

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
26 October 2000
301 Gowen Hall

Introductory Comments of Faculty Senate Chair Mary Coney

Mary Coney began the first meeting of the academic year by reminding senators of the long tradition of faculty governance. The Faculty Senate passes legislation that affects the professional lives of the faculty and shapes the University environment. She proceeded to review some of the accomplishments of the last several years including the Openness in Tenure legislation, the new salary provisions and the legislation pertaining to WOT faculty. Similarly, there will be important work this year, beginning with the first reading of legislation pertaining to research faculty, which had been tabled at the end of last academic year. Before turning to this issue, Coney highlighted issues that Councils have identified for action during this academic year:

- Enabling Legislation (FCFA)
- Tri-Campus Legislation (FCFA)
- Distance Learning (FCAS, FCEO)
- Teaching Awards (FCIQ)
- Honorary Degrees

Other issues may arise, and Coney referred to the graduate student teaching assistants' demand for recognition and bargaining as a situation the Senate will need to monitor. Faculty have expressed a wide range of views regarding TA unionization, and she may have to call a meeting in the future to address this issue.

Senators will be consulted for advice on behalf of their colleagues as well as to play a vital role in shaping legislation. Thus, it is important that Senators communicate with their colleagues about the issues. To help senators prepare for this role, Coney alerted senators to a handout that outlines Senate procedures. As she concluded her remarks, Coney introduced colleagues who play special roles in the process: Group Representatives, Council Chairs, the representatives from the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, the Vice Chair, the Secretary of the Faculty, the Parliamentarian, both Faculty Legislative Representatives and the Chair's Cabinet. She also introduced the staff in the Faculty Senate office. All senators and faculty are invited to drop by 36 Gerberding.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Brad Holt, Vice Chair, noted that the Committee has already met four times for background briefings to bring people up to speed on various budget issues. For example, there have been discussions about the University budget proposal. Also, there have been discussions on tuition setting and he suggested that senators may want to consult Dean Marsha Landolt's report on tuition, which is on the web. As part of this discussion, the Committee looked at the approaches of other schools and reviewed some studies on the impact of setting tuition at different levels. Graduate tuition levels have also been examined, especially whether we should move to a model of differential tuition for various graduate and professional programs. Holt concluded his remarks by noting that there are a number of issues that will be reviewed this academic year in addition to the budget: the UIF programs, faculty salaries, recruitment and retention funds, and unit adjustments.

Coney used this occasion to inform the Senate about the faculty's involvement in the UIF review process. Faculty will be sitting on a panel that will review the entire program. She asked senators to stay alert to this issue, noting that there will be an open meeting in the late winter.

Legislative Report

Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative, presented this report. He began his remarks by describing the various faculty bodies, both here and at the other Washington campuses that participate in the budget process. The next legislative session will begin on 9 January 2001, and much will turn on the upcoming election. Because this will be a budget year, Ludwig pointed out some budget highlights:

- A high priority request for increased faculty and staff salary
- A recruitment and retention pool request of \$15 million (\$9.3 million for faculty)
- A request for new enrollment of 700 students, divided among the three campuses
- Funds for an outreach and diversity program
- Capitol requests for new construction and modernization
- Start-up funds for the Bothell and Tacoma campus programs

At the same time, there are significant budgetary factors that may play a role in faculty prospects. First, the I-601 spending limits continue to influence the budget, especially since we are near budget limits. This may affect the type of salary increase that can be given as well as suggest that increased benefit costs may play a role in a salary vs. benefit trade-off.

There are five initiatives on the November ballot that have potential budgetary impact, and all of them appear to have a chance of passing. They include:

1. I-728: K-12 2000 Student Achievement Act
2. I-732: Cost of Living Increases for K-12 and Community Colleges
3. I-745: Traffic Improvements
4. I-722: A limit on Property Taxes
5. I-729: Charter Schools

Each of these will either increase expenditures or decrease revenues in a way that will affect the General Fund. Ludwig carefully explained the dynamics of funding under I-601.

Finally, Ludwig commented on Enabling Legislation. The legislative representatives have not been active in sponsoring this legislation, and it is virtually certain that a bill, much like last year's, will be introduced in the upcoming session. We need to be prepared this time, and he noted that he has been working with the FCFA and the legislative representatives at other schools.

Coney introduced the student representatives at the conclusion of Ludwig's remarks.

Report of the President

After thanking senators for this chance to speak, McCormick noted that he recently gave his Annual Address on the State of the University. Achieving the goals outlined in his address will depend upon the good will of the faculty and their involvement in shared governance. In the first part of his remarks, McCormick reviewed the contents of the Diversity Compact and explained that these are long term goals that are essential for creating a climate on campus in which all people are welcome, and can do their best. He noted that the conversation about diversity was really sparked and energized by student involvement last spring. McCormick called attention to the new Brotman Diversity Award, which will be for excellence in diversity programs.

Next, McCormick addressed the graduate students' quest for recognition and collective bargaining. He prefaced his remarks by underlining the ways in which graduate students are essential to the university community as future scholars and leaders. While they are here, they are vital to our teaching and research mission. The

students have raised a number of concerns, and the University faces the same difficulty in addressing some of those issues, such as salary levels, as they do with the faculty. Other issues are unique to graduate students, e.g. uniform teaching loads between departments. These and other issues have led them to work with the United Automobile Workers (UAW) to seek recognition, something which the University is not prepared to do at this time. Several reasons inform this decision. First, McCormick felt that the introduction of the UAW into the relations between faculty, graduate students and the University would be harmful. Second, the University already has methods in place for addressing these concerns. These bodies are effective and on-going participants in the shared governance that characterizes this campus. He cited the example of the health insurance initiatives undertaken last spring. In the upcoming legislative session, the University will be seeking extra salary funds for graduate students to help them meet the high cost of living in the Seattle area. Dean Marsha Landolt is chairing a committee that seeks to address some of the non-economic issues that are of concern to graduate students. McCormick noted that a union will not change the legislative realities at the University. There are also legislative concerns regarding a union. Currently, there is no enabling legislation that authorizes higher education collective bargaining so there is not a legal framework for shaping the relationship between the two parties. For example, what would the bargaining unit be? What issues would be bargainable? Legislation would resolve some of these issues.

This is a difficult situation. McCormick stressed that no one in the administration is adamant or ideological about this issue. It may well be that a time will come in which the University administration will need to work with the graduate students on enabling legislation. But he didn't believe that this time had come. In summary, he noted that the University administration is open-minded and listening.

On the same subject, he alerted the faculty that there will be a job action vote next week, and it is important to prepare for that possibility. He expressed the hope that the faculty would commit to the goal of protecting students' learning experiences. What that will mean will differ between different departments, and faculty will have to make decisions. He emphasized flexibility, stating that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution. McCormick stated that he realizes that faculty opinions may differ on this issue and that a wide range of opinions is within the faculty purview. At the same time, he hoped that faculty will join him to ensure the continuity of students' educational experiences.

McCormick then amplified Holt's remarks about a UIF Review, noting that he had promised that this program would be marked by accountability and careful review. The reviews will be available to the faculty. In the spring, working with the Senate, the entire program as a whole will be reviewed. A distinguished panel, including two faculty members, will be appointed to review the entire program and produce a public report. McCormick emphasized his belief that a University of this caliber needs a program that will enable it to take advantage of and respond to new opportunities.

Closing, McCormick directed senators to review the handout that he had brought which outlines the budget requests. Ludwig already covered many of these items, but he asked that Senators follow the development of the budget. He called attention to the request for Diversity Outreach funds.

Questions and Answers for the President

1. Storti (Engineering) pointed out that there has been no official faculty position taken on the graduate student recognition issue, so that the President should distinguish between University and administrative decisions. McCormick acknowledged this

point, and accepted the distinction but hoped that the faculty will engage in discussions about this issue and that a University position will emerge. Storti also noted the Regents' recent raise granted to McCormick, for which McCormick expressed gratitude.

2. Gastil (Speech Communications), noting that he had been in a graduate student union, asked McCormick which argument he regarded as the strongest for collective bargaining. While he could not speak for graduate students, McCormick stated that despite his own description of shared governance with graduate students and the successes on economic issues, he thought that many of them wished for even stronger representation.
3. Kuterdam asked to make some remarks, and proceeded to explain that GPSS and GSEAC are fundamentally different. They agree there is a responsibility for protecting the educational experience but that can be done if the administration recognizes GSEAC/UAW and avoids a job action. GSEAC would protect some rights that GPSS cannot.
4. Giebel (International Studies) asked why the salary increase is called a "keep up" increase when we are actually behind. Both McCormick and Provost Lee Huntsman responded. It was difficult to decide how to characterize the budget request for faculty salaries. Given the grim realities of the state budget process, they had to decide whether to ask for only an inflationary increase or whether they should join with other four year institutions in making a uniform salary request which would be more likely to garner legislative attention. There was a need to strike a careful balance here.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

Meeting was called to order at this point and the agenda, as amended, was approved.

Summary of other Senate Executive Committee Actions

Coney directed Senators to look at the printed agenda, in which the actions were summarized.

Announcements

Coney used this opportunity to give the final votes on the legislation that the Faculty approved in June. There were two pieces of Class A legislation that went to the faculty for a vote last spring quarter, and were approved. They both became effective on July 7, 2000.

- ◆ The first was the WOT legislation, which changed the procedures for handling WOT appointments and funding. There were 2,950 ballots sent out. 712 ballots were returned: 613 were for, 70 were against, and 29 were abstentions.
- ◆ The second piece of legislation was to update and change the procedures for adjudications. There were 2,950 ballots sent out. 712 ballots were returned: 655 were for, 26 were against, and 31 were abstentions.

Memorial Resolution

The minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Clinical Professor William Blake Baker of the School of Medicine, who died on September 26th after having served the University since 1961; Professor Emeritus Frederick Bergseth of Electrical Engineering, who died on July 23, 2000 after having served the University since 1947; Clinical Professor Richard I. Birchfield of Neurology, who died on July 2, 2000 after having served the University since 1960; Associate Professor Emeritus Mary Boozer of Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, who died on August 9, 2000 after having served the University since 1956; Clinical Professor Ernest M. Burgess of Orthopedics, who died on September 27th after having served the University since 1948; Professor Emeritus Mildred Disbrow of Family & Child Nursing, who died on October 3, 2000 after having served the University since 1968; Professor Emeritus David Figge of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on June 16, 2000 after having served the University since 1953; Professor Rodger C. Haggitt of Pathology, who died on June 28, 2000 after having served the University since 1984; Clinical Associate Professor Walter S. Keifer of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on August 8th after having served the University since 1960; Professor Harry "Bud" Knudson Jr. of Management and Organization, who died on June 9, 2000 after having served the University since 1958; Professor Emeritus Jacob Lawrence of the School of Art, who died on June 9, 2000 after having served the University since 1970; Professor Emeritus Robert Loper of the School of Drama, who died on July 7, 2000 after having served the University since 1967; Professor Emeritus Arthur Martin, Jr. of Zoology, who died on July 25, 2000 after having served the University since 1937; Clinical Associate Professor and former Executive Director of the University of Washington Medical Center Robert Muilenburg of Health Services, who died on September 20, 2000 after having served the University since 1978; Professor Emeritus Stanley Murphy of Mechanical Engineering, who died on September 11, 2000 after having served the University since 1958; Professor Emeritus Hermann Pundt of the Schools of Architecture and Art, who died on September 17, 2000 after having served the University since 1968; Assistant Professor Geraldine Shevlin Swenson of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, who died on June 10, 2000 after having served the University since 1959.

The senate chair is directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

Nominations and Appointments

Subject to the additions that appeared on the agenda and on the overhead at the meeting, the nominations and appointments were approved.

The Executive Committee nominates for Senate appointment, effective immediately:

- I Christina Emerick (Oceanography, III) as **chair** of the Faculty Council on University Relations, effective immediately, for a term ending 2001.
- II. Barbara Krieger-Brockett (Chemical Engineering, VI) as member and **chair** of the Special Committee on Faculty Women, for a term ending 2001.

- III. Levis Kochin (Economics, IV) as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits, effective immediately, for a term ending 2003.
- IV. Jay Johnson (Paper Science & Engineering, VI), as a voting member of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, effective immediately, for a term ending 2001.
- V. Michael McCann, (Political Science, IV) as a member of the Campus Security Committee.

VI. The following staff members to the Adjudication Panel :

Term ending 2003:

- Karen Zaugg (Facilities Services),
- John O'Laughlen (Psychiatry & Behavioral Services)

Term ending 2002:

- Stacy Waters (CARTAH)
- Marianne LaCrosse (Educational Partnerships)

Term ending 2001:

- Monica Banks (Equal Opportunity Office)
- Karen Crowder (Training and Development)

VII. Nominate, for Senate appointment effective immediately, Brunilda Amarilis Lugo de Fabritz, as a student member of the Adjudication Panel for a term ending 2001.

VIII. Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees, for terms ending 2001:

A. Representatives of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (*voting rights left to the discretion of the council/committee*):

Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards	Karen Liston
Educational Outreach	Nancy Huling
Educational Technology	William Jordan
Faculty Affairs	Carla Rickerson
Instructional Quality	Peter McCracken
Research	Tim Jewell
Retirement, Insurance & Benefits	Charles Chamberlin
Student Affairs	Angela Lee
University Facilities & Services	Richard Jost
University Libraries	Helene Williams
University Relations	Diane Grover

Special Committees:

Minority Faculty Affairs	Ju-yen Teng
Faculty Women	Susanne Redalje

B. Representatives of Research Faculty (*with vote*):

Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards	Karen Moe
Educational Outreach	Santica Marcovina
Faculty Affairs	Ludmila Chistoserdova
Instructional Quality	Randall Kyes
Research	Florence Sheehan
University Libraries	Cathryn Booth
University Relations	Michael Regier

Special Committees

Faculty Women	Rimli Sengupta
---------------	----------------

C. Representatives of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS) (*without vote*):

Faculty Councils:

Instructional Quality	Kathleen Cook
University Relations	Jamie Clausen

Special Committees:

Minority Faculty Affairs	Judith Pine
--------------------------	-------------

D. Representatives of Retired Faculty (*voting rights left to the discretion of the council/committee*):

Faculty Councils:

Academic Standards	James Morishima
Educational Technology	John Bjorkstam
Faculty Affairs	Norman Rose
Instructional Quality	Ellis Evans
Research	Ed Perrin
Retirement, Insurance & Benefits	Ernest Henley
Student Affairs	Jack Hatlen
University Facilities & Services	Martha Fales
University Libraries	[Mary] Ellen Soper
University Relations	Rheba de Tornyay

Special Committees:

Minority Faculty Affairs	Spencer Shaw
--------------------------	--------------

E. Representatives of the Professional Staff Organization (*without vote*):

Faculty Councils:

Educational Outreach	Bill Rogers
----------------------	-------------

Educational Technology	Karen Schmitt
Instructional Quality	Karin Stromberg
Research	Kevin Williams
Retirement, Insurance & Benefits	Marge Baylor
Student Affairs	Bruce Bennett
University Facilities & Services	Denis Martynowych
University Libraries	Kirsten Spillum
University Relations	Anita Whitney

F. Representatives of the Administration (*without vote*):

Faculty Council on Academic Standards:

Dean, Undergraduate Education, Frederick Campbell
 Executive Director, Admissions & Records, W.W. Washburn
 Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Tom Colonnese

Faculty Council on Educational Outreach:

Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary

Faculty Council on Educational Technology:

Vice Provost, Educational Outreach, David Szatmary

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs:

Vice Provost Steven Olswang

Faculty Council on Instructional Quality:

Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, George Bridges
 Director, OMA Instructional Center, Emile Pitre

Faculty Council on Research:

Assistant Controller, Grant & Contract Accounting, Susan Camber
 Director, Grant & Contract Services, Carol Zuiches
 Vice Provost for Research Alvin Kwiram

Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance and Benefits

Vice Provost Steven Olswang
 Interim Assistant Director, Human Resources, Benefits, Kathleen Dwyer
 Director, Retirement Center, Patricia Dougherty

Faculty Council on Student Affairs:

Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs, Eric Godfrey
 Associate Vice President, Minority Affairs, William Baker
 Associate Dean, Graduate School, Elizabeth Feetham

Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services:

Assistant Vice President, Facilities Services, Jeraldine McCray
 Assistant Vice President, Capital Projects, Frederick King
 Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration, John Coulter
 Capital & Space Planning, Director, Marilyn Cox

Faculty Council on University Libraries:
Director, University Libraries, Betty Bengtson
Director, Health Sciences Libraries and Information Center,
Sherrilynne Fuller

Faculty Council on University Relations
Associate Vice President, University Relations, Norman Arkans
Director, Community Affairs, Bridgett Chandler

Special Committee on Faculty Women
Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick
Director, Women's Center, Sutapa Basu

Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs
Assistant Vice President, Minority Affairs, Tom Colonnese
Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Helen Remick

Elinor Adman (Biological Structure) as the Research Faculty representative (replacing Ludmilla Chistoserdova) on the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (with vote), effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2001.

Kirk Beach (Surgery) as the Research Faculty representative on the Faculty Council on Educational Technology (with vote) effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2001.

Richard Simpkins as the Professional Staff Organization representative on the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (without vote), effective immediately, for a term ending September 15, 2001;

Thomas Williams (Technical Communication) as the faculty member on the Student Publications Board, effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2002.

Johnnella Butler as an administrative representative on the Special Committee on Minority Faculty (without vote), effective immediately for a term ending September 15, 2001.

David Roberts as the joint ASUW/GPSS member (with vote) on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2001.

ASUW representatives, without vote, on the following councils for terms effective immediately and ending September 15, 2001:

Jasmin Weaver on the Faculty Council on University Relations;

Dave Winsor on the Faculty Council on Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits;

Presentation by Dick Thompson, Director of Government Relations

Thompson gave a very informative presentation about the historical and political context of the budget in Washington State. First, he noted that the westward movement of the railroads shaped the Washington State constitution. For example, the drafters limited state lending of credit or gifts of public funds, created a weak executive branch in which many of the positions are elected rather than appointed, and provided for an elected judiciary. This results in enormous decentralization, and makes both the initiative and referendum processes very influential in this state.

It is also important to describe the political landscape here. Here, he sees politics in three parts. The first is traditional partisan politics in which there are two major parties, Democrats and Republicans by and large, involved. Another part of the mix is the divided geographic politics of this state. The predominant divide is between Eastern and Western Washington. This “Cascade Curtain” plays a central role in our politics. A second divide is the “Lake Washington wall.” This is the difference between Democratic Seattle, on one side, and the largely Republican Eastside. The last divide is between the Puget Sound region and the rest of the state, and this is mostly a difference in economic development.

These divides are accompanied by institutional politics in the state. Here, the first example would be the difference between the executive wing and the legislative. But this breaks further into differing philosophies that mark the House as distinguished from the Senate. In the ways that these operate, “top down” is not an accurate description of state government. Instead, Thompson chose the word “starburst” to describe the operation of the differing institutional bodies within the state. He ended by noting that with these complexities, it is hard to put our needs and requests into a “sound bite.”

Questions and Answers

1. Storti (Mechanical Engineering) noted that earlier the idea that we “don’t get it” tends to temper legislative requests. Isn’t it, he asked, the other way around? Thompson noted that we need to honor the context here, and understand that the legislature has to deal with a lot of other issues. Thus, legislators need to believe that we understand the press of these other issues in order to be a part of the discussion. If we do not demonstrate understanding of these competing demands, we risk being ignored.

Thompson ended by clarifying some numbers about health benefits, and noting that he and the members of his staff have already held numerous meetings with legislators.

Class A Legislation: Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 32. Sections 32 & 43 and Chapter 24, Sections 34 & 53. Voting Rights for Research Faculty – First Consideration

Coney provided a brief explanation of Class A legislation and the process it must go through before it becomes part of the Faculty Code. She then called upon Bob Holzworth, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, to introduce the legislation. Referring to an overhead copy of the legislation, he pointed out that this issue has been studied and deliberated for over a year. He estimated that in most cases, there would be a ten- percent effect from the research vote. The issue, as he depicted it, is whether

the research faculty's contributions should be recognized by giving them the vote. The matter was then opened to discussion.

In response to a question, Holzworth noted that the treatment of research assistant professors does vary in different departments. He also stated that while the Faculty Code governs faculty employment relationships for all faculty, currently, research faculty do not have a voice in its formation. Additionally, he stated that many research faculty teach students. Chavonda Jacobs-Young (Forest Resources) raised a question about whether research faculty are qualified to judge assistant professors in a promotion and tenure vote. Holzworth responded that the Council was reluctant to break the legislation into little pieces, and that research assistant professors would not be voting on tenure. He stressed the importance of giving research faculty a voice and opined that he thought it unlikely that research faculty would express opinions about faculty with whom they are unfamiliar. Dorothy Paun (Forest Resources), developing the concerns about tenure and promotion, cited, generally, examples in which there was direct competition for a faculty line between a research associate professor and a tenure track assistant professor. That is, if the assistant professor failed to get tenure, then the research professor might be able to move into the tenure track slot. Responding to this, Holzworth thought that the Openness in Tenure legislation would make it more difficult for this to happen because "prejudices would be out on the table." Also, this would not promote collegiality. Sam Wineburg (Education) picked up on Paun's concerns by pointing out that the tenure vote is still done anonymously, and that research faculty have a completely different experience and may not fully understand the criteria that are used in the tenure decisions. Holzworth countered by noting that even among tenure track faculty, that faculty may review people in somewhat different fields than themselves so he discounted this argument.

As the discussion continued, Kathleen Blake (English) asked whether research faculty would have an obligation to perform service, which is traditionally part of the tenure decision. Holzworth noted that the legislation is silent on this point, but that he thought that if they got the vote, then they would have this responsibility. He also noted that service is not required because the department does not pay their salary. He hoped that this would change if they were to be given the vote. Douglas Underwood (Communication) suggested that the legislation be adopted but that the right to vote on tenure be deleted from it. Marcia Killien (Family and Child Nursing) noted that she has worked for many years with research faculty and would feel comfortable giving them the right to vote on tenure, and believes that they have the integrity to participate in this process. Moreover, they deserve to have more rights. Holt added a historical perspective. Earlier, there were two lines of research faculty. About five or so years ago, the research faculty was required to teach. But then we changed the code and then faculty had to decide whether they would be involved in teaching, or whether they would conduct research only. He also said that experiences with research faculty differ between departments.

At this point, Coney asked that debate be moved along in the interest of time. Alternatively, we could have a continuation meeting next Thursday. John Gastil (Speech Communications) spoke both about the exclusion of assistant professors and about the conflict of interest problem, and on the latter issue, he felt that we needed to see if there is actual data on this issue, and perhaps postpone this to the next meeting. Frank Vincenzi (Pharmacology) stated that collegiality is important and that we should honor research faculty contributions, and that they should have the right to vote. Vince Gallucci (Fisheries) suggested that we think about teaching contributions more broadly when we think about the contributions of research faculty, and tie this into the WOT designation. In response to a question, some information was supplied about the

numbers of research faculty employed at the University. Niels Anderson (Chemistry) recalled that at last spring's SEC meeting that one reason that assistant professors were removed from the legislation is that sometimes the title is not given in a meaningful fashion. Warren Guntheroth (Pediatrics) said that this issue has been around for a long time. He encouraged people to vote in favor of the legislation, watch what happens and remember that it can be amended to address problems. Jane Koenig (Environmental Health) asked about how to amend the legislation to include assistant professors. Coney tried to clarify what she meant, stating that she could make an amendment that research assistant professors could be added to the legislation. Koenig made a motion to this effect which was seconded. Before a vote could be taken, Holzworth cautioned care in making amendments, pointing out that we would need approval of the entire faculty and that the political realities suggest that this legislation will not pass if assistant professors are added. On vote, the motion passed. Coney then directed attention to the original legislation as amended to include assistant professors.

Then, Doug Underwood (Communications) moved that the legislation go forward as written but that the part of it that relates to giving research faculty the right to vote on tenure and promotion be removed. Seconded. Kochan (Economics) discussed research on the competition issue that had been done by a former colleague. Again, the differing nature of research faculty expectations was raised as it pertains to tenure and promotion. Provost Huntsman reminded the faculty of the protections that are in place during a promotion and tenure vote to put this issue in perspective. Storti (Mech. Eng.) stated that he felt this implicated the merit salary process also. Coney asked Underwood to explain the amendment again; it would exclude research faculty from voting on promotion and tenure. Then, the question was called. The amendment passed, and Coney focused the body on the main motion as amended. Holt raised a point of order. He asked whether the body could vote on the motion without the specific language since the motion was in principle, and did not refer to the numerous places in which the Code addresses promotion and tenure. The Parliamentarian repeated Holt's question and recommended that it be sent back to the SEC for amending, and that the amendments be worked out. Holzworth pointed out, by way of counter-argument, that this may be an appropriate job for the Advisory Committee on the Code. Storti said he thought that the Advisory Committee would be unhappy with this outcome since they were not present for the debate. Coney ruled that a vote would be appropriate, and then restated the motion. Holt called a point of order. Again, he doubted that the body could pass legislation without having the exact language, and noted that the procedure would be irregular. Coney suggested a motion or that it could be tabled while we wait for specific language. Kathleen Blake (English) moved to table the motion to the next meeting. Holzworth questioned whether this is the motion we wanted or whether we wanted the SEC to work on the language. The motion to table passed. Despite this, a motion was made to ask the drafting group to develop language on both the assistant professor provision and on the promotion and tenure provision. The question was called, and the motion on drafting the legislation carried.

Discussion: Enabling Legislation

Coney referred the body to the draft of Class C legislation on this topic. Given the time, there would not be time for a discussion. She and Holzworth asked the senators to take this resolution back to their colleagues for discussion. Holzworth briefly explained the history of this resolution before the FCFA, and noted how a wide variety of constituencies had been consulted prior to drafting the resolution. He directed senators attention to the four features that the FCFA felt were essential features of any legislation,

and explained the reasoning behind each provision. It will be discussed at the next Senate Executive Committee. Coney added that there would be ample time at the next meeting to discuss this issue.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Mary B. Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate