

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

2 April 2001

Gerberding Hall, Room 142, 2:30 p.m.

Present: Senate Chair Coney and President McCormick; Vice Chair Holt, Group Representatives Storti (VI), O'Neill (V), Salas (IV), Roberts (VII), Killien (VIII), Martin (III), Pace (II), Cirtautas (I); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjävik; Faculty Council Chairs Emerick (FCUR), Wadden (FCAS), Holzworth (FCFA), Chalker-Scott (FCIQ), Schaufelberger (FCUFS); Government Relations Representative Taricani, Assistant to the President Niccolls; Guests Carol Kubota (UW Bothell), and Steven Buck (Psychology), Sandra Silberstein (English).

Absent: Group Representatives Carr* (VII); Faculty Council Chairs Bothwell (FCR), Murphy (FCSA), Martin (FCRIB), Simpson (FCEO), Zoller (FCET), Kielbowicz (FCUL); UW Bothell Representative Jack Meszaros*, UW Tacoma Representative Crawford*; ASUW Representative Weaver, GPSS Representative Kuterdem; Special Committee Chairs Krieger-Brockett (SCFW), and Fabien (SCMFA),

* = Excused Absence

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

There were two changes to the agenda. The first was to include nominations, and the second was to change the Class B: Honorary Degree Action Item to a Discussion Item. The agenda was approved as amended.

Approval of the Minutes

Approved.

Announcements- Mary Coney (Chair)

First, the Class A legislation relating to Research Faculty passed on 6 March 2001. Currently, the ballot on a new Tri-Campus Council is pending; balloting ends on 5 April 2001 and Coney encouraged all SEC members to cast their votes.

Second, the UIF Review Committee will be on campus on Thursday and Friday of this week (April 5th and 6th). The Senate leadership (Coney, Holt, Silberstein) will be meeting with the Review Committee who will be writing their report on Friday afternoon. In the meantime, the Senate survey and report have been posted on the Senate webpage. Duane Storti (Group VI) expressed surprise that the Review Committee is not holding an open meeting while they are here. Coney replied that the Committee has selected a wide range of people to see, but also noted that they are on a very tight time schedule to complete their review and report. Additionally, Senate's Report has been forwarded to the Review Committee. Storti added that many of the previously posted individual project reports have some mistakes in them that need to be corrected. Pres. McCormick said that he will see that these

mistakes are addressed. Coney also assured Storti that the Senate leadership will present a balanced report that demonstrates the wide range of Faculty opinion on this matter. McCormick noted that they have tried to be diligent in obtaining the widest range of opinions that they could and cited the Senate survey and the Senate's open meeting in February. Coney concluded by stating that individual Faculty can send letters to the Committee.

Report of the President

The President presented a report on the latest legislative budget, drawing on summaries prepared Jo Ann Taricani (attached to official copy). The Senate budget is better than the Governor's proposed budget, but it is still not as favorable as we might have wished. This means that we will have to make some uncomfortable decisions in May and June, and discussions are already underway about these decisions. There will be an open forum regarding the choices that have to be made. The budget, as composed, means that there will be trade-offs. McCormick urged Faculty to engage in a conversation about our choices.

Second, it appears that the TA legislation has died. Despite this, GSEAC and the University have agreed to extend their agreement to May 28th and will continue to hold "meet and confer" sessions. The University did go together with GSEAC representatives to build support for the legislation. He believes that this effort allowed the University to demonstrate its good faith in this matter. The May 28th deadline is before the end of exams which leaves options open to GSEAC for some action; a June 15th deadline was not expected. He is hopeful, however, that some agreement could be reached that would be enforced through appropriate governance mechanisms on campus. The University intends to go back next session and seek TA legislation again.

Shifting gears, McCormick updated the group on the up-coming Funding Campaign, anticipated to take place over seven years. The "quiet" phase of the campaign will begin later this year, and the "public" phase will begin in 2003. In the "quiet" phase, as is typical, we will attempt to raise one-half of the campaign goal. To place fund raising in perspective, last year, we raised \$234 million in grants and contracts. Obviously, he hopes that the value-added features of a campaign will allow us to exceed these figures. We have retained a consultant to help us with this, and the development office has developed what he believes to be a fair process that will generate good decisions about who and what we target for fundraising. This is a pretty sensitive and challenging project, but he looks forward to a successful campaign.

He announced new appointments: W.H. "Joe" Knight will become Dean of the Law School, coming from Iowa's College of Law, and Nancy "Rusty" Barceló, coming from the University of Minnesota, will be the new Vice President for Minority Affairs. He also hopes that he is closing in on the Development position this week.

During the question and answer session, Storti asked that more budget data be available on the University webpage. Specifically, he asked for departmental budget information. McCormick, noting that these are public documents, will see that the information is provided. Ludwig asked about the results of a task force that looked into University outreach and communication prior to hiring Jack Faris. McCormick said that this report was given to Faris, and that Faris would be the best person to answer this question. He knows that one of the emphases of this report was ensuring that there was an effort to make reports between different reports complimentary. Additionally, it called for more frequent contact between the various communications officers. Members of the groups agreed that it would be useful

to have Faris address the SEC about the status of this report. Holzworth asked a question about the UIF; How much of our faculty salary money is being lost as part of the 1% tax, i.e. is there a net reduction in faculty salary and faculty positions? He said that he has not seen this kind of information. Storti noticed that all of the dean's letters on this issue are available on the ASUW UIF webpage. There is no summary or spreadsheet that collects all of the results at this point, however. Silberstein said that at the open meeting, Arts and Sciences claimed that they had lost 30-40 positions but the gains back had not necessarily been in faculty lines. Coney and McCormick agreed to ask Debra Friedman to generate this data. Storti said this is the reason that the Senate needs more staff so that it can get this kind of information. Finally, he asked when the merit salary data would be available. Holt said that it appears that the legislature will end on time, and Ludwig said that these figures would probably be available at the end of April.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Bradley Holt, Chair

Holt used this opportunity to report on three issues under discussion. The first issue was developing a policy for unit adjustments. This issue has been the topic of several discussions and it will be forwarded to FCFA to develop a legislative proposal. The second topic is how to handle the medical benefit cuts (that is, shifting the cost increases to faculty) against the backdrop of the 2% merit salary increases. One idea, he suggested, was to make an adjustment to offset these costs, and discussion is continuing on this issue.

Third, he directed attention to the budget spreadsheet that had been distributed at the start of the meeting. He described the salary budget exercise that SCPB is undertaking in order to determine priorities and goals for the budget: each committee member has been asked to submit a proposed budget using the spreadsheet. The budget distributed is a proposal, not fixed in stone. It merely lists ideas. He quickly went over the spread sheet to explain the various parts of the budget: revenue sources, expenditures, mandated items, and gap coverage items. He emphasized that this is an exercise, not a fixed budget. Holt encouraged people to contact him with any questions.

Report on Legislative Affairs – Richard Ludwig, Faculty Legislative Representative

Ludwig distributed a handout summarizing the gubernatorial and senate budgets. While the Senate budget appears better because of the higher faculty salaries, it has problems in almost every other area. He chose to spend his time focusing on the principles that inform the Senate budget. First, the Senate chose to fund state salaries at parity to the K-12 salaries. This is a two-edged sword because if K-12 gets only CPI increases under Initiative 782, it will be difficult for us to meet peer salaries because those rise faster than inflation and cost of living. Another problematic issue is that the salary increases are only for those employees who are state-funded which leads to a funding shortfall of about 28% that must be picked up by the University. For K-12 teachers this shortfall doesn't matter as much since their gap is generally covered by federal funds.

Another issue involves the use of Recruitment and Retention funds, which was funded at a much lower level. We can maintain some flexibility but not at the level that we would have hoped. Another issue is whether tuition increases have to be accompanied by state-funded financial aid increases. The Senate budget provides for financial aid while the Governor's budget does not. Also, this does not resolve long-term tuition setting policy although some progress has been made. The two research universities can raise tuition some and at some point the goal will be for a 50/50 state/tuition funding of the University. The Senate would

also allow more differential tuition funding, particularly in professional and masters degree programs. Another aspect of the tuition is that out of state students would have to pay the full cost of their education.

As to benefits, he noted that we will move from 6% cost to 10% cost over the biennium, with a proportional decrease of state support. Finally, the across the board 2% cut that appeared in the Governor's budget is not in the Senate budget which instead utilized targeted cuts. These targeted cuts, however, call for greater cuts overall than the Governor's budget and it reduces flexibility by identifying the areas to be cut rather than leaving it to the discretion of the institution

McCormick asked whether this budget is bad enough to precipitate a complete re-thinking of the way the state generates revenue. Ludwig said at this point, it hasn't seemed to lead to this kind of re-thinking. Part of the reason is that the Senate was able to make a one time tap of an over-funded pension fund. These patches allowed them to avoid the issue. Many of the legislators, he noted, seem quite comfortable with this budget. McCormick stated that he sees this as a lack of civic leadership for the future and as quite disappointing. Given this, McCormick said we need to think about what the University can do to be a catalyst for getting the kind of leadership that we need. Roberts (Group VII) cited the east versus west political split. But Silberstein noted that Michigan, which has similar demographics, does support higher education. Coney noted that it would be nice if the Regents would be more proactive on this front, rather than looking inward. McCormick agreed.

Nominations

A list of nominations was distributed and approved. There will be a meeting on April 23rd regarding nominations for Councils, and we will work to fill the Councils. Vaughn noted the Faculty Senate Council Status sheet that she has prepared which listed council chair vacancies and a summary of each council's upcoming issues .

Class B Action/Discussion: Honorary Degree Policy Volume Two, Part IV, Chapter 42, Section 42-35

Coney noted that this legislation was discussed two meetings ago, and that the Council responded to the SEC concerns. Vice Provost Olswang believes that it should be Class A legislation. It looks like this may be a discussion item at the Senate meeting; this doesn't change the issue but just how it would be handled.

Emerick (Chair, University Relations) introduced the substance of the proposal. (Attached to official copy.) This proposal places the responsibility for reviewing proposed honorary degree recipients with the Faculty Council on University Relations. These nominations could come from anywhere within the University but the Council would develop a protocol for meaningful faculty involvement and review.

Vaughn (Secretary of the Faculty) explained that there is some need to clarify the procedure by which these degrees are awarded and noted possible clarifications to the bolded language. The words "all" and "through the president" would make clearer the involvement of the Faculty in all appointments as well as the role of the President. Also, she outlined the various process options for deciding how the Faculty should review this issue. McCormick

stated that he had no opinion about the class of legislation, but that he does feel that the ability to give these degrees needs to be granted and soon. And, he believes that the central principles would be that the faculty be consulted and that the President also be able to review these degrees. Holzworth stated that the Faculty should have a role. He said that one way would be to come to a separate agreement that would require the Senate, through Class C legislation, to encourage the President to appoint a committee that would include faculty representation. He was concerned that the legislation was becoming too complicated. Thus, we needed to consider how we can do this. Pace (Group II) said that he is against the award of honorary degrees. He does not think that Universities should be aligned with individuals, no matter how distinguished or respected. Some people may disagree with these views, and he feels that the Faculty needs to have their say. Holt seconded these views and said that it is very dangerous to go down this line, and for example, noted the President's remarks about degrees and fund raising. He believes that the appropriate way is for the FCUR to nominate people to be given to the President. Arkans (Ass't VP and Director, University Relations) could bring names to the committee. He believes that this should be done as Class A legislation and that this would be the best way to go. Emerick said that there are two issues: Are the Faculty, at large, going to be interested in resurrecting this practice? Second, assuming the Faculty wants to confer honorary degrees, is FCUR the appropriate body to review proposed candidates? Emerick said that her Council's initial reaction was that this issue was directly within the Council's jurisdiction without the need for additional *Code* language. The Administration, to their credit, did come to the Faculty and ask for our involvement, which is not the case at other Universities

Vaughn charged with putting together a group that could come up with a final proposal. Many stated that it is not a burning issue on campus and it should be kept simple. The members of the group will include John Junker (Chair, Code Advisory Committee), Holt, Olswang, Emerick, and Vaughn. The group is to report back at next regular meeting of the SEC.

Discussion: Proposed Class C Resolution from the *ad hoc* Committee on Rewarding Teaching – Linda Chalker-Scott, Chair, FCIQ

Coney, before Chalker-Scott introduced the proposal, suggested that we have a straw vote on each of the seven sections of the resolution (attached to official copy). Chalker-Scott explained that this proposal had its genesis in a year of discussions about how to encourage good teaching. The Council will also present, in the fall, a piece of Class A legislation about making a permanent salary increase for distinguished teaching awards. Discussion (recorded on an issue by issue basis – the Class C resolution had seven parts):

1. More outside reporting regarding good teaching: Holzworth commented that these Class C resolutions are usually trying to get movement when the Administration is reluctant to move but that this doesn't seem to be that type of issue. Wadden asked why FCAS, named in the paragraph, would be involved in this. Chalker-Scott replied that this was the result of some discussions with the prior chair of FCAS but that it would not be a major role. Emerick stated that she believes Jack Faris' office is aware of this need and that they are working on this. She cited the Student Awareness campaign as an example of movement in this area. Killien (Group VIII) said she does not see any harm in including it. Vote: Most in favor.
2. Improve communications among award winners: Holzworth noted that it was a little unclear as to what the audience was for increased awareness. Killien made the

suggestion that "awareness" be deleted which would shift the focus to increasing excellence. Coney asked that "between" be changed to "among." Vote: Most in favor.

3. Honorific – Distinguished Teaching Professor: Coney noted that the Cabinet suggested that this be reserved for Class A legislation. Storti said that he would rather see this built into our merit evaluations rather than a separate process. Coney noted that there have been discussions about this. If it is treated as merit, it will come from departmental merit pools. On the other hand, if it were to be a separate award of funds, then it could arguably come from central funds. Thus, there would not be a competition among faculty in a department. Each year, five of these are awarded. Vote: Majority in favor of moving to Class A for discussion next fall.
4. Institute teaching awards in all colleges and major units: Holzworth suggested that the title instructor be added. Killien said that she had some practical concerns about the titles that are included and that there should be some discretion left to the unit. Vote: In favor.
5. Departmental Endowed Professorships in Teaching: McCormick spoke to this, although noting it covers items 6 and 7 as well. This raises a number of questions that he would like to discuss with chairs and deans before it is implemented. He is concerned about establishing various classes of faculty and making it this explicit. He urged the group to involve deans in this discussion. Chalker-Scott noted that this is to encourage that behavior, not to mandate it. Silberstein suggested that funding teaching in this way would show that the University takes this seriously, and trying to change the culture in the ways in which teaching is regarded. Coney noted that, as a Class C resolution, this would be advisory and not binding. McCormick said that he takes Class C recommendations seriously and would want to be able to follow through. Coney talked about Giovanni Costigan and Jon Bridgeman as examples of faculty where their creativity came alive in front of a classroom, and that this is the type of person we are talking about. These are people whose genius operates in front of a classroom. Holzworth says that because this is a recommendation, the shalls should be changed to shoulds. Vote: Yes: Six. No: 1
6. Endowed Professorships in Teaching Innovation: Chalker-Scott said that this is distinguished from five by being directed at the entire University rather than the departmental level. Initial vote: Yes-6 No-2

The concern is that this development goal comes at school and college level. Cirtautas (Group I) raised the objection that the criteria for getting such a distinction are not clear. This could operate in favor of people who teach large classes and overlook those who teach smaller classes. Pace said that one of these problems is that we are going through the resolution one item at a time and that these sections operate as a package. As a package it raises a different set of issues than may arise as separate questions. Schaufelberger (Chair, University Facilities) said that his objection comes from creating an endowed professorship as opposed to an award. Chalker-Scott said that these would be a defined period professorships. One person then asked how would this relate to the teaching excellence awards. There would be two: one for excellence and another for innovation? Thus, we need to talk about the connection between excellence and innovation. This could be handled by making innovation one of the criteria for excellence. Revote: Fails

7. Award for Excellence in Mentoring Graduate Students: Schaufelberger proposed that the focus should be on teaching, because mentorship might relate to research and other

activities. Sjøvik said that he saw this differently. This talks about a type of teaching that would prepare graduate students for all aspects of their careers. This would be an award for entire department, and needs clarification. It should be teaching mentorship. Holzworth suggested that the preamble be revised, taking out the names.

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

Wadden began presentation and brought Steve Buck (Psychology) who has been on taskforce. The two councils were asked to look at the elimination of the residency requirement. This opened up a number of issues about distance learning (DL), and the Councils declined to move forward with legislation last spring as the discussion became more focussed. A taskforce was created with four members from each council as well as various administrators with an interest in this topic. Most Faculty do not know the current policies that are in place, and he quickly reviewed these. Importantly, deans and chairs can waive any of these requirements. At the same time, distance learning is developing quickly on this campus and elsewhere. Wadden went over the talking points that his task force has developed. Briefly, the task force proposals included:

1. 45 of 60 final credits must be in non-distance learning.
2. DL courses may be reported as a regular grade if academic criteria met, e.g. same prerequisites, etc.
3. Faculty teaching in DL courses must have UW titles.
4. If a DL course is on a non-quarter schedule, it must have starting and ending dates.
5. DL courses can be used to fulfill departmental requirements.
6. The University must develop ways to evaluate DL courses.
7. Of the 45 non-DL credits required for graduation, no more than 10 could be waived.

Some people feel this proposal is too cautious; others see it as too far reaching. A possible second proposal would allow departmental DL programs that would need to have a waiver before operation based on articulated criteria. All of this applies only to undergraduates. The Graduate School has removed all restrictions on DL courses. There are additional compensation, fee and intellectual property issues that are not addressed here. This can raise some additional issues for students. These issues need to be discussed. While we are a little behind the curve, the advantage of that is that we could look at the experience of others. For example, a webpage from the five major accrediting organizations appeared this week that describes, in depth, best practices in this area. Then there are issues about what Council has jurisdiction over this issue and this is complicated by tri-campus issues. He described the suggestion for a DL major in human rights that was proposed by one campus. This would also have an effect on existing courses. He believes that change in this area will be better if it take place as the result of an intentional, open and transparent process.

Steve Buck added that these issues come up in two areas. One has to do with extension courses and the other has to do with courses that are developed by departments. The intent of this proposal is to apply the same kinds of standards to DL courses that we apply to traditional classroom courses. It tries to pull all courses together into a common framework. We do not know what will happen five or ten years down the road, but we want to avoid having these courses take on a life of their own. He believes that DL courses can play a valuable role. Students find these courses useful. For example, some students like the additional time they can take to cover difficult material or to squeeze in an additional course so that they can graduate on target.

Holt suggested that Wadden's comments be mailed out to members of the SEC and that individuals could mail in comments. Wadden said they need to do one more minor re-write, but that comments would be helpful. He thinks that it will now need to shift from talking points to legislation. Coney suggested that most of this would be Class B, and that it could be presented at the next meeting. Holt asked whether we wanted to put this out for a Faculty vote after our last Senate meeting, especially considering how important the issues are. Coney suggested that we have a discussion of this at the Senate also.

Information

None.

New Business

- a. Review of draft of 19 April 2001 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Change to insert nominations as number nine. Approved.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

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

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