

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**301 Gowen Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Thursday, 19 April 2001**

The meeting began at 2:36 p.m.

**Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting - Brad Holt, Vice Chair of the Senate)**

Holt quickly described the recent work of the Committee on developing budget priorities and strategies. Much of this work had been done as part of budget exercise that Holt had designed in which committee members worked with the actual budget to develop their budget priorities before discussing the priorities as a group.

He also mentioned that he had investigated and resolved a matter involving the use of social security numbers for parking permit applications.

**Legislative Report – Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative**

Although today's Senate meeting marks the 102<sup>nd</sup> day of the 105 day legislative session, Ludwig began by noting that there is no House budget yet, and blamed this on the 49/49 split in the House. Given this, the Legislature will go into a special session. He characterized current drafts of the House budget as closer to the Governor's budget, and noted that there was no separate tuition bill although there was language pertaining to tuition in the budget. Also, the House seems more inclined to fund financial aid to meet any tuition increases. In response to a question, he noted that there probably would not be a provision for differential tuition in the House bill.

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

At 2:47 p.m., a quorum having been achieved, the meeting was called to order. The agenda was approved with the deletion of Item no. 11, pertaining to Honorary Degrees, because that topic was still under discussion and not ready for presentation to the Senate.

**President's Report**

McCormick's initial remarks focused on labor relations at the University, and he asked Karen Kavanaugh, Vice President for Human Resources, to speak. Kavanaugh reported that the TA legislation did not make it out of the legislative process, but that GSEAC has agreed to extend their agreement with the University, and to continue "meet and confer" sessions. At this time, there are thirty-four proposals on the table. On another front, given the threat of statewide public employee strikes, she expected that there would be picketing at the University on 20 April 2001. Most of these demonstrations would be held at campus entrances rather than at the medical school or at dormitories.

McCormick then resumed his remarks, commenting on the future of financing the University. He announced that on 25 April 2001, there would be a campus-wide open meeting to discuss budget and finance issues that face us. The Administration has put together a website with additional information regarding our budgetary choices, which he characterized as "tough." It is even more disheartening because our tight economic picture is not the result of a cyclical downturn but is rather the result of vote initiative choices. It

will be important to discuss support for research at the University, noting that only 15% of our support comes from the state, and is likely to decline. At this time, UW is first in federal research support among public universities but our space is limited and we need to think about research infrastructure. Another source of income will be self-supporting programs, although he acknowledged that not all programs can be placed on a self-supporting footing. Finally, it will be important to develop our fund raising capacity and that the upcoming, seven year funding campaign will be an important part of our financial future. In response to questions, he noted that the meeting is so that Faculty and other members of the community can express their views and deferred to Provost Huntsman regarding a question on the details of our indirect funding costs.

### **Report on the University Initiative Fund – Mary Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate**

Coney began her report on the University Initiative Fund Report by thanking Nancy Hooyma, Dean, Social Work, and the other members of the review team for their hard work. This project, she reported, was begun under the Senate leadership of Gerry Philipson and the Year 1999-2000 Senate Executive Committee. She described the report recommendations as "Solomonic" and urged senators to discuss the report with their colleagues. Referring to the overhead screen, she reviewed the two page executive summary. The group suggested keeping the program, but changing its sources of funding (phasing out the unit tax by UIF 7) as well as ending unit specific proposals.

During questions and answers, Guntheroth (Pediatrics) opined that the program should be stopped now. In his view, the program is a subsidy for research while educational programs suffer. Storti (Mechanical Engineering) questioned the review committee's belief that funding would be available from other sources. At this point, McCormick noted that the full report will be posted on a University website. Martin (Oceanography) asked how the word "significant" would be treated (no tax in years of "substantial" budget reductions) but McCormick replied that the report is not even in final form yet so he had not had time to think through all of the recommendations, let alone act on them. Finally, Coney noted all of the opportunities for Faculty involvement, including a web-based survey, in the process in response to Guntheroth's remark that there should have been a poll of the entire faculty.

### **Announcements**

Coney announced that the Faculty and the President approved the Research Faculty legislation and that it became effective on 5 March 2001. Research Faculty will now be involved in all areas of faculty governance except promotion and tenure decisions. Second, the Tri-campus legislation has been similarly approved and became effective 9 April 2001. Finally, there will be a reception for Senators after the last meeting on 24 May 2001, and Coney expressed her hope that all would be able to attend.

### **Requests for Information**

Several faculty raised pointed concerns about classroom assignments and "multiple bookings" of classrooms this year. Huntsman apologized for these problems and stated that they were due to the \$9 million classroom renovation project. The renovation work is almost done. On the issue of scheduling, Huntsman announced that it needs to be "reinvented" with new criteria given the growing use of new technologies in the classroom.

Storti raised an objection to the siting of a facilities shed adjacent to the Burke-Gilman trail.

## Nominations

The nominations were approved as printed on agenda item nine.

## 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: Professor Emeritus Arnold Arons of Physics, who died on February 28th, after having served the University since 1968. Professor Donald F. Gordon of Economics, who died on March 15th, after having served the University since 1950. Professor Emeritus Neal B. Groman of Epidemiology, who died on March 31st, after having served the University since 1950. Professor Emeritus Markham Harris of English, who died on April 11th, after having served the University since 1946. Professor Emeritus Dan F. Henderson of Law, who died on March 14th, after having served the University since 1962. Professor Emeritus John Verrall of Music, who died on April 15th after having served the University since 1948. 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.

## Discussion Item: Proposed Class C Resolution Regarding Rewarding Excellence in Teaching – Jan Carline for the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality

Carline quickly reviewed the distributed copy of the proposed Class C Resolution (attached to bound copy). He hoped that it will be presented at the next meeting.

## Discussion Item: Possible Legislation Regarding Distance Learning from the *ad hoc* Committee on Distance Learning – Roger Simpson (Chair, FCEO) and Douglas Wadden (Chair, FCAS)

Simpson began the presentation by noting the wide variety of concerns regarding the use of new technologies on campus for teaching. He noted that Extension especially has been a force for innovation in this area but increasingly that departments are also becoming distance learning innovators. The two councils reviewing this issue have focused on undergraduate education because the graduate school no longer has resident requirements like those in the undergraduate program. Council discussion centered on program quality, unit supervision, and the ability to innovate. Members of the administration were also involved in the discussions. Today, Wadden and he wanted to present some talking points for consideration.

Currently, seniors must spend their final 45 credits in residence. Distance learning courses receive a "C" prefix, count within the 180 graduation credits, but are not applied to the grade point average. Students can obtain exceptions to the 45 credit in residence rule. He concluded, noting we are in the "midst of an educational revolution."

Wadden, taking over the presentation, noted that the committee focused on structural issues and did not address either compensation or intellectual property issues. He then placed the multi-part recommendation up for review on the overhead projector. Some of the recommendations included the following: Faculty approval of courses and instructors, requirement of UW title for instructors teaching in the courses, regular University curricular approval for distance learning (DL) courses, regular quality reviews of courses and efforts to assure consistency between DL and non-DL courses. Additionally, residency requirements

would state that of the final 60 credits required for graduation, that 45 of those credits must be non-DL courses and that only 10 of those 45 resident credits could be waived. Finally, DL programs, minors and degrees must be approved the same way that any other undergraduate program must be approved.

During discussion, some faculty raised questions about exactly how we would define a distance learning course. For example, how much on-line material or interaction makes a course a DL course? How is it different from the older correspondence model? A concern was expressed that any rules generated not stifle Faculty creativity in developing courses using new technologies. Other Faculty asked informational questions about the operation of DL courses and questions about specific parts of the proposals, such as the requirement for listing beginning and end dates on DL courses (so that someone reading a transcript would know how long it took a student to complete a course).

### **Adjournment**

Hearing no requests for new business, Coney adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

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

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