

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of the Meeting – 8 January 2001**  
**Gerberding Hall, Rooms 26 and 142**

**Present:** Senate Chair Coney and President McCormick; Vice Chair Holt, Group Representatives Carr (VII), Pace (II), Roberts (VII), Salas (IV), Killien (VIII), O'Neill (V), Cirtautas (I), S. Martin (III); Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Legislative Representative Ludwig, Deputy Legislative Representative Sjävik; Faculty Council Chairs Holzworth (FCFA), Emerick (FCUR), Chalker-Scott (FCIQ), Simpson (FCEO), Wadden (FCAS), Murphy (FCSA), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Bothwell (FCR), D. Martin (FCRIB); UW Bothell Representative Jack Meszaros, UW Tacoma Representative Crawford; Special Committee Chair Krieger-Brockett (SCFW) Provost Huntsman; Assistant to the President Niccolls; and Government Relations Representative Taricani.

**Absent:** Group Representative Storti (VI); Faculty Council Chairs Kielbowicz (FCUL) and Zoller (FCET); ASUW Representative Weaver; GPSS Representative Kuterdem; and Special Committee Chair Fabien (SCMFA).

**Call to Order**

Chair Mary Coney welcomed members to the first meeting of the year 2001. She welcomed Jack Carr, Clark Pace, Nancy Murphy and Marilyn Roberts, all of whom had been unable to attend meetings during the fall quarter.

**Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as written.

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the SEC meetings (13 Nov 2000) and the Senate meetings (14 and 30 November 2000) were approved.

**Report from the Chair**

Coney reviewed two matters that have occupied her time since the last meeting. The first is the UIF Review, which will be chaired by Nancy Hooyman, Dean, School of Social Work, and which will be meeting April 5 and 6, 2001. This is a cooperative effort undertaken by both the President's Office and the Faculty Senate. The Senate will undertake a survey of the University community. This survey is intended to be a fair and objective measurement of community sentiment. There will also be a public meeting in February at which interested people can make comments. McCormick thanked Coney for the cooperation that has characterized this venture, and stated that he believes the report will benefit the entire community.

The second issue that has preoccupied her time is that of enabling legislation. Briefly, she reviewed developments since the last Senate meeting at which the Senate approved a Class C resolution on enabling legislation. The Chair's cabinet had agreed to go forward from this resolution, and had met with the President and representatives from his office. At the conclusion of that meeting, Coney asked whether the administration would work with the

Senate on legislation. The president responded by a letter dated 4 January 2001 (copy attached to the official copy of the minutes).

### **Report of the President**

The President also discussed enabling legislation. He reiterated his remarks that if the legislation has the four Class C resolution factors, the administration would "support" the legislation. But, he pointed out, support comes in a wide variety of forms. This distinction is especially crucial now as the administration goes forward with GSEAC/UAW on the TA enabling legislation for this legislative term. The Administration is hopeful that legislation will pass, but noted that the course of labor legislation in the legislature is always difficult. If asked whether he supports faculty legislation, he will say that he supports it. But, he added, it will not have the support that some other legislative priorities have this session. These priorities are not at odds with faculty enabling legislation but, on the other hand, this is a time of severely constrained legislative resources. If faculty legislation should not pass this year, and if it should come up again or in subsequent years, he will support it provided it is consistent with the Class C resolution. The level of support, however, will depend upon the legislative climate at that time. For example, if it should come up in 2002, and there is a chance to gain a salary increase (if 2001 shouldn't be a good year), then the priority would likely be salary. Support depends upon what else is in play. Thus, he cannot assign a priority in the abstract. While he is open to having a discussion, the timing may depend upon other issues at this meeting.

Then, he turned to the legislative session and the budget. The short-term picture is pretty grim as Locke's budget, presented before Christmas, suggested. It may be the best we may see. The good news is that there are legislative attitudes towards us are positive, and our stature has increased. But due to voter decisions in the initiative process, the picture for funding higher education is pretty grim. Thus, even when the economy is strong, as it is now, the cumulative effect of the initiatives is that they have skewed the enhancement that had traditionally accompanied a strong economic year. There may be a budget cut of 2 percent for the non-instructional costs, a salary increase of 1.8% for the first year, a reduction of benefits, nothing done to cover increased fuel costs and a capital budget described as a "disaster." In a recession, this might be understandable, but this is not the case.

On the other hand, McCormick sees enormous momentum at this University on the basis of the strategic planning in the various units. The UIF program and the Tools for Transformation program have led to substantial developments and improvements. At the same time, the federal government has increased its investment in higher education, particularly in research programs. So, the University is on the move. This leads to the following conclusion: we cannot muddle through. The state's budget problems are long term, not cyclical. The University needs to develop a long-term budget and revenue strategy to address these realities. For example, federal research opportunities won't wait because all of our momentum is at risk. McCormick suggested a two pronged strategy:

1. State support: This component has several dimensions. We have to press hard for the best budget we can get, even though we won't get everything we want. We will need more flexibility with tuition, both to raise it and to spend it, most likely on faculty salary. We also need to seek more autonomy, and referred to the symposium on late November at which former University of Michigan President Duderstadt highlighted the importance of autonomy. We can ask what is the best use of autonomy from universities like Michigan and use this knowledge to help shape our momentum. For example, we can

seek additional autonomy when it comes to research. Finally, we will also have to consider taking initiatives to the people, and some behind the scenes work has already started. The final piece of this would be working across the University to work with external constituencies to improve our communication. In this sense, Jack Faris has been particularly effective. These efforts are part of a long-term strategy.

2. The second prong means continuing internal discussions about investments, additional funding strategies, and how to use these sources of revenue. Provost Huntsman will be working with SPBC and other groups to look at possible revenues and investments to enhance our position. Some of the investments will not be discretionary, e.g. covering fuel costs. Other investments will be discretionary and highly desirable. On this, faculty salaries come easily to mind. The University also needs to be able to make venture investments through either internal reallocations or from federal funds or other sources. Conversations about these ideas will be taking place in the coming months.

Also, we should explore other strategies that might be available for seeking new sources of revenue that would close the gap between current funding sources and the investments that we wish to make. We are beginning a capital campaign. There are also technology transfer funds. Some parts of the University may need to think about their privatization, citing the example of the near private status of the professional schools at Michigan. We need to think honestly about that approach. Another strategy, which he raises with trepidation, would be program reduction. We have to ask this if we are to face this situation responsibly. This is largely a unit and faculty inquiry.

Finally, another strategy would be to think about structural changes in instruction and admissions. Suppose we change to a semester system? We shouldn't change, however, unless there are academic benefits to any structural change. These are academic issues which means that they are faculty issues and will require working together with the faculty. This will call for a conversation with and between many constituencies within the University and will be a strategy that will unfold over the coming years.

### Questions and Answers

1. Chalker-Scott (FCIQ) asked if we will be working with other universities regarding the budget? The President replied that we will, and we will be working also with K-12 as well as community colleges. He noted that Univ. of North Carolina recently passed a huge capital budget so that there is support for higher education.
2. Holzworth (FCFA) asked Huntsman to parse out some of the research savings ideas. Huntsman pointed out, for example, that several years ago there was a sales tax waiver that had initially applied to the University of Washington. One thing we could do is to revisit the decision in which the tax was applied. Another example is the 1996 amendment of the Ethics Law which said that if we comply with federal law, that would be good enough. But, that really was not the case and state standards have been applied. These are beginning to cause problems. The Governor's proposal has a million dollars for some research issues. Also, in our indirect cost structure, we have operations, depreciation, etc. but currently we cannot use those funds for mortgages for research facilities so we are asking for bonding authority that would allow us to have more flexibility.
3. Another person noted that the University has asked for 6/4% salary increase, retention funds, and tuition enhancement of salary. Additionally, there is an ATI proposal and suggested (noting his departments benefit from this) that it would be an easier sell to the legislature because they can see an immediate payback as in the technology programs. Pursuit of these would put us more in control of our own

destiny. McCormick noted that they are thinking about these types of initiatives and Huntsman said that this was a perceptive comment. Legislators do like to see a return and have been impressed by the research proposals that have a return. We have to be careful about getting support, however, for existing activities and not just expansion. Most of the research funds have gone for new activities. We need to convert the enthusiasm to existing as well as new programs.

4. Chalker-Scott asked about the budget's emphasis on teaching excellence, and suggested using students to testify or to communicate to people about this and how good teaching matters. Coney and McCormick noted that Jack Faris has been making a better use of the student voice.

### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**

The committee has been looking at the budget planning, and a departmental merger, that was characterized as "friendly." This merger presents an opportunity to work out a set of workable procedures for departmental mergers and consolidations.

### **Report on Legislative Affairs**

Ludwig (Senate Legislative Representative) did not want to repeat the President's comments but did emphasize two points. This budget will be more a product of budget limitations than of revenue caps. This is a change in emphasis. The legislature will have to present a budget based on an economic forecast that will be done in March, and it is not expected that this forecast will be particularly optimistic. It could well be, also, that there may be a salary increase that will be eaten up in covering benefit gaps. Another interesting aspect of the budget is that salaries of higher education employees and other public employees have been separated from K-12 salaries. Initiative 732 required that K-12 salaries be tied to the CPI which is more generous than the state's traditional index. A lot of legislators are not happy with this approach. Also, the \$15 million retention fund request may not be fully met.

He added a quick word about the legislature: It is likely to go longer than the official April stopping point, and may go into the summer as they encounter difficulties in crafting a budget. The senate is 50-49 and the house is evenly split as it was last year. The house will have co-chairs and its efficiency will depend upon how the chairs get along, although this year it is not necessary for both chairs to agree before a bill is heard. Staffers have already told him that things are not getting off to a great start.

On non-legislative issues, the primary concern for the University is the TA legislation. He sees the Senate's earlier vote as a mandate to work hard on this legislation and will work with the administration on its passage. But faculty collective bargaining is important also. The WFT/WEA is submitting bill which has been affected by our class C resolution. The current draft has adopted three of the parts of the resolution but not the strike clause. We have also been drafting our own bill based upon the California legislation and may go forward with that. Two fundamental opinions have informed his approach on this. First, we need legislation that reflects our unique structure. Second, we would be best served if the faculty and administration could work together on legislation. He hopes that we can have a stronger statement from the President because we need to be able to explain to the faculty why we might want to wait. But there is a lot of room for negotiation and discussion.

## Discussion

1. Clark Pace asked the President why couldn't the Administration join in with the faculty? McCormick stated that he believes that we need to come in "under the radar" on the TA issue, and that if we are too public with other legislation, then it would endanger the legislation and might lead to a strike. Ludwig suggested that the faculty remain quiet on this until the TA legislation passes and then we could go jointly. McCormick said that we could talk about this and appreciated how this suggestion respects the TA situation but that he will need to discuss this with Dick Thompson. He also stated that he would be more comfortable with UW specific legislation than with the AFT/WEA legislation. Holt pointed out that if WEA includes us because of inclusion of the fourth principle, we would be in a very awkward position and might well have to go forward. Ludwig agreed, pointing out how working with CFR, we have been able to get some changes in the WFT/WEA legislation. McCormick asked that we sit down with Dick Thompson and that this was, from his point, a new approach and worth talking about.
2. Seelye Martin (Group II) asked what we do if we are included in the AFT bill. Currently, Ludwig stated, we have an agreement that we are not included. McCormick stated that if the UW were included and the bill was inconsistent with the Class C resolution, we would have to oppose it. But Holt said that the problem is that we may well be close to having the WFT bill line up with our interests.
3. Diane Martin (FCRIB) asked about the effect of a bill on our salaries. Ludwig said it was hard to predict. There might be a trade, and it might be worth it if we are not going to get a meaningful increase. We will have to deal with this if it comes up. McCormick said that this is a real worry because it does telegraph priorities and they may pass this rather than grant a salary increase. Ludwig pointed out that if we are always worried about salaries as a priority, there will never be a good time. That is an eternal issue. McCormick stated he will take the initiative in scheduling a meeting on this issue.

## **Nominations and Appointments**

The nominations were approved as listed in the agenda.

### **Class A Legislation: Voting Rights for Research Faculty**

Coney explained the procedure as we lead up to a second reading of the legislation. The President supports the legislation and has no comments. Vaughn read the minor wording suggestion from the Code Committee which was approved. Coney then asked whether the SEC was ready to send this to the Senate for a second reading. It was moved and unanimously approved to send it to the Senate with the change suggested by the Code Committee.

### **Class A Legislation: Establishment of Tri-Campus Council and Proportional Representation**

Holzworth introduced this legislation, noting that the FCFA has taken a great deal of time, working as a Council as well as with the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, in developing this legislation. This is legislation that would fully enfranchise the Bothell and Tacoma campuses and bring them into full partnership in faculty governance. This would provide for proportional representation as well as meaningful representation in the work of councils, especially considering the commuting difficulties that are raised by their distance from

Seattle as well as their greater teaching loads. Holzworth also explained the evolution of this legislation as both campuses grew and matured, especially as it pertained to coordination of the activities of all three campuses. Originally, there had been a Tri-campus Conference. A body of that would be retained in the legislation but it would be more effective. This legislation also reflects a belief that our University is strengthened by the involvement of all three campuses.

Another issue that was faced was the way to provide for Bothell and Tacoma participation in the other councils. At this point, while they are welcome to participate, but it is not practical. FCFA addressed the level of participation by including more representation on the SEC so that Bothell and Tacoma representatives could explain Bothell and Tacoma positions as well as be able to vote. He also introduced Rob Crawford and Jack Meszaros as representatives of their campuses.

The last item involved the handling of Class B legislation. Class B legislation becomes "law" unless there is a 5% objection of the Faculty. Neither Bothell nor Tacoma can mount this kind of vote. This was one of their biggest concerns because a lot of the Class B legislation describes the way in which faculty make academic policy, particularly regarding the curriculum. This approach of the legislation allows both campuses to have a meaningful voice on these issues.

As written, then, the legislation is a careful balance that acknowledges the need for voice of these campuses but also acknowledges the reality of the tri-campus arrangement. An effort was made to try to keep this legislation as simple and consistent as possible. Thus, the legislation now says group or campus. He also reviewed the charge to the new council: Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy which is meant to be all inclusive.

Coney asked for a motion to introduce the legislation and begin discussion. Approved.

### Discussion

Rob Crawford (Tacoma) suggested a few amendments:

- a. 22-41C: Amend this section to read "Chairs of Faculty Councils and Chairs of Bothell and Tacoma faculty organizations." (See his handout, attached) Moved and seconded. Holzworth agreed with this suggestion because the point is to give voice and make sure that council chairs and others have a voice. Approved.
- b. 22-37B: Insert word "campuses." Moved and approved.

Vaughn commented that an audit of the Handbook in next year or two will probably reveal the necessity for other technical amendments to add "campus" to various sections of legislation. The motion as amended was approved.

### **Class C Resolution on Honorary Degrees**

Coney began by explaining the status of a Class C resolution. The resolution was introduced by Christina Emerick (FCUR). She explained the history of this legislation which began when the Office of Exercises suggested that it would be appropriate. She briefly summarized the information that was presented in the agenda, noting that the last honorary degree was given in 1910. In part this is because until recently, the University President gave the commencement address. She also reviewed the list of the dignitaries who have spoken at

graduation. This resolution would also present opportunities when other deserving persons appear at the University. The Council was concerned that a role for meaningful faculty voice in this process be maintained. Granting an honorary degree can be an important way to raise the profile of the University. She gave the example of Desmond Tutu whose biographical note lists all honorary degrees. In a web based format, which she had consulted, there were links from the list of degrees to the degree granting institution. Finally, she went over the language of this proposal, emphasizing the process of faculty voice. Moved and seconded.

O'Neill (Group V) suggested that "for an honorary degree" be added at numerical paragraph two. Approved. McCormick asked that the SEC support this resolution. This is a traditional way for institutions to involve themselves with men and women of significant achievements. The honor runs both ways: both to the recipient and to the granting institution. This would be done in small numbers and after careful review. It allows alignment with individuals and ideas that bring credit to the University. Holzworth suggested several problems with the resolution. He thinks that it should be Class B legislation, and noted that the President already has this authority so that the proposed resolution limits the authority of the President. Emerick said this language is from Handbook. Holzworth said it sets a procedure so should be Class B. Holzworth objected to the coupling of commencement speakers and honorary degrees. He pointed out that there are other speakers, e.g. Danz lecturers, that should be similarly honored. This is not to say that he objects to honorary degrees. His third point is that we drop the procedure and just encourage the President to set up a process. The Faculty have control over academic degrees and that is enough since this is basically political. Emerick responded by saying that this was not limited to commencement speakers since numerical paragraph 4 makes it possible to give honorary degrees in other circumstances. She also pointed out that the resolution was the process of careful consultation with a wide variety of groups in which it was agreed that this was the best way to present this issue. Jack Carr (Group VII) said that he was somewhat uncomfortable with the proposal because it seems that the order is turned around since it means that we decide speakers before degree status. The point of this is honorary degrees and the process for granting them. Holt asked why it was not being presented as Class B legislation. Emerick said it does not change what the faculty can do; it does not change the handbook. Vaughn pointed out that the test of the class of legislation is not whether there is a procedure but rather the level of review that the SEC or the Senate wishes to have it. Holt then cited the state statute regarding this matter and reviewed the stringent requirements in it. Maybe his is really a matter for the state legislature, he conjectured. Holzworth suggested that to get this passed it be de-coupled from commencement, and address deserving people more generally. Then, the FCUR could develop procedures for the review of various categories of candidates. O'Neill (Group V) stated that if we changed paragraph one to consider candidates for honorary degrees including commencement speaker, and then deleted paragraph 4, that this would address the de-coupling. Chalker-Scott said that perhaps making it confined to the Committee on Public Exercises is too narrow also, and that any group that proposes a speaker would then send it to FCUR as the faculty group responsible for screening these. Emerick was cautious about this because she worried that this might mushroom. Schaufelberger (FCUFS) pointed out that you could just say that the FCUR could just be given the power whatever the circumstances to approve honorary degrees. Holzworth, who cannot vote at SEC meetings, asked that it be tabled and sent back to FCUR. A motion was made to send the resolution back to the Council and de-link the nominations as discussed. There should be a Class C resolution which would grant approval of honorary degrees and Class B legislation that would outline the process by which a faculty body would review the nominations. The motion was approved.

## **Approval of Agenda**

The body voted to drop item 13 regarding honorary degrees from the agenda. Ludwig pointed up it could still come up from floor. The agenda was approved as amended.

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

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