

Faculty Assembly Minutes

1 December 2004

Attending: Barsness, Beaudoin, Benner, Davies-Vollum, Dawson, Detray, Dobratz, Dierwechter, Dobratz, Emler, Fiegenger, Greengrove, Hoffman, Hong, Jackson, Kinder, Landenburger, Louie, Lowenberg, McLane, G. Mobus, J. Mobus, Nelson, Ogilvie, Primomo, Purdy, Rea, Richardson, Secord, Stein, Stevens, Tenenberg, Thompson

Agenda for the meeting:

- Minutes from the meeting on 20th December-Review and Approve.
- Introduction of Mythri Raj-The new assistant for the faculty assembly
- Reminder of Faculty Meeting to consider qualifications of all the candidates for chancellor, December 9, 12-1, Tacoma Room.
- Report of Vice Chancellor - Jack Nelson
- Presentation by Gary Quarfoth, Vice Provost UW Seattle Budget Office, on the topic of **performance contracting and next legislative session**
- Discussions and Questions

Meeting Minutes

- The meeting came to order at 12:50pm.
- Bob Jackson introduced Gary Quarfoth, Associate Vice Provost & Budget Office Director. Quarfoth spoke on *performance contracts*. The intent of the performance contract is to change the dynamics of interaction with legislators and policy makers in Olympia. He characterizes the current tone of discussions as being "boast and whine": boast about all of UW's accomplishments and whine about not having sufficient funds to carry out UW's mission.

He mentioned that he believes a fundamental shift in this discussion happened when they started discussing level of funding on a per student basis, rather than the overall level of funding as compared to peer institutions. And on a per student basis, UW is seriously underfunded, which is acknowledged now by policy makers.

What is the performance contract? It is a basic bargain, where the legislature guarantees UW a particular funding level, but in exchange UW provides specific outcome guarantees. These might include such things as number of students doing research, number of publications in certain sorts of journals. He believes that the regents (and administration) should be making the implementation decisions for how the UW meets its goals, not the legislators.

Quarfoth then discussed several different scenarios for raising the funding per student, which included raising the university's general level of funding, raising tuition, stop taking students. He provided a handout that details what some of these different scenarios would look like in terms of how each would affect the budget. One of the conclusions that he drew was that these contracts, would in effect, provide UW more control over its own destiny. For example, once a particular target level of funding is determined, if the legislature does not fund at the needed level, then the

university would be granted tuition setting authority to reach the target level.

He stated that there is additional information on this on the UW [planning and Budgeting](http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/) webpage (<http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/>) and that more will come out on this. And he expressed that it has more legs in Olympia than they thought it might. He distributed a handout called "UW Performance Contract Prototype, Executive Summary, October 13, 2004". The UW administration thinks that the performance contract idea is reasonable, and they have raised this issue with Locke, Gregoire, and Rossi, indicating that this is a direction that they would like to pursue further.

He also mentioned that other states have tried this approach and they have all failed miserably. The administration at UW hopes they can pull this off, though.

He then entertained questions.

Thompson asked *to what degree are faculty involved in the actual perf contract, stating that "the devil is in the details?"*.

Quarforth said that there is an oversight group with faculty representation from the Senate, and also a working group with representation from both Tacoma and Bothell. If this goes forward, then there will be continuing discussion with faculty. And he indicated that faculty can email directly to him if they have comments on the proposal.

He was asked *if he had any sense about which gubernatorial candidate is more comfortable with this?*

He said that Rossi is more comfortable. Gregoire is not necessarily opposed, but she probably has not thought about this to the same extent. Both were open to the idea.

Purdy asked *why is there reason to believe that it will work here when it hasn't worked elsewhere?*

Quarforth said "optimism". And that they have been at it for a while with legislative staff. He said that the nature of the discussion changed when UW started discussing funding levels on a "per FTE" basis. Legislators are now acknowledging that it is a problem and we need to do something about it. So we have a fair shot at being successful.

Mobus asked *what will the performance contract do that we wouldn't otherwise do?*

Quarforth stated that it gives partial flexibility in setting undergraduate tuition. They will let the UW set tuition level to reach FTE funding targets, regardless of what happens with funding from the General Fund. It gives more control over our own destiny - we want to be successful whatever they decide to do.

Secord asked *how this might backfire?*

Quarforth answered that perhaps the legislature might want too much control, micromanaging how UW carries out its mission. For example, taking the position that they don't just want to provide funding for new enrollments but also want to say in what majors the funding will be directed. Administrations biggest fear is that they will want that sort of control as it is the road that they have traveled with their "high demand" enrollment.

Lowenberg asked *if it might not be the case that an unintended consequence is that the outcome measure would include tests similar to WASL that is used in K-12?*

Quarforth indicated that this is happening nationwide, such as in Pennsylvania. So it is a real fear. If that is the road that the legislature goes, then UW won't sign.

Jackson asked *if he could you say anything about the timeline for adoption?*

Quarfoth indicated that Locke will present his proposed budget in about 2 weeks. As part of that, Quarfoth thinks Locke will propose something on performance contracts which will serve as a starting point for discussion. The legislative session starts January 15, 2005. The Senate just rearranged its committees so that there is no longer a Higher Ed committee -- it has been combined with K-12. His fear is that the K-12 issues will overwhelm the higher ed issues.

- Josh Tenenberg asked if there were any changes to be made to the minutes from the October 20, 2004 meeting. Jill Purdy mentioned that she had attended the meeting and should be added. June Lowenberg made a motion to accept the minutes as amended, and Zoe Barsness seconded. The motion to approve the minutes as amended was approved.
- Josh Tenenberg introduced the new faculty assembly office assistant, Mythri Raj. Raj introduced herself and invited faculty to stop by the FA office at WCG 309 to say hello and if she can provide any help related to faculty governance. Tenenberg indicated that Raj is in the office MW 12:45 - 4:45 this week and next, and then most likely M-Th afternoons next quarter. He indicated that she will send contact info to faculty, as she will be serving as one of the key contact people for FA business. She will be contacting current and future chairs of FA committees and councils within the next several weeks or early next year for agendas, minutes of your meetings and any policy decisions that your committee made. She will also be instrumental in the redesign of the FA website - please feel free to send suggestions to her. She will be taking on increasing roles throughout the year.
- Bob Jackson reminded faculty of the faculty meeting to consider qualifications of all the candidates for chancellor, December 9, 12-1, in the Tacoma Room.
- VCAA Nelson provided a report. He reported that UWT has about 10 faculty searches campuswide going on. Business has 9 people coming before the break. We expect to make appointments in winter quarter.

At the Board of Dean's meeting earlier this morning, there was a discussion of budget. He said that there will likely be a minimum 2% raise for faculty and professional staff, more likely 3%. But there is also likely to be a 2% budget reduction. There is also likely to be a 7% tuition increase without performance contracts. There is about a 1.75 billion dollar gap in the state budget.

The Faculty Senate is about to act on a transfer credit policy. It will say that UW will accept up to 90 lower division credits prior to coming to UW, but that they can accept more if it provides credit toward the major.

Nelson stated that sabbatical requests have come in, which exceeded initial allocations by 4 quarters. The allocations have been recalculated, and there are just barely enough releases to support all who have applied.

On the 2707 process, Nelson stated that the the Regents enthusiastically endorsed the UWT report, and added a codicil that we should move more rapidly to accept freshman and sophomores. The big question is how Community Colleges will react.

Nelson stated that the proposal for program approval from Tri-campus council has been sent to Ross Heath. Jack and Steve have sent their opposition to Ross about this proposal. However, both he and Steve believe that UW Seattle shouldn't be able to pass summary judgement about our programs.

- Jackson stated that we are looking for ways to get a handle on the review and approval process for programs at UWT. And also to simplify the committee structure to the extent that we can. Hopefully by the end of the year we will have some proposals related to these topics.
- Jackson then solicited other items or issues from the faculty membership.

Primomo said that one thing that would be useful would be to talk about merit policy on a campus level. Specifically, what processes are currently used in different programs, and if there should be campuswide processes. How is merit allocated? This would be useful, to ensure there is some consistency. This would be helpful to discuss at the EC.

Nelson asked how many people here have seen all four Chancellor candidates who have come so far, and indicated that the low number who have done so is disturbing.

Jackson asked for ideas to get the "faculty assembly juices flowing", to engage more people. Stein indicated that food seems to help. Greengrove indicated that more informal time when we aren't in meetings would help. More would get done if we met informally, perhaps once per quarter.

A general discussion ensued on the Chancellor search. There was a sentiment that we need to record the conclusions of the December 9 faculty meeting in writing, and officially pass it to our representatives on the search committee. This will then be brought to the committee as a whole. If it isn't in the final report, then we need to make sure that the sentiment gets transmitted to the President's office.

- The meeting adjourned at 2pm.