

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
301 GOWEN HALL
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 25 January 2001

The meeting began at 2:37 p.m.

Remarks of the Chair

Chair Mary Coney noted that since the last meeting, the University Initiative Fund (UIF) Review and enabling legislation have dominated her agenda. The Senate leadership and President McCormick have planned a comprehensive effort to assess the UIF program. At this point, the Senate leadership will sponsor:

- A story in University Week discussing the program and seeking faculty input
- An electronic survey that will be posted on 12 February 2001
- A campus-wide open meeting to be held in Kane Hall on 22 February 2001

After these and other information gathering activities are completed, the Senate report will be forwarded to the University UIF Review Committee. She urged senators to discuss this review with their colleagues, and urge them to participate in the Senate activities.

Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

A quorum was achieved at 2:42 p.m. and the meeting was called to order. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Report of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Brad Holt, Vice Chair, reported that since the last Senate meeting, the Committee has addressed the following issues:

1. Consolidation of two departments: This is the first time that the reorganization procedures in the Faculty Code have been used. Because this is a friendly merger of two departments, a lesser level of scrutiny was employed.
2. Tuition Policy: Questions of the level of tuition, financial aid, and differential tuition are all items that have been discussed. Most of the focus has been on differential tuition. For example, the business school is seeking to double the tuition for the MBA program. If this should be done, the Committee has discussed how should the additional revenue be used. Similarly, they have discussed whether some of the funds should be used for additional financial aid.
3. Legislative Budget: Discussion has begun on short and long term goals for funding.
4. UIF Program: The Committee will be conducting a review of certain aspects of the program.

Legislative Report

While displaying an overhead, Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative, discussed the Governor's proposal, noting that the Senate budget will be presented in March. The Governor's proposal was not particularly favorable, featuring a 2% across the board cut and no funding for utilities inflation. Also, there would only be partial funding of faculty salary increases. All told, the University could face cuts totaling \$26 million. In response, the Senate message has been that this budget will force students to shoulder a greater proportion of the costs of their education, and that faculty salaries will continue to fall

behind that of our peer institutions. Additionally, we are urging state government to think about new ways to fund higher education. Finally, we are arguing that the Governor's budgetary add-ons will be at the expense of the basic instructional program

The legislative agenda extends beyond budgetary issues. Both enabling legislation for teaching assistants and for faculty have been the subject of extensive discussions. The TA bill was "dropped" on 24 January 2001. Ludwig and the Senate leadership have also been working behind the scenes of enabling legislation for faculty. First, they have persuaded the Washington Federation of Teachers (WFT) to include three of the four Class C resolution principles in their legislation. Second, faculty leadership has been working on its own bill, modeled after California legislation, and pursuing discussions with the University administration.

Questions and Answers

1. Asked to explain the partial funding of faculty salaries, Ludwig explained that after the K-12 bill passed last fall, the Governor decided to fund only those teachers on state lines. Given this decision, he has decided to follow the same policy for the University. Provost Lee Huntsman interjected at this point that we should be careful how we use the phrase "state funds" since the Governor is breaking the "fund" into smaller pieces and paying out of one of those pieces.
2. Asked about the Governor's add-ons, Ludwig listed the following as examples: The Technology Institute, the Virtual University, and the Catalyst Website. The full list can be seen on the Governor's webpage.
3. In response to a question about tuition setting authority, Ludwig replied that the University had not yet fully decided what to ask for here. But, it appears that we may well seek broader authority over a multi-year period.

Report of the President

Last time the Senate met, the President began, the University was facing the threat of a strike. Fortunately, that strike was resolved on 4 December 2001 with the agreement that the parties would jointly craft legislation and seek its passage in Olympia. In the meantime, the parties have been "meeting and conferring" on a number of issues. He is hopeful that should the legislation not pass, the parties would continue to talk.

Shifting to the faculty enabling legislation, the President said that this spring, the Administration will work with the Senate leadership to draft a faculty enabling legislation bill consistent with the Class C resolution passed in the fall. Assuming that the TA legislation should pass this year, the University will move on the faculty legislation in the 2002 legislative session. The President cautioned, however, that given the state of the budget, the Administration wants to retain discretion on how actively they would push this legislation.

As to this year's legislative session, the President characterized the budget picture as "bad." This picture, he averred, is the result of a series of voter initiatives, and noted that the legislature has had to dip into reserves. The cuts proposed in the Governor's budget, he stated, seem unfair when the state is so prosperous.

On the other hand, he said, "The University is on the move!" All units now have a strategic plan and a sense of momentum. This is not a time to muddle through, but rather a time to look at the University's short and long term strategy. As to this general observation, he said that two points stand out. First, the University will need to continue to put pressure on

Olympia to be more responsive to the needs of the University. Second, the University will need to seek a tuition proposal that, unfortunately, will shift more of the cost of education to students. While we might like to reverse what is now a national trend of shifting costs in this manner, it seems impossible in the current budgetary climate. Nonetheless, funds will be set aside for financial aid to meet the needs of students who cannot meet higher tuition costs. Ultimately, we will need more autonomy from the state that will allow us to make better use of our resources and opportunities. Another idea under discussion is presenting a higher education initiative to the people. Former governors Booth Gardner and Dan Evans have been discussing this proposal, and McCormick noted that North Carolina recently voted by a 75% margin for a massive higher education funding proposal. This topic, in both its short and long-term aspects, will need considerable discussion as the University develops a strategy to deal with the hard decisions that face it. For example, we will need to generate "venture capital" within the system, and in this regard, he noted both the UIF program and an upcoming capital campaign. Wryly he remarked that we have gone from state supported to state assisted to state located.

Summary of Senate Executive Committee Actions

The body was referred to Item 5 on the Agenda for further information.

Announcements

1. Prof. James Tolefson will give the Annual Faculty Lecture on 21 February 2001 at 7:30 p.m. His lecture is entitled "Linguistic Winners and Losers."
2. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology recently distributed a survey to faculty, and Coney urged senators to ask their colleagues to complete it.
3. On 9 February 2001, the Taskforce on Distance Learning will hold a public forum in Gates Hall.

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 and former Faculty Senate Chair Barnet Baskerville of Speech Communication, who died on December 31, 2000 after having served the University since 1948; Professor Emeritus Zygmunt William Birnbaum of Mathematics, who died on December 15, 2000 after having served the University since 1939; Lecturer Frank Brouillet of Education, who died on January 20, 2001 after having served the University since 1963; Professor Emeritus Gordon Griffiths of History, who died on January 13, 2001 after having served the University since 1959; Clinical Associate Professor John Scott of Obstetrics and Gynecology, who died on December 19, 2000 after having served the University since 1968. 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.

Nominations and Appointments

All listed nominations were approved on a voice vote.

Election of Vice Chair

Since the last meeting, at which the Senate Executive Committee presented the nomination of Prof. John Schaufelberger, Prof. Sandra Silberstein indicated her interest in running for

this position also. Following this indication of interest, Prof. Silberstein was nominated from the floor, and both candidates answered questions that covered their views on increasing faculty participation in governance, their experience in faculty governance and their programmatic priorities and interests. After the vote was taken and at the conclusion of the meeting, it was announced that Prof. Silberstein would be vice chair for the 2001-2002 academic year.

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

After noting a two-word change recommended by the Code Advisory Committee, this legislation passed on a voice vote. A ballot with a statement of reasons for and against the legislation will be prepared by the Secretary of the Faculty and presented to the entire faculty for a vote.

Class A Legislation on Tri-Campus Legislation – First Consideration: Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 22, Sections 37, 41, 42, 47, 52, 62 and 74; Part IV, Chapter 42, Sections 31, 32 and 46; and Chapter 44, Section 31

Bob Holzworth, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, explained that this legislation would make four significant changes to the Code:

1. It would provide for proportional voting rights for faculty at all UW campuses
2. It would give Bothell and Tacoma faculty leaders each a vote on the SEC
3. It would create a new council on Tri-Campus Policy, and
4. It would provide a special voting procedure for Class B legislation that would allow reconsideration of this legislation in the event that 2/3 of the voting faculty of either the Bothell or Tacoma campus should oppose the legislation.

Both Jack Meszaros (Bothell) and Rob Crawford (Tacoma) made statements in favor of the legislation. Meszaros described the programs at the two campuses, noting that both are upper division degree programs staffed by about 60-70 full time faculty at each campus. The students at these two campuses tend to be non-traditional and about 80% of each student body is employed. These campuses stress interdisciplinary approaches to learning, and stress excellence in teaching. The faculties at these two new campuses have spent much of their time building programs and institutional characters. Each campus has reserved areas of independence such as curriculum design, awarding of tenure and their own chancellors. Crawford, in his comments, said that the time had come for an innovative restructuring of faculty governance to accommodate the realities of these two campuses. He felt that this legislation was an appropriate balance of integration and local autonomy. In the end, this legislation will benefit all three campuses and will provide the faculty with one voice as we learn that our general welfare is a three campus matter.

Discussion of the proposed legislation was brief, and confined to clarification of the Class B legislation provisions. The legislation, on vote, passed unanimously.

Adjournment.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Mary B. Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate