

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 10, 2006, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: José Alaniz, Karen Boxx, Steve Buck, Beth Kerr, Donna Kerr, Ashley Emery, Bill Erdly, Richard Christie, Ross Heath, Blayne Heckel, Robert Jackson, Don Janssen, Kalpana Kanal, Marcia Killian, Clark Pace, Kevin Laverty, Daniel Luchtel, Dina Mandoli, Margaret Rogers, John Schaufelberger, Brent Stewart, Gail Stygall, William Welton, Phyllis Wise.

Absent: James Antony, Jan Carline, Mark Emmert, Brian Fabien, Lee Dunbar, Kathy Gill, Adam Grupp, Annie Lam, David Lovell, Michael Vitiello.

Guests: Patrick Dobel.

1. Approval of Agenda. **Approved.**
2. Approval of Minutes of the 13 February 2006 Senate Executive Committee meeting and 2 March 2006 Faculty Senate meeting. **Approved.**
3. Opening remarks from the Chair.
Ashley F. Emery, Chair of the Faculty Senate.
4. Report from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Phyllis M. Wise.
 - *Dean Search Update.* The deanships of School of Social Work, the Information School, the College of Architecture and Urban Planning and the College of Engineering have all been filled.
 - *Vision statement update.* Within another month or so the final form of the vision statement for the University will be issued.
 - *Undergraduate Education.* The reports on undergraduate education have been received; a reorganization will be announced within a week or so.
 - *College Structure.* Arts & Sciences Dean David Hodge will take a position at another university; this is an opportune time to create a group charged with assessing the structure of the College of Arts and Sciences, looking at ways to achieve optimum efficiency of college operations.
5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
G. Ross Heath, Immediate Past Chair and Committee Chair.
 - While the Storti case was in process, the work of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting was on hold because of concerns about communication between the administration and the faculty.
 - To fund the Storti settlement, the University is taking about 17 million dollars out of University reserves for salary.
 - In the 2006 legislative session, the University of Washington did well.
 - Planning for the 2007-09 budget is at the conceptual level so far; it will go to the Office of Financial Management already in mid-September.
 - Last week the SCPB was given a "course" by Gary Quarfoth – a kind of Budget 101 on the general operating funds, the designated operating funds and the capital budget.
6. Report on Legislative Affairs.
David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative.

In David Lovell's absence, Senate Vice Chair Gail Stygall presented his report.

- This morning the Council of Faculty Representatives met with Washington Learns, in order to showcase faculty who work on projects that are “meaningful” for the state of Washington.
- The work of the Higher Education Coordinating Board on its College Readiness Project continues. UW Professor Gail Stygall is a member of the group charged with defining college readiness in the subject area of English. The plan calls for having standards prepared to present to the HECB by mid-summer.
- The search is underway for a deputy legislative representative for 2006-07.

7. Information.

Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative.

J. Patrick Dobel, Professor of Public Affairs, Faculty Athletic Representative.

Professor Dobel spoke to three issues, the first two of which are addressed in Exhibit A:

- Creating a position of Associate Athletic Director for Student Development to forge a direct relation between dean of undergrad education and the associate director of athletics.
- A policy for “preliminary admission” of some athletes to the University.
- The “challenge program” in basic academic skills is a month-long summer experience *before* training begins. Not totally success last year, it is being revised with the help of Writing Program, English, and Education. The belief is that the program will be much improved in the summer of 2006.

8. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.

Donna H. Kerr.

- Senate elections are underway, with voting to end on April 24, at 9:00 p.m.
- Because more time is needed to do the preliminary work on replenishing the membership and leadership of the University’s standing committees, the Secretary is asking that the nominating session of the SEC be postponed from April 24 until the next regularly scheduled meeting, May 8.
- Gene Kim and the Secretary have been working on the development of tools to assist the 18 schools, colleges and new campuses with the process of reviewing and revising their bylaws.

9. Reports from Councils and Committees.

a. Report on Undergraduate Education. Gail Stygall, Committee Chair.

Professor Stygall presented highlights from the UW Faculty Senate Report of the ad hoc Committee on Undergraduate Education, full report is at <http://www.washington.edu/facsenate/reports/undergrad.pdf>.

b. Reports from the Faculty Councils.

Academic Standards, Don Janssen

Don Janssen alluded to handouts on current projects, types of University degrees, preliminary admission of exceptional students. The definition of degrees has been sent to the Board of Deans for response. **{Exhibit B}**

Benefits and Retirement, Karen Boxx

Dina Mandoli presented the “Princeton policy” at last meeting of Benefits and Retirement; Benefits and Retirement is interested, for this is not just a women’s issue and needs careful further consideration.

The Council is working on education regarding benefits to faculty. She noted specifically that it is difficult to add Roth-IRAs, and the like because payroll system is so antiquated. Dubbing the payroll system “UW’s “viaduct,” it does not have the technical capacity to add to package.

Educational Technology, Kalpana Kanal

Professor Kanal reminded the SEC of the upcoming presentation by an online plagiarism service, Turnitin.com, on April 17, 9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m., in 142 Gerberding.

Educational Outreach, Bill Erdly.

Chair Erdly anticipates Class B legislation on distance-learning classes. Also the Council has been reflecting on the competitive nature of Educational Outreach and querying how regular programming can be provided at a distance, if there is no state funding. This question is a harbinger of changes in education in this century.

Faculty Affairs, Dan Luchtel

Faculty Affairs has been discussing the qualifications required for promoting faculty to the title of Principal Lecturer. Luchtel noted that, in the past, appointment to Principal Lecturer has been rarely used. The council may be recommending changes to Section 24-34 (B)(3) of the Faculty Code in order to ensure faculty are promoted to this title in recognition of exceptional distinctions and contributions and not just as a title awarded to just a select few.

Research, Brent Stewart

Serious concerns continue regarding "Effort Certification" for faculty on 100% federal funding. Some department chairs expect some faculty so funded to teach or serve on committees, without providing funding to cover such activities. At a meeting of the Research Advisory Board, Mary Lidstrom suggested that deans need to be attentive. However, Professor Stewart observed that there appears to be no way to track what the deans are doing and that there appears to be "no leadership here on any level." Especially because deans get a cut for departmental administration and because the legal liability is so high regarding this issue, this problem needs immediate attention, both Professor Stewart and several SEC members opined. Stewart noted that the idea that "deminimus" activities can be tolerated within Federal guidelines may unjustifiably minimize the problem and so get in the way of addressing it.

Student Affairs, Clark Pace

Problems students have in accessing majors continue. In explanation, Professor Pace noted that UW has a two-tiered admission, one for incoming freshmen and another at the point a student attempts to declare a major. In this regard, Student Affairs is working on a plan for the allocation of resources.

Tri-campus Policy, Maria Killien

Tri-campus Policy is meeting with Educational Outreach to consider the impact of EO activities on the programs of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. Professor Killien noted that her council is interested in what impact any restructuring might have on Tri-campus Policy.

University Facilities and Services, John Schaufelberger

Current concerns regard signage on campus; the master plan for athletic facilities, and Sound Transit. Professor Schaufelberger expressed concern about how the UW is to be involved in the latter in particular, for planned meetings have been cancelled.

University Libraries, Beth Kerr

Professor Kerr noted that *University Week* has an article on the costs of online journals.

Women in Academia, Dina Mandoli

Professor Mandoli reported on the attached Report on the Princeton Policy Assessment, an automatic extension-of-tenure policy for women and men linked to the birth or adoption of a child. This is a major issue nationally – one that she urged the SEC to consider next steps, asking other councils to consider and then perhaps taking to the full Senate for discussion. Report on Princeton Policy Assessment from Women in Academia **{Exhibit C}**.

10. Announcements.

None.

11. Unfinished Business.

None.

12. New Business.

a. Postponement of SEC Nominating Committee Meeting.

Action: Approve to postpone the April 24, 2006 SEC nominating meeting to the May 8, 2006 SEC meeting. **Approved.**

b. Review April 27, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda .

Action: The Faculty Senate agenda was approved as attached Exhibit D.

13. Adjournment. 4:37

PREPARED BY: Donna H. Kerr, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Ashley F. Emery, Chair, Faculty Senate

Relation between Associate Athletic Director for Student Development and Dean of Undergraduate Education (or equivalent position)

I. The Associate Athletic Director for Student Development is an employee of the Intercollegiate Athletic Program. As such, the Associate Athletic Director for Student Development has a regular reporting and responsibility relation within the athletic program.

II. As the steward for the academic and personal growth of student athletes at the University of Washington, the Associate Athletic Director for Student Development also has an ongoing relationship of consultation and review with the Dean of Undergraduate Education. The Undergraduate Dean's office will work collaboratively with the Athletic Department to ensure the success of student athletes on and off the field and reinforce the mission and commitment to undergraduate education.

III. As part of this relationship the Associate Athletic Director of Student Development shall consult with the Dean of Undergraduate Education on a regular basis. These consultations shall cover topics of mutual interest such as:

- Create partnerships between the academic programs and the Athletic Department that can provide support for the academic growth of student athletes and support the issues of undergraduate education at the university.
- Review the advising and coordinating functions of the athletic department and its relation to the academic success of student athletes.
- Create or coordinate academic opportunities that enhance the chance of success for student athletes and encourage their maximum integration into the academic life of the university.
- Address issues that may arise from the unique circumstance of student athletes and general undergraduate mission such as class enrollments; faculty and student relations; travel concerns.
- Bring issues of common concern to the attention of Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA).

IV. As part of this relationship and in accordance with the recommendations of the NCAA Certification Review process, the Office of the Undergraduate Dean will undertake an annual report on the performance of the Office of the Associate Athletic Director of Student Development. This report will be shared with the Associate Director, the senior management of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the ACIA.

Every four years the Dean of Undergraduate Education will undertake a full administrative and academic review of the performance of the offices of the Associate Athletic Director of Student Development. The results of this full review shall be shared with the Provost, The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Associate Athletic Director of Student Development, senior management of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the ACIA.

The Associate Athletic Director for Student Development and the Undergraduate Dean shall work collaboratively in light of these annual reports and the four year full program review to improve the performance of ICA in light of the mission of undergraduate education.

This recommendation was preliminarily passed by the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to forward to the Provost and President of the University of Washington. (1/12/06)

Policy for Preliminary Admission of Recruited Student Athletes to the University of Washington

POLICY

The Undergraduate Admissions Office (UGA) is working with Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) to admit the most academically competitive student body. To achieve this goal, UGA will provide recruited student-athletes (RSA) who meet certain minimum academic requirements preliminary admission provided certain conditions are satisfied prior to initial enrollment.

The policy creates a procedure for ICA and UGA to identify and make decisions on preliminary admission for qualified RSA during spring of their junior year extending to January 15th of his or her senior year of high school.

The policy applies only to RSA who meet the following academic requirements:

1. An unweighted grade point average, calculated by UGA, of 3.25 or higher.
2. A combined SAT critical reasoning and mathematics score of 1030 from one sitting. The subscore in each discipline should be at least 450. The ACT minimum composite score is 22.

RATIONALE

This policy improves the ability of UGA and ICA to recruit and admit well-qualified and talented recruited student-athletes (RSA).

This policy:

1. **Helps coaches to obtain commitments from RSAs who will flourish at the University of Washington (UW) at a much earlier point in the recruitment process.**
2. **Better prepare RSAs academically for admission to UW by guiding their study and preparation during their junior and senior years in high school.**
 - Informing RSAs of the academic requirements that must be met to finalize the preliminary admission will better prepare RSAs for the rigor of academic life at the UW.
 - Preliminary admission will provide earlier feedback to stave off potential problems and provide solutions to admission deficits prior to admission to the UW.
3. **Put the UW on an even playing field with peer institutions in the recruitment of academically qualified RSAs.**
 - For reasons largely driven by RSAs' desire to escape the turmoil and pressure of the recruiting process, promises of admission are now being offered to juniors in high school in a number of sports. These offers are generally given to well-qualified academic performers whose records suggest a strong probability of academic success.
 - Several conditions are attached to these offers, such as maintenance of a certain level of academic performance, graduation from high school, satisfaction of specific institution requirements, and/or fulfillment of NCAA eligibility requirements.
4. **Define clear lines of responsibility for the RSA, ICA, and UGA within the preliminary admission process.**
 - The RSA preliminary admission procedures delineate clear lines of communication and responsibility within and between UGA and ICA.
 - The RSA has a clear understanding of the requirements necessary for the RSA to achieve his or her goal of attending the UW.

Procedure for Preliminary Admission of Recruited Student Athletes

A. Definition of Preliminary Admission of a Recruited Student Athlete

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions (UGA) preliminarily admits (with additional required conditions for final admission) a recruited student athlete (RSA) after conducting an evaluation of academic information submitted by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) and determining certain minimum academic standards have been met.

B. Timeline for Preliminary Admission of RSAs

The time period for preliminary admission begins in the spring of the RSA's junior year and extends to January 15th of his or her senior year of high school.

C. RSA Identification Process

- 1) Each team will designate a coach to work with the Initial Eligibility Coordinator to identify potential RSAs for preliminary admission. The coach will request an academic evaluation for all RSAs to be considered for preliminary evaluation. The Initial Eligibility Coordinator will perform the preliminary evaluation and forward the evaluation to the Associate Athletic Director for Student Development.
- 2) The Associate Athletic Director for Student Development will provide additional comments and forward to the coach and Initial Eligibility Coordinator.
- 3) The head coach will then determine whether or not to make a request for preliminary admission.
- 4) The preliminary admission request will include the UGA request form, current unofficial transcripts, and test scores. Other information may be provided upon request.

D. Academic Requirements for Preliminary Admission

To qualify for preliminary admission a RSA must have:

- a) An unweighted grade point average, as calculated by UGA, of 3.25 or higher.
- b) A combined SAT critical reasoning and mathematic score of 1030 from one sitting. The subscore in each discipline are at least 450. The ACT minimum composite score is 22.

E. Monthly ICA Admission Committee Meeting (May – January)

- 1) *Chair*: Initial Eligibility Coordinator
- 2) *Members*: Sport Supervisors, Senior Associate Athletic Director for Compliance/Student Development, and Associate Athletic Director for Student Development.
- 3) Two weeks prior to the UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee meeting, RSA files submitted for preliminary admission will be reviewed by the ICA Admission Committee. This committee will determine which files will be sent to the UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee meeting.
- 4) At least one week prior to the UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee meeting, approved files will be forwarded to UGA for a preliminary admission decision.

F. Monthly UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee Meeting (May – January)

- 1) *Committee Chair*: Philip Ballinger, Director of UGA.
- 2) *Members*: Chair of the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA), Faculty Athletic Representative, Senior Associate Athletic Director for Compliance/Student Development, Associate Athletic Director for Student Development, Initial Eligibility Coordinator, Counseling Services Coordinator for UGA and UGA representatives as determined by the Director of UGA.
- 3) Two weeks after the ICA Admission Committee meeting, representatives of ICA will discuss recommended files with the UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee.
- 4) Based on the information received and discussed, UGA will make a preliminary admission decision on each RSA file presented.
- 5) UGA will offer the RSA preliminary admission, deny preliminary admission; or retain for further review. Denied cases will be returned to the coach by the sport supervisor.
- 6) If a RSA is denied preliminary admission, RSA may apply through the regular admission procedure for RSAs.

NOTE: UGA retains sole authority to decide upon Preliminary Admission.

G. Preliminary Admission Requirements for RSAs Prior to the Final Offer of Admission

- 1) UGA will detail the conditions that must be met to receive a final offer of admission (i.e., submission of a completed application; official transcripts; official test scores; NCAA qualifier; participation in sport; completion of requirements including, but not limited to, specific courses or grades in courses).
- 2) If all conditions are not met within the proscribed timeline, the preliminary admission acceptance is null and void. The RSA may then apply through the regular admission procedure for RSAs.

H. Notification of Preliminary Admission Decision

- 1) Within two weeks after the UGA-ICA Joint Admission Committee meeting, UGA will provide the letters of preliminary admission acceptance, including outlines of required conditions.
- 2) Within one week, the Initial Eligibility Coordinator will contact the relevant coach of the preliminary admission decision. The team head coach will determine if the preliminary admission acceptance will be sent to the RSA.
- 3) The head coach will notify the Initial Eligibility Coordinator if the preliminary admission acceptance letter should be sent to RSA.
- 4) Within one week of notification from the head coach, the Initial Eligibility Coordinator will notify UGA to send the preliminary admission acceptance.
- 5) Within one week of notification UGA will mail the preliminary admission acceptance letter. A copy of the letter will be sent to the Initial Eligibility coordinator who will forward copies to the relevant coach as well as the Associate Athletic Director for Student Development.

Passed and recommended to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards by the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (1/12/06).

Preliminary Admission of Exceptional Students

BACKGROUND

High school students often have a variety of exceptional talents that can be identified early while the students are a year or more away from graduating from high school. This early recognition and subsequent guidance could benefit one or more programs/departments/schools on campus. These talented students may be heavily recruited by other universities or not be counseled properly to take the right courses to be competitive for UW admission. After identifying an exceptional student, the interested UW campus group would have a greater potential of getting the exceptional student to apply, be admitted and enroll in the University of Washington if they could:

- 1) provide guidance to the prospective student with respect to specific areas that may be lacking in the student's profile, and
- 2) provide incentive to the student to address any potential problem areas identified (or to maintain the student's current level of broad achievement) and to apply to the University of Washington.

The purpose of Preliminary Admission of Exceptional Students is not to admit students that would otherwise not be likely to be admitted, but rather to recruit exceptional students and make sure that they are desirable students for admission.

PROCEDURE

The procedure for identifying and contacting exceptional high school students would be expected to vary, depending upon the program/department/school interested in recruiting the student. Specific details must be worked out with the Director of Admissions (or his designee) and can be approved only after review by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (in their University Handbook-defined role of being responsible for Admissions Policy). These details are expected to include specific conditions that must be fulfilled for the student to actually be admitted.

LIMITATIONS

Specific limitations regarding procedures for identifying and contacting exceptional high school students will be worked out as described above. In general, offers of preliminary admission must be made before the end of December of the student's senior year in high school. Also, the number of offers of Preliminary Admission for Exceptional Students made by a specific program/department/school during a given academic year should not exceed 20% of the average number of students who enrolled in that program/department/school at the UW each year for the past five years. This number may be modified for specific groups once historical data on the success of that group's Preliminary Admission Program becomes available.

Any Preliminary Admission procedures that are developed for specific programs/departments/schools must comply with the Statement of Principles of Good Practice (SPGP) of the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC).

Endorsed by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, April 7, 2006

**University of Washington
Faculty Council for Women in Academia**

“Princeton Policy Assessment”

In August 2005, Princeton University became the first university in the United States to automatically grant men and women faculty additional time in the probationary period before tenure review for the birth or adoption of a child¹. Previously, eligible faculty at Princeton had to request an extension.

Historically, Princeton’s reputation with women and minorities has been perceived as poor. This change in policy was motivated by a faculty survey that found that some faculty feared repercussions if they requested such an accommodation. The new policy is an effort to support some of the faculty with whom Princeton has the lowest rapport.

Currently at University of Washington, faculty who take leave for six months or longer at >50% full time equivalence (FTE) (i.e. they work <50% FTE for ≥6 months) are automatically granted an extra year on the probationary tenure clock². This time can be discontinuous, paid or unpaid but must sum to 6 months in one year and the individual’s workload *must* be reduced by more than 50 %. Although the one year tenure clock extension is automatically granted if the faculty member takes 6 months leave at >50% FTE, the faculty member can request “early” promotion for tenure review. Early promotion requests by faculty who have taken such a leave require that the chair or dean initiate recalculation of the tenure clock. Faculty who do not take leave may request a tenure clock extension if care giving responsibilities have “interrupted the regular dedication to teaching or scholarship.” This policy applies both to male and female faculty.

Hence, in contrast to Princeton University, the University of Washington has a partially automatic tenure clock decision because faculty who do not take 6 months leave at >50% effort in one year must actively request a tenure clock extension. Faculty who do take leave, but do not want the extension, must actively request “early” promotion. Early promotion usually entails an outstanding performance to honor faculty on a “fast track” to success. Faculty who have taken leave are not suggesting that they are on a “fast track” but this may not be clear to those involved in their promotion decisions.³ On the other hand, Academic Human Resources acknowledges that no request for a tenure extension has ever been denied.

FCWA has outlined some of the pros and cons of implementing a policy similar to that of Princeton at the University of Washington. Questions raised in the course of our deliberations are also enumerated.

Pros:

- 1) Automatic tenure clock extension regardless of numbers of months of leave taken would inform faculty unaware of their option(s) and would educate chairs/deans/etc. about this important issue.
- 2) A uniform automatic leave policy will condone and acknowledge that new families require increased time commitments away from the University, potentially avoiding the rejection, inappropriate comments or confrontation that could otherwise arise under the current policy wherein a faculty member must request the tenure clock extension from their chair or other administrator.

Cons:

- 1) There is no paper trail that differentiates requesting a tenure clock extension and declining an automatically granted tenure clock extension.

¹ <http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S12/42/89K59/index.xml?section=newsreleases>

² http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/procedures/leaves/leaves_med_fam.html

³ At both UW and Princeton, parents who adopt children are not entitled to the 90-day paid “sick leave” that natural birth parents are given even though they typically devote an equal amount of time with their new family member(s). An analogy to this is that when a parent dies who is not a blood relation, one is not entitled to paid leave or grievance time. While this is not an issue of tenure extension per se but a policy of insurance companies, it is linked to tenure extension because it differentially impacts the finances of birth versus adoptive parents and therefore erodes work-life climate at UW.

- 2) Tenure extension delays promotion of faculty who become parents; the magnitude of the delay scales according to the number of children.
- 3) For those seeking to relocate, tenure extension may be perceived negatively by institutions that do not ascribe to or have a similar policy. Labels associated with this are “not on the fast track”, “not a serious scientist”, “slow in being promoted”, etc.
- 4) Automated tenure extension mechanism is not recognized by granting agencies (yet) hence time off or decrease in workload can compromise the continuation of grants.⁴
- 5) If very few men/fathers opt to make use of their extension, a disproportionate number of female faculty will fall behind their peers⁵.
- 6) Automatic tenure clock extension could raise conflicts between faculty with children and those without children. Those without children, or those who did not take off time, will be promoted earlier and may feel they have had to “cover for” or increase their workload so that someone else could have children.
- 7) Having a child may be cast as a choice against a full-time or “serious” career.

In addition, this policy raises important issues about tenure clock extensions in general.

- 1) For non-tenure faculty, income derives from grants and from financial support based on productivity.⁶ What are the policies and procedures in place at the University for compensating the faculty during this time and are these policies uniform across campus?
- 2) How should responsibilities (e.g. teaching, students, etc.) be diminished during this time, and who should make this determination? Does UW have policies for curtailing responsibilities that can guide chairs toward uniform resolution of these issues?
- 3) What is the maximum number of years or times this extension can be taken, and who should make this determination?
- 4) Is there an explicitly stated mechanism for grievances regarding tenure clock decisions?
- 5) Is it appropriate to request that a paragraph explaining the tenure clock extension be added to the letters of recommendation for promotions or for transfers to other institutions, which do not adopt or favor such policies?
- 6) Those adopting children are also permitted tenure clock extensions. Although the UW policy acknowledges the time commitment inherent in the addition of a child, independent of whether or not the new parents are the ‘birth’ parents or not, the policy does not explicitly state that adoptive parents are also eligible. Adding explicit language to the current policy would avoid inadvertent misunderstandings. For example, the disparity in eligibility for 90-day paid leave for natural birth (eligible) and adoptive parents (not eligible) might lead one to assume that tenure clock extensions worked the same way.
- 7) How can we, an institution seeking positive climate change, deal directly with the unspoken fears surrounding taking time-off for family that can or does decrease the quality of the climate at UW? Two fears FCWA encountered are: delay in my promotion clock will cause disapproval/disrespect among my colleagues; delay in my promotion clock will cause salary disparities with my peers. Absent data, parties interested in improving work-life issues such as FCWA are left unarmed to put these fears to rest.

Providing flexible career options, particularly for female faculty, emerges as a main concern from the results of the Leadership, Community and Values Initiative (LCVI) survey.

(<http://www.uwnews.org/Uwnews/Sites/oop/index.asp?sm=192>) Hence, the issue of tenure clock extension needs to be examined within the broader context of other work-life balance issues. Family-related issues that can have comparable impact on career development include caring for aging parents, medical problems within the family (e.g. of a spouse, children, etc.), and availability of childcare. In sum,

⁴ Information about how various granting agencies suggest one manage grants while on leave is provided by the UW automated tenure extension policy <LINK>

⁵ Academic Human Resources believes that females disproportionately are the parents who take time off, however FCWA was told that there are no statistics to support this contention.

⁶ Every granting agency has their own rules and regulations for leave-taking on their website. In some cases, policy changes depending on the grant program within the same agency. Some agencies have very little tolerance for leave of absence. UW does not facilitate their faculty finding information about leave policies of granting agencies by offering links to these sites.

issues of work-life balance, including tenure clock extensions, are important to maintaining and improving the climate in the entire University community, impacting research faculty, professional staff, and others in addition to tenure-track faculty.

Current Tenure Extension Policy at the University of Washington

http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/procedures/leaves/leaves_med_fam.html

The University recognizes that under special circumstances, such as care for new infants, faculty women and men must devote extraordinary efforts to their family responsibilities (that) may significantly detract from their research and academic capabilities. Even if the faculty member continues to work full time, efforts normally devoted to scholarship may necessarily be reduced by these new family responsibilities. In recognition of these family obligations, the University has developed several programs to stop temporarily the tenure clock.

When a faculty member takes a medical and/or family leave for six months or longer, the year in which the leave is taken is not counted as a year towards mandatory tenure review.

In the situation where a faculty member becomes a parent but chooses to take less than six months leave, or when other family care responsibilities have interrupted the regular dedication to teaching or scholarship, she or he may request the year in which this occurs not count as a year towards the mandatory tenure review. The faculty member who wishes a year be waived on the tenure clock may apply through her or his department chair and dean to the Provost. Please contact Academic Human Resources for additional information, 206-543-5630 or email at: acadpers@u.washington.edu

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, April 27, 2006
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
2. Introductory Comments – Professor Ashley F. Emery, Chair, Faculty Senate.
3. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – Mark A. Emmert.
4. Report of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor G. Ross Heath, Immediate Past Chair and Committee Chair.
5. Legislative Report – Professor David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative.
6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions.
7. Memorial Resolution.
8. Announcements.
9. Requests for Information.

Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative.

J. Patrick Dobel, Professor of Public Affairs, Faculty Athletic Representative.

10. Unfinished Business.

11. New Business.

Motions involving Class C actions should be available in written form by incorporation in the agenda or distribution at the meeting. It is preferable that any resolution be submitted to the Senate Chair and Secretary of the Faculty no later than the Monday preceding a Senate meeting.

12. Adjournment.

PREPARED BY: Donna H. Kerr, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Ashley F. Emery, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on May 4, 2006 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.