

The following nominations were approved: Kim Buike (Naval Science, V) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards for a term ending September 15, 2004. Loree Hyde as the representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS) to the Faculty Council on University Libraries (voting rights left to the discretion of the council) for a term ending September 15, 2002. Lucien Brush (Materials Science & Engineering, Group VI) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2002. Randall Kyes (Psychology, Group 4) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2003. Marcy Stein (Education, Tacoma) as a voting member (replacing Suzanne Goren) on the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2004.

Class A Legislation – Second Consideration: Policies regarding Competitive Offers and WOT Faculty, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-40 and Section 24-71.

The Code advisory committee made one suggested change in this legislation that was highlighted in an overhead presentation.

Passed on a unanimous voice vote to go to the Faculty for a vote.

Class A Legislation – Second Consideration: Policies regarding Eligibility for Senate Membership, Volume TWO, Part II, Chapter 22, Section 22-43.

Passed on a unanimous voice vote to go to the Faculty for a vote.

**New Business**

None.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Bradley R. Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate