

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting, 9 October 2000**  
**142 Gerberding Hall, Room 142**

**Present:** Senate Chair Coney, and President McCormick; Vice Chair Holt; Group Representatives Cirtautas (I), Salas (IV), Storti (VI), O'Neill (V), Martin (III), Killien (VIII); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, and Deputy Legislative Representative Sjåvik; Faculty Council Chairs Zoller (FCET), Chalker-Scott (FCIQ), Simpson (FCEO), Bothwell (FCR), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Martin (FCRIB), Holzworth (FCFA), Emerick (FCUR), Kielbowicz (FCUL); GPSS President Kuterdem; ASUW President Weaver; Provost Huntsman; Executive Assistant to the President Niccolls; and Government Relations Representative Taricani; Richard Stackman, Vice-Chair General Assembly, UW Tacoma (guest).

**Absent:** Group representatives Carr (VII)\*, Roberts (VII)\*; Faculty Council Chair Wadden (FCAS)\*; UW Bothell Representative Meszaros, UW Tacoma Representative Crawford\*; Senate Committee Chairs Krieger-Brockett (SCFW)\*, Fabien (SCMFA).

*\*Excused*

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

The meeting was called to order at 2:34p.m. Mary Coney, Chair, began the meeting by asking all members to introduce themselves at this first meeting. The agenda, as amended to include an item under new business, was approved.

### **Opening Remarks from the Chair**

Coney began by noting the great beginning at the SEC orientation that took place last week. This year, she would like to emphasize the importance of communication between group reps and the senators. She anticipates the following issues will be prominent during the 2000-2001 academic year:

- Enabling legislation at the upcoming legislative session
- Admissions policy review
- Diversity and climate issues for the entire campus community
- Tri-Campus legislation
- Distance learning legislation
- Possible approval for awarding honorary degrees
- UIF Review

### **Approval of the Minutes**

Approved.

### **Report from the President**

After welcoming new SEC members, the President chose to highlight two items from his annual address. First, by way of introducing the topic of funding and revenue enhancement,

he noted that we will be launching a fund raising campaign. This process starts by canvassing the Deans regarding their departmental funding needs. Throughout the fall, a Regents conversation about tuition and fees will take place. All of these discussions form part of the revenue picture. In the long term, he is hopeful that some initiatives in the Office of Technology can also be a source of revenue. Similarly, self-supporting programs can also be a source of revenue. These programs can help various units to meet needs that otherwise could not be met. Thus, the big issue is how will the University develop revenue streams that will fund the total needs of the University. With these points in mind, he noted that his office is working with the Evans School to present a conference on 29 November 2000 on funding for higher education.

Second, he observed that we are getting ready for the upcoming legislative session. Referring to a handout, he focussed first on the access issues that are highlighted at the beginning of the statement. Then, he stressed steps that need to be taken to fund programs that will keep us a competitive and world-class university. The final theme of the budget submission is "Initiatives for the New Economy." This last theme recognizes one of the reasons that the people of the state are so willing to support the University. While the state has been reluctant in the past to fund programs that might benefit the private sector, this is an area where other states and Universities are aggressively seeking funding.

Coney expressed her thanks for McCormick's participation in these meetings, and opened the floor for questions, in which the following issues were raised:

1. Seelye Martin (Oceanography, Group III): Why is the nuclear reactor listed as the largest cost in the budget?

Provost Huntsman, answering for the President: This has to do with modernization of this equipment. We used to have a reactor on this campus but it was de-commissioned. There are stringent federal guidelines on how to de-commission a reactor, and we have been seeking funding from the state to complete this project. The federal government has been very understanding about this situation but it does need to be addressed.

2. Duane Storti (Mech. Eng., Group V): There was mention of reorganization of technology transfer functions. Will that affect the agreements that are done by centers?

Huntsman: The reorganization doesn't specifically address that, and I don't understand why the centers would be doing this differently. After hearing Storti's example, Huntsman characterized it, however, as one of the entitlements that are created for industry consortia, an area where he feels we have a consistent set of policies. Holt pointed out that when faculty apply for funding, they do not know what the "strings" might be. Huntsman agreed that this is a longstanding and frustrating problem because faculty focus on funding their research, but not necessarily the details of each arrangement. This lack of focus, he noted, can get one into deep trouble. He feels that failure to communicate these strings is an on-going problem. OTT needs to call the consortium leaders and go through this again, and he promised to follow up on this issue.

3. Storti: Regarding budget requests, he noted that we typically do not get what we ask for. Thus, he inquired, doesn't the request for a catch-up increase mean we will not keep up when they give us less.

McCormick: No, although he said truthfully we should be asking for 15%, even though this does not recognize Seattle's high cost of living. But even the 6/4% figures may be problematic, and the legislature may not understand the need for the increase. This is why it will be important to develop other revenue sources, and this will be a theme of the fund raising campaign.

Storti followed these remarks by asking about a line item for instructional equipment, commenting that it has been a decade since we received funding for this. Huntsman replied that we have addressed this need from other funds. What we have chosen to do is to list it under "teaching technology" in the "Access and Innovation" section of the budget request. Huntsman believes that we have gone really far with technology and that the next pinch point will be the use of technology in the classroom. That is what this request will highlight rather than a general equipment request that the administration did not think would find favor with the legislature. Holt disagreed with this assessment, pointing to the lack of availability of technology for the faculty for their own purposes. He gave the example that his department requires a \$200 fee before hooking faculty up to the Internet.

### **Report from the Senate Comm. On Planning and Budgeting**

Brad Holt, Vice Chair, noted that this Committee is just getting under way and has an active agenda. The group will address the following issues this year:

- undergraduate research and how to support it
- review of new enrollment monies
- UIF proposal review
- salaries and how unit adjustments are made
- the allocation and use of recruitment and retention money
- budget issues and the legislative session
- support for faculty computers

### **Legislative Report**

Dick Ludwig, Legislative Representative, started by talking about the different budgets. The "biggie" is the biennial budget. But, because of the ability to propose amendments in "off" years, every year is a budget year so we are always talking about budget planning. Last year, we began discussions and planning for the budget. He urged members to consult the Planning and Budgeting WebPages for additional information before highlighting three different points.

First, he considered our success in the Winter, 2000 session. The University sought funding for RA and TA health insurance, cost coverage for our Internet fees and a new grant was for diversity initiatives. For capital projects, we requested funds for the Life Science I building as well as authorization to use tract funds for classroom renovation. As to these requests, we did get half the cost of the health insurance monies, some funds for Internet connectivity, and some funds for bonding capacity. We got nothing, however, for new building design or for diversity.

The picture for the next biennium's requests will be a little clearer after the next election in which the 49-49 tie might be broken in the legislature. But beyond the election for governor and representatives, there are several initiatives that could decrease revenues for the University as they act to earmark funds for specific purposes. Most of these initiatives

involve K-12 issues, and result in decreased revenues as opposed to increased expenditures. He added that we are very close to the I-601 spending limit, and will likely go over it given health insurance costs and other items. Ludwig stated that many characterize the picture as very grim.

Not all of the issues we will present will pertain to the budget. The first issue is whether University employees would like to trade benefit coverage for salary. He expects that the issue of enabling legislation will return to the table. The legislative representatives intend to work closely with the WFT. While WFT initially said it would leave out the research institutions, they have reconsidered this stance given the possible unionization of the graduate teaching assistants. Of course, he concluded, accountability measures, such as looking at graduation rates, contact hours, etc., are also on the table, and we will need to have a continuing dialogue about these measures.

### **Report from Councils and Committees: Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

Bob Holzworth, chair, reported that the two main things that this council is working on involve the enabling legislation and tri-campus legislation. As to enabling legislation, the Council is developing a Class C resolution that would list important aspects of any bill which would be necessary, and will come to next SEC. FCFA has sought views from many groups, and they want to have something that clarifies our views on what enabling legislation should do. Second, last year Holt chaired a subcommittee, which examined how to bring the Bothell and Tacoma faculties up to full representational status in the Senate. This is especially important for the work of the councils. The proposed legislation will establish a tri-campus council, and increase Bothell and Tacoma representation on the Senate. The Bothell campus has asked to slow down the consideration of the legislation because they do not feel quite up to speed on this issue, and he will do so. Finally, he noted that the research faculty proposal will be considered at the first Senate meeting.

### **Presentation by UW Police Chief Vicky Peltzer**

Police Chief Vicky Peltzer began by thanking the faculty for this invitation. She wanted to use this opportunity to bring us up to speed on events since the tragedy this summer at the Medical School. The Campus Security Committee, which she chairs, is reviewing the event and putting together a plan to avoid such incidents in the future. One of the most pressing issues has been the need for training of all staff, and they will be doing several levels of training. The bottom line is that all staff should report anything so that it can be acted on. The Committee also recognized that we need a central point for gathering information so that they can be aware of the little events that lead to a bigger event. The Police Department will be responsible for collating the information, and they are developing an information conduit that will work across human resources, security and student affairs. Our police department will be making appropriate interventions in cases of trouble before the problem gets worse as well as analyzing situations both from a psychological and legal point of view. The department is also developing counseling programs for victims and observers of campus violence. Human resources is very involved in this, also, and is developing programs such as ones on anger management and stress reduction.

In the question session, Holzworth asked about privacy concerns and noted that the Police will remain sensitive to those issues. Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, noted that the University Sexual Harassment Policy requires reporting of incidents, and that the legal trend is to require employers to have reporting procedures. In response to a question from Storti, Peltzer assured the group that they will be sharing information with other universities. She

ended by noting that it is difficult to notify everyone on campus in the middle of an incident, but that the police will contact employees who are in danger.

## **Nominations and Appointments**

Amending Item 9: List of Nominations, Holt moved that the names of Michael McCann (Political Science) be added for the Campus Security Committee and the name of Barbara Krieger-Brockett be added for the SCFW.

Before voting on the nominations, the SEC voted on which members of councils and committees would get to vote at meetings. As to each council and committee, they concluded:

1. Ex officio members are, by definition, without vote.
2. The decision to permit librarians to vote will be discretionary.
3. All research faculty will be able to vote.
4. GPSS representatives will not be able to vote.
5. The decision to permit retired faculty to vote will be discretionary.
6. Professional Staff Organization representatives will not be able to vote.
7. Administrators will not be able to vote.

Following this, on motion, all nominations and appointments were approved.

## **Information**

Storti noted that the Washington Department of Labor and Industries is conducting an investigation of the incident at the Medical School this summer.

## **Old Business**

Coney discussed our progress on the UIF review. Philipsen, past chair, tried very hard to launch this review, but had difficulty in locating a faculty person who would be willing to take on this kind of role without support. Later, the President said he would be launching a parallel review and discussion turned to joining together in this effort. In June, faculty leadership decided that this would be the best way to go. Thus, Coney stated, we have a motion that would probably need rescinding and then we would need a new motion that would approve a joint process. Since that time, she continued, we have worked very hard with McCormick to develop this process. Certain features have already been agreed upon such as the timing of the process, the Senate's involvement with the "meta-review" but not the individual reviews, joint drafting of a charge letter, and the right to appoint representatives to a joint committee.

At this point, McCormick added his perspective. When this UIF process was launched, McCormick promised that it would have accountability, more than the usual amount. It will be a two-phase review. All of the UIF 1 projects will be reviewed by faculty committees appointed by the Provost's office. Also, all projects will henceforth be reviewed in their fourth year. But, he said, there is also an issue about the UIF program that may not be revealed by the discrete reviews. We need to know if this program is advancing the goals of the University. He has appointed Bill Richardson (Kellogg Foundation), Dean Nancy Hooyman, and Bob Craves (Chairman, HEC Board), and is seeking a third external person. The faculty appointments are under discussion. It is anticipated that individual reviews will

be completed by the end of fall quarter or beginning of winter quarter at the latest. These reviews will provide information for the supercommittee and we will have the external site team come in during April for a two day visit.

Bob Holzworth noted that this is not a code issue, so that our interest as faculty is to compare the benefits to the costs. We know there have been benefits, and if like other national programs, about 80% of programs will be successful, but we need more information than that. Coney said that the issue here is not the UIF program per se but whether the SEC approves of this new turn. The cost is included as part of the charge. Further, the SCPB will also be looking at this issue as they look at departmental strategic plans to see if they fit with UIF initiatives. Coney asked that group reps talk to senators about this. The Senate will launch a University wide effort to get comments from the entire faculty. We plan to make these responses available to the committee. Also, the Senate leadership is planning an open meeting, probably chaired by the local members of the supercommittee. They can bring the results of this to the meeting with the external people. The leadership has been promised a research assistant to support this effort, and will draft a report. Debra Friedman has promised to transmit reports on individual projects.

Holt moved to rescind, and the motion passed. Kate O'Neill (Law, Group V) moved to ratify the leadership's efforts so far and to undertake a joint review with the administration following the outline described in Coney's comments. The motion carried.

### **Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda for Meeting on 26 October 2000**

Approved.

### **Adjournment**

Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

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

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