

MINUTES FOR THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
April 9, 2007, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: Stygall, Luchtel, Emmert, Wise, Schaufelberger, Heckel, Harrington, Jain, Astley, Collins, Stein, Philipson, Dillon, Bowen, Erdly, Kaminsky, Sjøvik, Booth-Laforce, Fabien, Killien, Wilkinson, Gill, Silberstein, Emery, Friese, Niccolls

Absent: Annabi, Breidenthal, Stern, Murphy, Lovell, Baldasty, Roy, Balick, White

Guest: Steve Demorest

Chair Gail Stygall called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda. **Approved.**
2. Approval of Minutes of the 12 February 2007 Senate Executive Committee Meeting and 1 March 2007 Faculty Senate meeting. **Approved.**
3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.
Gail Stygall, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

The Chair reported that the Committee would be addressing one new piece of Class A legislation and would be re-visiting two pieces of Class A legislation today. There are also three reports on the agenda to be given by Astley, Kaminsky and Bowen. In the interest of time, she said she would refrain from any formal remarks and encouraged other presenters to be as brief as possible as well.

4. Report from the President.
Mark A. Emmert, President.

The President commented on the death of Rebecca Griego, saying that the entire incident was utterly shocking and abhorrent. He has recently spent considerable time with her family. He stressed that it is important that the University community understand that this situation has been handled very well. He is proud of the faculty and Dean in Architecture and Urban Planning, as well as those involved in counseling in the aftermath. At some point in the near future, the University will stop and evaluate exactly what transpired in order to determine what worked well and what didn't – before, during and after the event.

With two weeks to go in the legislative session, President Emmert reported that the situation in Olympia is looking very favorable. All three budgets are on the table. Even the worst of the three is still pretty good, but UW staff members are working hard to support the best of the three. The Governor is being very supportive. The legislature shows signs of an increasing understanding of the need to balance general fund money with some flexibility in setting tuition. This is unprecedented and seen as favorable for everyone concerned.

The proposed capital budget is also largely favorable and there is still time to address the one drawback in the current budget related to Bothell campus funding.

Finally, he reported on the passage of bill that caps tuition at 7%. The UW very strongly supported this bill, and he is very pleased it passed.

In response to a question about his recent trip to India, the President responded that he would be very interested in relaying his experiences, but in the interest of the crowded agenda today he would defer that to a later meeting. Suffice to say that the UW and the region have many contacts with business enterprises and alumni in India. It is a very wonderful and challenging place.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
Ashley F. Emery, Immediate Past Faculty Senate Chair and Committee Chair.

Emery reminded Committee members that SCPB is charged with making recommendations to the President regarding funding priorities such as faculty salaries from among the budgets on the table in Olympia. The Senate budget is not as favorable as the other two. Once a decision is made in Olympia, concrete proposal for local allocations will be drafted.

6. Report on Legislative Affairs.
J.W. Harrington, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative.

Harrington reiterated that SCPB activity is very important because allocation of funds is up to individual institutions. David Lovell has contacted both the House and Senate expressing concern about the proviso in the Senate budget proposal that would fund salary increases from an increase in tuition. There are many draw-backs to this proposal. He is looking forward to developing strategies and tactics for the next biennium with the Special Committee on Legislative Matters.

7. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.
Gerry F. Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

Philipsen reported that the Class B legislation on Distance Learning indicators on transcripts was approved by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting and submitted to faculty via Class B Bulletin for their consideration. Objections from 202 voting faculty members were required to derail the legislation. One hundred and forty nine objections were received by the deadline (close of business on Friday, April 6) and the legislation has been enacted. He offered his congratulations to the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, the Council that authored the legislation.

He encouraged Council Chairs to poll the members of their Council members for recruitment ideas for the coming year. Senate leadership will meet on April 18 to develop a slate of nominees for all Councils and Committees.

Finally, he introduced Melissa Kane, a new member of the staff of the Office of University Committees, who will be on-board until June 15 in support of the Faculty Councils and the office in general.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.
Discussion: Faculty Compensation at Base Salary - Susan Astley, Group VII.

Group Representative Susan Astley asked the Committee to consider the issue of faculty being compensated at less than the University's base salary to teach courses. In fact, in her case, that amounts to a rate of one half of her salary. Program directors say it's a "budget issue," but Astley questioned whether there could be *any* valid reason to compensate a faculty member at a rate less than his or her base salary.

After some discussion, Senate Chair Stygall said that she would refer this issue to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, as well as the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, to assess the problem and to see how extensive it is.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

Stygall announced that the faculty who were approved as members of the Review Committee for the Pathobiology RCEP via E-mail vote are:

- Jan Carline, Medical Education and Committee Chair.

- Bill Erdly, Computing & Software Systems, UW Bothell.
- Asuman Kiyak, Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery.
- Don Janssen, Civil and Environmental Engineering.
- Kate O'Neill, School of Law.

- a. **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit A}**

Nominations as published in the agenda were approved.

- b. **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, James "J.W." Harrington, Professor, Geography, as the 2007-08 Faculty Legislative Representative.

The *University Handbook* states that the Executive Committee shall submit to the Senate one or more nominations for the position of Faculty Legislative Representative and one or more nominations for the position of Deputy Legislative Representative if appropriate. Since the 2008 legislative session is a non-budget session, the SEC will not be designating a Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative until next year.

James "J.W." Harrington, Geography Professor, was nominated for the position of Faculty Legislative Representative for a term beginning August 1, 2007 and ending July 31, 2008, and there were no additional nominations from the floor.

James Harrington was approved as Faculty Legislative Representative by a unanimous vote of the members present, and Chair Stygall offered her congratulations on behalf of the Senate.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.

There were two reports from councils and committees on the agenda. The first came from the Faculty Council on Educational Technology. This report on Plagiarism was given by Council Chair Werner Kaminsky.

The second was a report from the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement regarding a dependant tuition benefit proposal. Council Chair Bob Bowen presented the report.

- a. Faculty Council on Educational Technology
Plagiarism Report, Werner Kaminsky, Council Chair. **{Exhibit B}**

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology began looking into the issue of plagiarism after a faculty member reported that he had recently received a paper from a student in one of his classes that he himself had written as a student and submitted for an assignment 20 years ago.

The Faculty Council had decided, after considerable discussion, that teaching students about the issue, and about how to avoid plagiarism, would ultimately be more effective than the standard punishment now imposed. It is a problem that has gotten much worse with the proliferation of material available on the web – and often no clear guidelines on how to document that material as a source in research papers.

Their report and recommendations are attached as Exhibit B.

Due to the limited time available for discussion, Professor Kaminsky was invited to speak about the issue at the next Senate meeting and to return for further discussion at the next SEC meeting. He was also encouraged to contact Gerald Baldasty, Chair of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, about the work that Council has done on the same issue.

b. Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Dependent Tuition Benefit Proposal, Robert Bowen, Council Chair. **{Exhibit C}**

Council Chair Robert Bowen introduced Council member Steven Demorest, who discussed the exhibit attached to the agenda – a Proposal for Dependent Tuition Benefits. This proposal is consistent with the University's recognition that having a family friendly environment is an effective recruitment tool. It can even be seen as an extension of childcare. The UW lags behind similar benefits offered at peer institutions. Adding this benefit would help put the UW in the middle of the pack.

This benefit would grant a 50% waiver of regular, full-time resident undergraduate tuition for immediate family members of faculty, professional staff and librarians. Prospective students would still need to meet admission requirements, and there would be a five-year vesting period (which would lower to cost of the plan and add a retention incentive). There would be a 15 quarter limit per dependent in addition to restrictions defined in the exhibit.

A question was raised about how this would be seen by the public. Wouldn't this be perceived as unfair in view of faculty salary increases? In informal polling, people already think that faculty members have this benefit. Demorest stated that this would need to be weighed against the effectiveness of having the benefit for a recruitment tool.

In response to a question about whether the research that went into the proposal included the Tacoma and Bothell campuses, Demorest replied that he did not know, but would check and let the inquirer know.

Senate Chair Stygall stated that this is also an issue that should be considered by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

11. Information.

There were no information items.

12. Announcements.

Stygall had two announcements: First, the SEC E-mail vote to endorse the Husky Tee Project was approved and will go before the Faculty Senate as a Class C resolution at its April meeting.

Second, nominations are being sought for the 2007-2008 University of Washington Annual Faculty Lectureship Award. This year the committee is seeking nominations within the natural sciences, engineering, and health sciences. Nominations will be accepted through Friday, April 20, 2007.

13. Unfinished Business.

a. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. {Exhibit D}

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed Changes concerning the procedure for designating the Secretary of the Faculty.

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

The next agenda item was the final consideration of the Class A legislation proposing changes concerning the procedure for designating the Secretary of the Faculty. After first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once, sends it back to the SEC and then has a second consideration. Although Legislation may be amended at either consideration by the SEC, it is only at the first consideration that the SEC can make substantive or major changes in legislation. At the second reading, the role of the SEC in making amendments is responsive. They may amend legislation only in response to requests made by either the President

and/or the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations, which reviews it after the first Senate consideration.

The President and the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and regulations approved the legislation with no changes.

The legislation was approved by the Council.

b. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. {Exhibits E, F, & 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.

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

The next agenda item was to continue discussing the final consideration of the Tri-campus legislation proposing changes to clarify the definition of a campus and distinguish campuses from schools and colleges. At the February 12 SEC meeting a substitute amendment to the main motion was introduced and after discussion tabled to allow time for further review of the legislation. The meeting agenda included three exhibits, or versions of this legislation attached to be considered.

First, Stygall asked for a motion to take from the table the substitute legislation as shown in Exhibit F attached to the agenda. A motion was made, seconded, and approved by the Committee.

She then explained that since this motion was tabled at the last meeting, the legislation remained in its second consideration. Therefore the role of the SEC in making amendments is responsive to either the President or the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations. The Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulation was now offering a substitute motion in Exhibit G to the substitute motion in Exhibit F.

She then asked for a motion to amend by striking substitute amendment Exhibit F and substituting it with Exhibit G. A motion was made, seconded, and approved by the Committee.

Next she asked for a motion to approve the new Exhibit F as a substitute to the main motion Exhibit E. A motion was made, seconded and approved by the Committee.

Finally she addressed the main motion and asked for a motion to submit this legislation, as amended, amending the *Faculty Code*, to the Senate for approval or rejection. A motion was made, seconded and discussion ensued.

Marcia Killien, chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy that had authored the legislation, explained that this proposal changes the *Faculty Code* to reflect current practices and documents the existence of faculty governance on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. The Council discovered that the first draft considered had included changes to an Executive Order – something that can be changed only by the President. She assured the committee that the third version, the one approved today, was consistent with the intent of the original, withdrawing proposed changes to the correlative Executive Order. It does not give any new powers or responsibilities to the campuses that they do not already have in practice.

The Committee then approved the motion to submit the legislation (the one labeled G in the agenda package) amending the *Faculty Code* to the faculty for approval.

14. New Business.

a. Class A Legislation. {Exhibit H}

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed faculty salary changes to the *Faculty Code*.

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

Chair Stygall explained that this Class A legislation revises the *Faculty Code* concerning the Faculty Salary Policy. After first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once, sends it back to the SEC and then has a second consideration. Although Legislation may be amended at either consideration by the SEC, it is only at the first consideration that the SEC can make substantive or major changes in legislation. At the second reading, the role of the SEC in making amendments is responsive. They may amend legislation only in response to requests made by either the President and/or the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations, which reviews it after the first Senate consideration.

After hearing a motion and a second to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* to the faculty for approval or rejection Stygall introduced Jan Sjøvik, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, to provide information on the legislation.

Jan Sjøvik told the Committee that this legislation had come through the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA), but it originated in a special committee consisting of FCFA and Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) members. The basic work of drafting the legislation was done in the special committee and then came to FCFA for review. There are two significant additions this legislation brings to the Salary Policy. It mandates that funds be used to recognize high merit and permits the use of funds in addressing salary compression.

Chair Stygall then delivered a presentation on the background and impetus for drafting this legislation. The Special Committee had studied the Benson Committee Report (1990) concerning the California step plan; the recommendations of the Provost's ad hoc Committee on Faculty Salaries (1998) focusing on a step system and grades within ranks; and the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Salaries (1998) which examined merit-based salary grades.

The Special Committee did not recommend the California Plan for the following reasons: Departments/units were already using market for entry level; large differences in starting salaries; salary scales were out of date nearly as soon as published; and the system uses continuous off-scale hiring and continued salaries.

The current Salary Policy lists both mandatory and permissive ways to fund faculty salaries. Mandatory items include ordinary merit (2%), promotions, and salary floors. Permissive items include additional merit, unit adjustments and retention. The proposed changes to the Policy would add "additional merit" to the mandatory list and "compression" to the permissive list.

Stygall reported that the Special Committee had done its own internal study of compression and had found that approximately twenty percent of faculty meet the definition of salary compression or inversion. In response to the question - Can the UW afford to correct this inequity? - she suggested that with previous administrations this was a matter of will rather than financial necessity. The percentage change in state general fund allocation between 1991 and 2007 indicates that with very few exceptions, funding has been adequate to provide at least a 3% salary increase over the past dozen years. The UW is increasingly thought of as a world-ranked University. It's also increasingly incongruous for such an institution not to have a provision for extraordinary merit.

She suggested that this is a fairly small but meaningful change – especially after the corrosive effect of widespread and significant salary compression.

Finally, she reported that another major impetus for this change came as a request from the Board of Regents, that the Faculty Senate consider suggesting a proposed amendment to the correlative Faculty Salary Executive Order, clarifying and strengthening the "funding caution section" to allow for not following the policy during severe financial emergencies. She reiterated, however, that faculty can only make a recommendation. The President has the final word on changing Executive Orders. With that statement she asked the President to comment.

President Emmert agreed with Stygall's characterization of the situation with previous administrations. Priorities did not always include addressing the increasing salary disparities caused by compression and inversion – nor the need to recognize high merit in faculty. The language proposed regarding financial exigency that would allow the University not to honor the 2% commitment is irrelevant. The

real question is when and how we can begin to close the funding gap. Two or three percent won't do it. A 5% or more would be required to start closing the gap. He said he would like to set aside proposed changes to both the *Faculty Code* and the Executive Order pending further conversation with the Regents and Senate leadership about the possibility of a six year salary plan that would effectively close the funding gap. The problem really needs many years of significantly better compensation increases to deal with merit, retention and compression problems all at the same time.

This would involve putting the legislation on the table for now in hopes that something much better might be worked out. Faculty clearly need to have confidence in the process and they are reluctant to see anything changed in the 2% salary policy with no quid pro quo. Chair Stygall suggested that faculty need to hear from administration that there's a longer term commitment to fix these problems.

The President responded that he and the Provost, along with a group of faculty, would begin on a six-year plan for faculty compensation – a plan that will also allay Regent's fears about ending up in court again. Chair Stygall asked, and was assured, that this would be expressed to faculty as a public commitment.

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion to approve the proposed changes to the Faculty Salary Policy. The motion to table was approved by the Committee members present.

b. Review April 26, 2007, Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda {Exhibit I}

Action: Approve for Distribution.

The agenda was approved for distribution.

15. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Gerry F. Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate.

Faculty Council and Committee Nominations**Educational Outreach:**

William Erdly, Group IX, Computing & Software Systems, as Chair, for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations:

Mícheál Vaughan, Group I, English, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Karen Boxx, Group V, Law, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Adjudication Panel:

Thomas Andrews, Group V, Law, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees:

Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, Paul Zuchowski, Professional Staff Representative (alternate) member of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services for a term ending September 15, 2007, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty council.

Faculty Council on Educational Technology

Contact: Werner Kaminsky (Chair: kaminsky@chem.washington.edu, tel. 543 7585)

Recommendation on responding to the increasing problem of plagiarism

Summary

The problem

With the increasing prominence of the Internet in the life of students and faculty alike, improper use of this technology has drastically increased. Estimates range from 30% to 50% of all students who use information from the internet do so without proper disclosure of their sources. Included in these estimates are students who make use of fraudulent "paper mills" to represent their own original work. Of even greater concern, plagiarism among faculty has also increased. In general, a growing number of members of university communities fail to understand how or when to appropriately cite references or to recognize the importance of intellectual property and potential consequences of copyright violation. However, cases of plagiarism reported in newscasts outside the secured university environment indicates that the general public judges plagiarism much more seriously [See (g) and attachment 1].

Relevance to the University of Washington

The University has an important legal and ethical responsibility to teach students about appropriate use of intellectual property, implications of copyright, and the consequences of violating University rules on these issues. We also have an opportunity to take a leading role among our peer institutions to establish a culture of citation that faculty and students learn from and participate in. Institutional failure to do so could harm the reputation of the University thereby diminishing the value of a UW degree. It could indeed have larger legal consequences if no active anti-plagiarism measures are taken, and the institution is challenged as the "home site" of increasing numbers of students and faculty who fail to observe the rules of copyright. A failure to instill ethical conduct, provide training, and create acceptance of intellectual property rights among our students will also negatively impact our graduates' future careers and ethical behavior.

Recommendations for Action

An approach of working with the UW community to inform, educate, and build acceptance for appropriate use of intellectual property is recommended (for details, see section on proposed strategy). The program would start by building enthusiasm and would include tools for easier and proper citing intellectual matter.

- a) Provide all entering students with- and discussed at orientation- an information package covering Intellectual Property Rights and the consequences of Plagiarism.
- b) Develop a UW 'Code-of-Honor' that specifically addresses the forms of Plagiarism that are undermining the educational process.
- c) Provide students technical assistance – example: mandatory training on proper citation techniques, and access to online educational resources.
- d) Installation of some form of electronic identification of plagiarism in student papers for students to use, starting with a 2 month free pilot program.

Proposed Strategy

- a) The **information package** should contain a letter with a phrasing that is close to the language spoken by freshmen. The example given in the appendix [See (g) and attachment 6] may serve as guidance. Input from students is welcomed to find a text that reaches out to increase their awareness of the problem. Similarly, a 'memo' to faculty and staff in appropriate formulation would be useful. A more direct language is complementary to that used in the Student Conduct Code. At the earliest opportunity during students' orientation, their attention should be drawn to
 - o Resources for students on how to avoid plagiarism and cite sources correctly, as well as information about the scholarly process and academic culture

- Information about discipline-specific issues surrounding plagiarism [See (g) and attachment 2]
- Resources about UW policies

b) Code of Honor

In cooperation with ASUW, the 'Code-of-Honor' needs to be formulated and forwarded to all members of the university including undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, the administration, and visiting faculty and students. A possible text can be found here:

<http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/docs/AI.Acknow.pdf>

c) Technical Assistance

In cooperation with the C & C, UW Libraries and Catalyst, technology that guides the process of proper citation is compiled and made accessible to all members of the University of Washington community.

There are various groups on campus that are already engaged in education about plagiarism. Below is a preliminary list of groups that have expertise and information that would be useful to an educational endeavor. Other partners should also be identified.

- UW Libraries
- CIDR
- 4x4 Initiative
- UW Writing Centers
- TRIO
- Committee on Academic Misconduct

Additional measures could also include general strategies implemented by teachers to make plagiarizing more difficult [See (g) and attachment 5].

d) "Site by Site" Plagiarism identification

After implementation of the steps (a) to (c), a mechanism to measure and administer the progress of creating awareness of plagiarism, easy to use detection tools are needed. The different possibilities include:

- The commercial service 'turnitin.com' on a limited scale. The company has offered a two-month free pilot program to test the software and its feasibility and ease of use at UW. Turnitin's standard method includes the collection and storage of student work in their database. As a result, there are FERPA concerns to consider. Under pressure from FCET, Turnitin has offered to modify their standard system to avoid some of these concerns [See (g) and attachment 3]. This service has been used before on campus. [See (g) attachment 4].
- Collect university - internal papers of students on a database with search options arranged via software to be provided by C & C or Catalyst enabling faculty to compare a student's submission electronically.
- Microsoft Research is under consideration to discuss the possibility of an alternative contextual search and detection tool.
- It may be possible to use Google in conjunction with Catalyst tools to complete more complex searches. This approach seems feasible, but more discussion and exploration of the project is needed at present.

When students are given these tools, they can **ON THEIR OWN** compare their work with available intellectual property and refine their writing skills. This "**Site by Site**", one site representing the text written by the student, the other site the report by one of the above listed technologies is a key element in engaging the students rather than the faculty in enhancing the citation climate on our campuses.

e) Develop an Academic Protocol for cases of Plagiarism

It was reported to the FCET that students often managed to avoid the consequences of plagiarism, and that retaliation toward faculty by students who had plagiarized poses a significant problem especially for non-tenured teachers. This problem needs to be discussed by all other Faculty Councils to devise a proper protection strategy on one hand and a **universal protocol** for handling plagiarism on the lowest possible level.

Level 0: as outlined in (d), the students should be encouraged to use some sort of plagiarism analysis to screen their works and on a faculty's request may submit a plagiarism report together with their papers to certify this effort.

Level 1: after the detection of plagiarism by a faculty, the faculty member informs student, rejects paper, and allows one (UW policy allowed) resubmission within reasonable time.

Level 2: plagiarism identified in 2nd submission. Faculty rejects paper and (UW policy) reports the case to the Intellectual Property Center (to be set up) for independent review, preservation of students' rights, avoidance of retaliation, and to connect students to classes on citation practice.

f) Time Line

It would be useful to start the 2 month free pilot with Turnitin.com parallel to other possible efforts outlined in (d) after Summer Break 2007 with the returning students. During this study, some training on how to use Turnitin.com or other tools may need to be provided.

The number of plagiarism cases should be monitored and the result presented to the Senate (or subcommittee) for evaluation. If it seems necessary, one or other automatic plagiarism identification process should be implemented with the start of spring term 2008.

g) Attachments

[1] On plagiarism

COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM June 2006/Vol. 49, No. 6 23

ACM Publications board policy: <http://www.acm.org/pubs/plagiarism%20policy.html>

Brian Martin Article: <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/94jie.html>

Russell Hunt Article: <http://www.stthomasu.ca/~hunt/4reasons.htm>

[2] Faculty Resource on Grading: <http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/gprevent.htm>

[3] Turnitin.com and FERPA



IPARADIGMS, LLC PRELIMINARY POSITION ON 8 FABHEP 13 (GPCO 2006)

September 28, 2006

iParadigms, LLC is currently reviewing its response to the recent FPCO clarification on FERPA standards in the context of institutions dealing with companies that offer services related to detecting plagiarism (in this case, the Company's Turnitin service). A preliminary legal document is being drafted by its corporate counsel, Foley & Lardner, a leading national firm and the Company's intellectual property attorneys.

Prior to the issuance of a formal legal opinion, iParadigms, LLC strongly recommends the following best practices be put in place by its users to best ensure compliance with FERPA.

- When reasonably possible, Turnitin institutional clients should direct its instructors to submit anonymous documents to the system with some identifying code that is kept by the faculty, and not the Turnitin system. As stated by FPCO, "this is permissible...it would not be considered a 'disclosure' under FERPA."
- When reasonably possible, Turnitin institutional clients should have their students submit their own papers. Their acceptance of our Terms & Conditions suffices as voluntary consent to the submission of personal data. The institution should allow the student to decline submission to the Turnitin service. The consequences of this denial should be consistent with the institution's own current policies and/or Student Handbook.

Further upgrades to the Turnitin service's current technology (slated for release in late 2006 - early 2007) to counter the instances in which an instructor submits the work of a student using personally identifiable information (e.g. email address) will most likely include the following:

- Encryption of all Turnitin student users' personally identifiable information upon entry into the Turnitin system
- Decryption of all Turnitin student users' personally identifiable information only granted to the relevant class instructor

We will continue to update the academic community as concrete timelines and tactical steps are identified.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Barrie'.

John Barrie, Ph.D.
iParadigms, LLC CEO

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Melissa Lipscomb'.

Melissa Lipscomb
iParadigms, LLC COO

- [4] Use of Turnitin.com at the University of Washington
<http://depts.washington.edu/trio/center/howto/write/writing/avoid/index.html>

Sharon Primm-Dayot
Curriculum Coordinator
Instructor in Technology, Research, Writing
TRIO Training
University of Washington
Office of Minority Affairs
580 Schmitz Hall
Box 355845
206-543-9288 office
206-685-2457 fax

TRIO programs are federally funded through the Department of Education and are dedicated to prepare low-income and non-traditional students, often at-risk, for college, graduate/professional school, and a successful life in this society's economic and social cultures. TRIO represents three tiers of programs which work with middle school, high school and higher education students. The topics of intellectual honesty and appropriate attribution are a priority in our trainings with TRIO staff and students. Although we provide numerous resources and tutorials on our web site, Turnitin is one of the most powerful teaching tools that we use.

One of the best examples of using Turnitin as a teaching tool within our training is during one of our TRIO Quest activities, TRIO ThinkQuest (TTQ). TTQ is a national competition for middle and high school students who participate in TRIO programs. This competition challenges students to research, write, and create educational web sites with the goal of preparing them for college-level writing. Students and staff are informed that sites will be submitted to Turnitin for plagiarism checks and are instructed to use our plagiarism resources to learn about intellectual honest and appropriate attribution.

Once we receive the originality reports from Turnitin, we share the results with our participating staff and students. For our students, being able to see a highlighted line that is similar or exact to another document gives us that "teaching moment" to illustrate how to quote and cite properly in order to maintain academic integrity. It is surprising that they do not seem threatened by the reports; they are so hungry to improve their skills in order to be accepted into college that they embrace the learning moment and the results show after they make corrections.

Because technology makes it easier to find sources, and even easier to copy and paste information, Turnitin plays an extremely important role in helping our students understand intellectual honesty. The visual strength of Turnitin's reports allows our students to literally see the similarities between their writing and others on one page. Along with the teaching moments that result from reports, we are seeing less and less plagiarism within our educational web site competition.

For more information on plagiarism rules for the TTQ activity, go to:
<http://depts.washington.edu/trio/quest/rules.html> and click on TRIO ThinkQuest Rules where you can view rules on plagiarism (NOTE # 4 and # 6).

If you are interested in the students' work, click the TRIO Quest tab at the top of the page. You can explore the winning educational web sites created by these students and note how intellectual honesty is emphasized within them. I need to emphasize that these students are non-traditional and many come from poor urban and rural school districts. TTQ is often the first experience that these students have to this type of research and writing.

- [5] Anti-Plagiarism Strategies for Research Papers: <http://www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm>

The Libraries sponsored a workshop in February 2005 on pedagogical approaches to preventing plagiarism and materials from this workshop can be found at
<http://www.lib.washington.edu/about/events/academic/>.

On February 9, 2007 the Libraries will be presenting a half-day workshop for faculty. The workshop, entitled "Helping Students 'Do the Right Thing': Preventing Plagiarism Through Assignment Design," focuses on what many librarians feel is the most productive approach to this

challenge: rethinking and restructuring research-and-writing assignments to minimize the opportunities to plagiarize and to maximize student engagement and deep learning. The workshop is co-sponsored by CIDR, the Teaching Academy, and the Libraries. A companion website should be available soon.

[6] Example to address freshmen:

"Do you want words you wrote being used by someone else under his/her name? If not, don't do it yourself.

Do you want a graphic you worked on being used by others without giving you the credit? If not, don't do it yourself.

Do you feel angry at the thought of putting the results of your own hard work on the internet for others to benefit, only to see it being used by someone else pretending it was his/her work? If you would, don't do this yourself.

Each of these cases is a form of plagiarism; all are viewed by the general public, and the law, as criminal acts.

Learn how to cite references and sources correctly; avoid academic sanctions and possible prosecution.

Help and information on proper citation is available from the Librarians at the University of Washington, please ask. From the online tools perspective, many of the online databases licensed by the UW Libraries include a "cite this" feature which properly formats citations at the point of discovery. Such a feature allows researchers to indicate their preferred style (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago/Turabian) and the citation is automatically formatted.

Be aware that the University of Washington has mechanisms installed that allow detecting plagiarism"

**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Dependent Tuition Benefit Proposal
April 2007**

Background: UW Faculty and staff currently have a UW Tuition Exemption Program benefit:

“The University of Washington Tuition Exemption Program, established under the authority of [RCW 28B.15.558](#), enables University of Washington employees, state of Washington employees and members of the Washington State National Guard who have been admitted to the University of Washington, to have tuition waived for up to six credits when enrollment is on a "space-available" basis. The Tuition Exemption Program is available at the University of Washington Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses.” Reference: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/APS/22.01.html#1>

Current eligibility for the program is as follows:

“Professional staff, faculty, librarians, and permanent classified staff who meet all of the following criteria are eligible to participate in the Tuition Exemption Program:

- Employed half-time or more;
- Employed on the first day of the quarter;
- Paid monthly (except for employees in the Print Plant Craft Bargaining Unit) and not hourly; and
- For classified staff new to the University, have completed the probation period prior to the first day of the quarter. “

Proposed Tuition Waiver Benefit

A Tuition Waiver Benefit developed within the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR) would build on the current program and provide an expanded benefit:

- Dependent children of faculty, professional staff, and librarians¹ receive a quarterly tuition waiver equivalent of up to 50% of the full-time, standard, resident, undergraduate tuition at the UW (benefit is linked to undergraduate standard tuition rate, regardless of the program in which dependent is enrolled).

The proposed new benefit would be a recruiting and retention tool that could be very attractive to a wide range of faculty, librarians, and professional staff. It serves as a recruitment benefit by offering prospective faculty, librarians and staff the security of knowing that their service at UW will be rewarded by offering support for their children’s education. It serves as a retention benefit because the proposal recommends that the dependent benefit be made available for most employees after 5 years of employment. This rewards commitment and longevity in one’s position.

Parameters of the Benefit

Student Status

- 50% waiver benefit recipients would have full student status (**not** space available) and
- must qualify for admission through standard guidelines (no special admission status for these students).
 - Enrollments would count against UW enrollment cap.

¹ The FCBR represents faculty, professional staff and librarians. Thus our proposal does not speak to benefits for other employees.

Parameters of the Benefit (cont'd)**Dependent Status**

- Definitions match current PEBB medical/dental dependent eligibility:
 - Dependent children through age 23
 - A 15-quarter limit per dependent

Employment service requirement

- Proposed eligibility requirement is 5 years
- POSSIBLE: Faculty offered tenure at employment, librarians offered permanent or continuing status at appointment, and newly hired senior administrators (grade 10 or above) may receive benefit immediately on employment.

Restrictions:

- Benefit may only be used by one eligible dependent at a time.
- Benefit cannot be additive between two married/same-sex partner employees, but each could support a different eligible dependent.
- Benefit would not cover additional tuition costs beyond full-time, standard, resident, undergraduate tuition.
- Benefit for enrolled students only (not non-matriculated).
- Benefit would be taxable.

Peer Institutions – as of 2004

- HECB list: 58% offer some tuition benefit ranging from 50% – 100% of tuition costs
 - Includes Ohio State, Michigan State, University of Pittsburgh.
- OFM Peer list: 50% offer tuition benefit ranging from 50% – 75% of tuition costs
 - Includes University of Oregon, University of Arizona, University of Illinois

Funding

- The 'cost' of the tuition waiver in Table 1 attached represents tuition foregone. Our estimate is that, in equilibrium, the total cost estimate to fund tuition waivers for dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians is approximately \$1 million per year – based on 2006-2007 tuition rates and employment/enrollment figures from 2003-04. The estimated cost would be less than \$250,000 in the first year and then costs would increase gradually over five years as eligible dependents under this benefit are added to each freshman class, approaching \$1 million in the fifth year.
- The estimate assumes that student slots occupied by dependants of faculty/professional staff/librarians would displace other *full-tuition* paying students. To the extent that student slots remain vacant or are filled with subsidized students, foregone tuition would be less and could even be zero. If *out-of-state full-tuition* paying students are displaced, these amounts could be understated.
- While the number of students served by this benefit may remain relatively stable, the cost of the benefit will increase as the cost of UW tuition increases.
- The estimate was based on actual enrollments of dependents of employees in 2003-04. While this waiver would likely attract more applications from dependents of employees, it is a self-regulating benefit because University Admissions are very selective and would not consider a student's dependent status.
- Table 1 includes an estimate of the incremental cost to fund a tuition waiver for classified staff.

TABLE 1. Cost Estimates for Dependent Tuition Benefit.

Personnel Type	Student Level	Number of Students	Annual Waiver Amount
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS	1. UG	12	\$66,831
EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH	1. UG	2	\$11,970
FACULTY	1. UG	78	\$461,344
LIBRARIANS	1. UG	3	\$17,955
NON-GRADUATE STUDENT	1. UG	1	\$5,985
PROFESSIONAL	1. UG	79	\$463,385
RESIDENTS/INTERNS	1. UG	1	\$5,985
CLASSIFIED	1. UG	160	\$943,531
CLINICALS	1. UG	1	\$6,106
Faculty/Professional Staff/Librarians		175	\$1,033,455
All Faculty & Staff		336	\$1,983,092

Notes:

Estimates prepared by Carol Diem, Office of Institutional Studies, University of Washington with the following conditions: 1) only dependent children under 24, 2) only one child at a time for an employee, 3) employees with 5 yrs at UW, and 4) excluding waivers for costs beyond full-time, standard, resident undergraduate tuition.

The number of dependent students by employee group is estimated from 2003-04 enrollments.

The annual waiver amounts are tuition dollars lost relative to a student paying 100% of the posted in-state tuition.

This is a steady-state estimate assuming the program had been in place approximately 5 years. To the extent there are vacancies, (i.e., some full-tuition paying students are not displaced), these amounts are overstated.

To the extent out-of-state full-tuition paying students are displaced, these amounts are understated.

While the number of students served by this benefit may remain relatively stable, we assume that the cost of the benefit will increase as the cost of UW tuition increases.

Proposed Handbook Changes for Designating the Secretary of the Faculty

Changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 22, Section 22-56

Section 22-56. The Secretary of the Faculty

- A. ~~The Secretary of the Faculty shall be a member of the faculty with tenure. The term of service shall normally be five years. He or she shall be appointed by the President from a list of not less than three nominees submitted by the elected members of the Executive Committee. The secretary shall serve at the pleasure of the President.~~
- B. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be elected by a majority vote of the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by a majority vote of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate shall publish the name of the individual elected by the Senate Executive Committee in the agenda of the Senate meeting in which confirmation is sought.
- C. If the position of the Secretary of the Faculty falls vacant, a committee consisting of the Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, and immediate past Senate Chair shall appoint a temporary Secretary of the Faculty, pending a prompt election and confirmation process for a permanent successor.
- D. ~~B.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall keep the minutes and the records of the Senate.
- E. ~~C.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall administer the Office of University Committees. He or she shall also maintain a file of council and committee rosters and provide the Executive Committee with lists of nominees for council and committee appointments.
- F. ~~D.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall perform the additional duties prescribed in ~~this Chapter~~ the Faculty Code.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964: with Presidential approval.

Rationale: In the current system for designating the Secretary of the Faculty, a faculty committee provides a list of three nominees from which the President chooses one. It is desirable to replace this procedure with one in which the Secretary is chosen by representatives of the faculty.

While the Secretary could, in principle, be chosen in several different ways, the Senate Executive Committee seems to be the most appropriate body in which to vest this power. Comprised of the President of the University, the officers of the Senate, the group representatives, the council chairs, and representatives of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, its members have a broad understanding of the role of the Secretary of the Faculty and are well prepared to make an appropriate choice. As the Faculty Senate is given the power to confirm this choice, it retains ultimate control of the process.

**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 that were established through the Washington State legislature and prior action of the university faculty. 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 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 college faculty.~~ The faculty of campuses, schools and colleges shall have the right to review decisions on organization and rules of procedure determined by the faculty of their academic sub-units.
- B. Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the 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 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 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.
- D. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty governance organization that, in addition to the responsibilities set forth in Sub-section B, also advise their Chancellor and Vice Chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses.

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.

**First Substitute Amendment (02-12-07 SEC)
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
- 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.

Executive Order (unnumbered) of the President, May 31, 1956; revised October 1, 1982, revised January 30, 2004.

Section 23-24. The Graduate School: Definitions

- A. In addition to its function in the advancement of research, the Graduate School has the function of supervising the content and level of programs leading to graduate degrees. It provides the services necessary for the processing of graduate student applications for admission to the University. It has jurisdiction over the completion of degree requirements by individual graduate students, and over the membership of committees charged with supervising advanced course programs and dissertations of students in the various fields of graduate study.
- B. The term "graduate degree" designates all master's degrees and all doctor's degrees except those of Doctor of Medicine, Doctor of Dental Surgery, Juris Doctor, and Doctor of Pharmacy.
- C. The term "graduate student" designates only those students who have been admitted to the Graduate School.
- D. A **[campus, a*]** college, a school, or a department which has been authorized by the graduate faculty to offer a program of study leading to a graduate degree is termed "qualified."

Executive Order (unnumbered) of the President, May 31, 1956; revised June 26, 1968; October 1, 1982

Section 23-25. Presiding Officers of [Campuses] Colleges, Schools, and Departments

[A. The presiding officer of the faculty in a campus is its chancellor]*

[B.]* The presiding officer of the faculty in a college or school is its dean. (See also Section 12-24).

[C.]* The presiding officer of the faculty in a department is its director or chair. (See also Section 12-26.)

Executive Order (unnumbered) of the President, May 31, 1956

***Because Sections 23-23, 23-24 and 23-25 were established by Executive Order, the bracketed amendments to those sections are intended as suggestions to the President.**

Section 23-31. Delegation of Authority by the University Faculty

[For delegation by the University faculty of powers and duties to the faculties in colleges and schools, see Section 13-31, Subsection A.3.]

Section 23-41. Governing Body of a Campus, College or School

The faculty of a campus, college or school is its governing body, and under the provisions of this chapter may exercise direct control of its affairs or may delegate such control as it deems appropriate to an executive committee, council, or other committee or committees.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-42. Campus, College, School, and Department Faculties: Composition

- A. Except for the Graduate School faculty, the faculty of each campus, college, school, or department is organized in the following manner.
1. It consists of those members of the University faculty, whether full-time or part-time, whose official appointments are to positions within it.
 2. Its voting members are those of its personnel who are voting members of the University faculty under Section 21-32.
- B. The graduate faculty consists of those members of the University faculty who have been designated by the Dean of the Graduate School, with the advice of committees established for this purpose.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 54, March 7, 1977: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-43. Campus, College and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23, 13-24, and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty grant to the faculty of each campus, college and school, with exception of the graduate faculty, the powers and duties enumerated below. This authority is subject, however, to the power of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University (Section 22-32, Subsection B) and to the procedures set forth in Sections 23-47 and 23-48 for the coordination of campuses, colleges and schools. Except for the graduate faculty, the faculty of each campus, college or school:

- A. shall, with respect to academic matters,
1. determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
 2. determine its curriculum and academic programs;
 3. determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
 4. recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
 5. exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;
- B. shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Section 25-41;

- C. may, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties specified in paragraphs A and B of this Section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-44. The Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23 and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty confer upon the graduate faculty the powers and duties enumerated below. The graduate faculty shall:

- A. determine requirements for the admission of graduate students;
- B. recommend to the Board of Regents the designations of graduate degrees;
- C. approve the requirements for graduate degrees;
- D. determine which departments or undepartmentalized colleges or schools are qualified (Section 23-24) to give courses of study leading to graduate degrees;
- E. determine those courses for which students may receive credit toward a graduate degree;
- F. recommend to the Board of Regents those graduate students who qualify for degrees;
- G. determine the scholastic standards required of graduate students;
- H. promote research by members of the faculty.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval. (Subsection H added silently in 1956 edition)

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 or other academic unit may be determined by the department faculty, but shall be subject to review by the appropriate campus, school or college faculty.
- B. Each campus, school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the 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, 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.
- D. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty governance organization that, in addition to the responsibilities set forth in Sub-section

B. also advise their Chancellor and Vice Chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses.

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.

Section 23-46. Prescribed Procedure in Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments

[For Program Termination, see Section 26-41]

- A. Except as provided in Subsections B and C, a proposed action or proposed rule of a **campus**, college, school, or department faculty under the authority of Sections 23-43 and 23-44 is effective if passed by a quorum majority of its voting members present at a meeting or responding by mail, or of its authorized council or committee, and if approved by the **chancellor or** dean. Approval by the **chancellor or** dean is not required in internal department matters.

"Quorum majority" means:

- 1 in the case of a vote taken at a meeting, a majority of those members voting at a meeting at which at least half the members entitled to vote are present; and
 - 2 in the case of a vote taken by mailed (written) ballots, a majority of those voting, provided that at least half of the members entitled to vote have cast ballots.
- B. When conducting a mail ballot, as described in Subsection A, **campus**, school and college faculties (but not departmental faculties) shall have a choice either to require a quorum majority or to follow Faculty Senate procedures as described in Section 29-36, Subsection C. Under these procedures proposed actions or rules of a **campus**, school or a college, except as stated in Subsection C, shall become effective in the case of a mail ballot either if approved by an affirmative majority vote of the eligible voting members of the faculty, or by a two-thirds majority vote of those casting ballots, provided that at least 45% of the eligible faculty members cast ballots. **Campus**, school and college faculties shall decide, by means of a quorum majority vote, whether to change their rules for procedures governing mail ballots.
- C. When a proposed action concerns a faculty employment recommendation, such as appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion, it will be effective only if passed by a majority of all eligible voting members of the unit, and in accordance with the appropriate procedures as specified in Sections 24-51 to 24-55 and 25-41.
- D. **Campuses**, Colleges, schools, and departments may vote by mail in matters of faculty employment, provided that they use specific procedures they have adopted and published and that these procedures provide for:
1. reasonable opportunity for each faculty member of the unit to study all information relevant to the employment action,
 2. secrecy and security of the ballot, and
 3. security and impartiality of the ballot count.
- E. In a departmentalized school or college, the chairperson or director of a department shall transmit to the dean for approval a copy of any action by the department which may affect college or school policy. If the chairperson or director does not concur in the action, he/she may also submit his/her own recommendation.
- F. Subject to the provisions of Subsections A, B, C, D and E, and of Sections 23-47 and 23-48, a proposed action or rule of a **campus**, college, school, or department becomes effective at the time

indicated in the action or rule.

- G. When requested by one or more voting members of a **campus**, college, school, or department faculty the vote upon any matter before it shall be by secret ballot.
- H. Upon request, **the chancellor of a campus**, the dean of a college or school or the chairperson of a department shall provide a member of his or her faculty with information concerning salaries, teaching schedules, salary and operations budget requests, appropriations, allotments, disbursements, and similar data pertaining to his/her college, school, or department.

Section 13-31, S-A 20, April 16, 1956; S-A 43, November 14, 1972; S-A 56, February 21, 1978 and S-A 74, January 2, 1987: all with Presidential approval.

Section 23-47. Coordination Among Campuses, Colleges and Schools

In exercising its authority under the provisions of Sections 23-43 and 23-44, the faculty of a **campus**, college, school, or department shall carefully consider the effect of its actions upon other **campuses**, colleges, schools, and departments. The **chancellor of a campus and the** dean of a college or school considering any action shall consult with the **chancellor of each campus and the** dean of each college or school which may be affected by it.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-48. Procedure for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campuses, Colleges and Schools

[This section was entitled "Coordination Among Colleges and Schools: Procedure" in 1956, 1964 and 1969.]

- A. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 to 23-46, and the action so taken deals with admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, graduation, honors, personnel policy, schedules, registration, or student discipline, the **chancellor or** dean shall file copies of it with the President and with the Secretary of the Faculty for transmittal to the appropriate faculty committee, or if there is no other appropriate committee, to the Senate Executive Committee. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.
- B. The action becomes effective 60 days after such filing of copies, unless:
1. it has been approved at an earlier date by both the President and the faculty committee, in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or
 2. the President within the 60-day period suspends its effect, in which event he shall notify the faculty committee to which the matter has been assigned; or
 3. the faculty committee within the 60-day period suspends its effect on grounds either
 - a. that it fails to conform with general University policy or regulations, or
 - b. that it requires review by other **campuses**, colleges or schools which may be affected by it, and refers the matter to the President for final decision.
- C. When a matter is so referred to the President by a faculty committee, the President, after a hearing, shall decide whether the proposed action becomes effective. In so doing the President may employ whatever procedures he or she deems necessary or helpful.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 27, March 31, 1961: both with Presidential approval.

**Substitute Amendment to Substitute Amendment of 02-12-07
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 13-31. Organization of the Faculty and the Allocation of Powers and Duties

By authority derived from statutes of the state, from resolutions of the Board of Regents, and from executive orders of the President, the University faculty:

- A. enacts Sections -31 to -99 in each Chapter of the *Faculty Code* (Part II of this *Handbook*) and thereby:
1. establishes its own organization as set forth in Chapter 21;
 2. establishes the Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee as its legislative and executive agency operative under the powers and duties set forth in Chapter 22;
 3. confers upon the **chancellors**, deans and faculties of the independently organized **campuses**, colleges and schools, and the departments thereof, the powers and duties set forth in Chapter 23, and authorizes the faculty in each of these to effect its own organization and to delegate to committees, councils, or departments such of its powers and duties as it deems appropriate;
 4. establishes the rules and procedures governing faculty appointment and promotion which are set forth in Chapter 24;
 5. establishes rules and procedures governing faculty tenure which are set forth in Chapter 25;
 6. authorizes the Faculty Senate to initiate amendment of the *Faculty Code* in the manner set forth in Chapter 29.
- B. establishes standing committees of the University faculty, and defines the powers and duties of each as set forth in Part IV of this *Faculty Handbook*, and vests in the Faculty Senate authority to establish or abolish standing or other committees of the faculty, and to define or redefine their powers and duties;
- C. establishes the rules which are set forth in Parts V and VI of this *Faculty Handbook*.*

S-A 20, April 16, 1956; S-A 50, January 22, 1976: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-31. Delegation of Authority by the University Faculty

[For delegation by the University faculty of powers and duties to the faculties in colleges and schools, see Section 13-31, Subsection A.3.]

Section 23-41. Governing Body of a Campus, College or School

The faculty of a **campus**, college or school is its governing body, and under the provisions of this chapter may exercise direct control of its affairs or may delegate such control as it deems appropriate to an executive committee, council, or other committee or committees.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-42. Campus, College, School, and Department Faculties: Composition

- A. Except for the Graduate School faculty, the faculty of each **campus**, college, school, or department is organized in the following manner.

1. It consists of those members of the University faculty, whether full-time or part-time, whose official appointments are to positions within it.
 2. Its voting members are those of its personnel who are voting members of the University faculty under Section 21-32.
- B. The graduate faculty consists of those members of the University faculty who have been designated by the Dean of the Graduate School, with the advice of committees established for this purpose.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 54, March 7, 1977: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-43. Campus, College and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23, 13-24, and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty grant to the faculty of each campus, college and school, with exception of the graduate faculty, the powers and duties enumerated below. This authority is subject, however, to the power of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University (Section 22-32, Subsection B) and to the procedures set forth in Sections 23-47 and 23-48 for the coordination of campuses, colleges and schools. Except for the graduate faculty, the faculty of each campus, college or school:

- A. shall, with respect to academic matters,
 - 1 determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
 - 2 determine its curriculum and academic programs;
 - 3 determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
 - 4 recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
 - 5 exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;
- B. shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Section 25-41;
- C. may, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties specified in paragraphs A and B of this Section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-44. The Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23 and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty confer upon the graduate faculty the powers and duties enumerated below. The graduate faculty shall:

- A. determine requirements for the admission of graduate students;
- B. recommend to the Board of Regents the designations of graduate degrees;
- C. approve the requirements for graduate degrees;
- D. determine which departments or undepartmentalized colleges or schools are qualified (Section 23-24) to give courses of study leading to graduate degrees;
- E. determine those courses for which students may receive credit toward a graduate degree;
- F. recommend to the Board of Regents those graduate students who qualify for degrees;
- G. determine the scholastic standards required of graduate students;

H. promote research by members of the faculty.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval. (Subsection H added silently in 1956 edition)

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 Subsections B and C. 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 campus, school or college faculty.
- B. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty council or councils that shall advise their respective chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses, matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each campus shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.**
- ~~C.~~ B. Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the 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 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.
- ~~D.~~ ~~C.~~ 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.
- ~~E.~~ ~~D.~~ 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 fields of graduate study.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 80, December 11, 1989: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-46. Prescribed Procedure in Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments

[For Program Termination, see Section 26-41]

- A. Except as provided in Subsections B and C, a proposed action or proposed rule of a campus, college, school, or department faculty under the authority of Sections 23-43 and 23-44 is effective if passed by a quorum majority of its voting members present at a meeting or responding by mail, or of its authorized council or committee, and if approved by the chancellor or dean. Approval by the chancellor or dean is not required in internal department matters.

"Quorum majority" means:

1. in the case of a vote taken at a meeting, a majority of those members voting at a meeting at which at least half the members entitled to vote are present; and
2. in the case of a vote taken by mailed (written) ballots, a majority of those voting, provided that at least half of the members entitled to vote have cast ballots.

- B. When conducting a mail ballot, as described in Subsection A, **campus**, school and college faculties (but not departmental faculties) shall have a choice either to require a quorum majority or to follow Faculty Senate procedures as described in Section 29-36, Subsection C. Under these procedures proposed actions or rules of a **campus**, school or a college, except as stated in Subsection C, shall become effective in the case of a mail ballot either if approved by an affirmative majority vote of the eligible voting members of the faculty, or by a two-thirds majority vote of those casting ballots, provided that at least 45% of the eligible faculty members cast ballots. **Campus**, school and college faculties shall decide, by means of a quorum majority vote, whether to change their rules for procedures governing mail ballots.
- C. When a proposed action concerns a faculty employment recommendation, such as appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion, it will be effective only if passed by a majority of all eligible voting members of the unit, and in accordance with the appropriate procedures as specified in Sections 24-51 to 24-55 and 25-41.
- D. **Campuses**, Colleges, schools, and departments may vote by mail in matters of faculty employment, provided that they use specific procedures they have adopted and published and that these procedures provide for:
1. reasonable opportunity for each faculty member of the unit to study all information relevant to the employment action,
 2. secrecy and security of the ballot, and
 3. security and impartiality of the ballot count.
- E. In a departmentalized school or college, the chairperson or director of a department shall transmit to the dean for approval a copy of any action by the department which may affect college or school policy. If the chairperson or director does not concur in the action, he/she may also submit his/her own recommendation.
- F. Subject to the provisions of Subsections A, B, C, D and E, and of Sections 23-47 and 23-48, a proposed action or rule of a **campus**, college, school, or department becomes effective at the time indicated in the action or rule.
- G. When requested by one or more voting members of a **campus**, college, school, or department faculty the vote upon any matter before it shall be by secret ballot.
- H. Upon request, **the chancellor of a campus**, the dean of a college or school or the chairperson of a department shall provide a member of his or her faculty with information concerning salaries, teaching schedules, salary and operations budget requests, appropriations, allotments, disbursements, and similar data pertaining to his/her **campus**, college, school, or department.

Section 13-31, S-A 20, April 16, 1956; S-A 43, November 14, 1972; S-A 56, February 21, 1978 and S-A 74, January 2, 1987: all with Presidential approval.

Section 23-47. Coordination Among Campuses, Colleges and Schools

In exercising its authority under the provisions of Sections 23-43 and 23-44, the faculty of a **campus**, college, school, or department shall carefully consider the effect of its actions upon other **campuses**, colleges, schools, and departments. The **chancellor of a campus and the** dean of a college or school considering any action shall consult with the **chancellor of each campus and the** dean of each college or school which may be affected by it.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-48. Procedure for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campuses, Colleges and Schools

[This section was entitled "Coordination Among Colleges and Schools: Procedure" in 1956, 1964 and 1969.]

- A. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 to 23-46, and the action so taken deals with admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, graduation, honors, personnel policy, schedules, registration, or student discipline, the **chancellor or** dean shall file copies of it with the President and with the Secretary of the Faculty for transmittal to the appropriate faculty committee, or if there is no other appropriate committee, to the Senate Executive Committee. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.
- B. The action becomes effective 60 days after such filing of copies, unless:
1. it has been approved at an earlier date by both the President and the faculty committee, in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or
 2. the President within the 60-day period suspends its effect, in which event he shall notify the faculty committee to which the matter has been assigned; or
 3. the faculty committee within the 60-day period suspends its effect on grounds either
 - a. that it fails to conform with general University policy or regulations, or
 - b. that it requires review by other **campuses**, colleges or schools which may be affected by it, and refers the matter to the President for final decision.
- C. When a matter is so referred to the President by a faculty committee, the President, after a hearing, shall decide whether the proposed action becomes effective. In so doing the President may employ whatever procedures he or she deems necessary or helpful.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 27, March 31, 1961: both with Presidential approval.

Class A Legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Salary Plan

Section 24-70. Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles

- A. Faculty at the University of Washington shall be salaried on a merit-based system that reflects the University's standing among its peer institutions. Under this system, all faculty deemed meritorious shall be regularly rewarded for their contributions to their department, school/college, and university. Resources permitting, the University shall provide its meritorious faculty with salaries commensurate with those of their peers elsewhere.
- B. Advancement in salary can be effected in several distinct, but not mutually exclusive, ways. A salary increase:
1. shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review (conducted in accord with procedures of Section 24-55);
 2. shall attend, in addition to awards under B. 1 above, promotion in rank (approved in accord with Section 24-54);
 3. shall be awarded to recognize high merit (following review procedure of Section 24-55);
 4. shall be awarded to raise individuals' salaries to the minimum salary for each faculty rank (in accord with Section 24-71.A.4 below);
 5. 4. may be awarded to all meritorious faculty as an additional merit salary increase beyond that available under 24-70.B.1 and 24-70.B.3 (following review procedures of Section 24-55);
 6. may be awarded as a result of compression adjustments (in accord with Section 24-71.B.2 below);
 7. 5- may be awarded as a result of unit-level adjustment (in accord with Section 24-71.B.2 3 below);
 8. 6- may be offered in response to a potential or actual external offer of appointment (upon review in accord with Section 24-71.B.3 4 below); and
 9. 7- may be allocated as a University-wide increase in the faculty salary base that shall be distributed in equal dollar amounts or equal percentage salary increases to all meritorious faculty.

S-A 99, July 9, 1999: with Presidential approval.

Section 24-71. Procedures for Allocating Salary Increases

- A. The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall subsequently recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in Section 24-70.B. The President shall make the final decision on these allocations and shall report the decision to the Faculty Senate.
1. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty deemed meritorious under Section 24-55.
 2. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide salary increases to all faculty awarded promotions approved in accord with Section 24-54.
 3. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide additional merit to all faculty deemed highly meritorious under Section 24-55.

4. 3. Every two years, the Provost shall, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, determine the minimum salary for each faculty rank. This determination shall take account of the recent salaries of beginning Assistant Professors at the University of Washington, and shall endeavor to reflect in the floors for other ranks the general expectation of salary advancement for faculty.
- B. The Provost may distribute, in the course of a biennium, funds allocated by the President:
1. to provide additional merit salary increases (beyond those awarded under 24-71.A.1 and 24.71.A.3). This allocation shall be distributed as equal-percentage increases to all units to fund merit increases for faculty (in accord with Section 24-55).
 2. to make available funds to address compression in the professorial and lecturer ranks. Allocation of such funds will follow consultation by the Provost with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Funds to address compression shall take account of both the recent salaries of beginning Assistant Professors and lecturers, salaries across ranks, the possibility of within rank compression, and the percentage of total faculty affected by compression. Distribution of compression funds shall take merit into account.
 3. 2. to address the market "gap" of an individual unit. Allocation of such funds to units shall follow close consideration of individual units and consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. The Provost shall periodically gather updates on salary information from appropriate sources, including unit heads, and shall make those findings available to the faculty. The department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall consult with the unit's voting faculty who are senior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank—or the unit's designated faculty committee(s)—about the appropriate distribution of these funds; and
 4. 3- to retain a current faculty member, based on the recommendation of the dean. Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. The faculty of each academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to cast an advisory vote on the appropriate response; alternatively, the faculty may establish, consistent with the procedures of Section 23-45, a different policy regarding the level of consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This policy shall be recorded with the Dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially.
- C. The deans of the schools and colleges shall, after consultation with their elected faculty councils (Section [23-45.B](#)), allocate to the faculty of the constituent units of their school/college, all funds made available to provide salary increases under Section [24-70.B](#). Distribution of these awards to individual faculty shall be carried out following the requisite procedures of Chapter 24.

S-A 99, July 9, 1999 and S-A 105, May 6, 2002: both with Presidential approval.

Rationale: The current policy, principles and procedures for allocating salary increases provides three mandatory categories—a minimum equal percentage raise for all faculty deemed meritorious, a salary increase to all faculty awarded promotions, and a floor for the professorial ranks. There are also currently three permissive categories for allocating salary increases—an additional merit increase, an allocation to address individual units, and retention. Currently, there is no mandatory additional merit category, leaving faculty deemed highly meritorious without raises. Additionally, although as many as one-fifth of the faculty are affected by either compression or inversion, there is no permissive category to address compression. These changes add one mandatory category—an allocation for additional merit—and one permissive category—an allocation to address compression.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, April 26, 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 February 12, 2007.
7. Announcements.
8. Requests for Information.
 - a. LCVI Update: Mindy Kornberg, Vice President for Human Resources
 - b. Intercollegiate Athletic Report: Patrick Dobel, FAR and Todd Turner, Athletic Director.
9. Nominations and Appointments.

Action: Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
Action: Confirm James “J.W.” Harrington as the 2007-2008 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2007 and ending July 31, 2008.
10. Memorial Resolution.
11. Unfinished Business.
 - a. **Class A Legislation – Final Consideration.**
Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Proposed Changes concerning the system for designating the Secretary of the Faculty.
Action: Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
 - b. **Class A Legislation – Final Consideration.**
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 final review of proposal to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
12. New Business.
 - a. **Class A Legislation – First Consideration.**
Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Proposed faculty salary changes to the Faculty Code.
Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
 - b. **Class C Resolution.**
Senate Executive Committee
Title: Faculty Senate Endorsement of the Husky Tee Project.
Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
13. Adjournment.

PREPARED BY: Gerry F. Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate