

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Gowen Hall, Room 301,
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 6 December 2001

Introduction – Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate

Holt began by thanking everyone for attending. The focus of his brief remarks was on the budget picture. Several of the reports today, as well as a request for information, will focus on that topic. Holt emphasized the central and active role of the faculty in budget planning. He stated that the Senate, through its committees and on an informal basis, has been actively pursuing faculty interests in regards to the budget. Faculty involvement, however, needs to take place at the unit level as well as at the University level because many of the important budget decisions take place at the unit level. He urged Senators to seek an open discussion of these issues within their units. The *Faculty Code* requires that each college, or similar unit, have an executive or college council that advises the dean on budget, curriculum and other matters. These councils play a central role in RCEP proceedings, but to do so, they must be fully informed. He urged Senators to speak with their elected representatives on these councils and invite them to departmental meetings. Holt stated that he would be glad to answer any questions.

Finally, the Request for Information will be moved up to accommodate the schedule of Harlan Patterson, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting.

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

Silberstein first inquired as to how many present had received her “e column.” This column explained initial information about the budget process in advance of the release of the Governor’s budget. The lowest figure she has heard in terms of higher education cuts has been 5%. This will be a lengthy process, and these cuts may well be permanent. Moreover, these initial conversations will set the tone for the budget discussions for the next biennium. It is important that everyone be well informed and that the multiple processes are as transparent as possible.

Like Holt, Silberstein emphasized the role of faculty involvement at the unit level. At the same time, she underscored one activity undertaken by SCPB. The group has been having discussions about priorities so that these have been reviewed before actually cuts have to be made.

Legislative Report – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig focused on the genesis and prospects for the budget situation. This problem began as soon as the last budget had been passed. At that time, there was approximately a \$350 million “hole.” The state budget is driven by revenues as well as mandated expenditures. On all fronts – K-12 schooling, welfare case loads, prison population – there were increased expenditures. Additionally, two initiatives passed that reduced the state revenue stream on one hand, and increased expenditures on the other. All of this adds up, in this case, to about a \$1.2 billion “challenge.” Two other pending issues will have an impact. K-12 teachers filed a suit on the status of non-state funded teachers; if successful, this will increase costs, as will a lawsuit regarding welfare costs.

The legislative session will begin on January 14th. The good news is that there is no longer a split in the House. The Governor has asked seven state agencies to present budget cut scenarios, and has asked higher education to consider cuts. The capital fund had been frozen. It is likely that the Governor's budget will be more friendly to higher education than to other state agencies. Items on the table will be a second year salary increase, tuition formulas, and capital construction.

What is our response going to be? The University would like the flexibility to manage these cuts internally rather than have them imposed by the legislature. Similarly, the University would like flexibility on tuition increases. In terms of priorities, the preference is quality over access. The University believes that the state should fund financial aid rather than forcing the institution to absorb this. Two things, at least, dictate these views. First, we are in the midst of a baby boom echo. Second, cuts can affect the University for upwards of ten to fifteen years, and yet the University is an important anti-recession tool.

Requests for Information

Harlan Patterson appeared on behalf of Provost Huntsman. First, he provided more context about the legislative budget picture. The University has suffered, like many state universities around the country, a three decades long slide in state support. This means that the University has been forced to look at other sources of revenue. While this is serious, the Administration is not panicking. The range of possibilities is quite broad, ranging from the draconian to tolerable. We will need to watch carefully and be diligent; so far, we do not need to make an abrupt response.

In the session, we will fight to minimize the cut and maximize our flexibility. We are looking at a variety of tuition and financial aid models. This fall, there have been conversations about priorities and possible areas for cuts. In the spring, there will be a broader community discussion.

There are some specific items that the Administration has begun to identify. Individual, and largely private, discussions have been held with deans and vice-presidents both about cuts and long-term opportunities. These discussions will become more public in March and April. They are committed to collaborative discussions but at this point, discussion is difficult because of the lack of information as well as the tentative nature of the plans. Priorities right now focus on maintaining quality, especially if we are going to ask for more tuition and contributions from donors. Our reactions should be in light of our long-term plans and prospects. These cuts will probably be permanent so we need to make "smart, long-term" decisions. These will all be aired in public forums. They are trying to avoid across the board cuts because these tend to erode quality. On the other hand, identifying acceptable targeted cuts will be difficult.

Sue Woods (Biobehavioral Nursing) asked about early retirement packages. There has been some discussion of this issue, but there really has not been enough information yet. They have been talking, however, about ways to provide health care coverage in a way that make this attractive. Retirements, however, do not always save money, and can leave holes in programs that demand replacements. Miceal Vaughan (English) stated that we have heard about 5% cuts. He asked at what point would the Administration think about a financial emergency? Patterson pointed out that this is difficult because there are three considerations: cuts, salaries and tuition. It is hard to assess until all three are in place. They are hoping to avoid a financial emergency; he does not believe that we are going to have to do this. Our one advantage is that we have some flexibility in setting tuition in a

way to help us adjust to cuts. They remain "cautiously optimistic" that this won't be a case. A faculty member from Oceanography asked why, if there was a reluctance to take across the board cuts, this had been the approach for the UIF program. The UIF program, in light of the report, will be moving away from this approach.

Report of the President

McCormick began by picking up the UIF question. At the time the program went into place, no one had a better suggestion for how to fund this program. They remain open to better ways to fund these initiatives.

McCormick underscored the accuracy and meaning of Holt's and Silverstein's remarks about the necessary and important role of faculty in budget decisions. While there will be disagreements, there will be discussion and consultation. The University continues to need, at the same time, to make the best case they can before both the public and the legislature for our need for support and flexibility. McCormick met with the Governor for an hour on Monday, and the Governor stated that universities, and this one in particular, are essential to economic recovery and development. The Governor is sympathetic to our request for tuition flexibility. Some of our students could pay higher tuition and the market could bear it, while others cannot. Our current tuition policy is regressive, and subsidizes wealth students (they pay about 30-40% of the cost of their education) and provides too little help for poorer students. The high tuition, high financial aid model attempts to address these inequalities. There are four sources of financial aid: federal government, state government, privately raised funds, and tuition revenues. It is unlikely we would get more tuition setting flexibility without providing for financial aid.

A second point that deserves emphasis is the long term re-orientation of our budget so that our dependence on state funds is lessened. This is not that we are going to give up on state sources, but that we need to adjust to the long-term and permanent decline in state funding

There has been little change in the TA negotiations, and the parties are still deadlocked over the issue of recognition. The administration, once again, will go to the legislature seeking enabling legislation. Current discussions have focused on academic issues. In his view, academic issues are not bargainable because those issues belong to the Faculty. Another area of disagreement is the inclusion of research assistants in the bargaining unit. The Administration does not see these people as part of the unit. A third issue is the extent to which compensation will be bargainable. The UAW has been surprised about the limits on compensation bargaining in this state because it is limited by the state appropriation. He does not know whether there will be a job action.

Questions/

1. Alan Hess (Finance & Bus. Econ.): What does the 16% refer to? McCormick confirmed that the 5% cut refers to the 16% of our budget that comes from state funding; thus it would be 5% of the dollars represented by the 16%.
2. One Senator pointed out that some research assistants are teaching. He wondered if that is recognized? McCormick said that they are making that distinction and trying to take out those on federal salaries who are doing research. Olson also expressed concerns about statements that are coming from the Provost's office regarding the continued employment status of potential strikers. The Administration thinks this is a factor that can be considered in re-employment evaluation.

3. One of the Senators from the School of Pharmacy asked for clarification of GSEAC's position regarding research assistants. McCormick responded that GSEAC would like all RAs in the unit. The Administration seeks to carve out those who are doing research.
4. Gail Stygall (English): She asked a question regarding Provost's letter, which she characterized as an invitation to fire TAs, and explained how it would upset the composition program. McCormick said that this is a decision to be made at the local level.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

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

Summary of Executive Committee Actions

These materials appear in the agenda. Holt commented that two special committees were appointed. The Fact Finding committee reported that GSEAC chose not to participate. The Junker Committee prepared a report with general principles upon which most agreed, but it was prepared for a faculty, not a public, audience. The SEC moved to adopt the principles of the report, and that it could provide the basis of a Class C resolution.

Announcements

The legislation on distance learning received no objections and became effective on 26 November 2001.

Memorial Resolution

ADD**

Nominations and Appointments

The nominations and appointments, as amended from the floor, were approved.

Nominations were:

- I. Cynthia Fugate as the representative of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) to the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (***voting rights left to the discretion of the council***) for a term ending September 15, 2002.
- II. Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees, ***with voting rights left to the discretion of the council or committee***, for terms ending September 15, 2002:
 - A. Representatives of the Professional Staff Organization (PSO):

Faculty Councils: Academic Standard, Richard Simkins, Educational Outreach, Bruce Bennett, Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Marge Baylor, Student Affairs, Bruce Bennett, University Facilities & Services, Denis Martynowych, University Libraries, Kirsten Spillum, University Relations, Anita Whitney

Special Committees: Faculty Women Karen Stromberg

- B. Representatives of the Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW):

Faculty Councils: Academic Standards, Will Rasmussen, Educational Outreach, Anthony Rose, Educational Technology, Luke Nervig, Instructional Quality, Lindsay Graff, Research, Sharon Takhar, Retirement, Insurance & Benefits, Nick Hamilton, Tri-Campus Policy, Kevin Futrell, University Facilities & Services, Tony Schulz, University Libraries, Eric Stride, University Relations, Jeff Anderson

Special Committees: Minority Faculty Affairs, Rita Gobran

Statement of the Candidate for Vice Chair

Silberstein moved that Douglas Wadden (Art) be nominated for a term as Vice Chair for the academic year 2002-2003, and to become Chair for the Academic Year (2003-2004).
[Remarks appended to archived copy.]

Class B Action on Honorary Degrees - Christina Emerick, Chair, Faculty Council on University Relations

Holt began the discussion by explaining the Class B legislative process. Christina Emerick was introduced to explain the history and background of the bill. This was an opportunity to celebrate the kind of environment in which we work, she began, one that celebrates creative and scholarly achievement. The Faculty is authorized, by state statute, to confer honorary degrees. She highlighted RCW 28b.20.130 in this regard. She commented that many colleges and universities confer such degrees. The ability to confer such degree would add to the special, celebratory nature of commencement and other academic convocations.

The plan of this legislation is to add a new section to Chapter 11 of the University Handbook. Emerick then outlined the proposed provision. She also explained that this provision has been under discussion for the last two years. The proposal originally came from the Office of University Relations and was brought to her Council. It was reviewed and revised in light of SEC comments last spring.

Moved, by Silberstein on behalf of the SEC. Cristoph Giebel (Int'l Studies) stating that he approves of the legislation, sought to clarify the meaning of the underlying state statute. He urged that we be sensitive about not recognizing contributions to politicians. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, noted that the Senate cannot amend state law. Another Senator said that this looked like a reasonable idea and that the motivation seemed appropriate. He wondered how often these awards will take place. Emerick said that the Council envisions this as a rare event, perhaps on a once a year basis to one person. We would not, she thinks, follow the Harvard practice of awarding twelve degrees at one time; they would not be conferred in absentia. Eric Smith (Anthropology) asked a question about the procedure. He was curious about the role of the faculty senate in making these awards, especially in the case of controversial nominees. Emerick explained that the Council would represent the Senate, and that the Council will communicate with the Senate and seek advice. As far as controversial individuals, she stated that there is no guarantee that these appointments will always be controversy-free. These nominations will depend upon the conscientiousness of the nominating groups, and upon the careful review of FCUR. The criteria and process will be public, but the actual, discrete discussions will be confidential given the potential for embarrassment for nominees. The Committee on Public Exercises, which also plays a role,

also has faculty members. In response to a question, Emerick said these will typically be doctorate degrees. Roland Maiuro (Psychiatry) asked whether conditions will be put on the use of these degrees. Emerick replied that the degrees will be labeled as such, and that most institutions are pretty savvy about their use and worth. She anticipates that a recipient would list it on their CV, a book dust jacket, etc. Vaughan (English) asked whether the legislation limits nominations from groups. Emerick stated that the point was to show that nominations come from faculty but that this is not meant to be the exclusive source of nominations. She anticipates that individual faculty who wish to nominate someone should get support from a group of faculty. This will help assure that good and comprehensive information has been gathered. Question called.

Vote: The motion passed overwhelmingly; there were only four no votes.

Class B Action on Undergraduate Admissions – Douglas Wadden, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards

Doug Wadden provided background for this proposal. Many of the changes were made necessary by the passage of I-200, a measure that restricts the use of race or gender in state decision-making. Because of the legal and policy implications of changes to admissions policy, a wide range of groups reviewed the legislation. In addition to making changes in criteria, it moves this into a Faculty Council. Thus, there would be a special Admission sub-committee to FCAS. While the Council reviewed this part of the Code, they also made some housekeeping amendments, for example, the math requirements. The preamble has already been reviewed and accepted by the Board of Regents. At the same time, some modifications were made that would provide for more flexibility in admissions. For example, rather than specifying a specific admissions test, it merely provides that testing can be required.

Silberstein moved adoption of the legislation on behalf of the SEC. Ashley Emery (Mech. Eng) suggested consistent use of the word "baccalaureate." Another Senator asked about the personal factors considered in admissions. While understanding that these criteria are to measure success at the University, he wonders if criteria that would include the ability to make contributions out beyond their attendance at the University. Wadden said that these concerns are encompassed by the procedure although it is not obvious. It is implicit here, citing the example of a talented musician. There is also a percentage for whom we can overlook any requirements. David Morris (Tacoma) asked about the distinctions drawn between the campuses. Wadden replied that the most obvious distinction that came to mind involved transfer students. There are operational elements that can be under local control and cited GPA requirements.

Vote: The legislation passed with only one dissenting vote.

New Business

None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

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

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