

MINUTES FOR THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 8, 2007, 2:30 p.m.

142 Gerberding

Present: Stygall, Luchtel, Emery, Harrington, Lovell, Booth-LaForce, Kaminsky, Breidenthal, Bowen, Rogers, Stern, Killien, Heckel, Wise, Schaufelberger, Friese, Astley, Collins, Stein, Dillon, Wilkinson, Sjàvik, Jain, Kerr, Fabien, Balick, Gill.

Absent: Emmert, Annabi, Murphy, Baldasty, Roy, Silberstein, White.

1. Approval of Agenda. **Approved.**
2. Approval of Minutes of the 13 November 2006 Senate Executive Committee Meeting and 30 November 2006 Faculty Senate meeting. **Approved.**
3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.
Gail Stygall, Chair of the Faculty Senate.
Professor Stygall said that because of a very full agenda, she would not make her usual remarks. She requested patience with what may be a long meeting, including Class A legislation and two Class C resolutions.
4. Report from the President
Phyllis M. Wise, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Standing in for the President, Provost Phyllis Wise reported that the big news is Governor Gregoire's budget, one of the best in a decade. The Governor is recommending a \$181-million increase over the biennium. This is a wonderful start to the legislative season, but of course the Governor's budget will not be the only proposal on the table. Nonetheless, it is important to appreciate its strengths: it provides a multi-year plan to get us on track with our Global Challenge peers, including providing an increase of \$50 million for faculty and staff, and additional enrollments in Seattle, Tacoma and Bothell, \$ten million for new research initiatives, and \$500,000 to enhance technology transfer.

The Provost said that the administration is equally happy with the Governor's capital budget, which provides for 94 million new dollars.

There were some needs not addressed in the Governor's budget. Specifically, the University did not get operations and maintenance for UW Tower; further, it does not include a response to the request for funds earmarked especially for the undergraduate experience, but money for that purpose is included in the overall budget.

The Provost concluded with the hope that the faculty and administration can go in with a unified voice. In summary, she said that she is grateful and believes that the proposed budget is on the right path. In response to a question by Faculty Legislative Representative David Lovell, she noted that a sum of \$500,000 was included for the recruitment of minority students, but nothing was tagged for advising. The latter, she said, would come out of the figure for enrollment.
5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
Ashley F. Emery, Immediate Past Faculty Senate Chair and Committee Chair.
There was nothing to report, because the SCPB had not met since the last SEC meeting.
6. Report on Legislative Affairs.
David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative.
Professor Lovell said that his report is the Class C Resolution to be addressed later in the meeting.
7. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.
Donna H. Kerr, Secretary of the Faculty.
Professor Kerr reported on the groundwork for recruiting to replenish University Committees and Adjudication Panel. Through a process of email or in-person discussions with all chairs of the Faculty Councils, except Tri-campus Policy, the membership needs have now been established. The

principal considerations are broad representation on councils from the Faculty Groups and pertinent expertise and experience. During the Winter Quarter the aim is to recruit 68 new members, of whom 58 will serve on the University Committees and another 10 on the Adjudication Panel. Because of the increasing expectations regarding the qualifications of new members, the “yield” for last year’s recruiting season was roughly one for every three contacts made. Hence, on behalf of the SEC, the Secretary of the Faculty faces a major challenge in the coming weeks and will need the help of council chairs and faculty group representatives.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.

Discussion: Challenges Facing Non-tenured University of Washington Faculty - Susan Astley, Group VII. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/conind2006.htm>

Professor Susan Astley identified herself as non-tenured faculty member in epidemiology, who is responsible for bringing in her entire salary through grants. Her concerns included the following points: See **{Exhibit A}**.

- In the Faculty Effort Certification online training, those faculty with 100% grant funding are instructed that each activity engaged in is supposed to be paid for by a grant. In her department, all faculty are required to serve on theses and dissertation committees. That is, the training advised faculty to put a grant budget number next to activities that are covered in the grant. Hence, no way to submit an auditable FEC. “I bring up this issue,” Professor Astley said, “because after year of trying, I am still not finding an answer. Each quarter, I sign those forms, but the numbers don’t add up. Students pay for thesis or dissertation advisement, but faculty are not paid for this.”
- The activity of writing proposals for new grants took Professor Astley two solid weeks in one quarter (20% effort). Professor Astley said that it is her understanding that grant writing is supposed to be covered in indirect-cost revenues, but that those funds are not being funneled into the PI’s salary. Even though Brent Stewart brought this up a year ago, there has been no help. She said that since then she was given 1% to get her on the payroll – a figure that has since been increased to 5%. But the numbers still do not add up. She noted that there has to date been no communication with faculty to get the FECs turned in appropriately.

Professor Cathryn Booth-LaForce, chair of the Faculty Council on Research, noted that Sue Camber has been working at the national level to try to have influence; further, she knows that Camber is drafting a document to address this problem. Professor Astley responded that she is aware that the matter is being discussed, but observed that it is not yielding results. She underscored that some faculty are refusing to sign the FEC, because it appears to be a legally binding document.

Professor Stygall said that even if faculty are allowed 5% for activities that fall outside the scope of their grants, it does not necessarily reflect reality. In response to Professor Dan Luchtel’s question whether the 5% was University-wide, Professor Astley said that it seems to be different school to school and department to department. Moreover, she noted, chairs will be required to negotiate whether a faculty member supervises a graduate student. In response, Provost Wise said that the administration is trying to move to at least 5% support, because they know that would be the minimal for a year. She agrees that there needs to be better communication and opined that there are no answers right now. To get to 5-7% costs between \$2 and 10 million.

Astley: For me, the central question remains, “Am I legally liable?”

Professor Stygall requested that Professor Booth-LaForce report back at the next SEC meeting.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

- a. Nomination of the 2007-2008 Vice Chair Candidate was moved seconded. Professor Stygall reported that the search committee identified one nominee, David Lovell, for the position of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. The committee (consisting of Professors Mary Coney, Doug Wadden, Annie Lam and Steven Hauschka) contacted 43 members of the faculty. She said that the lack of an articulated compensation policy hindered the search and that she is awaiting a response from the Provost’s Office.

The motion passed to forward David Lovell’s nomination to the Faculty Senate for election.

- b. Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees, after amended, were approved as indicated on **{Exhibit B}**.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.

There were no reports, because of the otherwise crowded agenda.

1. Information.

a. Timeline on Seatbelt Issue. **{Exhibit C}**

Professor Stygall called attention to Exhibit B and asked SEC members if they would like her to invite Elizabeth Cherry to come to the next SEC meeting to explain why seatbelts would be a liability. It was noted that the Children's Hospital shuttle has seatbelts.

b. Global Support Project — Ann Anderson, Assistant Vice President and Controller. **{Exhibit D}**
Ann Anderson, with Karin Johnson, is working with the Provost's office to improve support for global activity. She is beginning with research, because this is where most of the activities are taking place. A faculty advisory committee is being set up to make sure solutions proposed are pertinent. Currently a web portal is being developed as a better mechanism to get the word out regarding what support is available. The Web Portal would offer lists of:

- what to consider when attempting research in a participating country or region (tax implications, insurance policies available, "go-to" persons, and the like);
- who needs to know what regarding research in a particular country;
- how to knit together different sources of information;
- how to partner better with other universities doing such work.

There are no acknowledged "best practices." The project is not using central funds at this point. Currently, Anderson noted, they are working on scope. Since 9/11 we cannot send cash. There are HR issues regarding hiring in other countries. It is clear that there is a need for more education programming. She said they want to have a permanent group to update continuously. Further, they will include contact with Human Subjects. At this point, they are near going live with a Website and they request feedback.

c. Computer Security Policy – Kirk Bailey, Chief Information Security Officer. **{Exhibit E}**

Kirk Bailey said that the new data security standards will be in effect by mid-summer. The purpose of this new standard, in conjunction with the existing UW Information Systems Security Policy and the UW Minimum Computer Security Standards, is to provide for the protection of UW data from unauthorized internal and external access, from inappropriate use, and from loss, corruption or theft. While such standards have been published as "computing guidelines" for the last five years and have been implemented in our peer institutions, only UW Medicine has officially incorporated them into their security policies and standards. The levels of security required match the categories of data: confidential, restricted and public. For example, protection of confidential data requires encryption, including on laptops. He reviewed the groups that have been consulted both inside and outside the University to date and invited persons with concerns to contact him as a resource.

2. Announcements.

There were none.

3. New Business.

a. **Class C Resolution.**

David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative and Chair, Special Committee on Legislative Matters.

Title: Principles of State Higher Education Policy.

Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Discussion: David Lovell said that because the Governor's budget reflect the University's needs, the Special Committee of Legislative Matters has proposed this set of principles to support the University administration's position. Attention has been given to clarifying the faculty role in

shared governance and to seeking to extend its paramount duty regarding education to address in some measure the availability to of higher education. The thought regarding the latter is that this does not argue for a constitutional amendment. Chair Stygall noted that it is useful to have statement of the faculty's position in hand in Olympia.

Approved as attached Exhibit F.

b. **Class A Legislation – First Consideration.**

Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.

Proposed Changes to Clarify the Definition of a Campus and Distinguish Campuses from Schools and Colleges - Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 and 23-45.

Action: Decide whether to forward resolution for Faculty Senate consideration.

Discussion of proposed change to Section 23.23:

Professor Killien observed that the UWT and UWB are now four-year institutions. The proposed changes may appear to be small, but they are not minor. The first adds a definition of "campuses." Questions and answers were as follows:

- Can each campus arbitrarily pick its own standards? No. They are approved University-wide.
- What counts as a campus? Here, only those that are designated in the Faculty Code.
- What does "academic standards" mean? For about the last 5 years program proposals been reviewed across the three campuses. The Tri-Campus review does not include approval, only review, with an invitation for comments. (Professor Stygall pointed out that that segment of the *Code* has already been changed.)
- Is the goal to create more separation between campuses? Steve Collins responded that the issue regards authority to make decisions on each campus; the *UW Handbook* treats the new campuses the same as schools and colleges. The reality is that the new campuses are more organizationally complex than a school or college.

Discussion of proposed change to Section 23.45:

Professor Killien noted that the proposed change is intended to authorize the campus faculties to advise the chancellors on the general welfare of the campus. Questions and answers were as follows:

- Where is this headed? We don't know; this is all evolving.
- Does not decentralization cost more money and so leaves less money for other needs? This is about identity, a serious issue when this comes to recruiting faculty. The proposal calls for acknowledgement for the ways in which campuses are different from schools and colleges. Students apply to and are admitted to a specific campus, but all have a University of Washington degree.

Provost Wise said that even though programs are differentiated across campuses, there is single accreditation.

Professor Bowen responded that the review committee in the Business Program recommended separate accreditation. The Provost rejoined that she wants to discourage separate accreditations for such would mean higher costs. She added that if we want to control quality, we should not have separate accreditation. Marcia Killien averred that practice has evolved over the last 15 years; the aim here is to have the *Code* catch up with practice.

Approved as attached Exhibit G.

c. The January 25, 2007 Faculty Senate agenda was approved as amended with the addition of Class A and Class C resolution attached as **Exhibit H.**

d. A Class C resolution to support students on Lobby Day was moved and seconded. After brief discussion the motion was approved as follows:

WHEREAS, Lobby Day will be held Thursday, February 15th, 2007, and
WHEREAS, this is an opportunity for al University of Washington students to present their opinions regarding higher education to their legislators, and

WHEREAS, Thursday, February 15, 2007, is a scheduled class day,
BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the proposal of the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate that the faculty of the University of Washington make every effort to facilitate student involvement in Lobby Day by excusing them from class on Thursday, February 15th, 2007.

Sponsored by:
Kimberly Friese, GPSS
Cullen White, ASUW
Dr. Gail Stygall, Faculty Senate

4. The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

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

APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on Tuesday January 16, at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.

Non-tenured Faculty and Faculty Effort Compensation
Presented to the Senate Executive Committee, January 8, 2007
Susan Astley, Ph.D., SEC member

Key Issue:

1. Why have non-tenured faculty not been paid for grant proposal preparation, instruction provided to students while serving on University of Washington Master's and Doctoral Committees, and University activities such as attending departmental meetings, service on admission committees, etc?
 - a. The University of Washington GIM 35 Effort Reporting Policy for Sponsored Agreements states
 - i. "The total UW Institutional Base Salary must be distributed across all faculty member's university research, instruction, administration, service and/or clinical activities. This requirement may not be avoided by characterizing true UW activities such as proposal writing, instruction, university-related administrative duties, service or clinical activities as "unfunded" or "volunteer" activity for which no UW salary is paid."
 - ii. This policy is not new. The federal Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, Cost Principles for Educational Institutions has been in effect since 1979.
 - b. What potential sources of funds are available to pay faculty for these University administrative and instructional activities?
 - i. Circular A-21 states that faculty administrative duties including proposal preparation fall under the OMB definition of Facilities & Administrative (F&A) costs (see Attachment 1 below). Thus, it appears F&A funds are intended to be used to compensate faculty for these activities.
 - ii. Faculty providing instruction on Master's Thesis Committees and/or Doctoral Dissertation Committees typically serve for a 1-3 year period. The student is required to pay the UW tuition on a quarterly basis for thesis credit hours. Departments require a student to obtain a minimum number of thesis credits to graduate. Thus, like all other courses offered at the UW, it would seem reasonable that the source of funds to compensate faculty for thesis instruction would come from the tuition the student paid for the thesis credits.
 - c. How many faculty have not been compensated for their UW administrative activities and thesis committee instruction?

- i. University administrators have estimated at least 300 faculty are impacted by this. (See Exhibit B, SEC Meeting Minutes, January 9, 2006.) These faculty are often referred to as “100% research funded, non-tenured faculty”. These faculty do not receive salary support from the UW. Rather, they are responsible for securing their entire salaries through successful research grant submissions. They not only obtain funds to support their entire salary, but they typically secure funds to support the salaries of their entire program staff, and support University operation costs through 52% F&A. These faculty make up a large portion of the faculty who secure almost 1 billion dollars of research funding annually for the University of Washington.
- d. How long has this been going on?
- i. Based on my conversations with University administrators, no one can recollect a time when these faculty were paid for these activities.
 - ii. Per my experience as a professor at the University, I have never been compensated for these activities. My faculty appointment started in 1992.
- e. When did this issue come to light?
- i. Excerpt from the SEC Meeting Minutes from January 9, 2006
Faculty Effort Certification
Report to the Senate Executive Committee, January 9, 2006
Brent Stewart, Chair, Faculty Council on Research
Q: Why the sudden change in faculty effort reporting practice?
A: Based on the advice of legal counsel, the University of Washington (UW) began Faculty Effort Certification (FEC) Compliance Review during 2004/2005, including review of related organizations and internal practices. Although effort reporting rules have not substantially changed since the early 1980s (A- 21, see below), the impetus for review included recent major federal settlements with several large research universities (e.g., \$5.5M with Northwestern University) and increasing scrutiny and stringent interpretation of these rules by auditors. Ross Heath, then Faculty Senate Chair and I met with several high-level members of UW Administration a couple times over the summer of 2005 to discuss proposed modifications of the then current UW FEC policy. Mandatory on-line FEC training was instituted during autumn quarter 2005. The new FEC policy can be found in Grants Information Memoranda (GIM) 35
 - ii. The On-Line FEC training not only instructed faculty on the proper way to complete an FEC, but was the first written, broadly distributed statement by the University informing faculty that University activities

such as service on committees, proposal preparation, and instruction are required to be compensated.

- iii. This posed an intractable problem for the “100% research faculty”, for which the online training did not present a solution. Faculty were being told they are legally required to report ALL University activities, but “100% research faculty” had no funding source to charge those activities to.

f. Current status

- i. Dr. Astley will present the current status from a faculty perspective.

References.

1. AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006
<http://www.aaup.org/aaup/pubsres/research/conind2006.htm>
1. SEC Meeting Minutes Jan 9, 2006, Exhibit B. Faculty Effort Certification (FEC-Senate-2006.pdf)
2. Circular A21.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a21_2004.html#b
3. GIM35. Effort Reporting Policy for Sponsored Agreements
<http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/gim/gim35.html>
4. Faculty Effort Certification: FAQ
<http://www.washington.edu/research/maa/fec/#FAQs>

Faculty Council on University Libraries

Sonnet Retman, Group 4, American Ethnic Studies, for a term of September 16, 2006 – September 15, 2009.

Mark Kot, Group 3, Mathematics, for a term of September 15, 2006 - September 16, 2009.

The following are nominated to serve a term of September 16 – September 15, 2007:

Academic Standards

Erin Shields, ASUW

Benefits and Retirement

Andrew Everett, ASUW

Educational Outreach

Angela Ju, ASUW

Jonathan Ting, GPSS

Educational Technology

Linda Lane, ASUW

Faculty Affairs

Erin Shields, ASUW

Instructional Quality

Erin Shields

Multicultural Affairs

David Kim, ASUW

Sara Diaz, GPSS

Research

McKinley Smith, ASUW

David Foster, UWRA

Student Affairs

Anna Batie, GPSS

Erin Shields, ASUW

Tri-Campus Policy

Paul Fleurdelys, ASUW

University Facilities and Services

Adel Sefrioui, ASUW

University Libraries

Jessica Albano, ALUW

Jessica Mortensen, ASUW

University Relations

Scott Macklin (with Suzette Ashby-Larrabee as alternate), PSO

Nataly Bankson, ASUW

John Bolcer, ALUW

Women in Academia

Kelly Gilblom, ASUW

Pamela Yorks, ALUW

SEATBELTS IN UW SHUTTLE VEHICLES

History of Issue:

- In 1999 an email inquiry was sent to former President McCormick after a staff forum was conducted asking why seatbelts were not provided in the Health Sciences Express (HSE) buses.
 - There was broad-based discussion held in Transportation Services and Facilities Services involving the following staff:
 - Fleet Manager
 - Property and Transport Services Manager
 - Shuttles Operations Manager
 - Transportation Services Director
 - Associate Vice-President for Facilities Services
 - After the discussions, it was determined not to install seat belts based on the additional liability the University would incur because drivers would not be able to enforce the use of seat belts.
- In February, 2001 an email was sent from the Director of Transportation Services to the Attorney General's Office regarding asking for an opinion regarding the issue of whether seat belts should or should not be factory installed in the new fleet of buses being purchased. The Executive Vice President also requested a review of whether seat belts should or should not be installed in the new buses before bus specifications were finalized with the manufacturer.
 - The Attorney General's Office referred the issue to Risk Management.
- In March, 2001 Risk Management rendered an opinion regarding seat belts in buses, concluding that the use of passenger restraints on buses would create liability exposure for the University.
 - Based on the Risk Management opinion, the Director of Transportation Services made the decision to not have seat belts installed in the new HSE buses.
- In January, 2006 UW Shuttles received an inquiry from a faculty member regarding lack of seat belts in the South Lake Union shuttle vehicles.
- In March, 2006 UW Shuttles consulted with its shuttle service partner, Gray Line of Seattle.
 - Gray Line stated that safety studies conducted regarding whether having seat belts in coaches or other large buses would make them safer have been inconclusive. Gray Line has adopted the industry standard and does not have seat belts in their large buses.
- In March, 2006 UW Shuttles sent a request to Risk Management to review the issue based on current laws and safety information and to render an updated opinion.
 - In March, 2006 Risk Management rendered an opinion which concurred with Risk Management's March, 2001 opinion.
- On November 6, 2006 the Risk Management Office reviewed the issue again and rendered an opinion that was in agreement with previous Risk Management opinions stating the following:
 1. There is no state or federal regulation requiring seat belts in large buses.
 2. Similar public transit buses in the Seattle area do not use seat belts.
 3. By installing the seat belts, the UW would be exceeding community standards; therefore creating more liability for itself.
 4. If seat belts are installed, drivers will be required to insure compliance with their use and will be required to limit passengers, i.e. no standing passengers on the bus.

**University of Washington
Global Support Project
January 2007**

Project Concept

The University of Washington (UW) needs an institutional administrative framework to effectively support global activities. While the UW has been engaged in global research and education for many years, administrative processes to support these activities are insufficient to handle increasing volume, scope and complexity. The support mechanisms need to be redesigned to better **enable global activities and provide services that are easy to use, timely and effective, and also address associated risks**. This project aims to establish mechanisms to better facilitate global work, including enhanced collaboration on administrative matters related to global activities.

Objective: To engage members of the tri-campus community in a discussion focused on identifying and establishing the components of an institutional framework to administratively support global activities. **Project activities will be closely aligned with institutional global strategies and initiatives, while at the same time working to address current challenges.**

I. Phased approach and Timeline

- Phase I - Sponsored Projects, (to be completed mid-2007)
- Phase II - Education and Programmatic Activities, (to be completed in Fall 2007)
- Phase III - Other Global Activities (e.g., foreign visitors) (to begin Winter 2008)

While each phase will inform the others, initial focus will be developing strategies to support sponsored projects. The greatest degree of growth, complexity and institutional risk involves externally funded research and training. In addition, with institutional strategy being mobilized towards global health, focus on administrative processes to support this strategy is timely and appropriate.

II. Campus-wide involvement (refer to Global Support Organizational Chart)

- Core Working and sub-working groups
- Critical project stakeholders
- Campus-wide communication

III. Potential deliverables

- Tools and guidelines (e.g., Web portal to relevant administrative procedures)
- Country by country matrix on key issues/challenges
- Data and information
- Policies and procedures (e.g., foreign office opening)

IV. Other potential outcomes

- On-going organizational and communication structure to address emerging issues and reassess current structures
- Partnering with selected universities involved in global research and education activities

V. Funding

No central funds to support the project are needed at this time. Depending on services or systems needed to support this activity, requests may result as the project evolves.

VI. Next steps

- Process improvements based on priority areas identified by faculty/staff in focus groups
- Assess additional issues encountered in Education and Programmatic Activities

Contacts:

Karin Johnson
Global Support Project Manager
Financial Management
kejohnso@u.washington.edu
206-616-1603

Ann Anderson
Assistant Vice President and Controller/Project Co-Lead
Financial Management
andera@u.washington.edu
206-543-4993

Team members:

Susan Jeffords
Vice Provost for Global Affairs – Project Co-Lead

Constance Adams
Office of Global Affairs

Doug Breckel
CFO, Treasury, Financial Management

Jean Brouelette
Administrator, Center for Studies in Demography
and Ecology

Kim Dinh
Administrator, Provost's Office

Steve Gove
Buyer, Purchasing

Karen Long
Director, Financial Services, Financial
Management

Rebecca McIntyre
Assistant Director, UW Real Estate

Frank Montgomery
Special Projects, Financial Management

Ted Mordhurst
Assistant Director for Compliance, Grant and
Contract Accounting, Financial Management

Linda Nelson
Director of Finance & Administration
College of Arts and Sciences

Lawrie Robertson
Director of Finance & Administration
School of Public Health and Community Medicine

Mani Soma
College of Engineering; Associate Vice Provost for
Research

Jeanne Semura
Quality Improvement Manager, Financial
Management/
Global Support Project Facilitator

Ysabel Trinidad
Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, UW
Tacoma

Amy Van Dyke
Project Specialist, Office of Administrative Services
UW Bothell

Daren Wade
Program Manager, Global Health Resource Center,
Health Science Administration

Sally Weatherford
Assistant Director, Center for AIDS and STD, School
of Medicine

Carol Zuiches
Assistant Vice Provost for Research, Office of
Sponsored Programs

Karen Van Dusen, Environmental Health and Safety

Project Advisors:

Elizabeth Cherry, Risk Management
Bill Nicholson, Attorney General's Office
Maureen Rhea, Internal Audit

DRAFT

Minimum Data Security Standards (Data Classification and Related Measures of Protection)

University of Washington

September 2005 // Revised 10/24/05 // Revised 12/06/05 // Revised 1/10/06
Edits (EL) 1/20/06, Edits (KS) 3/6/06, Edits (KB) 10/11/06

Prepared by:
Privacy Assurance and Systems Security Council (PASS Council)
Kirk Bailey, UW Chief Information Security Officer, Chair

Prepared for:
The University Technology Advisory Committee

Table of contents

- 1. *Background* 14
 - 1.1. Context 14
 - 1.2. Purpose 14
 - 1.3. Applicability 14
 - 1.4. Audience 14
- 2. *Data Classification and Examples* 14
- 3. *Controls for Protection of Data* 17
 - 3.1. Records Management (Retention and Disposal of Data) 17
 - 3.2. System Owners and Data Custodians: Roles and Responsibilities 17
 - 3.3. Access Control Principles 17
 - 3.4. "Controlled" Computer 17
 - 3.5. Controlled Application 18
- 4. *Protective Measures for Data* 18
 - 4.1. Protective Measures for Public Data 18
 - 4.2. Protective Measures for Restricted Data 19
 - 4.3. Protective Measures for Confidential Data 19
 - 4.4. Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures 19
- Section 5. Exemptions* 21
- Section 6. Reporting* 21
- Section 7. Enforcement* 21
- Appendix A. Glossary* 22
- Appendix B. References* 23

Section 1. Background

1.1. Context

The University of Washington (UW) and its affiliated institutions solicit, acquire, generate and maintain an enormous amount of information as part of business operations, education programs, and extensive research efforts. This information is a core asset for the UW and central to its ability to succeed in its mission.

This document describes the measures the UW and certain affiliated organizations take to protect electronic information entrusted to its care. A companion UW document, *Minimum Computer Security Standards*, describes the measures used to protect computers at the UW.

This document covers standards that are specific to the protection of UW information assets in electronic form (data). The intent of these standards is to support existing UW policy and information protection objectives by defining a minimum set of security standards that also support the UW's compliance requirements.

Proper protection of data is determined by a combination of compliance requirements mandated by state and federal government statutes and regulations, accepted best practices, and institutional risk management decisions. The approach taken at the UW is to adopt a classification scheme for all data and to define measures and practices that provide appropriate protection for each class of data.

1.2. Purpose

These standards define a classification scheme for data and related measures that employees and others working with data must take to protect it. This standard, in conjunction with the [UW Information Systems Security Policy](#) and the [Minimum Computer Security Standards](#), provides the basic directions for the protection of UW data from:

- Unauthorized internal access
- Unauthorized external access
- Inappropriate use
- Loss, corruption, or theft

1.3. Applicability

This minimum data security standard applies to all data associated with UW business; to any other data caches covered by statutory or regulatory compliance requirements that are found in all UW colleges, schools, departments, and other business units; and to data caches on UW affiliates' information systems. Data associated with UW hosted research efforts that represent significant intellectual property interests also are subject to this standard, and, in addition, may be subject to other specific protective requirements.

Any questions about the applicability of this standard can be forwarded to the UW Chief Information Security Officer for review by the PASS Council.

1.4. Audience

The targeted audience for this standard includes all UW *system owners* and *designated data custodians* (see Appendix A, Glossary). It also is for all individuals who have access to and use UW information systems and data assets.

Section 2. Data Classification and Examples

The nature of the data largely determines what measures and operational practices need to be applied to protect it. To help clarify the various minimum requirements for UW data security, three categories of data

have been defined. It is essential that those who are accountable for protecting the data (e.g., system owners and data custodians) understand and inventory their data assets according to these categories.

- **CATEGORY A – CONFIDENTIAL:** Data that is very sensitive in nature and typically subject to federal or state regulations. Unauthorized disclosure of this data could seriously and adversely impact the university or the interests of individuals and organizations associated with the university.
- **CATEGORY B – RESTRICTED:** Data that is generally circulated and subject to disclosure laws, yet sensitive enough to warrant careful management and protection to ensure its integrity, appropriate access, and availability.
- **CATEGORY C – PUBLIC:** Data that is published for public use or has been approved for general access by the appropriate UW authority.

Table 1. clarifies the nature of each data category and provides criteria for determining which classification is appropriate for a particular set of data. When using this table, a positive response for the most restrictive (highest risk) category in any row is sufficient to place that set of data into that category.

Table 1. Data Classification Categories

	Category A CONFIDENTIAL	Category B RESTRICTED	Category C PUBLIC
Legal Requirements	Protection of data is required by law. (See examples of specific HIPAA and FERPA data elements below.)	UW has a contractual obligation or best practice (due care) reason to protect the data.	
Risk Level	High	Medium	Low
Examples of Risk	The UW’s reputation is tarnished by public reports of its failures to protect sensitive records of employees, students, or clients.	Data is disclosed unnecessarily or in an untimely fashion, which causes harm to UW business interests or to the personal interests of an individual.	Confusion is caused by corrupted information about enrollment and tuition that is displayed on the official UW Web site.
Examples of Specific Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIPAA – protected data <i>when associated with a health record</i>¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Patient names – Street address, city, county, zip code – Dates (except year) for dates related to an individual – Social Security Numbers – Health conditions and symptoms – Prescriptions – Account/Medical rec. #s – Health plan beneficiary information – Certificate and license #s – Vehicle ID and serial #s – Device ID and serial #s – Biometric identifiers – Full-face images – Any other unique identifying number, characteristic, or code – Payment guarantor’s information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UW NetID account information • Contact information between the UW and business partners or vendors • Library use records • Employee Internet usage • Telephone billing information • Parking permits • Location of assets • Critical infrastructure blueprints or schematics • Specific physical security measures • Specific technical security measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus promotional material • Annual reports • Press statements • Job titles • Job descriptions • Employee work phone numbers (with special exceptions) • Employee work locations (with special exceptions) • Employee email addresses (with special exceptions) • Value and nature of fringe benefits • University of Washington business records

	Category A CONFIDENTIAL	Category B RESTRICTED	Category C PUBLIC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Telephone and fax #s - Email, URLs, and IP #s • FERPA – individual student records² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grades - Courses taken - Schedule - Test scores - Advising records - Educational services received - Disciplinary actions - Student ID # - SSN - Student private email (with exceptions related to UW business) • Export Controls (e.g., ITAR)³ • Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLB)⁴ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employee financial account information - Student financial account information (aid, grants, bills) - Individual financial information - Business partner and vendor financial account information • Employee information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Security Number - Date of birth - Home address or personal contact information - Performance reviews - Specific benefit selections • Donor information • Trade secrets, intellectual and/or proprietary research information • Information required to be protect by contract • Vendor non-disclosure agreements • Attorney/client privileged records • Restricted police records (e.g., victim information, juvenile records) • Computer account passwords • Certain affirmative action related data⁵ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proprietary research • UW employee business-related email (including student employees, but only their work-related email) 	

¹For more information on HIPAA: http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/faq_hipaa.html

²For more information on FERPA: <http://www.washington.edu/students/reg/ferpafac.html>

³For more information on Export Controls: <http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/ecr.html>

⁴For more information on GLB: <http://www.ftc.gov/privacy/glbact/glb-faq.htm>

⁵For more information on UW Affirmative Action Policy:
http://www.washington.edu/admin/eoo/hb_Vol-IV_Non-discr.html

Section 3. Controls for Protection of Data

This section outlines the controls that are necessary to implement the protective measures outlined in Section 4, Protective Measures for Data.

3.1. Records Management (Retention and Disposal of Data)

This standards document is specific to measures and practices necessary for the protection of electronic UW data. Everyone who is accountable for the management or use of UW data must also become familiar with other university-wide and departmental policies and procedures related to records management that are published separately. These include records retention policy and procedures for the proper disposal of electronic media and paper records. For details, see the Records Retention and Confidentiality Web page: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/pol.proc/cdl/recordsReten.html>

3.2. System Owners and Data Custodians: Roles and Responsibilities

Section 6 of the *UW Information Systems Security Policy* defines the specific roles and responsibilities of groups and individuals within the university. These roles and responsibilities form the basis of accountability for and functional requirements of the protection of UW information systems. The roles of the *system owner* and *data custodian* are key to successful data protection practices. All individuals who have been designated as a *system owner* and/or *data custodian* should review their responsibilities as specified in these *Minimum Data Security Standards*, the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*, and the *Minimum Computer Security Standards*.

3.3. Access Control Principles

A required measure for protecting both confidential and restricted data is an *access control system* (see Appendix A, Glossary) that has physical, technical, and procedural elements. Any access control measure established by a *system owner* or *data custodian* must be implemented and maintained in compliance with the *principle of least privilege* and the *principle of separation of duties* (see Appendix A, Glossary) as specified in the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*.

3.4. "Controlled" Computer

All computer systems that host confidential data or applications that use restricted data must be carefully controlled in terms of their configuration, operation, maintenance, and security measures.

It is the responsibility of the owner of the controlled computer to ensure that all management requirements are met. Controlled computers must be managed with a level of care and professional support that includes the following:

3.4.1. Controlled computers will meet all UW minimum computer security standards.

3.4.2. *Controlled* computers must be managed to professional standards, preferably by well-trained or certified employees or contractors with sufficient knowledge and resources to ensure that data on them are properly secured.

3.4.3. Operating systems and applications on controlled computers must be patched to and maintained at the most current level provided by their manufacturers.

3.4.4. Controlled computers should run no programs or services that are not necessary to their core purpose. For example, controlled computers that contain sensitive data should not run Web or file-sharing services, since these are frequently targeted and compromised by outsiders. Network-aware client software on controlled computers, such as Web browsers or email readers, should block the automatic execution of attachments, graphical files, or other common carriers of computer viruses, Trojans, or worms.

3.4.5. Controlled computers must prevent unauthorized users from running programs or accessing raw data. For example, there should be no "guest," shared or general-purpose accounts on controlled computers. User accounts should be limited to the minimum necessary for the operation of the computer and its core functions. Accounts with substantial system-administration privileges should be granted only to a few individuals with general management responsibility for the systems in question, and never to individuals without UW faculty or staff appointments. In general, system-administrator and similar "root" accounts should be used only when strictly required, and never when use of a less privileged account could achieve the same purpose.

3.4.6. User-authentication processes must encrypt or otherwise protect username and password exchanges from interception. In general, login or shell access to controlled computers must be restricted to the campus network and/or with secured remote access (security industry best practices) including two-factor authentication mechanisms.

3.4.7. All user passwords associated with administrative access to controlled computers should meet or exceed UW policy for complexity guidelines. In addition, users with extensive access to controlled computers should avoid using the corresponding passwords for other purposes.

3.4.8. Controlled computers must be reasonably secured against unauthorized access, including data interception and compromise. For example, controlled computers must connect to the network using technologies that are reasonably secure from sniffing, which excludes unencrypted hub or wireless connections. Controlled computers must run antivirus and anti-spyware software, updating definition files frequently. They should run host-based firewall or equivalent port-blocking software, configured to disable all ports not necessary for system functioning.

3.4.9. Controlled computers must be provided physical security measures necessary to prevent theft, tampering, or destruction.

3.4.10. Controlled computers must subscribe to a regimented backup process to ensure data integrity, system availability, and business continuity functions as required.

3.5. Controlled Application

All applications that handle restricted data must be written in a way that ensures that restricted data is not inadvertently exposed, either through errors in design or coding or by not implementing appropriate security measures (e.g., encryption, authorization, and authentication). In addition, Web application code should be securely developed to meet Open Web Application Security Project standards (see Section 4.3.2).

Section 4. Protective Measures for Data

This section outlines the specific measures that must be taken and practices that must be followed by university units and personnel in order to adequately protect data owned or managed by the university.

4.1. Protective Measures for Public Data

The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host public data. In addition, public data must be protected by the specific measures identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

4.2. Protective Measures for Restricted Data

The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host restricted data. In addition, restricted data must be protected by the specific measures identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

4.3. Protective Measures for Confidential Data

4.3.1. The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host confidential data. This basic requirement, along with several other specific measures, is identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

4.3.2. Applications that are linked to databases or data files that contain sensitive data must meet the Open Source Web Application Security Project (OWASP) standards for secure coding (<http://www.owasp.org>). Owners of such applications are required to demonstrate compliance with these standards when audited or when requested by the UW CISO (Chief Information Security Officer).

4.3.3. Loading confidential data onto laptops and other portable computing and data storage devices (e.g., USB flash drives, CDs, PDAs, BlackBerries, etc.) is discouraged and restricted to unusual operational circumstances that require such action. If it is necessary to load confidential data on to a portable computing or portable data storage device, the data must be encrypted and password protected, or an equivalent access protection measure must be taken. A laptop or other portable computing device that has confidential data stored on it must be treated as a "controlled computer." It must also have additional security features to prevent unauthorized use of the system if it is lost or stolen.

* **4.3.4.** *Contractor and vender controls and practices... (implementation of strong risk transfer approach...standard contract recitals for data sharing, indemnification and oversight). Also, preferred management practices associated with outsider data privileges and access.*

4.4. Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures

At a minimum, every computer on or directly connecting to the campus network is required to be a "controlled computer" and must meet minimum computer security standards. In addition, the data on a UW computer may need to be protected with additional security measures, which are summarized in the matrix in Table 2.

Table 2. Matrix for System Security Measures for Data Classifications

PROTECTIVE MEASURE	DATA CATEGORY		
	CONFIDENTIAL	RESTRICTED	PUBLIC
Minimum Computer Security Standards	Yes	Yes	Yes
Access Control Measures (Authorization)	Yes (documented and audited for compliance once every three years)	Yes (documented)	Yes (limited to system administrators)
Log Reviews and Alerts	Logging alerts and regular reviews	Regular reviews	Basic logging and random periodic reviews
Authentication	Yes (two-layer Minimum)	Yes (two-layer recommended)	Configure computer access to: yes for "write," none for "read"
Firewall Protection	Yes (per controlled computer requirements)	Yes	Yes (if feasible)
Backup and Recovery Processes	Yes (per controlled computer requirements)	Yes	Yes
Physical Security	Yes	Yes	Yes
Encryption (During Transmission)	Yes	Yes	No
Encryption (Storage)	Recommended	Optional	No
Personnel Criminal Background Check	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)
Audit of Security Measures	Yes (minimum of once every three years and more frequent audits, if possible)	Yes (random sampling)	Recommended (random sampling)

Section 5. Exemptions

While rare and unwelcome, there are situations that may require exemptions from these standards. In accordance with the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*, the PASS Council is empowered to grant exemptions. For details, see *UW Information Systems Security Policy Development, Revision, and Exemption Processes*:

<http://www.washington.edu/computing/security/pass/is.sec.pol.revision.html>

In the case of UW Medicine, exemption requests must follow UW Medicine IT Services procedures before submission to the PASS Council.

Section 6. Reporting

When a breach of security is discovered that may have caused the compromise of confidential data, including a breach of security on a controlled computer, it is required that the incident be reported as soon as possible to C&C Security Operations.

Section 7. Enforcement

Enforcement of these minimum data security standards is the responsibility of the UW Chief Information Security Officer and the PASS Council, with support from Risk Management, Internal Audit, and Computing & Communications.

Appendix A. Glossary

(From UW [Information Systems Security Policy](#), Definitions)

Access Control System: Physical, procedural and/or electronic mechanism that ensures that only those who are authorized to view, update, and/or delete data can access that data.

Authorization: The process of giving someone permission to do or have something; a system administrator defines which users are allowed access to the system and what privileges are allowed for each user.

Confidentiality: An attribute of information. Confidential information is sensitive, contractually protected, or information whose loss, corruption, or unauthorized disclosure could be harmful or prejudicial.

Data Custodians: As defined in the UW Information Systems Security Policy, individuals who have been officially designated as being accountable for protecting the confidentiality of specific data that is transmitted, used, or stored on a system or systems within a department, college, school, or administrative unit of the UW and certain affiliated organizations.

Encryption: The process of turning readable text into unreadable (cipher) text, which requires the use of a decipher key to render it readable.

Ownership: The term that signifies decision-making authority and accountability for a given scope of control.

Personally Identifiable Information: Personally identifiable information is defined as data or other information that is tied to, or which otherwise identifies, an individual or provides information about an individual in a way that is reasonably likely to enable identification of a specific person and make personal information about them known.

Personal information includes, but is not limited to, information regarding a person's home or other personal address, social security number, driver's license, marital status, financial information, credit card numbers, bank account numbers, parental status, sexual orientation, race, religion, political affiliation, personal assets, medical conditions, medical records or test results, home or other personal phone numbers, non-university address, employee number, personnel or student records, and information related to the UW [Affirmative Action Policy](#)

Principle of Least Privilege: Access privileges for any user should be limited to only what they need to have to be able to complete their assigned duties or functions, and nothing beyond these privileges.

Principle of Separation of Duties: Whenever practical, no one person should be responsible for completing or controlling a task, or set of tasks, from beginning to end when it involves the potential for fraud, abuse or other harm.

Privacy: An individual right to be left alone; to withdraw from the influences of his or her environment; to be secluded, not annoyed, and not intruded upon; to be protected against the misuse or abuse of something legally owned by an individual or normally considered by society to be his or her property.

Security: An attribute of information systems practices that includes specific policy-based, procedural, and technical mechanisms and assurances for protecting the confidentiality and integrity of information, the availability and functionality of critical services and the confidentiality of sensitive information.

Sensitive Information: General term for any information that requires access controls and other control measures to meet legal, policy and/or ethical requirements.

System: A network, computer, software package, or other entity for which there can be security concerns.

System Owners: As defined in the UW Information Systems Security Policy, individuals within the UW community who are accountable for the budget, management, and use of one or more electronic information systems or electronic applications that support UW business, client services, educational, or research activities that are associated or hosted by the UW.

Users: Any individual that has been granted access and privileges to UW computing and network services, applications, resources, and information.

Appendix B. References

Washington State Information Services Board IT Security Policy, Standards and Guidelines
(<http://isb.wa.gov/policies/security.aspx>)

[UW Information Systems Security Policy](#)

[Minimum Computer Security Standards](#)

Resolution Concerning:**Principles of State Higher Education Policy**

WHEREAS, Higher education enables citizens to better understand their world and adapt throughout their lifetimes to a changing social landscape; and

WHEREAS, Higher education is increasingly a prerequisite for participating in a knowledge-based economy through rewarding occupations that take advantage of the intellectual and creative talents of our people; and

WHEREAS, The social and economic welfare of all people in a region, not just those who go to college, is advanced when excellent higher education is widely accessible; and

WHEREAS, Policymakers in Washington State, through the "Washington Learns" process, have identified a set of eight "global challenge" states with advanced, knowledge-based economies that compete on a global stage; and

WHEREAS, Washington State ranks last among the global challenge states in the percentage of high-school freshmen who go on to complete baccalaureate degrees; and

WHEREAS, The University of Washington's combined funding from tuition and state sources per full-time equivalent student is approximately \$4,000 below the average of peer institutions in the global challenge states; and

WHEREAS, Competitive levels of per-student funding will enhance the ability of students to serve the public welfare and take advantage of the opportunities our economy offers; and

WHEREAS, Faculty share the governance of the institution with the administration and are responsible for setting admissions and degree requirements, hiring and promoting faculty, and maintaining academic standards; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate endorses the following principles for state higher education policy:

1. The paramount duty of the state to make ample provision for the education of all children should be understood to cover affordable access to higher education for all persons living in Washington, at a level consistent with their needs, abilities, and interests;
2. To provide the quality of education that Washington students need and deserve, public funding of four-year institutions, in combination with affordable tuition payments, must rapidly reach a level competitive with peer institutions in the global challenge states;
3. Faculty are ready to contribute their talents and experience to educational policy and believe that such consultation will promote the public benefits of a widely accessible, high-quality college educational system.

*Submitted by:
Special Committee on Legislative Matters
January 8, 2007*

**Proposed Handbook Changes to Clarify the Definition of a Campus and Distinguish
Campuses from Schools and Colleges**

Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 and 23-45

Section 23-23. Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments: Definitions

For purposes of the University Handbook:

- A. The word "campus" refers only to those listed in Section 23-11A. Campuses shall have the full range of powers and responsibilities required to serve the needs of their students and other stakeholders in accordance with their respective campus missions, including the powers to determine their curricula, academic standards, and admissions policies.

Rationale: No definition of "campus" is given in this section, in spite of its title. The wording here clarifies that the campuses are entities designed to serve different sets of stakeholders in accordance with different mission statements. It thus acknowledges a greater degree of institutional complexity and autonomy than that of a school or college. Although this may not be the ideal place to enumerate powers specific to campuses, a "campus" is distinguished from a "college" or "school" in part by the additional functions required to provide seamless, self-contained graduate and undergraduate degree programs that are responsive to a student population largely distinct from that served by other campuses.

- B. The words "college" and "school" refer only to those listed in Section 23-11B.
- C. The word "department" refers to any separately organized unit within a college or school which has been established by the Board of Regents or by the President, to any department-level interdisciplinary unit which has been established by the dean of a college or school, and to any department-level interdisciplinary unit involving two or more schools or colleges which has been established by the Provost.
- D. An academic program is an area of specialization which has one or more of the following characteristics: has program as part of its title; grants a degree or a credential; has a sequence of courses with a common prefix; has been identified as a program by a distinct faculty action. Ordinarily, an academic program shall be smaller than an administrative unit such as a department and larger than the activities of a single faculty member.

Section 23-45. Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure

- A. Subject to the provisions of Section 23-46, the faculty of each campus, college or school other than the Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure except as stipulated in Subsection B. The organization and rules of procedure of a department may be determined by the department faculty, but shall be subject to review by the appropriate academic sub-unit ~~college~~ faculty.
- B. Each campus, college, or school ~~or college~~ shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise their respective chancellor or dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and ~~advise the dean on~~ matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each campus, college, or school ~~or college~~ shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each campus's, college's or school's procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.

- C. The Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure. It may directly control its affairs or may delegate to a council, executive committee, or other committees any of its powers, provided that such council or committees shall be representative of the various campuses and fields of graduate study.

Rationale: Faculty councils at the UWB and UWT preside over organizations that are more integrated and self-contained than those of schools and colleges. They also serve student populations and other stakeholders different from those served by UWS. This section acknowledges that the “general welfare” of these campuses is not necessarily identical to that of UWS, and that it is the responsibility of the elected faculty councils on these campuses to uphold it.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2007
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
2. Introductory Comments – Professor Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate.
3. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – President Mark A. Emmert.
4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Ashley Emery, Committee Chair.
5. Legislative Report – Professor David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative.
6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of November 13, 2006.
7. Announcements.
8. Requests for Information.
Senators are encouraged to submit requests for information in writing to the Senate Chair prior to meetings. Responses will be provided by the appropriate persons.
9. Statements from Candidates for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.
10. Nominations and Appointments.
 - a. **Action:** Election of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.
 - b. **Action:** Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
11. Memorial Resolution.
12. New Business.

a. **Class C Resolution. {Exhibit E}**

Title: Resolution Concerning Principles of State Higher Education Policy.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

b. **Class C Resolution. {Exhibit F}**

Title: Resolution Regarding Student Lobby Day.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

c. **Class A Legislation – First Consideration. {Exhibit G}**

Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.

Title: Proposed changes to clarify the Definition of a Campus and Distinguish Campuses from Schools and Colleges – Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 and 23-45.

Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* to the Faculty for approval or rejection.

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.

13. Adjournment.

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

APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate