

MINUTES FOR SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 12, 2009, 2:30 p.m.

142 Gerberding

Present: Lovell, Balick, Emmert, Ahmad, Rahn, Wilcock, Harrington, Zahorjan, Van Voorhis, Jaffe, Forman, Schaufelberger, Demorest, Breitner, Kaminsky, Sjøvik, Wenderoth, Haselkorn, Fabien, Primomo, Rorabaugh, Wiklinson, Silberstein, Luchtel, Faleschini, Wise.

Guests: Scott Woodward, Patrick Dobel, Doug Wadden, Carol Niccolls, and Cheryl Cameron.

Absent: Huber, Chew, Landis, Odegaard, Killien, Fridley, Bennett.

1. Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. and the Chair informed the Committee that Jan Sjøvik needs to leave the meeting at 4:20 p.m. If the meeting has not progressed to agenda item 14.a by 4 p.m., he will ask the Committee to move to that discussion. With that proviso, the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the SEC meeting of November 17, 2008, and the Senate meeting of December 4, 2008, were approved as written.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.

David Lovell, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Given the length of the agenda, and the anticipation of lengthy discussions, Senate Chair David Lovell simply wished the Committee a happy new year.

4. Report from the President.

Mark Emmert, President.

The President, in turn, also wished the Committee a happy new year. His report was short as well: The legislative session will be long and drawn out – and the only certainty at this point is that there will be a significantly reduced budget by the time classes begin next fall. He then asked for questions.

In response to one question concerning the Climate Action Plan, the President explained that this is a partnership among a number of universities to reduce the carbon footprint and increase sustainability in each of the member Universities – with a goal of achieving a zero carbon footprint within 3 years. The probability of achieving this goal is low, but honest efforts will be made. The President added that the UW has been recognized for what's been done so far. For example, all food service facilities now use only compostable cups, plates, forks and spoons. In addition, the UW is purchasing only green electricity. It costs slightly more, but it's entirely produced by hydropower. Finally, the figures from the UW Transportation Department are remarkable: Seventy percent of those who regularly commute to the University do so by means other than single occupancy vehicles. The UW has more work to do on its energy and water consumption, and the charter group of the Climate Action Plan is a good forum for sharing and implementing new ideas.

The President fielded two suggestions that the Climate Action Plan and the current budget crisis both provide a good opportunity to involve students in finding solutions. He acknowledged the ideas and assured Committee members that he would take those suggestions into consideration over the next several months.

When asked about the nature of budget cuts in the future, the President said that the initial cuts for this year were absorbed without needing to resort to program cuts. It will be very difficult, however, to avoid cutting programs in the next biennium. Schools, colleges and campuses are asked to develop plans for how to deal with eight, ten and twelve percent cuts. Nevertheless the Provost is asking deans, directors and chancellors, at the same time, to consider documenting and budgeting for proposals in their units for initiatives that will put the UW in a better place in five to ten years. These plans will then be reviewed by the Provost with each Dean, Director and Chancellor individually. This is a complex assignment and will require everyone involved to deal patiently with a fair amount of ambiguity.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

Dan Luchtel, Faculty Senate Past Chair and Committee Chair.

Dan Luchtel, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, began with a short update on the UW budget process so far and where the University now stands. For the 2008-09 budget, the present fiscal year, he reported that we now know that state support for the university was cut some \$17 million. How this budget reduction is being implemented was outlined in a December 2, 2008, letter from the Provost. Because this budget reduction was initiated after the start of the fiscal year, the Provost decided to lessen the shock to the individual units by providing funds to cover half of this reduction. These are considered as temporary payments, covered from central fund balances, with the understanding that this will be paid back by the individual units during the 2009-10 fiscal year. The remaining half of this year's reduction will be covered by across-the-board cuts in the budgets of the individual units. Academic units will take a reduction of 0.75% and administrative unit cuts will be 1.5%.

For the 2009-11 biennium, the key word is "uncertainty" in that while we can expect that the budget cuts for the university will be severe, we don't yet know how severe. The governor's proposed budget cuts the university's budget by another 13% for the 2009-11 fiscal period. Bad as that is, it's still better than the 20% cut originally feared. For the biennium, a 13% reduction would result in a loss of \$116 million. For the next fiscal year (2009-10), 13% is a reduction of \$58 million on the base of \$425 million in state operating funds. On the other hand, a 7% tuition increase would generate an additional \$21 million in revenue and would decrease the deficit to \$37 million for the 2009-10 budget year. This still would be more than double the budget reduction for this year and compounded, would be repeated for the 2010-11 fiscal year. But two caveats need to be kept in mind about any increase in tuition. The legislature may not approve a 7% increase in tuition. Second, any increase in tuition would be accompanied with an increase in student financial aid.

The Provost is presently preparing a document that will soon be sent out to all the Deans and Chancellors providing guidelines and principles for how to implement the 2009-11 budget cuts.

Several other variables should also be kept in mind. First, the Governor's budget is the first of three that will be proposed. There will be a Senate budget and a House budget, each of which may be better or worse for the university. Second, the budget deficit could be worse than the present benchmark of some \$6 billion and thus require further cuts in the 2009-11 budget. The final budget deficit that will be incorporated into the biennial budget won't be known until sometime in March. Third, Democrats in the state legislature may decide to propose new taxes to help meet the budget shortfall. Fourth, the federal government may appropriate money to help bail out the state. So, such is the University's uncertain future.

6. Report on Legislative Affairs. **{Exhibit A}**
JW Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington referred SEC members to the legislative agenda attached to the SEC agenda – which had been discussed at the last SEC and Faculty Senate meetings. He wanted to field any questions about the agenda from the Committee that might have come up in the past couple of months. Deputy Legislative Representative Jim Fridley and he will be focusing on the implications of the budget cuts, but they don't want to over-paint the bad picture (as many will be doing). He reported that there will be hearings and work sessions on the budget this week in Olympia. One such work session will include representatives of higher education institutions who have been invited to tell about the impact of cuts on their institutions.

The legislature will also be creating guidelines on what the higher education institutions must continue to do in spite of budget cuts. Harrington anticipates working with the legislature if those guidelines seem unrealistic.

He urged SEC members to contact him with comments on the agenda.

In response to a question about raising resident undergraduate tuition, Harrington said that this issue is one that is hard to read politically. If it becomes reasonable to discuss, it will be discussed – but it may be better to let the legislature grapple with this than laying the issue on the Regents' agenda.

In response to a question about whether the University should be modeling for a "real" budget disaster, the Provost noted that if the University does develop models for a 15 or 18% decrease it will give legislators the idea that this is a reasonable possibility – and will create a panic situation within the University. The President added that although it is a good question, administration will be "working like crazy" not to have this happen. A two or four percent decrease can be done around the fringes. Above that, cuts need to be considered, but very strategically.

7. Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative. **{Exhibit B}**

Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative and Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics.

Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative began the conversation by explaining that this constitutes one of his semi-annual reports to the SEC. He began by drawing attention of SEC members to student athlete graduation rates relative to other schools, noting that only Jesuit schools and Stanford are ahead of the UW in this regard. He also noted that this is a snapshot of classes that entered the UW two coaches ago. In addition, there are two other pieces of information to consider: the retention rate and the eligibility rate. These will be part of the determination on whether penalties will be applied to an institution.

The Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) follows and monitors these indicators. Six years from now, he would expect to see some graduation rate fluctuation because of coaching changes. Many students transfer and some will start underperforming after a bad season. This is what he has been seeing during this current period of destabilization.

Dobel also reported on the revision of the charge of the ACIA. The revision realigns the committee with actual practice. It ensures that faculty members on the Committee have been vetted by the Senate and it expands *ex officio* membership to include a representative of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs. Committee responsibilities are more clearly articulated, including the examination of all data related to student athletes and the review of policy analysis of student academic support services. He expressed his hope that this latter element will strengthen accountability in the office of student academic support services. ACIA is also exploring the possibility of moving student financial aid and registration issues into the office of the Vice Provost of Student Affairs (and out of the Athletic Department) as there is currently a potential for conflicts of interest.

President Emmert then introduced Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics. Woodward then told SEC members about his three priorities: student athlete welfare, providing the best possible academic and athletic experience for student athletes, and exploring ways for Intercollegiate Athletics to support the UW's mission as a University. He wants faculty to be proud to see student athletes on TV because that's how most of the country knows the University of Washington.

In response to questions about the salaries of football coaches, Woodward assured SEC members that football generates 85% of the funding of the entire Intercollegiate Athletics enterprise – including the salaries of football coaches. The UW does not subsidize its athletic department as many other universities do, including UCLA, UCB and WSU. State funds do not support the salaries of coaches at the University of Washington.

SEC member Van Voorhis brought up the issue of the mistaken public perception of intercollegiate athletics as taking resources away from the academic mission. Colleagues in South Campus read about the pay given to coaches and then about impending budget cuts, and they wonder about the disconnect. How can the University get the message to its own community that ICA is really self-sustaining?

President Emmert readily spoke up and noted that this is his responsibility and that he needs to do a better job of communicating this to UW faculty, staff and students.

Another SEC member questioned why there isn't a maintenance or depreciation fund for the stadium. Woodward responded that the stadium is beyond repair now. After years of making minor repairs, the lower bowl needs to be replaced.

Senate Chair Lovell noted that there are ethical concerns related to student athletes – including the place of athletics on campus and whether student athletes are being exploited. He hopes that student athletes, like all students on campus, will leave the University with a sense of the intrinsic value of what they have learned in the classroom. It's important that this be a part of on-going discussions in the Department of Athletics. Faculty Council on Student Affairs Chair Brian Fabien noted that a survey of student athletes last year revealed that most ranked their academic experience at the UW higher than their athletic experience.

Another faculty member reiterated how the stadium issue is a public relations "nightmare." How can we think the public will support this given the state budget – and given the misperception, even within our community, that ICA is not self supporting? The President assured Committee members that administration is taking the public relations issue seriously and that the stadium renovation will not be pursued if it looks like it will detract from support for the University as a whole.

With thanks to Scott Woodward and Patrick Dobel, Chair Lovell turned to the next agenda item.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.

There were none.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

- a. Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit C}**
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Lovell expressed appreciation for Christine DiStefano's willingness to serve on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. There were no further nominations from the floor, and the nominations were approved.

- b. Action: Approve 2009-2010 Vice Chair Candidates.
JW Harrington, Professor, Geography.
Robert Holzworth, Professor, Earth and Space Sciences.

Lovell explained that the *Faculty Code* procedures for the election of Vice Chair stipulate that the Vice Chair shall be chosen from among the voting members of the faculty by a majority vote of the Senate, and the Senate Chair, with the approval of the Senate Executive Committee, shall publish in the Senate agenda, the name of at least one nominee. The successful candidate will serve as vice chair in 2009-2010, as chair in 2010-2011, and as chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting 2011-2012. A nominating committee was appointed consisting of Jody Bourgeois, Ross Heath, Brad Holt, and Diane Morrison. The committee has forwarded two candidates for the position: JW Harrington, Professor of Geography and Robert Holzworth, Professor of Earth and Space Sciences. There were no further nominations from the floor, and the two nominations were approved.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.

- a. Review of Institute for National Security and Education (INSER): Mark Haselkorn, Chair, Faculty Council on Research.

Faculty Council on Research (FCR) Mark Haselkorn reported that the minutes of the December 12, 2008, meeting of the FCR are now posted on the FCR website. Item #5 in the minutes lists the outcome of the Council's review of INSER. Issues pertaining to potential conflicts when research in one unit impinges on another, and whether there were certain sources of research money that should not have been accepted on moral grounds were not within the purview of the Council and were not dealt with. The conclusions are as follows:

1. INSER had appropriately not checked the eGC-1 box that would have instigated an FCR review since the award did not require classified, proprietary, or restricted information.
2. The post-review of INSER stimulated by AAUP and faculty requests but based on current FCR criteria found that had INSER checked the box, it would have been approved.
3. More general moral and ethical concerns that went beyond research-specific issues were returned to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee without comment.

Haselkorn made a point to clarify that item #3 should not be taken as Council advice to foreclose discussion on those issues – simply that FCR is not the proper forum for that discussion. JW Harrington added that there is still concern about how this program may affect other student-abroad programs. Although FCR has done its job, this issue is not off the table.

- b. Faculty Council Issues as of January 12, 2009. **{Exhibit D}**

Chair Lovell noted that Exhibit D is an updated list of current Faculty Council issues. No further concerns had been brought to the Chair's attention.

11. Information.

There were no information items.

12. Announcements.

Faculty Council on Research Chair Mark Haselkorn announced the appointment of vice chair for that Council – Professor Gerald Miller from the Department of Physics.

13. Unfinished Business.

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

Werner Kaminsky, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Technology.

Title: Resolution Concerning Live Webcams on UW Websites.

Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Faculty Council on Educational Technology Chair Werner Kaminsky reviewed the history of the Council's Class C Resolution. Having been returned to the Council for further consideration by the SEC, he believes that the resulting revision, attached, will prevent trouble in two ways. It could save money and it could avoid legal problems for faculty. This version has been thoroughly vetted by both technical and legal advisors.

In response to a question about what is and is not a webcam, Kaminsky stated that a webcam, as defined in the second "whereas" in the resolution, is a stationary camera that shows output on the internet in regular intervals or on request. In addition, any form of published content that ends up on a website should also be considered – including sound recordings (at the insistence of the Attorney General).

A motion to forward this resolution to the Faculty Senate was approved with one opposed and four abstentions.

14. New Business.

a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration **{Exhibit F}**

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) – Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.

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

Chair Lovell explained that after first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once and sends it back to the SEC for 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.

In response to a request from the Chair for a motion to submit this legislation amending the *Faculty Code* for Faculty Senate consideration, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs Chair Jan Sjøvik said "so moved."

Sjøvik presented the legislation saying that when the Council began consideration of this portion of the *Faculty Code* the members didn't realize that there would be such keen interest in any proposed revisions. He cautioned SEC members that this is the kind of legislation that may well elude consensus. Its drafting has been a challenge within the Council and he anticipates challenges in this body as well as in the Senate.

The Council began its deliberations a year ago. They have consulted with, and have received constructive feedback from, a variety of stakeholders, including the Board of Deans, the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. As a result, Sjøvik feels that the current version, although not perfect, is a significant improvement.

One of the major changes is increased flexibility with timelines. They tend to be generous, possibly leading to a longer process, but experience has shown that rigid timelines can also lead to a longer process if parts of that process need to be aborted and re-started.

Another major change is eliminating the confidentiality requirement at the outset of the procedures. If information is withheld, rumors tend to multiply. If too much information is available there may be unintended consequences associated with that. The Council's action was based on actual experience. It's possible that confidentiality would be a benefit when a program is being considered for a change. If it is a very strong program, there may be few problems, but for smaller programs there may be more significant problems. Nevertheless, the FCFA concluded that it was better to open the process and assume the risks.

A question was raised about the ambiguity of having these procedures so specifically include the Bothell and Tacoma campuses at the same time when discussions are underway about the autonomy and increasing self-governance of those campuses. The President responded that although he hasn't studied the legislation under consideration in detail, it is the case that over time the campuses will have growing

autonomy. The individuals serving as chancellor of the Tacoma and Bothell campuses require a high level of tolerance for ambiguity because of the varying rates of evolution of those campuses. We need to understand that this evolution involves a lot of unexplored territory. It will take time and patience as issues are addressed and re-addressed during this process.

Sjåvik added that there certainly was not attempt to tie the hands or limit development of other campuses. The Council had attempted to ensure that the main principles were drafted such that they could be adapted to meet local needs.

Sandy Silberstein, Chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia and past Chair of the Faculty Senate noted that the original legislation – and this revision – was written in the spirit of protecting all faculty at the University of Washington. At this point there is only one *Faculty Code*, and until there are three, the language should be changed to ensure that faculty on all campuses are protected by the provisions of the *Code*.

Janet Primomo, Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy added that her Council has been and will continue to work on these revisions. Vice chancellors are ex officio members of the Council and participate fully in these on-going discussions. She appreciated the feedback and the question and will bring it to the next discussion of RCEP within her Council.

Doug Wadden, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Planning informed the Committee that the process integrally involves the Provost—who is the Provost for all campuses, overseeing all tenure and promotion cases as well. He believes this is consistent with the current assumptions regarding the status of the evolution of the campuses.

At this point, Provost Wise requested that Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, be allowed to join the conversation. Cameron serves as the President's Designee on the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and has been a part of all Council deliberations leading to the drafting of this proposal. Chair Lovell granted the request.

In response to a question concerning the length of time it would require to complete an RCEP if time limits were taken to the maximum extent, Cameron replied that the proposed legislation includes language that encourages participants to act expeditiously and not take advantage of the full extent of the limits. A related question addressed the concern that in order to complete an RCEP in one year, it would need to be initiated early in the fall. Cameron responded that the RCEP revision has eliminated the requirement that an RCEP be completed within an academic year.

On behalf of Brad Holt, a colleague and former Chair of the Faculty Senate, Vice Chair Bruce Balick conveyed two serious concerns. The first is the need for confidentiality at the outset of the process. Casting the shadow of a possible impending elimination on a program will have an impact on that program for a long time – significantly hampering its ability to attract new faculty and students. The second is the time scale involved in the original and revision of the legislation. Any process that cannot respond quickly is irresponsible. Holt suggests that in the face of a financial responsibility, RCEP will be cast aside because it simply takes too long. A fast-track version of the procedures is what is needed.

Responses to the concern about confidentiality addressed the fact that in general, by the time an RCEP procedure is initiated, significant (and probably open) discussions within the program about the possibility would have already been underway. The identification of a program for an RCEP would not necessarily be a surprise to those within or outside of a particular program.

Other concerns included:

- These procedures seem too burdensome – why consider them further, especially when everyone seems to agree.
- Procedures for eliminating a small program seem far more arduous than those for eliminating a college.
- RCEP needs a fundamental re-write; neither the original nor the revised version work well.

Cameron then asked to submit a few minor changes and one substantive one to the legislation as attached to the agenda:

The title of Section 26-41: The proposed legislation suggest that it should be: “Procedures for Restructuring of Academic Unit.” Cameron’s suggestion is that it should be: “Reorganization,

Consolidation and Elimination Procedures.” [At this point in the meeting, Sjøvik excused himself to teach his Monday afternoon class.] Cameron continued with some housekeeping changes, that culminated with her recommendation for a significant change by substituting the fourth word of the following section (26-41.D.1) “and,” to “or.”

If the Provost **and** a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting concur that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic priorities should be achieved by the elimination of a particular college or school in its entirety, or by its reorganization or consolidation with another college or school, the Provost shall ~~invite~~ request that the Chair of the Faculty Senate ~~to~~ appoint a Review Committee, ~~constituted as described in B.4 above.~~ of five faculty.

Ensuing discussion lead to the determination that more input from Sjøvik and the FCFA on this matter was required for the SEC to take further action.

Chair Lovell announced that he would entertain a motion to amend this legislation as proposed by Cameron up to, but not including the proposal for the change in 26-41.D.1. With no objection to this first set of “friendly amendments,” Lovell accepted those first wording changes.

He then directed the Committee’s attention to the more controversial issue. Cameron began by stating that in all other sections of 26-41, the role of the SCPB is consultative. Section D is the only one where an actual vote of the SCPB is required for the process to continue.

Ensuing discussion revealed uncertainty about whether Cameron’s proposed change for this section would somehow be a disadvantage to faculty. Again, SEC members felt uncomfortable without the presence of a spokesperson from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs present.

A point was made that this section, providing procedures for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of a college or school, has never been put to use. There is no track record of how procedures defined in this particular section have (or have not) worked. One committee member suggested it would make sense to fortify the language in section D to be more like the language in section B.

A question was made about whether the SCPB is the appropriate body to be representing the faculty in RCEP procedures.

A motion was made to table the proposal. The motion failed with a vote of three in favor and twelve opposed.

Another motion was made to refer the proposal back to the FCFA with instructions for the Council to address the issues about the language in 26-41.D.1 and the role of the SCPB – in addition to any further revising they deem appropriate.

The motion was approved with one abstention.

- b. January 29, 2009, Faculty Senate Agenda.
Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators. **{Exhibit G}**

With the deletion of item #12, the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting was approved.

15. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate

UW Faculty Legislative agenda

revised 25 November 2008, for discussion and review

OPERATING BUDGET

Protect core education activities of the university sector.

Maintain competitive compensation for faculty, professional staff, and librarians,

- written into the biennial budget, and
- at least comparable to the wage/salary adjustments negotiated for unionized state employees.

Improve health, safety, and child care for faculty, students, and staff.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Support the University's capital budget requests.

- The Husky Stadium ask is *not* part of the University's capital budget request.

POLICY LEGISLATION

Mandate gubernatorial appointment of **faculty regents** and trustees.

Renew **regential authority to set tuition except for resident undergraduates.**

Support **tuition and financial aid policies** that maintain broad student access to very high quality undergraduate education.

Support judicious proposals to **increase higher-education funding capacity.**

Support increased **access** to quality baccalaureate education.

- Be mindful of the large capital investments required for additional campuses.
- Draw attention to the requisites for high quality in BA/BS expansions at lower-division institutions.
- Support e-learning initiatives that call for adequate faculty, staff, and technical support to serve students' needs.

2008 NCAA Graduation Rates					
Comparison of Division I Schools on the West Coast					
	2001-02 Student Body	4-Class Average	2001-02 Student-athlete	4-class-average	Grad Success Rate
San Francisco	65%	66%	60%	59%	99%
Stanford	95%	95%	89%	91%	95%
Gonzaga	80%	79%	63%	61%	89%
San Diego	74%	74%	76%	76%	87%
Loyola Marymount	75%	75%	74%	73%	86%
UC Davis	79%	80%	77%	81%	86%
Santa Clara	84%	85%	75%	71%	85%
Pepperdine	80%	79%	73%	71%	84%
Washington	75%	75%	77%	68%	83%
UC Irvine	80%	80%	70%	67%	82%
Pacific	56%	64%	70%	70%	82%
Oregon State	61%	60%	57%	60%	81%
UC Santa Barbara	80%	78%	73%	70%	80%
UCLA	90%	88%	70%	68%	79%
Saint Mary's	67%	67%	63%	66%	79%
UC Riverside	64%	64%	64%	61%	77%
UC Berkeley	88%	88%	70%	69%	76%
Eastern Washington	47%	47%	64%	56%	75%
Washington State	63%	62%	58%	59%	73%
San Diego State	56%	53%	50%	55%	72%
Oregon	65%	64%	68%	55%	71%
Long Beach State	46%	47%	54%	52%	71%
USC	85%	83%	67%	64%	69%
Cal Poly	69%	68%	69%	64%	69%
Portland	70%	70%	71%	64%	62%
CS Fresno	48%	46%	49%	51%	61%
CS Sacramento	41%	41%	40%	49%	60%
CS Fullerton	50%	49%	45%	43%	56%
CS Northridge	13%	30%	48%	35%	56%
San Jose State	42%	41%	41%	46%	52%
Portland State	35%	35%	47%	46%	48%
	2001-02 Student Body	4-Class Average	2001-02 Student-athlete	4-class-average	Grad Success Rate
2006 Report National Averages					
Division I Average	62%	61%	64%	63%	78%
	2001-02 Student Body	4-Class Average	2001-02 Student-athlete	4-class-average	Grad Success Rate
Pac-10 Conference					
Stanford	95%	95%	89%	91%	95%
Washington	75%	75%	77%	68%	83%
Oregon State	61%	60%	57%	60%	81%
UCLA	90%	88%	70%	68%	79%
California	88%	88%	70%	69%	76%
Washington State	63%	62%	58%	59%	73%
Oregon	65%	64%	68%	55%	71%
Arizona State	56%	55%	67%	54%	69%
USC	85%	83%	67%	64%	69%
Arizona	56%	57%	54%	51%	64%
	Student Body	4-Class Average	Student-athlete	4-class-average	Grad Success Rate
UW Yearly Graduation Rates					
Class entering 1983-84		#			#
1984-85		**			**
1985-86					
1986-87	63%	61%	61%	55%	
1987-88	56%	55%	57%	54%	
1988-89	67%	64%	57%	57%	
1989-90	70%	66%	68%	60%	
1990-91	69%	68%	57%	59%	
1991-92	70%	69%	64%	61%	
1992-93	71%	70%	68%	64%	
1993-94	72%	70%	64%	63%	
1994-95	68%	70%	64%	65%	
1995-96	70%	70%	67%	66%	
1996-97	71%	70%	70%	66%	
1997-98	71%	70%	68%	68%	
1998-99	73%	71%	68%	68%	84%
1999-2000	74%	72%	61%	67%	82%
2000-01	75%	73%	64%	65%	81%
2001-02	75%	75%	77%	68%	83%
*Indicates two-year average		**Indicates three-year average			

Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

Mandate

The Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics ("the Committee") advises the President of the University of Washington on all matters pertaining to (1) institutional control of the athletic program; (2) the academic and financial integrity of intercollegiate athletics; (3) the academic and personal well-being of student-athletes; and (4) the accountability of the athletic department to the values and mission of the University of Washington.

Membership

The committee consists of the following voting members: the Faculty Athletic Representative and nine additional faculty members, and two representatives from the University of Washington Student Athlete Advisory Council. The faculty members shall serve staggered three-year terms that are renewable.

The President shall appoint the faculty members. Half of the faculty members shall be appointed from nominees from the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall elect its own Chair who may serve renewable terms.

Ex-officio members (non-voting) of the Committee include: the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, the Vice Provost for Student Life, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs or his or her designee, a Presidential representative, the Director of Admissions, and senior athletic administrators as designated by the Committee.

Relationship to the Faculty Senate

The President appoints the Committee in collaboration with the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Chair of the Committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Faculty via the Faculty Senate Chair. The Committee Chair is also responsible for apprising the Faculty Senate Chair in a timely manner of any Committee actions requiring Faculty Senate action. The Faculty Senate Chair will refer such matters to the appropriate Faculty Senate Council.

Faculty Athletic Representative

The Faculty Athletic Representative is selected by the President of the University of Washington and serves a renewable five-year term. The President will select the Faculty Athletic Representative with the advice of the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Faculty Senate Chair and the Athletic Director.

Authorized by University of Washington President Mark A. Emmert
With the concurrence of Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell
August 19, 2008

2008-20011 Faculty Member Appointments to Faculty Councils and Committees

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Christine Di Stefano, Group 4, Political Science, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

2008-2009 Representative Faculty Council Nominations

Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative ex-officio members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2009, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the Faculty Councils:

Associated Students of the University of Washington

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Educational Technology -----	Ryan Schmidt
University Facilities & Services-----	Jason Padvorac
University Libraries-----	Rujun Song
Women in Academia-----	Maria Guillen

Faculty Council Issues
For Distribution: January 12, 2009
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

1. Academic Standards
 - a. Academic Rigor Committee (Joint with FCIQ). The committee is currently crafting proposed guidance for independent study and special topics courses.
 - b. Provost's Working Group on English Proficiency. The working group submitted a progress report to the President and Provost recommending revised policies relative to English language proficiency and proposing additional resources for students needing support in improving their English skills.
 - c. Council reviewed a proposal to establish a curriculum committee for the University Honors Program and recommended its approval subject to revised procedures regarding the selection of committee members.
 - d. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
 - e. Review of Handbook language relative to graduation and application for degree process.
2. Benefits and Retirement
 - a. Conversion of opt-in system for UWRP contributions to an automatic-enrollment (opt-out) system (i) upon initial employment and (ii) for the increase in contributions from 7.5% to 10% at age 50. The University has decided to convert to automatic enrollment at 10% for those turning 50 (requires SCPB follow-up.). The council feels that one can still opt-out, but would be a bad idea financially as one would give up the University match on the incremental 2.5% contribution. The group was also told that the auto-enrollment at initial employment was meritorious but too expensive to implement at this point.
 - b. Continue to advocate the council's proposal that dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians receive a discount in the base undergraduate UW tuition.
 - c. Review a communication plan for the supplemental benefit.
 - d. Review retirement fund options, possibly meet with fund reps, and review the committee charged with evaluating such funds.
 - e. Explore ways to better understand communicate the "total compensation" faculty receive, that is, the value of their salary plus benefits.
 - f. Look into an easier way for faculty to distribute their salary and benefits contributions over 12 months.
3. Educational Outreach
 - a. FCEO Charge: A challenge the Council faces this year is deciding where to focus its attention. The challenge results in part from the fact that there may be overlapping issues among Councils. Council chairs will meet this fall to discuss potentially common issues. It may be that the Faculty Senate leadership will wish to consider whether the Council's charge is still appropriate.
 - b. Identification of University-wide "outreach programs" through development of a database of all fee-based, state-funded, degree/non-degree, and certificate programs with a goal of developing the means to support distance learning.
 - c. Departmental level support for faculty using instructional technology. This would be different from the proposed support for faculty who teach distance learning courses through UWEO.
 - d. Concern about what happens to the work of each year. For example, there is no indication of what happened to the request from last year's work, summarized in the Annual Report, and submitted to the Chairs (current and incoming) of the Faculty Senate as well as the Provost.
4. Educational Technology
 - a. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology requests a stable source of financial support for contemporary teaching technology to be made available for the 'Technology Consortium'* to innovate teaching capabilities to meet and satisfy student's and faculty's expectations and learning experience as well as sustain the University of Washington's position as a center of teaching excellence. * The Teaching Consortium consists of: Classroom Support Services; Health Sciences Classroom Services; University Libraries; Catalyst.
 - b. Continues to address issues of plagiarism. This issue will hopefully be broadened to include FCUL, FCIQ, and FCAS.

- c. Investigating current practices in research data archiving. FCET will continue to follow this issue in the coming year and to set the direction for providing more contemporary forms of data storage. FCET is seeking collaboration with FCUL.
 - d. FCET looked into the possible benefits of using cameras connected to the internet for educational purposes, as these cameras are inexpensive and easily installed. A list of recommendations was devised that should be considered by those using such cameras. This class C resolution was presented to the Senate Executive Meeting and is currently under revision. The issue seems to cross path with item b from FCIQ as it affects campus photos used on the internet in general.
5. Faculty Affairs
- a. Revisions to Section 26-41 of the *Faculty Code*, Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP).
 - b. Revisions to Section 27-41 of the *Faculty Code* concerning the conciliation procedures, with a view to revitalizing the mechanism for resolving differences. Although the section was extensively revised during the 2007-2008 academic year, the council is currently working on additional modifications to the text.
 - c. Restructure Proposal – the Council will continue consideration of the most recent version of this proposal, which was distributed at the SEC orientation.
6. Instructional Quality
- a. Ad hoc Committee on Academic Rigor: Committee was created to address the issue of academic rigor of UW courses. Committee members were drawn from FCAS and FCIQ. The committee began the process of establishing criteria to assess 'academic rigor' and applying those criteria to a systematic review of data from UW courses. The committee will continue this process in 2008-09.
 - b. Student photos attached to class lists: The council began looking at the possible benefits of the University providing student photos with class lists. FCIQ will continue to work with the Registrar and ASUW to help make student class photos a reality for faculty at the UW.
 - c. 10-year Review Process: FCIQ began an in-depth investigation of the purpose, aims and outcomes of the current 10-year review process as it is conducted by the Graduate School. The Graduate School welcomed input into the process and plans were made to begin work over the summer.
 - d. Summer school tuition rates and faculty pay: Members reviewed information concerning the comparison of tuition rates that students pay for summer school versus the academic year. In 2008-09, tuition is \$2,219 for 10-18 credits during the academic year and \$2,088 for 10-18 credits for residents during summer quarter. It was noted that the tuition cost are very comparable yet faculty who teach in the summer are only paid 2 months of salary whereas they are paid 3 months of salary for the same course during the academic year. As many lecturers teach during the summer months this could be a form of rank discrimination. Further information is sought as to why faculty are paid different rates for classes taught during the school year and during summer. This discrepancy will continue to be pursued during the next academic year.
 - e. Summer school: Exam period and A and B terms. Members are concerned that the current policy of having exams on the last day of class rather than on a final's week does not allow students enough time to gain a deep understanding of the material but rather encourages superficial understanding. We are pursuing the idea of an abbreviated exam week (M-T-W) following the last week of class.
Members are also concerned that the shortened terms (A &B) may encourage students to view courses as something to check off as quickly as possible rather than invest in building deep understanding.
 - f. Review of the general education requirements: How well do they prepare students for their majors? What are the proposed learning outcomes for these courses? What is the academic rigor of these courses?
 - g. Review of course approval form: Are learning outcomes clearly stated, how are learning outcomes assessed, create a 5 year review of courses to confirm that the course still meets the requirements established in the original course approval, this would also be an opportunity to modify course approval entry to better reflect the evolution of the course.
 - h. Teaching challenges for future faculty hires: Given the ever-increasing size of the student body and the need for large classes to meet this increasing student demand, are we recruiting faculty

- who are prepared to teach these classes and what support is the University offering faculty to help them attain teaching and learning excellence in the large class format?
- i. Inventory and publish best teaching and learning practices: Conduct a study of faculty to ascertain their best teaching and learning practice. Highlight and display the results of this study on a Learning at the UW site where written and videotape reports of teaching innovations will be stored.
 - j. Identify teaching challenges and solutions of 21st Century: Some topics could include; teaching students with disabilities, interdisciplinary teaching, technology in the classroom, helping students prioritize their time, etc.
7. Multicultural Affairs
 - a. FCMA began looking at first steps toward creating an exchange program with schools from the Black College and University Consortium. This project will continue during the next academic year.
 8. Research
 - a. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research: review, and if appropriate, approve applications for grants and contracts. Consider the mechanisms by which classified, proprietary and restricted research is accepted into the University.
 - b. Faculty Effort Reporting: including consideration of related issues such as the inability of research faculty to write new grants under funding from current grants.
 - c. Senate Interdisciplinary Research Committee (SIRC): This group proposed a class C resolution concerning fostering multi-unit interdisciplinary research adopted by the Faculty Senate spring of 2008, and is a first in a series of proposals that will be forthcoming.
 - d. Royalty Research Fund (RRF): participate in a comprehensive review of the RRF via an *ad hoc* committee including FCR members and others across campus. The *ad hoc* committee will report to FCR, which will make final recommendations and forward them to the Research Advisory Board and, if appropriate, to the Board of Deans and Faculty Senate.
 - e. Scholarly Communication Committee (joint with University Libraries): address issues of open access with the goal of encouraging and facilitating faculty publishing rights at the University of Washington.
 9. Student Affairs
 - a. North of 45th Street and Campus Safety issues require continuing attention and oversight, including tracking the Administration's implementation of recommendations of the North of 45th Street Working Group.
 - b. Review of efforts to streamline and coordinate the activities of the Mental Health Clinic at Hall Health Center and the Counseling Center in Schmitz Hall.
 - c. FCSA notes that the current policy regarding the admission of "special" and "priority" student athletes has expired and strongly suggests that the ACIA present a revised policy to the Faculty Senate.
 10. Tri-campus Policy
 - a. Tri-Campus Relations: FCTCP established a Tri-Campus Relations Work Group to provide a forum for discussion on the relationships among the three campuses of the UW. The Work Group will follow-up on the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Report and the 2005 University of Washington Presidential Tri-Campus Steering Committee and Task Force Retreat that addressed future challenges and opportunities facing our three-campus university." Specifically, we hope to delineate campus vs. university level functions and responsibilities (i.e. curriculum).
 - b. Schools and colleges at UWB/UWT: Determine strategy for this year's discussion.
 - c. Follow-up regarding meeting with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach about educational outreach issues that affect all three campuses.
 - d. Track revisions on the Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) revisions and Senate and Senate Executive Committee reorganization.
 - e. Assure that representation from UWB/UWT faculty on UW Faculty Councils is occurring as recommended.

11. University Facilities and Services

- a. Stewardship and Sustainability: FCUFS devoted much of its time this year to the implementation of sustainable operations practices and the implementation of best practices on the Seattle campus. FCUFS developed a class-C resolution praising the Environmental Stewardship Advisory Council (ESAC) and the Administration for their efforts and pressing for more support for future activities under consideration by ESAC. It is clear that the low-hanging fruit has been harvested in the greening of the campus, and that future progress will take more effort and collaboration, especially in areas of controlling atmospheric carbon (i.e., commuting, air flights, and campus heating). FCUFS went on record as wanting to remain an active collaborator with ESAC through frequent liaison as new programs reach the implementation stage.
- b. Sound Transit.
- c. Husky Stadium.
- d. Expansion of UW medical facility; proposed new Molecular Engineering Building.

12. University Libraries

- a. Formation of Scholarly Communications Committee: One response of the academic community to the problem of escalating serials costs for libraries has been the rise in open access publishing in which articles are made freely available on line. The FCUL and the Faculty Council on Research have joined to form an ad hoc committee to address issues of open access and maintenance of faculty authors' rights. The subcommittee consists of members from the FCUL, the FCR, and the Libraries.
- b. Effects of open access on small journals in the humanities and social sciences: The FCUL invited three faculty members who are journal editors or former editors to participate in a discussion of the compatibility of open access to journal publishing in the humanities and to present to the counsel the economic pressures faced by their journals.
- c. Status of librarians in relation to faculty: Librarians are currently classified as academic staff in a separate category from faculty. Librarians at all other public universities in the state have full faculty status. The FCUL has considered arguments for and against a change in status of University of Washington Librarians. Possible alternate forms of categorization such as affiliate faculty were discussed, as was increased participation of librarians in faculty governance. The FCUL unanimously passed a motion in favor of pursuing the representation of librarians on the Faculty Senate as full voting members.
- d. Effects of budget cuts on the Libraries delivery of services to students and faculty.

13. University Relations

- a. Ongoing issues: SR 520 and Sound Transit Issues.
- b. UW North Campus.
- c. The issue of the Honorary Degree nomination from UW Bothell was discussed at length. The submission of this nomination is unique and raises governance issues and concerns relating to a tri-campus university. It was suggested that faculty representation from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma might be added to the Faculty Council on University Relations.
- d. The Council is currently actively soliciting nominations for honorary degrees.

14. Women in Academia

- a. Continuing exploration of the quantitative and qualitative understanding of "The Lifecycle of a Female Faculty Member.

Class C Resolution Concerning Live Webcams on UW Websites

Werrner Kaminsky, representing the Faculty Council on Educational Technology
Rolf B. Johnson, representing the Attorneys General office
Sandy Moy, the President's Designee

Introduction

With the increased use of electronic cameras and frequent podcasting, the question arises if these practices need to be guided for the sake of protection of both the people seen in such activities and those who undertake them. It is undeniable that podcasting or live broadcasting of some activities is highly educational and has potential to support the mission of the university.

Privacy of individuals is governed by federal and state law. Although there are differences between the states, common practices can be established that address the most common privacy issues.

- a) Video or audio broadcasts and recordings of persons in a public space or other situations where a person normally has his "guard up" (that is, expects to be seen) usually have fewer legal restrictions.
- b) Capture and transmission of images or audible sounds in a situation where a person has his "guard down" (such as in a private office) usually raise a host of legal issues.
- c) In addition to generally applicable legal restrictions, the UW is subject to a number of specific privacy laws, such the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA," which protects patient information) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA," which protects education records).
- d) Audio as well as images must be considered.
- e) Most privacy concerns can be resolved by ensuring that no person in a video or sound broadcast or recording is individually identifiable.

With these facts in mind, the following resolution should be published to guide those members of the University of Washington who intend to connect cameras to the Internet in support of UW education, research, and outreach.

Class C Resolution Concerning Live Webcams on UW Websites

WHEREAS, the University of Washington encourages the use of educational technology to benefit teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, educational technology includes Websites published on the Internet showing output from digital cameras in regular intervals or on request ("Webcams"); and

WHEREAS, Webcams can help students to see research environments, experimental settings, equipment, buildings, specialists at work, or lectures in real time; and

WHEREAS, Webcams can sometimes enhance the learning experience; and

WHEREAS, published recommendations may assist in helping to prevent inappropriate use of Webcams (such as broadcasting images of people without their consent, unwelcome interactions directed at people seen on Webcams, or restricted equipment and locations being seen publicly and worldwide); and

WHEREAS, the individuals running UW Webcams could become subjects of retaliation or complaints; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the following practices should be readily available to UW faculty, staff, and students:

1. The content seen through a Webcam should be beneficial to the mission of the University of Washington to serve education and research.
2. The content seen on a Webcam must not include images of any restricted technology.
3. Preferably the content seen or heard on a Webcam should not permit the individual identification of persons.
4. If a Webcam is capable of identifying individual persons,
 - a. an easily viewed sign placed on or near the Webcam's camera should notify anyone whose voice or image might be captured on the Webcam of the existence of the camera and the fact that individually identifiable images (and, if applicable, sound) will be broadcast over the Internet;
 - b. individuals should be asked for their consent to be seen or heard (if no consent is given, the location of the camera should be revised accordingly); and
 - c. if possible, such consent should be obtained in writing.
5. Consideration should be given to not identifying the location of the Webcam's camera on the associated website so as to reduce the chances of unwelcome visitors.
6. Use of surveillance cameras should be checked with the UW police.
7. Help in establishing a Webcam can be obtained from unit Webmasters or at help@cac.washington.edu.
8. A link to the Webmaster responsible for the Webcam should be included on the UW Webcam's Website.

*Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Educational Technology
Werner Kaminsky, Chair
January 12, 2009*

Faculty Senate Proposed Changes
(Additions are underlined; deletions are struck through)

Changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41

Section 26-41. Procedures for ~~Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs~~
Restructuring of Academic Units

PREAMBLE:

This section provides a process for collegial dialogue and consultation when budget reductions, resource reallocations, or shifting academic priorities lead to consideration of organizational restructuring. The process provides administrative leaders with counsel from faculty, students, and staff, both internal and external to the unit under review for restructuring, and provides directly and indirectly affected or interested parties a forum for gathering or contributing information and perspectives. This consultative and collegial process is intended to lead to fully informed decisions regarding program reorganizations, consolidations, and eliminations.

A. (new A.) General provisions and definitions.

1. (old A.) For the purposes of sections B and ~~D~~ C below, a "program" is defined (comprising both 'department' and 'program' as defined in Sections 23.23.c and d) as follows:
 - a. (old A.1.) A department or other degree-granting unit (other than a departmentalized school, ~~or~~ college, or campus); or a sub-unit within a department, an academic unit in a non-departmentalized school or college, or a group of faculty (from one or more departments) which offers a distinct degree, or a track within a degree that is described as a distinct option in the University Catalog, or in the course catalog of the college or school in question, or is customarily noted as such on student transcripts.
 2. ~~Either a sub-unit within a department, or a group of faculty from one or more departments, which offers a distinct degree, or a track within a degree that is described as a distinct option in the University Catalog, or in the course catalog of the college or school in question, or is customarily noted as such on student transcripts.~~
 - b. (new b.) A disagreement as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a program shall be resolved by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, whose decision shall be binding. The dean or chancellor and the faculty group affected by the proposed action shall each submit a statement of their position to the chair of the Committee, which shall deliver its ruling within ten instructional days of the receipt of both statements.
2. (new 2.) {An "instructional day" is a day on which scheduled classes meet during Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters and excludes weekends, holidays, vacation and examination periods.}
3. For purposes of these proceedings, extension of any specific deadlines may be granted by the Secretary of the Faculty, who will inform the parties in writing of the reasonable grounds for which such extension has been sought, and granted.
4. Copies of all documents required under section 26-41 shall be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty.
5. Any written recommendations received by the Secretary of the Faculty under this section 26-41 must be made available to any member of the faculty on request.

B. Procedures for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of programs.

1. If a dean or chancellor after consultation with his or her elected faculty council (Section 23-45.C) determines that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic priorities can only be implemented by measures that will have one or more of the following results:
 - a. the termination of an undergraduate or graduate program as defined in Section A above;
 - b. the removal of tenured faculty, or of untenured faculty before completion of their contract;
 - c. a significant change in the terms, conditions or course of employment of faculty;
 - d. a significant change in the overall curriculum of a college, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole; or
 - e. a significant departure from the stated mission of a college, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole;

the dean or chancellor shall request authority from the Provost to initiate a formal review to identify one or more programs for elimination, reorganization, or consolidation with another unit and/or reduction in size. The Provost shall consider such requests in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

2. If the Provost grants the dean's or chancellor's request for such authority:
 - a. The dean or chancellor shall notify the Secretary of the Faculty of his or her intention to initiate a review under this section of the *Faculty Code*. The Secretary of the Faculty shall, after consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, appoint within ~~seven ten calendar~~ instructional days a ~~Program Identification~~ an External Faculty Committee composed of five faculty members (including one designated as the committee's Chair) from outside the college or school in which the review is to take place.
 - b. The External Faculty Committee, when convened by its Chair, shall establish a schedule of meetings for its own Committee. Such independent meetings of the External Faculty Committee will allow its members to form independent conclusions regarding the arguments and evidence supporting the proposed action of the dean or chancellor. The responsibility of the External Faculty Committee is to ensure that the recommendations of the elected faculty council and of the dean or chancellor are based on a process that was fair, thorough, impartial, and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials. (The External Faculty Committee shall retain copies of all the materials it has considered, which it will make available to the Review Committee, should one be appointed under B.4 below.)
 - c. ~~(old b.)~~ For the duration of the reorganization, consolidation or elimination procedures, and for the business of these procedures only, the members of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee shall also be added to the ~~college~~ elected faculty council of the college, ~~or~~ school or campus in question as *ex officio* members ~~with~~ without vote. They shall participate in all ~~discussions~~ meetings of that council, convened by its faculty chair or the dean or chancellor, leading to the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation or elimination, and shall have full access to all materials and personnel consulted by the dean or chancellor and ~~college~~ the elected faculty council in this process. This combination of the elected faculty council and the External Faculty Committee is hereinafter referred to as the augmented faculty council.
 - d. If the ~~college~~ elected faculty council does not include student members, the dean or chancellor shall request that the student organization (or organizations) of the affected school, ~~or~~ college or campus shall appoint a graduate student and, where appropriate, an undergraduate student to the ~~augmented college~~ council, provided that no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS and the ASUW serve, with voting rights, with the augmented faculty council for the business of these procedures only. If no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization and the ASUW or other appropriate recognized student organization.
 - e. ~~(old c.)~~ The dean or chancellor, in consultation with the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council, associate deans and other appropriate advisory bodies or affected groups in the college, ~~or~~

- school or campus, shall examine measures to meet the required budget reduction, ~~or~~ resource allocation goals or realigned academic priorities, including the ~~elimination of programs, and alternatives to elimination such as reorganization and consolidation~~ reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of programs, and alternatives to such actions.
- f. The information used as a basis for the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination, and of alternatives to such actions, shall consist of:
- 1) documents that pre-date the dean's or chancellor's request (under B.1 above), including:
 - a) the reports resulting from periodic reviews of programs or departments, any interim revisions of them, and responses to them by the dean or chancellor, the ~~college~~ elected faculty council, and the faculty of the program(s) in question.
 - b) accreditation reviews, if such exist for the program(s) in question.
 - c) any other performance data gathered and maintained by the school, college or campus, provided they are up-to-date and have been previously submitted to the faculty of the program(s) in question for review and response.
 - d) all relevant documentation resulting from the ongoing long-range planning process in the school, college or campus, and
 - 2) such other information requested by the dean, chancellor, or the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council as deemed necessary, or independently requested by the External Faculty Committee, provided it is up-to-date and has been submitted for review and response to the faculty of the program(s) in question for review and response for under consideration, and the faculty in the program(s) have had at least five instructional days to submit their comments on the information.
- g. **(old e.)** In proposing program reorganizations, consolidations or eliminations, the dean or chancellor shall protect, to the maximum extent possible:
- 1) the overall curriculum of the school, college or campus and the University and the educational needs of its students, consistent with the role and mission of the University;
 - 2) in the case of a reorganization or consolidation, the quality of the program in relation to e.g. 1) above;
 - 3) other programs in the University, including interdisciplinary programs, that may be affected by the proposed action(s);
 - 4) the University's commitment to tenure; and
 - 5) the University's commitment to ~~affirmative action.~~ diversity in faculty, staff and students.
- ~~f. Deliberations leading to the identification of programs for elimination shall be confidential until the conclusion of the identification process, except that, at least two instructional days before any public announcement, the dean shall inform the faculty of the identified program(s) of their status, in writing, and shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents. At least one instructional day before any public announcement, the dean shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions under sections B.3 and 5 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.~~
- h. When the Chair of the elected faculty council determines that the augmented faculty council is ready to conclude its review, a formal vote on the proposed action shall be taken by its eligible voting members. The result of that vote shall be communicated in writing to the dean or chancellor, who at least ten instructional days before any public announcement, shall communicate directly in writing with each faculty member of the affected program(s) to inform them of his or her intended action. The dean or chancellor shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents, and the accompanying statement by the External Faculty Committee described in B.3.b below (when available). At least five instructional days before any public announcement, the dean or chancellor shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining

- the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions under sections B.5 and B.6 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.
3. The dean's or chancellor's intention to reorganize, consolidate or eliminate the identified program(s) shall be announced within a period of ~~thirty~~ forty-five instructional days from the appointment of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee (2.a above). This announcement shall be made in the form of a detailed and specific report accompanied by a separate, independent statement from the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee. Both of these documents shall be submitted by the dean or chancellor to ~~the President~~, the Provost and the chair(s) of the affected unit(s), to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and to the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall publish them in a Class C Bulletin within seven five instructional days of receiving them.
 - a. The dean's or chancellor's report shall:
 - 1) justify the proposed measures in relation to existing program review materials and other publicly available planning documents;
 - 2) describe the impact of the proposed measures on the faculty in the identified program(s), on other programs, and on the curriculum and students of the school, college or campus of the college as a whole, and on the faculty affected; and
 - 3) be accompanied by all supporting documents, which need not be published in the *Class C Bulletin* referred to in B.3 above, but must be made available to any faculty member on request.
 - b. The External Faculty Committee's accompanying statement shall be prepared and signed by ~~the its chair of the Program Identification Committee~~, and shall reflect the opinion of a majority of the External Faculty Committee. It shall indicate:
 - 1) whether the Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean, giving reasons therefor, and whether in its view the program review process was fair, thorough, impartial and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and
 - 2) whether in its view the program identification process was fair, thorough, impartial, consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and free of conflict of interest, whether the External Faculty Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean or chancellor, giving reasons therefor.
 4. ~~For each college in which these procedures are being applied,~~ Upon receipt of the report and statement detailed in B.3 above, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, after consultation with the Chair of the External Faculty Committee and with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, shall appoint a Review Committee consisting of ~~five~~ four faculty members (including one designated as committee chair), one member of the External Faculty Committee, one representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization, and one representative of the Associated Students of the University of Washington or other appropriate recognized undergraduate student organization (all with full participatory rights). The formation and membership of this committee shall be announced in the *Class C Bulletin* described in B.3 above.
 5. **(new 5.)** ~~This committee shall conduct an open review of the dean's proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered, and The Review Committee's primary goal is to review the dean's or chancellor's report from the perspective of the University and the public and, to this end, shall conduct an open review of the dean's or chancellor's proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered.~~ The Review Committee may receive or request additional materials or arguments from the dean or chancellor, from the External Faculty Committee, from the faculty, students and staff of the identified program(s), and other constituencies in the University or the public at large. Meetings to invite public comment shall be scheduled at times that permit participation by the public. Within ~~twenty~~ thirty instructional days of ~~the publication of the Bulletin,~~ its appointment, the Review Committee shall deliver its written recommendation to the President

and the Provost. The recommendation shall be transmitted at the same time to the dean or chancellor and to the chair(s) of the affected program(s).

6. **(old 5.)** Following the submission of the Review Committee's written recommendations, the dean or chancellor may propose a modified course of action, and the affected program(s) may submit an additional statement. This statement may suggest alternatives to the measures proposed by the dean or chancellor, giving detailed reasons based on educational policy and/or past reviews of the program(s) in question, and may include additional relevant documentation. Any such materials must be transmitted to the President and Provost within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.
7. **(old 6.)** After the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a ~~final~~ decision on the matter and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, and to the dean(s) or chancellor(s), the chair(s) of the affected program(s) and the Chair of the Faculty Senate within ~~thirty fifteen calendar~~ instructonal days of receiving the Review Committee's recommendations, ~~but in no case later than the final day of Spring Quarter~~. The President's decision shall take careful account of the impact of the reorganization(s), consolidation(s) or elimination(s) on the University's ability to perform its educational role and mission, and on the diversity of the University community.

C. **(old D.)** Procedures for ~~L~~imited ~~R~~eorganization and ~~C~~onsolidation of ~~P~~rograms.

1. In order to reallocate resources, ~~or~~ implement educational policies or realign academic priorities, a dean or chancellor may at any time propose the reorganization of one or more programs within a school, college, or campus, or their consolidation ~~or amalgamation~~ with other units. The reallocation of graduate degree programs (Section 23-24.B) from one qualified academic unit (Section 23-24.D) to another, or to an interdisciplinary program within the Graduate School, is a limited reorganization that should follow the procedures outlined in this section.
2. **(new 2.)** If the proposed measures will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the dean or chancellor may proceed with the measures, provided:
 - a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected program(s), and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the school, college or campus;
 - b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the Provost and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in ~~B.2.d~~ B.2.f above; and
 - c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected program(s) may exercise the option described in ~~section D.2~~ C.3 below.
3. **(old 2.)** If a majority of the voting faculty of ~~a~~ an the affected academic program(s) determines by a vote judges that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the Provost for a review under the procedures for reorganization, consolidation or elimination of programs (under Section B above). The Provost shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the dean or chancellor to conduct a program reorganization, consolidation or elimination of program review following the procedures described in Sections A and B.2 through 7 above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners, the dean or chancellor, and to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining this decision. ~~why an elimination review is not deemed appropriate.~~

D. **(old C.)** Procedures for ~~the~~ reorganization, consolidation or ~~E~~elimination of a ~~C~~college or ~~S~~school.

1. If the Provost and a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting concur that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic priorities should be achieved by the elimination of a particular college or school in its entirety, or by its reorganization or consolidation with another college or school, the Provost shall ~~invite request that~~ the Chair of the Faculty Senate ~~to~~ appoint a Review Committee, ~~constituted as described in B.4 above.~~ of five faculty.
2. The Provost shall submit to the Review Committee a detailed justification of the proposed measure, prepared on the basis of the materials described in B.2.~~ef~~ above and other appropriate planning documents made available by the central administration, provided they have been previously submitted to the dean or chancellor and faculty of the college or school in question for review and comment. The justification shall:
 - a. review alternatives and explain why elimination of the college or school is preferable; and
 - b. protect to the maximum extent possible the aspects of the University described in B.2.~~eg~~ above.
3. The Secretary of the Faculty shall publish the Provost's proposal, and the accompanying justification, in a *Class C Bulletin* within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.
4. The Review Committee shall conduct an ~~open~~ review of the Provost's proposal in the manner described in B.3~~5~~ above, and shall deliver its written recommendation to the President, Provost, deans or chancellors of the affected college or school, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, within thirty instructional calendar days of the publication of the *Bulletin*.
5. Following the delivery of the Review Committee's report, the Provost may propose a modified course of action, and the dean or chancellor of the affected college or school may submit an additional statement of the kind described in B.5~~6~~ above. Any such materials must be submitted to the President within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.
6. Within fifteen instructional days of the comment period provided for in D.5 above, and A after the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a final decision and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, the deans or chancellors, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. ~~as prescribed in B.6 above.~~

E. **(new E.)** Procedures for limited reorganization and consolidation of colleges and schools.

1. In order to reallocate resources or implement educational policies, or align academic priorities, the Provost may at any time propose the consolidation of colleges and schools. If the proposed measure will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the Provost may proceed with the measures, provided:
 - a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected colleges or schools, and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the colleges or schools;
 - b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the President and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in B.2.f above; and
 - c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected college/school(s) may exercise the option described in E.2 below.

2. If a majority of the voting faculty of an affected college or school determines by a vote that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the President for a review under the procedures for elimination of a college/school. The President, or the President's delegate, shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the Provost to conduct a review following the procedures described in section D above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining why a review under section D above is not deemed appropriate.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 29 JANUARY 2008
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
2. Introductory Comments – Professor David Lovell, 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 Dan Luchtel, Committee Chair.
5. Legislative Report – Professor James “JW” Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.
6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of January 12, 2009.
7. Announcements.
8. Requests for Information.

Update: SR 520 Project
Theresa Doherty, Assistant Vice President, Regional Affairs

9. Nominations and Appointments.
 - a. **Action:** Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
 - b. **Action:** Elect 2009-2010 Faculty Senate Vice Chair.

10. Memorial Resolution.

11. Unfinished Business.

Class C Resolution.

Title: Resolution Concerning Live Webcams on UW Websites.

Action: Approve for Distribution to the Faculty.

12. New Business.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration.

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) – Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.

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

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

13. Adjournment.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on Thursday, February 5 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.