

## **Senate Meeting 4/23/15**

### **Chair's report update**

Salary policy – Close to a proposal from FCFA, input consultation with those who opposed plan and with administration.

Tweak to current policy; working on modification of play with more flexibility for units in regards to figures and formulas. More flexibility in additional raise, tweaks in unit adjustment (probably not have tiers) and other HR modifications.

So will present three options (Current, modified plan, tweak current code). Ask faculties in every unit to rank those plans. We need to beg folks to participate in Catalyst poll

Hope to identify where there is broad based consensus in regards to which direction to take.

Assuming there is a discernible consensus will polish code in support of that direction over summer, Will return to Senate in fall for formal consideration and vote.

Timeline – conduct poll this spring before end of school year. Redraft code, review code cops over summer. Have legislation before senate first meeting of the fall. → 1 reading by senate to allow for revisions and amendments back to SEC, then back to senate for up/down vote then to full faculty for a vote.

At very earliest new plan in place for the next biennium. Faculty will see three options and get to express a preference, then move formal legislation forward reflective of expressed faculty preferences.

### **Setting Priorities over multiple years for Senate**

Issues considering.

- (1) Reviewing jurisdictions of the various faculty councils. Senate is not a nimble body. Major work happens in the councils. Make sure that those councils are properly aligned with administrative priorities and faculty's priorities and perceived needs.
  - (a) Some awareness that one area of need for review is tri0-campus policy. Two other campuses have matured, own governance bodies. Not clear tri-campus council is good venue for issues that relate to three campuses. Need to consider carefully
  - (b) Intellectual property. Currently three councils dealing with it as well as an administrative committee. 4 bodies circling around IP issues. Need to think about whether that's appropriate
  - (c) Council on EO no longer exists. Subsumed into Teaching and Learning. Is this adequate? Or do we need more different oversight in regards to these issues?
  - (d) Are there faculty groups who are underrepresented (e.g., LBTG; non-US faculty, etc.)

Faculty councils are where all shared governance work is happening if not aligned with our needs, then not well served. Then administration appoints ad hoc committees. We need to give administration a clear place to go when they have policy issues.

We as campus need to consider how councils and mechanisms in Seattle serve us, where are we over or under or not at all served?

Document about sustainability needs faculty review and consideration. This is leading administration; identifies direction administration is taking.

### **Legislative Rep report**

Near end of the regular session – sole goal is to write a budget. What will delay end of this process are differences of opinion. So will likely be a special session, usually week or two taken off by full legislature and then committees work on negotiating solution and writing budget. Maybe multiple special sessions if needed.

Fiscal year ends June 30. Always met this deadline, even if so late difficult for us to write our budget.

Where are we with budget? See report sent in advance. Major areas of divergence between house and senate.

Tuition plans are very different – both freeze tuition, Senate reduces tuition and then even further in 2<sup>nd</sup> year of biennium. Plan to provide backfill to institution in place of what would have earned from tuition. Not clear where and how this will be funded. But way to reestablish support for higher ed from the state.

Leaves question about GET funding and what implications of tuition freeze reduction is for GET funding. This is likely to be a big sticking point.

Salary increases – differences between house and senate versions.

There is some money for new enrollments in high demand areas (computer sciences, STEM, WAMMI) also new money for medical residencies to keep folks in the state.

Big differences in financial aid under two budgets. Proposals hit lowest income families hardest. STATE NEED GRANT differs 70M between house and senate budgets.

Desire to fund higher education is there. Real differences are in HOW to FUND that backfilled support of state to higher education. Big philosophical differences (democrat and republicans) this is where they need to work. Democrats wanted additional revenue; republicans want to fund by transferring from elsewhere.

KEY, we're not the football; there is strong support on both sides for higher ed and maintaining quality of the offering and institutions.

BACKFILL – different sources of funding available to be used. House part comes from increased capital gains taxes in second year. Most of the \$\$ will come from general fund. And general revenue stream.

State's in good position at moment. Biggest issues is funding for McCleary decision.

### **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Will follow up in terms of legislative report. 3 weeks on the job. Agrees with JoAnn's take that there is a real interest in higher ed among legislators this year. Students, faculty and administration have successfully pushed point that higher education is important. Heard good things coming from their constituencies.

What's scary is that both house and senate budgets are less scary than governor's budget. Issue is that they are so different, what happens when last minute compromises are being made. So worries that we will not fare as well once compromises begin. Are we a top priority or one that will be traded away?

Has heard lots of positive things from both sides about higher ed, role we play in state economy.

She's been hammering on the WAMMI budget (senate budget is a disaster for us in this regard). Also arguing this in Spokane. 40 medical school slots will NOT move to Seattle if WAMMI closes down. WSU won't be graduating any new doctors for at least 10 years. She's told the legislature that "It's not a football game guys"; emphasized that it is about what serves the citizens of Washington. She's hopeful on this one.

Capital budgets are very different. Senate budget has 40M toward computer science building house only 6 million.

She's feeling optimistic that we will be able to talk about raises; worries if it comes to two special sessions may need to bundle them in different or back them in over the summer (depends on when budget is finalized and how we can then fund our own).

Hoping for a 4% for next year and figure out second year. Do we want to hold a bit of second year raise back to jump start a new faculty salary policy?

Once session is over, let's start thinking about next session a year ahead of time. Let's do longer range strategy, build support over the long range. Easier to do in the off years? Who/which particular legislators do we want to get to know. How do we cultivate the legislature and build relationships that last?

Race and Equity talk given – aimed at students, but initiative aimed at all of us; wants ALL of us to take seriously as she feels that some of work that needs to be done is by the faculty.

E.G. when we did thorough analysis of our hiring patterns by gender showed that we're hiring much higher percentage of men at full level and 50/50 at junior levels. So with data you provided she's been able to push back in terms of hiring patterns.

Offer been made to new Associate Vice Provost for Advancement. Need to start figuring out how to raise awareness and training for faculty (e.g., microaggressions). Not just about students and administration, but also about faculty and how we talk to each other. She thinks this is also about childcare. What stands in the way of the equity we want? Hard, will require small steps.

Salary Policy—acknowledges that we do this as part of a faculty legislative process. WON'T be done by executive order (misstep on her part).

**Academic Student Employment – strike vote?** Fees are imposed on themselves and these funds support student governances. Students vote fees on themselves. She said they are working on tuition issue at the bargaining table. She's referring to the fees that the students vote on themselves. In terms of the building fees she argues they are negotiating in good faith. She too would like to be above the median.

Note this is going to be a big issue for all of us, including faculty that Seattle is becoming an expensive place as it's more popular and influx of population to area. Peers we're comparing ourselves too include

schools in locations that are even more expensive (e.g., Berkeley; UCLA). Median isn't cap but it's a goal we want to achieve for time being, this will bring us up. She's hopeful we won't end up with a strike.

Some pressure from faculty I audience to have us as institution put pressure on legislature to focus on revenue side.

She responded that she did testify in support of new revenue, along with two other state institutions. We do need to figure out how we can have more of a voice in that; what role can faculty play? No reason that faculty can't take a position on this.

May be worth having one of the councils examine the graduate student issues (tuition, funding etc.) Can't just keep raising tuition on undergraduates to subsidize graduate studies. She emphasizes benefits to their education, so some cross-subsidies okay, but what's the limit/right balance?

What are we doing for the middle class? This is an issue we need to take on? Our financial aid goes up to 70K; think about a family of 80K paying full fare. We need to consider this in light of capital campaign. Can we find some additional funds/matching funds to help support the middle class.

Convene a faculty group with administration to consider these issues.

Kate brought these final questions from Ana Mari back to the council jurisdiction issue she and norm want tackled over next couple years.

## **POTENTIAL AGENDA ISSUES**

Summer school – fold into ABB process or keep separate?

Tuition waivers for grad students

Is ABB creating obstacles to cross college collaborations and enrollments?

WHERE in council structure should these issues be talked about?

How is ABB supposed to pencil out for graduate programs when the programs are designed for small cohorts? Are we being forced to develop undergraduate programs to subsidize graduate programs under ABB?

Faculty STATUS – Instructional career paths/Lecturers, etc. Does the faculty code has right kinds of appointments available?

**CLASS C RESOLUTION on Childcare approved.**