

MINUTES FOR SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 23, 2009, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: Balick, Emmert, Ahmad, Rahn, Harrington, Huber, Zahorjan, Van Voorhis, Landis, Schaufelberger, Kaminsky, Sjøvik, Haselkorn, Primomo, Rorabaugh, Wilkinson, Silberstein, Luchtel, Wise.
Guests: Cheryl Cameron, Carol Niccolls, Doug Wadden; Duane Storti, Rich Christie, Susan Neff.
Absent: Lovell, Wilcock, Chew, Jaffe, Forman, Demorest, Brreitner, Wenderoth, Fabien, Odegard, Killien, Fridley, Bennett, Faleschini.

1. Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 and the presiding Chair, Bruce Balick, announced that Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell was ill and unable to attend the meeting. He referred members to revised Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate agendas, noting that two pieces of Class A legislation were moved from "New Business" to "Unfinished Business." There were no objections, and the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the SEC meeting of January 12, 2009, and the Senate meeting of January 29, 2009, were approved as written.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.

Given the absence of the Senate Chair and the length and importance of the agenda, presiding Chair Bruce Balick declined to make any remarks.

4. Report from the President.

Mark Emmert, President.

The President reported that the University's financial situation is no less clear than it was the last time the SEC met. The assumption that there would be an \$8-8.5 billion shortfall was confirmed last week with the most recent report on the revenue deficit. The Governor's budget had been predicated on a deficit of less than \$6 billion. Given the news, it is likely that the UW will need to eliminate 800 positions or so and decrease student enrollment significantly. This has finally caught the attention of legislators who tend to be fixated on student access to higher education and jobs. But regardless of the attention those numbers garner from state legislators, there are equally compelling and wrenching reports coming from all state agencies. Competition for funding is enormous, and those involved in the legislative process often feel they are in the midst of battlefield triage.

Most of the details related to the federal stimulus package and its impact on the state and the University are still unclear. It does appear, however, that stimulus package funds will support students with tuition tax credits for families with incomes less than \$160,000. This would apply to 90% of UW students. It would also increase Pell grants by \$1,000 for about 25% of UW students. In addition, Pell grants will fully fund summer quarter tuition for the first time. With these provisions in place, consideration of a tuition increase becomes somewhat more conceivable for state legislators. The President noted that he has the sense that legislators have a new-found empathy with the plight of the University. They seem to understand the magnitude of what these budget cuts will mean for the state, as well as the students, faculty and staff at the UW. He concluded his remarks by saying that at this point it looks as if the University won't escape cuts in the 13-20% range.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

Dan Luchtel, Faculty Senate Past Chair and Committee Chair.

SCPB Chair Dan Luchtel reported that the SCPB has initiated the first step of the RCEP process by concurring with the Provost's request to move or consolidate the College of Forest Resources with its existing programs into the College of the Environment.

SCPB will soon be reviewing reports from Deans, Directors and Chancellors to the Provost that outline the impact of budget cuts to their colleges, schools and campuses. Luchtel reported that the Dean of his School has been very consultative and transparent in gathering information and advice to prepare her response to the Provost about how the cuts would impact the School of Public Health. Other SEC

members reported their experiences in other schools, colleges and campuses—some had been equally open and transparent, some not so. Luchtel expressed his hope that those in colleges or schools where the process had not been transparent would encourage their deans to consult with their elected faculty councils as ever evolving news require modifications and adjustments in plans at every level of the university. Although all of these documents are public documents, some include specific staff positions that might be eliminated given different levels of cuts, which would not be suitable for posting to the web.

Although draft Executive Order concerning the Faculty Salary Policy would be taken up under agenda item number 14, Luchtel took a moment to provide some context for the idea that brought forth this draft. The possible suspension of Executive Order No. 64 was initially discussed at a meeting called by President Emmert that included the President, Board of Regents Chair Craig Cole, Senate Chair David Lovell, and Vice Senate Chair Bruce Balick to discuss modification of the 2% Faculty Salary Policy (stated in Executive Order No. 64) in light of the current financial crisis. This discussion led to the appointment of the Joint Committee to re-evaluate Executive Order No. 64 to draft a proposal that is now attached to your agenda as Exhibit D. The committee included David Lovell, Bruce Balick, Lea Vaughn, Gerry Philipson, Phyllis Wise, Doug Wadden and Cheryl Cameron. The attachment is now a discussion draft. The SCPB has reviewed it and has made some suggestions, which will be considered by the re-evaluation committee. If the SEC has suggestions, the re-evaluation committee will also consider them.

The President concurred with Luchtel's review of the history of this proposal and added that although the Regents have authority over Executive Orders and the *Faculty Code*, they are very sensitive to the principals of shared governance and to the needs of this institution. The President hopes to find a way not to back away from the UW's commitment to competitive faculty salaries. At the same time, he hopes to find a way to "pause" the annual 2% salary increase policy for the '09-'11 biennium. The issue is complicated by Executive Order No. 64 being embedded within the *Faculty Code* (Section 24-70). If portions of the *Faculty Code* are not simultaneously "suspended" or amended (requiring Class A legislation), and if the Executive Order were suspended, the *Code* would preclude any new hires or salary adjustments required to retain a faculty member who has been offered a greater salary elsewhere. He hopes that working together, the University can find a solution that would allow the suspension of the 2% policy—but still provide departments with constrained flexibility to make hires and retention increases. The current budget situation must not keep the University from filling critical vacancies. He is fully aware of and appreciates the fact that faculty have been frustrated in the past by the unspoken assumption that the only way to negotiate a raise at the UW was by documenting a competitive offer from another institution. Although that "routine strategy" will no longer be recognized, departments still need the flexibility to make competitive offers when there is a clear need. As currently written, the *Code* language would not allow this, and the President is concerned that this will create confusion and divisiveness over the next couple of years.

Luchtel then reported on the related SCPB discussion earlier that afternoon. The focus of the discussion centered around two questions:

- Should this suspension be for two years or for one?
- How will priorities be established?

The President responded immediately by saying that a one-year suspension would not make sense. Ensuing discussion included the question of whether there would be faculty furloughs. Furloughs are allowed only after a financial emergency has been declared, and the President explained that such an emergency would not be declared unless the situation became much, much worse. He suspects very few institutions will declare financial emergencies over the next couple of years. Such a declaration announces that an institution is truly bankrupt and, as a consequence, few would consider going to such an institution as a faculty member or as a student. The collateral damage would be significant and long lasting. It affects accreditation, the ability to attract faculty and students, the University's bond rating—and the repercussions would last a long time. Lack of time precluded discussion of how priorities will be established.

6. Report on Legislative Affairs.
JW Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington noted that he likes to think of the short-term and long-term aspects of what Jim Fridley and he are trying to do in state legislative and policy matters. They have recently seen some progress in two long-term matters. SHB 1841 has passed the House Higher Education Committee and the House Rules Committee, and should advance to the floor of the House. This bill calls for gubernatorial appointment of a faculty member to the state's universities' governing

boards. Secondly, last week the faculty legislative representatives from each of the institutions spoke jointly in a work session of the Senate Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee. They spoke on the immediate and pressing issue of the on-the-ground implications of budget cuts; and in so doing, there was a long-term effect of illustrating the ways in which faculty can provide useful information in budget deliberations.

To segue from the long term to the short term, he noted that they constantly reiterate a plea for flexibility. Again and again Harrington tells legislators that he and Fridley work quite intensively with the administration on budget, organization, curriculum, and other matters. The faculty and the institutions are well served by as much flexibility as possible. This makes the work of the Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Councils, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and Faculty Senate really important, and he thanked SEC members for the seriousness with which they take this work.

In the short term, Harrington and Fridley have worked alongside the administration to urge more flexibility in ESSB 5460, which Harrington calls the “freeze everything” bill. The Governor signed this legislation last week, which freezes hiring, salaries, travel, and large-equipment purchases in state agencies (see <http://legrep.blogspot.com>) for details. The Legislature agreed to reduce the proposed restrictions on universities’ use of non-state, non-tuition funds. The administration will seek language in future legislation that would increase flexibility.

SHB 1235 and SSB 5734 extend institutions’ authority to set tuition for all students except resident undergraduates. Each has been passed out of the relevant policy committee and on to the budget committees. Student organizations are opposed to institutional authority to set tuition for any types of students, preferring that this authority be retained by the Legislature. Jim Fridley and he support tuition flexibility, though neither they nor the administration actively seek institutional authority to set resident undergraduate tuition.

The President added that the “freeze everything” bill arguably renders some of the current conversation regarding the 2% faculty salary policy moot. If unchanged, there will be no pay increases from March 2009 to March 2010. The Governor understands the University’s position on this bill, as does the House, and she has encouraged the President to propose modified language that might be included in a supplemental budget to be introduced within the next several days. Work is currently in progress in hopes of finding ways to create the flexibility to manage this bill.

7. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.
Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

Presiding Chair Balick announced that Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien was unable to attend the meeting due to a family emergency.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.

There were no current issues or concerns reported by the Group Representatives.

9. Nominations and Appointments.
 - a. Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit A}**
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

There were no further nominations from the floor and the nominations as presented in Exhibit A were approved.

- b. **Action:** Ombudsman Confirmation – Susan Neff, Interim Ombudsman.

Presiding Chair Bailick noted that the Ombudsman assists in the protection of the rights and interests of individual members of the student body, the faculty, and the staff against arbitrary or capricious action or lack of appropriate action by University units, the student body, the faculty or the staff. The Ombudsman is appointed by the President in consultation with representatives of students, staff and faculty, and confirmed by the Senate Executive Committee.

A search committee was formed comprised of faculty, staff and students and chaired by Professor Judith Howard. As a result of the committee’s work, the President has chosen Susan Neff for SEC confirmation.

A motion was made and seconded to confirm Susan Neff as the University Ombudsman. Balick then introduced Susan Neff to the Committee.

Ms. Neff thanked Balick and the Committee for the opportunity to speak with the group and to address any questions they may have about her candidacy for this position. She noted that much of today's meeting discussion is reflected in her daily work as ombudsman. The UW Office of the Ombudsman was established forty years ago during a time of considerable disruption. She will be taking over during another time of disruption and she expressed appreciation for the support of this and past administrations. In the interest of the full agenda, she declined to say more, but welcomed any SEC member to drop by her office for a personal orientation to the work of the Ombudsman's Office.

In response to questions concerning the reporting relationship of the Ombudsman and the staffing of the office, Ms. Neff noted that she reports to the President through the Special Counsel to the President. Given budget cuts, her understanding is that the office staff will include only one staff person. Nevertheless, she is committed to providing access to conciliation and mediation services to upper and lower campus as well as the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

Following a call of the question, the motion to confirm the appointment of Susan Neff as Ombudsman was approved unanimously.

- c. **Action:** Approve nominations for the RCEP Review Committee in the College of Forest Resources. **{Exhibit B}**

Balick noted that there was one additional nomination, Professor Lillian McDermott from Physics, for the College of Forest Resources RCEP Review Committee as listed in Exhibit B.

He reminded the Committee that the *Faculty Code* states that each time college RCEP procedures are being applied, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, appoints a Review Committee consisting of five faculty members, one representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate and one representative of the Associated Students of the University of Washington.

A motion was made and seconded to confirm the appointments as amended by the addition of Professor McDermott for the College of Forest Resources Review Committee, and the motion was approved unanimously.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.
Faculty Council Issues as of February 23, 2009. **{Exhibit C}**

Balick noted that Exhibit C is an updated list of current Faculty Council issues.

11. Information.

There were no information items.

12. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

13. Unfinished Business.

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

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 II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.

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

Presiding Chair Balick noted that there were two items of unfinished business. The first item was legislation proposing changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs attached to the agenda as Exhibit E. This legislation was referred back to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs at the January 12 SEC meeting. Therefore, the legislation remained at its first consideration.

He reminded the Committee that Class A legislation changes the *Faculty Code*. After review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers the legislation once, sends it back to the SEC for 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. With those comments, he introduced Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) Chair Jan Sjøvik.

Sjøvik reported that one of the major issues that brought the legislation back to the FCFA was a proposed change that would make language in new section D.1, regarding RCEPs for Colleges or schools, parallel to similar language in section B, regarding RCEPs for Academic Programs. Given that the proposal would change legacy language that had not yet been tested and found unsatisfactory, the Council opted to leave the language as it stands. The other concerns dealt with the length of time required to complete the procedures. Sjøvik noted that the Council had tried to streamline the procedures but had not been fully successful. Having reviewed the case of an RCEP that had to be stopped and then re-started because of a missed deadline, the Council was reluctant to decrease time for many of the deadlines defined within the procedures. In addition to ensuring ample deadlines, the Council added the provision that parties could request deadline extensions from the Secretary of the Faculty. The negative result of those decisions was that the procedures can take longer, theoretically, if all the time allowed is in fact taken.

Ensuing discussion included the question of whether RCEP was a tool for saving money or a strategic tool for reshaping the University. Most agreed that it was a better tool for use in making important strategic decisions about future University directions.

A friendly amendment was made, and accepted by Sjøvik, to change the following sections:

- Section 26-41.B.3 (first sentence): revert to original time period of thirty instructional days, instead of proposed 45 instructional days.
- Section 26-41.B.5 (fourth sentence): revert to original time period of twenty instructional days, instead of proposed thirty instructional days.

After further discussion of a timeline distributed by Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron, the question was called on the friendly amendment. It was approved unanimously.

With the amended legislation now on the floor, discussion ensued regarding the amount and nature of involvement in the process by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. Another concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of undergraduate student members on review committees dealing with programs that don't include undergraduates.

The question was called on the amended main motion, a vote was taken, and the motion to forward this legislation for Faculty Senate consideration was approved unanimously.

- b. Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **{Exhibit F}**
Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Proposed changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings, Volume 2, Part II Chapter 27, Section 27-41.

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

The second item of unfinished business was legislation proposing changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings attached as Exhibit F to the agenda. This legislation was referred back to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs at the October 6 SEC meeting. Therefore, this legislation also remained at its first consideration.

Sjøvik reported that the Council had worked hard on a complete revision of Chapter 27, but the results of their work were called into question by a new member, who had not been involved in the original revision, and who had substantial expertise in matters of conciliation. This member

raised a number of questions that will require further deliberation and coordination with administration. In the meantime, the attached legislation was proposed to address an immediate need for more than the six conciliation officers currently allowed. As noted in the rationale for the legislation, the current and anticipated caseload is simply too large to be handled by the current six officers.

In addition to the change proposed in Exhibit F, a question had been raised about the requirement to recruit twice the number of candidates that the President would then select. After some discussion, the value of the President's active and substantive participation in the selection of these officers was affirmed, and a motion was made to amend the legislation as follows:

- Section 27-41.A.2: There shall be not ~~more~~ fewer than six conciliation officers who shall serve three-year ~~staggered-terms commencing on September 16~~.
- Section 27-41.A.3: Conciliation officers shall be selected by the president from a list of names equal to twice the number of ~~vacancies~~ positions to be filled, prepared and approved by the Senate Executive Committee. ~~Vacancies~~ for the remainder of unexpired terms shall be filled according to this same procedure. Conciliation officers may be reappointed to successive terms by mutual consent of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.

The question was called on the amendment to the motion, and the amendment was approved unanimously.

The question was called on the main (amended) motion to forward this proposal for Senate consideration, and the motion was approved unanimously.

14. New Business

a. **Discussion Item:** Draft of a New Temporary Executive Order on Salary Policy. **{Exhibit D}**

Presiding Chair Balick noted that the draft under consideration is the President's draft of an Executive Order. The Faculty Senate has authority over changing the *Faculty Code* and the President has authority over Executive Orders. On occasions like these, when the two are melded, side-by-side in the same document, it becomes necessary to work together to coordinate changes for the good of all involved.

Although the SEC was invited to discuss this Executive Order, this was not an action item. It will also be discussed at the March 12 Faculty Senate meeting.

SEC members were invited to share what they had heard from colleagues in their departments, schools and colleges regarding the proposal to suspend the Faculty Salary Policy. Members responded fairly unanimously that although they did not want to see the Policy abandoned, they felt that they needed to participate in supporting the general welfare of the University and the state by forgoing a raise during a period of time when staff are being laid off and student enrollments are being reduced.

The President's draft Executive Order (which would institute a partial suspension of Executive Order No. 64, the Faculty Salary Policy) is only part of what needs to happen in order to protect the University from what the President sees as a very likely law suit (or suits) challenging this suspension. Portions of the *Faculty Code* will also need to be modified, at least temporarily, to clarify how the suspension will work with regard to such issues as promotions, recruitment and retention, new hires, "open positions," and university priorities. Care will need to be taken to make the Policy very clear, but include room to allow for local administrators to make reasoned judgments for the good of their departments.

Balick notified the Committee that Chair David Lovell had previously promised to allow Professor Duane Storti to speak to the Committee for five minutes. Storti thanked Balick for the opportunity to speak and told SEC members that he was concerned that faculty salaries had slipped among administration's priorities in favor of other items. He questioned if there had been a full consideration of other options short of suspending the Faculty Salary Policy and raises for faculty members. He questioned whether this action is meant to deal with short term cash flow issues or to devalue the faculty. Although he said he could identify with those who wanted to help out during hard times, he felt that faculty salaries are always the first target during hard times at the University. Later in the meeting he suggested granting 2% raises to faculty with the some sort of agreement that the faculty would then return those raises to the University.

Another suggestion was to retain the Faculty Salary Policy, but to temporarily decrease the percentage guaranteed from 2% to 0.01%. Neither of these suggestions generated significant attention or support from the Senate Executive Committee.

Executive Vice Provost Doug Wadden noted that lay-offs have already begun, many TA positions have been or are being cut, and many efficiencies have been implemented. The suspension of faculty salary raises would be a part of the budget plan, but it is not the “balancer.” Provost Wise added that forgoing salary raises does not save money – it just means they will not have to make cuts in other areas.

Next steps were discussed. The *Faculty Code*, Section 24-70, will need to be amended to coordinate with and support the suspension of the Faculty Salary Policy. SCPB Chair Luchtel remarked that this is very nearly done. He suggested that the re-evaluation committee that had come up with the draft Executive Order under consideration could probably put this together fairly easily. The President agreed, and suggested any final drafts be reviewed by Jack Johnson, Division Chief, Office of the Attorney General. Executive Vice Provost Doug Wadden added that this needs to be done quickly. The next Senate meeting is March 12 and the Regents meeting is March 17. It would be an enormous contribution to be able to present a united front to the Regents at their March meeting.

- b. March 12, 2009, Faculty Senate Agenda.

Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators. **{Exhibit G}**

The agenda for the March 12 Faculty Senate Agenda was approved.

15. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

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

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:

Graduate and Professional School Senate

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Benefits and Retirement -----	Caroline Pew
Educational Technology -----	Shannan Marsh
Faculty Affairs -----	Theresa Barker
Research -----	Michael Vannatta
Student Affairs-----	Brad Osborn
Tri-Campus Policy-----	Julia Petersen
University Relations-----	Arendt Speser

College of Forest Resources Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP)
Review Committee

John Schaufelberger, Construction Management, Committee Chair

Kurt Johnson, Rehabilitation Medicine
Robert Plotnick, Evans School of Public Affairs
William Talbott, Philosophy
Theresa Barker, GPSS Representative
ASUW Representative, to be appointed

Faculty Council Issues
For Distribution: February 23, 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. Review of proposed revised foreign language graduation requirements for College of Arts and Sciences.
 - d. Review of proposed curriculum for a Bachelor of Paramedicine degree to be offered by the School of Medicine.
 - e. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
 - f. 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: The Tri-Campus Relations Work Group continues to discuss relationships among the three campuses of the UW. The Work Group is following 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, naming).
 - b. Updates about schools and colleges at UWB/UWT.
 - c. Work 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

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

DRAFT EXECUTIVE ORDER NO.

(Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64)

Purpose. The purpose of this Executive Order is to address the immediate financial circumstances facing the University by temporarily controlling faculty salary levels while reaffirming the University's commitment to ensuring the quality of the University through a competitively compensated faculty dedicated to academic excellence.

Need for Temporary Reevaluation of Faculty Salary Policy. Executive Order No. 64 recognized that in the event of decreased State support, the Faculty Salary Policy would need to be reevaluated. Unfortunately, we face that contingency to a degree that could not have been predicted even a year ago. The nation and the State of Washington are experiencing the effects of a global financial crisis of historic proportions. One consequence of this financial crisis is a drastic reduction in the State budget, which is virtually certain to result in significant reductions in State support for the University. The expected reductions in State support, combined with other economic forces, will result in cuts to programs, increased tuition and reduced access for students, lay-offs and non-renewal of personnel, as well as limitations on the University's ability to increase salaries for broad classes of its employees. The cost of maintaining regular merit increases for the 2009-11 biennium would be even more damaging in the midst of broad and dramatic budget cuts across the institution.

Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64. In light of the economic circumstances facing the University, the portions of Executive Order No. 64 which provide for a regular 2% merit salary increase for all faculty members deemed meritorious must be and are immediately suspended.

This suspension shall expire at the conclusion of the 2009-11 biennium.

Reaffirmation of Principles and Commitment. Although the suspension of merit salary increases is a temporary imperative, it remains equally evident that the hiring, retention, and competitive compensation of talented faculty is of critical importance to the long-term success of the University. The principles and priorities set out in Executive Order No. 64 are reaffirmed because they are as sound today as they were when that order was issued nine years ago. While the Administration and Faculty should continue to collaborate to refine the details of the Faculty Salary Policy to best achieve both predictability for individual faculty members and flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, University leadership remains steadfastly committed to its fundamental elements.

Executive Order No. ____ of the President, March ____, 2009

February 18, 2009

Faculty Senate Proposed Changes to Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41

Rationale:

In 2006-2007, the Faculty Senate leadership charged the FCFA with reviewing Chapter 26-41 of the *Faculty Code* (Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs). The immediate impetus behind this request was some actual experience with the RCEP rules that had demonstrated that they were not working as well as was desirable. Specifically, the relatively tight timeline for completing an RCEP had made it necessary to stop and then re-start one such process, leading to a significant waste of the time of those involved. Also, the principle that the early part of an RCEP process should be conducted with a high degree of confidentiality had proven problematic.

The FCFA as part of this process sought the input of individuals who had actual RCEP experience both from the perspective of the faculty and the administration. Our preliminary observations were shared with various constituents, including the Board of Deans and Chancellors and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

While many possible changes to Chapter 26-41 were considered, the FCFA determined that it would mostly limit itself to trying to fix the more problematic aspects of Chapter 26-41, as these had been made manifest by actual experience. We have therefore proposed elimination of the requirement that the early part of the process should be conducted in confidence. We have clarified the role and function of what is now called the External Faculty Committee, and have also lengthened the maximum duration of the process by approximately 50 percent. Furthermore, the proposal allows the Secretary of the Faculty to extend certain deadlines, when necessary.

As it presently stands, Chapter 26-41 is a very complex document. While much of this complexity is no doubt required by the nature of the type of process described therein, the FCFA has also attempted to make the proposed version of Chapter 26-41 more accessible by including a preamble and by simplifying some of its language.

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

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

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

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, a timely review and consultation process is required. Each stated time period is intended as the maximum period for action, review, comment, or advice. An extension of a stated deadline may be granted by the Secretary of the Faculty only upon reasonable grounds submitted in writing.

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, Within five instructional days of 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 as described below 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, when required, 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 five~~ thirty five calendar instructional days of the comment period provided for in 26-41.B.6 above. ~~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~~limited ~~R~~reorganization and ~~C~~consolidation of ~~P~~programs.
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 ~~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 elimination of a ~~College or 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 and the two student members described in B.4 above.
 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.~~d~~ f 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.~~e~~ g 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 end 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, when required, 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.

S-A 49, December 4, 1975; S-A 57, April 3, 1978; S-A 67, December 5, 1983; S-A 73, May 24, 1985; S-A 95, June 17, 1996: all with Presidential approval.

Changes to Conciliatory Proceedings, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 27, Section 27-41

Rationale:

Although the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs will be considering a more thorough review and revision of Chapter 27, Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences, that revision will not be ready for SEC review until later in the academic year. In the meantime there is some urgency in making this one particular change. In part, the request to increase the number of conciliators from six to twenty-four, addresses the enlargement of the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to include Tacoma and Bothell. Currently, four cases are being conciliated and the Ombudsman has been made aware of eight other possible conciliations. Growth in the conciliation caseload is a positive development that should be encouraged, for conciliation offers the possibility of reaching a mutually satisfactory resolution and avoids adjudication. Several factors limit the Board's capacity to provide conciliation services. The Ombudsman's general practice is to assign two conciliators to each case. The conciliation process routinely lasts more than one quarter. Typically, a conciliator is assigned to one, possibly two cases per year. Conciliators can only handle cases arising outside their own school or college. In this regard, Arts and Sciences cases present challenges in finding neutral conciliators, since the college and its faculty are so large. If the current year caseload in fact reaches 12 cases, the board of conciliators will be severely challenged to meet that level of demand and to provide services without delays.

For these reasons, the Board requests that the maximum Board size be set at 24. A Board of 24 will address current needs and allow for future growth if warranted. Setting an outer limit of 24 also avoids the need for future class A legislation each time an increase is desirable.

Finally, the Board agrees with FCFA that staggered terms and a specific start date (September 16) should not be codified. This will give the Ombudsman flexibility to fill vacancies and add new Board members as necessary to carry on the current practice of staggered terms without being mandated to do so.

Version of Chapter 27 adopted by the FCFA to increase Board size to 24.

Section 27-41. Conciliatory Proceedings

- A. If the process of resolution by mutual consent under Section 27-31 does not take place or fails, the faculty member or the dean may request the assistance of a conciliation officer as a neutral third party by applying to the University Ombudsman for the assignment of a conciliation officer. Conciliatory proceedings aim at resolving problems by informal means without resorting to the more formal adjudicative proceedings provided in Chapter 28.
 1. Conciliation officers shall be tenured members of the faculty, associate and full professors without tenure for reasons of funding, or emeritus faculty who are familiar with procedures and opportunities for the resolution of disputes or complaints involving faculty members.
 2. There shall be not more than ~~six~~ twenty-four conciliation officers who shall serve three-year ~~staggered terms commencing on September 16~~.
 3. Conciliation officers shall be selected by the President from a list of names equal to twice the number of vacancies, prepared and approved by the Senate Executive Committee. Vacancies for the remainder of unexpired terms shall be filled according to this same procedure. Conciliation officers may be reappointed to successive terms by mutual consent of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.
 4. Any conciliation officer may be removed during his or her term of office by concurrent decision of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.
 5. Conciliation officers shall be attached to the Office of the University Ombudsman but shall be limited in their activity to disagreements arising among faculty members or between individual faculty members and the University administration.
 6. The Ombudsman, who may consult with the other members of the Conciliation Board (Section 27-42), shall determine which conciliation officer shall be assigned to a case, and shall inform the Secretary of the Faculty of appointments made. No conciliation officer shall be assigned to a case arising within his or her own school or college.

**AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 12 MARCH 2009
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 February 23, 2009.
7. Announcements.
8. Requests for Information.
9. Nominations and Appointments.

Action: Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

10. Resolution of Appreciation for Retired Faculty Members.
11. Memorial Resolution.

12. Unfinished Business.

a. 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.

b. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings

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

13. New Business.

Discussion Item: Draft of a New Executive Order on Salary Policy.

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.

14. 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, March 19 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.