

## MINUTES FOR SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 6, 2009, 2:30 p.m.

142 Gerberding

Present: Lovell, Balick, Emmert, Ahmad, Rahn, Wilcock, Harrington, Zahorjan, Van Voorhis, Forman, Schaufelberger, Kaminsky, Sjävik, Wenderoth, Haselkorn, Fabien, Primomo, Rorabaugh, Wilkinson, Silberstein, Luchtel, Killien, Faleschini, Wise.

Absent: Huber, Chew, Jaffe, Demorest, Breitner, Odegaard, Fridley, Bennett.

Guests: Mícheál Vaughan, Betsy Wilson, Fred Holt, Tim Jewell, Mark Kot, Josephine Ensign, Amy Hagopian, Peter House, and Maggie Milcarek.

Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

### 1. Approval of Agenda.

The agenda was approved.

### 2. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the February 23, 2009, Senate Executive Committee meeting and the March 12, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

### 3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.

David Lovell, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Chair David Lovell limited his remarks to noting that the issue of the faculty salary policy has been put to rest for now. The new Executive Order (number 29) has been promulgated and it partially suspends Executive Order 64. This proposal was discussed widely within the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee. Recommendations from faculty were accepted with appreciation, and the order was put forward. Administration asked for consultation, and faculty advice was heeded. There are correlative portions of the *Faculty Code* that should also be amended, and those changes will be deliberated over the next few months. This could help insure the University from the results of probable future law suits stemming from the suspension of executive order 64. He then invited the President to report on the status of this issue as it relates to the Board of Regents.

### 4. Report from the President.

Mark Emmert, President.

President Emmert responded by joining Lovell in expressing some relief at putting the faculty salary issue aside, but surmised that part of that is due to the fact that in the meantime an increasing number of troublesome and weighty issues have been added to his agenda. Nevertheless, he feels comfortable with the status of the partial suspension of Executive Order 64. He has not yet discussed this with many members of the Board of Regents, but he believes that if the Regents take any action in response to the new Executive Order, it would be something akin to a Faculty Senate Class C resolution of support.

He then began his report to the SEC with his take on what has been happening in Olympia the past week. He described the budgets proposed by both the House and the Senate as being the worst state budget proposals (as far as higher education is concerned) in the country. In fact, it's so bad, that no other states even come close to the extent of the cuts to higher education proposed. The House budget would cut funding by 31%. The Senate budget would eliminate 10,000 slots for student enrollment. The proposals are so extreme, it has become relatively easy to recruit defenders of the University. Support has been forthcoming from alumni, the business community, editorial boards in newspapers, and even adequate attention from electronic media. The President has been working hard to make sure the word is out on the real impacts these proposals would have on the UW, and resulting support is gaining momentum. Nevertheless it will be necessary to "keep shoving" until the last day of the session. He expected to hear the next day that the Governor might be in support of putting money back into higher education. Everyone feels that higher education has been "slaughtered." The Governor may suggest that the proposed budgets are irresponsible and may suggest alternatives that could include a 14% tuition increase. If so, financial aid would need to be adjusted in order to maintain the diversity of the student body. Even if all that were to come about,

the budget will just be “ugly” instead of catastrophic. As is, the House budget would move the UW back twelve years, and that cannot be tolerated.

Ensuing discussion included the move toward more centralized, local control of the University, since the relative amount of state funding gets smaller and smaller as the amount of research dollars becomes a greater and greater source of revenue for the UW. The President was asked if a state senator could be enlisted to propose that once state funding dipped below, say 10%, the UW would then be allowed to take over tuition setting. The President responded that the politics involved is unfortunately not as logical as the proposal just made. There’s less than a 30% chance that tuition authority will be granted.

Other issues addressed included plans for how student aid will be adjusted to assist those most affected by a possible increase in tuition. Executive Vice Provost Doug Wadden was asked by the President to distribute recent data illustrating those plans to members of the SEC. He also announced that he would be sending an e-mail to the UW community later this week concerning the tuition issue.

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 (SCPB), reported that the Committee has begun reviewing how individual units would propose to take cuts of 8, 10 and 12%. It now looks like cuts would be much greater, and the prospect of a 12% cut is looking relatively good. Anything above 12% would be desperate news for most units. There is no way to implement such a cut without seriously compromising the quality of programs offered to students. Luchtel told SEC members that the SCPB is committed to reviewing these plans thoughtfully and providing advice to the Provost (without any attempt to micro-manage) as she develops a strategy for dealing with the budget that finally comes out of Olympia.

He concluded with the statement that the UW would be a different place once these cuts are implemented. There will be fewer staff, fewer graduate students and TAs – and those of us who are left with jobs will be asked to do more with far less support.

Ensuing conversation included the relative value of considering vertical versus horizontal cuts; the possibility of voluntary furloughs (not possible); the morass of regulatory issues involved in the process of faculty and staff lay-offs; and the idea of closing one of the campuses (this was deemed unacceptable by the President).

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

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington briefly reported on the status of the state’s 2009-11 operating budget for higher education. The House Ways and Means Committee has scheduled an executive session for this afternoon, at which they may amend and act on the budget proposed last week. There is reason to hope that funds will be moved from K-12 education to higher education, to bring the House’s plan closer to the 17% cut to higher education (community and technical colleges as well as universities) proposed by the Senate Ways and Means Committee. This, and the authority for universities to raise tuition by 14% (at least for one year) may happen now, in the negotiations over the next three weeks, or not at all.

The grassroots advocacy that is occurring by those who decry such huge cuts is important. Continued advocacy and political action after the session is over will be important, because no matter how bad the budget cuts, the budget wrangling will not end here.

The bill to mandate gubernatorial appointment of a faculty member to universities’ governing boards passed the state’s House of Representatives, but did not get out of the Senate Higher Education Committee. Part of the reason was last-minute objections by the administrations of some of the universities. Harrington expressed appreciation that the UW administration stayed neutral on this policy measure; President Emmert confirmed the administration’s neutrality.

Harrington ended by noting the importance of having faculty representatives on site in Olympia on a daily basis. Faculty can help the University’s information dissemination and information gathering,

complementing the administration's representatives in the rapidly moving and sometimes random process of deliberation and legislation. Faculty also play an important role in trying to explain to legislators (in small doses) the nature of teaching, learning, and research, and explaining the roles that the faculty have in managing the university. Legislators are prone to see the university as a production venue for degrees, and to see faculty only as labor in the production process.

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

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien announced that the Class C Bulletin regarding the College of Forest Resources RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs procedures) was sent last week. She thanked John Schaufelberger for his willingness to Chair the Review Committee and noted that it would meet for the first time next week.

She reported that Faculty Senate leadership has been actively involved in encouraging and monitoring faculty involvement in budget planning for anticipated cuts. She and the Senate Chair are in the process of surveying the chairs of elected faculty councils in the colleges, schools and campuses – asking about the nature of their Councils' involvement with the Deans in budget planning. That information will be compiled and shared with members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting as well as with the Senate Executive Committee. She has also contacted the Deans with a request for copies of departmental plans for the process they will use in reviewing requests for retention raises. Chair Lovell interjected that it is very important to have these procedures on file, and that the *Code* be followed to the letter with these requests from now on.

On a more positive note, she reminded SEC members that her office is now actively seeking nominations for the 2009 Annual Faculty Lecturer. This year the nominee should be from the natural sciences, engineering or health sciences. She urged everyone to consider nominating a colleague for this honor.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.

There were no issues or concerns from Group Representatives.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jim Fridley, Professor, Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as the 2009-10 Faculty Legislative Representative.

Chair Lovell explained that the Executive Committee submits to the Senate, at its first spring quarter meeting each year, one or more nominations for the position of Faculty Legislative Representative. Since next year is a short legislative session, there will be no deputy position. Jim Fridley, Professor of Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, has been nominated for the position of Faculty Legislative Representative for a term beginning August 1, 2009 and ending July 31, 2010. There were no additional nominations from the floor. The current Faculty Legislative Representative, JW Harrington, then noted that Fridley is well-positioned to take on this assignment, with many years working as an advocate for a number of causes in Olympia. He has been working with Harrington throughout the current legislative session as Deputy Legislative Representative, and Harrington assured Council members that Fridley is well prepared to represent UW faculty in Olympia next year.

The nomination was approved by a unanimous vote.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.  
Faculty Council Issues as of April 6, 2009. **{Exhibit A}**

Lovell referred Council members to the attachment of Faculty Council issues. There were no additional issues raised from the floor.

11. Information.

There were no items of information

12. Announcements.

Jake Faleschini, President of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS), requested faculty support of a GPSS proposal being drafted that would allow for a tuition waiver for graduate students in their fourth and fifth years. Anticipated cuts will mean a loss of 600-800 Teaching Assistant positions, and those who are most affected are PhD students approaching completion of their degrees – many are now facing no jobs and the loss of tuition waivers. Chair Lovell asked Faleschini to contact him with more details.

13. Unfinished Business.

a. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. **{Exhibit B}**

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.

Chair David Lovell noted that there were two items of unfinished business. The first was the second and final consideration of Class A Legislation proposing changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) as shown in Exhibit B.

After first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once, sends it back to the SEC and then has a second consideration. At the second reading, the role of the SEC in making amendments is responsive. They may amend legislation only in response to requests made by either the President and/or the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations, which reviews it after the first Senate consideration.

The President approved the legislation with no changes. The Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations (Code Cops) recommended some minor changes that would be discussed after the motion was on the floor.

A motion was then made to submit this legislation amending the Faculty Code to the Senate for approval or rejection. The motion was seconded, and Lovell introduced Míceál Vaughan, Chair of the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations.

Vaughan reported that changes to the proposed legislation were largely copy-editing. The Advisory Committee had no substantive changes to suggest.

A motion was made to amend the legislation to include changes proposed by the Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded and approved by the SEC.

The motion to send the amended legislation to the Faculty Senate was then also approved by the SEC.

b. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. **{Exhibit C}**

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 Chair then introduced the second item of unfinished business – the second and final consideration of legislation proposing changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings attached as Exhibit C. He pointed out that the legislation was amended on the Senate floor so that the President would select from a list with more than the number of vacancies to fill, instead of twice the number of vacancies. The President and the Advisory Committee both approved the legislation without changes.

A motion was made to submit this legislation to the Senate for approval or rejection. The motion was seconded and approved by the SEC.

14. New Business.

a. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Scholarly Publishing Alternatives and Authors' Rights.

**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration. **{Exhibit D}**

Chair Lovell referred Council members to Exhibit D, a Class C Resolution concerning scholarly publishing alternatives and authors' rights. A motion was made to submit the resolution in Exhibit D for Faculty Senate approval.

Charles Wilkinson, Chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, was then introduced to provide information on the resolution. He began by recounting how this resolution came to be. Last October, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) voted to approve the formation of an *ad hoc* committee, the Scholarly Communication Committee, to address concerns about the rapidly escalating costs to libraries of both online and print journal subscriptions resulting from the monopolistic pricing practices of a few major commercial publishers that increasingly dominate scholarly publishing. The current economic climate will cause large-scale journal cancellations at UW libraries, which further exacerbates the problem. One response of the academic community to that problem has been a movement toward open access publishing in which publishing costs are shifted from subscribers to authors, funding agencies, or institutional funding sources. As a matter of fact, a growing number of universities and individual schools and departments have passed resolutions mandating publication in open access journals. Another related issue involving publishers' control of scholarly communication is the frequent restrictions placed by publishers on the authors' subsequent use of their own work.

The Scholarly Communication Committee, made up of members of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, the Faculty Council on Research, and UW Libraries was charged with drafting a resolution about open access and faculty authors' rights, which we have accomplished and which is included in the agenda. At this point, Wilkinson introduced key players in the drafting of this resolution: Betsy Wilson, Dean of University Libraries; Dean Fred Holt, Interim Director, Digital Ventures; Tim Jewell, Director, Information Resources & Scholarly Communication; Mark Kot, Associate Professor, Applied Mathematics, and Mark Haselkorn, Professor and Chair, Faculty Council on Research.

The resolution recognizes that publishing cultures and journal pricing practices vary widely across disciplines, and rather than putting an emphasis entirely on open access, the drafters chose to emphasize faculty awareness of the pricing and authors' rights practices of the journals in which they publish or for which they review. It encourages faculty members to publish in moderately priced or open access journals, to use a publication agreement addendum to preserve their rights to their work, and to deposit their publications in ResearchWorks, the UW institutional repository that is freely accessible and searchable by Google. In addition to increasing the availability and broad dissemination of UW faculty works, this use of the repository will inevitably increase the frequency of citation and impact of those works. It also encourages the University Libraries to assist the faculty by providing information about individual publishers' practices, and encourages the administration to provide resources to foster the development of the repository and to work to assure that these new publishing realities are taken into consideration in the review process for promotion and tenure.

Ensuing conversation covered the topics of archival possibility, authors' rights, copyright, royalties, and additional resources on the web for further investigation of this topic. Lovell thanked the guests who had attended the meeting and participated in the discussion.

The vote to send the resolution to the Senate was approved with one abstention.

- b. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Citation Practices.  
**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration. **{Exhibit E}**

The Chair introduced the resolution as attached in Exhibit E, and a motion was made to send it to the Senate for approval. He then introduced Werner Kaminsky, Chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Technology, whose Council authored the resolution. Kaminsky reported that since distribution of the resolution with the agenda for this meeting, the resolution had raised serious questions with various constituents that would be affected by this resolution. Those parties have been invited to help re-write the resolution, and he is confident that, working together, they will be able to draft a final resolution that satisfies the needs of all parties. That being the case, he asked for a resolution that would recommit the resolution to the Faculty Council on Educational Technology for further consider. A motion was made, seconded and approved to do just that.

- c. Class C Resolution: Concerning Student Photos on Class Lists.

**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration. **{Exhibit F}**

The Chair introduced the resolution concerning student photos on class lists and a motion was made to submit the resolution for Faculty Senate approval. Mary Pat Wenderoth, Chair of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, was introduced, and she gave a brief summary of the history and impetus for this resolution. She assured the SEC that access to student photos is for faculty only, and faculty are instructed that any printout of these photos are for faculty eyes only, and should be shredded at the end of each quarter.

A friendly amendment was proposed to substitute "Faculty Senate" for "Faculty Council on Instructional Quality" in the final, "Be it resolved" phrase. The friendly amendment was accepted, and the motion to submit the resolution for Faculty Senate approval was approved with two abstentions.

- d. Class C Resolution: Resolution in Support of the University of Washington Hosting Tent City III.  
**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration. **{Exhibit G}**

After referring the SEC to the resolution in support of UW hosting Tent City III, Chair David Lovell informed SEC members that Josephine Ensign, Associate Professor of Psychosocial and Community Health Nursing, Amy Hagopian, Acting Assistant Professor with the Department of Health Services, Peter House, Director of Regional and Rural Education in the School of Medicine, and Maggie Milcarek, an associated graduate student were advocating for the resolution. Ensign explained that Hagopian and House had to leave to teach a class before the issue came up on the agenda, so she and Milcarek presented the proposal and fielded questions.

Ensign explained that this initiative arose from a grass roots effort instigated by students asking faculty to be more involved in the issue of homelessness than they already are. Homelessness continues to increase in Seattle. Tent city accepts people eighteen years old and older and may, in fact, include UW students. Seattle University hosted tent city in 2005, and they have offered to share their expertise on how they would do it better the next time. There are statistics that show the rate of crime in the area surrounding Tent City generally goes down. The UW last considered hosting Tent City in 2005. At that time the concept was approved by the ASUW. Both ASUW and GPSS are now looking at this proposal again.

President Mark Emmert confirmed that the UW had considered a proposal to host Tent City in 2005, but at that time a decision was made that it was not in the UW's best interest to proceed. Any future decisions about whether to host Tent City will ultimately land on his desk again, as there are currently no procedures that govern such a decision.

Ensuing discussion included expressions of concern about safety, sanitation, organization, timing, size of the area required, siting, and the importance of relating this proposal to the educational mission of the University. Ultimately, the SEC felt there simply was not enough information that addressed their concerns that would enable them to forward this resolution to the Senate with their approval.

A motion was made to postpone consideration of the resolution until the next SEC meeting, while informing the Senate of its existence in the meantime. After some discussion the question was called, but the request to call the question was not sustained. After further discussion, the motion was modified to send the resolution back to the authors who would be instructed to provide more detail about what is proposed, including input from UW Police and Risk Management. This motion was seconded and the ensuing vote approved the motion with four opposed and one abstention.

- e. April 23, 2009, Faculty Senate Agenda.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators. **{Exhibit H}**

The April 23, 2009, Faculty Senate Agenda was approved as amended by removing items 12.B and 12.D.

## 15. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40.

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

.

Faculty Council Issues  
For Distribution: April 6, 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 departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
  - d. 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 45<sup>th</sup> Street and Campus Safety issues require continuing attention and oversight, including tracking the Administration's implementation of recommendations of the North of 45<sup>th</sup> 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.
- e. Parking
- f. Longhouse

#### 12. University Libraries

- a. Scholarly communication: The Scholarly Communication Committee (joint with Faculty Council on Research) adopted a resolution addressing issues of escalating online and print journal costs for UW Libraries, publishing options open to faculty members and the importance of informed choices, preservation of faculty members' rights to the products of their work, and use of ResearchWorks, the UW institutional repository for published papers. The FCUL unanimously passed a motion approving the SCC's resolution.
- b. Libraries' budget: Review with Libraries' leadership of impending serials cancellations, potential reductions in Libraries' hours, and possible closures of branch libraries in light of budget constraints.
- c. Development of ResearchWorks: discussions with Libraries' leadership regarding plans and priorities for future development of the institutional repository.
- d. Faculty access to information about journal costs and publishing policies: discussion of collection and organization of resources by Libraries' staff to aid faculty in identifying policies of individual publishers and journals.
- e. Survey of UW faculty in editorial positions: FCUL is co-sponsoring, with the UW Libraries, the Graduate School, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of Research a survey designed to identify faculty members with editorial responsibilities to facilitate communication about common concerns.
- f. Status of librarians in relation to faculty: Librarians are currently classified as academic staff in a separate category from faculty. Possible alternate forms of categorization for UW Librarians have been discussed, as well as 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.

#### 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

Completing the report on the "Career Cycle of Female Faculty Members."

## 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. Furthermore, the proposal allows the Secretary of the Faculty to extend certain deadlines, when necessary.

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

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 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 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 fifteen 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 review of the proposed 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 ~~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~~ 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.~~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.~~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.*

*Approved by Senate Executive Committee  
Committee  
February 23, 2009*

*Approved by Senate Executive  
April 6, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 2009*

## 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 one particular change. In part, the request to increase the number of conciliators 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.

The Conciliation Board agrees with the 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.

### 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~~ fewer than six 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~~ exceeding 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.
  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.

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.

*Approved by Senate Executive Committee  
Committee  
February 23, 2009*

*Approved by Senate Executive  
April 4, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 2009*



**Class C Resolution Concerning Scholarly Publishing Alternatives and Authors' Rights**

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the products of faculty scholarship are generated for the public benefit, are supported in part by nonprofit or public agencies, and are created, peer reviewed, and edited by faculty with little or no direct remuneration; and

WHEREAS, scholarly journal publication, especially in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and medicine, is increasingly being dominated by and aggregated in the hands of a few large commercial publishing houses; and

WHEREAS, the costs to academic libraries of journals published by these commercial publishers have risen far more rapidly than inflation, thereby limiting free and open exchange of scholarly information; and

WHEREAS, the publication agreements offered by some publishers limit authors' rights to use their own work in their teaching and research and/or to archive their work in an openly accessible repository; and

WHEREAS, proprietary formats, new forms of digital protection, and new subscription models for selling "backfile" databases to libraries threaten to further restrict access to scholarly resources; and

WHEREAS, the continued increases in journal costs have impaired the Libraries' purchasing power and have forced the Libraries to conduct a serials review that will almost certainly result in widespread cancellation of journal subscriptions; and

WHEREAS, the current system for production and distribution of scholarly works is increasingly dysfunctional and fiscally unsustainable and restricts rather than increases access to and dissemination of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington Libraries has established an online, freely accessible and searchable repository, *ResearchWorks at the University of Washington (ResearchWorks)*, for the dissemination and preservation of scholarly works published by members of the University community; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that

1. the University of Washington prepare for a future in which academic publications are increasingly available through open sources by encouraging faculty members to:
  - assess the pricing practices and authors' rights policies of journals with which they collaborate (as authors, reviewers, and editors) and advocate for improvements therein; and
  - adopt and use an Addendum to Publication Agreement such as that provided by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) in order to retain their rights to use their work in the classroom and in future publications and to archive final accepted manuscripts; and
  - publish scholarly works in moderately priced journals, in journals published by professional societies and associations, or in peer-reviewed "open access" journals; and
  - archive their work in the UW's *ResearchWorks* or other repositories supported by research institutions, professional societies, or government agencies in order to provide the widest and most affordable access to their scholarship; and

2. UW Libraries is encouraged to

- provide relevant, current information regarding journal publishers, pricing, and authors' rights to departments and individual faculty members; and
- maintain and further develop *ResearchWorks* and related services; and
- allocate personnel to facilitate the deposit of faculty publications in *ResearchWorks*, and to obtain publishers' permission to deposit previously published works when possible; and

3. the University of Washington administration is encouraged to:

- provide resources to the Libraries and to academic units to foster these efforts; and
- work with departments and colleges to assure that the review process for promotion, tenure and merit takes into consideration these new trends and realities in academic publication.

*Approved by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Submitted by:  
Scholarly Communication Committee  
Faculty Council on University Libraries  
& Faculty Council on Research  
April 6, 2009*

**Background and Rationale:**

The following resolution was drafted by the Scholarly Communication Committee, an *ad hoc* committee established by the Senate Executive Committee in October 2008, the membership of which consists of representatives from the Faculty Council on University Libraries, the Faculty Council on Research, and the University Libraries.

The rationale for the formation of the committee grew out of discussions in the Faculty Council on University Libraries about the escalating costs to the Libraries of both online and print subscriptions of scholarly journals, due partly to the increasing dominance of a few large commercial publishers that have restricted dissemination of knowledge by the imposition of monopolistic pricing and “bundling” policies upon institutional subscribers. One response to this challenge has been the development of “open access” journals, the publishing costs of which are borne by authors, educational institutions, and/or funding agencies rather than subscribers. A related issue of publishers’ control over scholarly communication is the limitation of authors’ rights to use material from their publications in teaching and in subsequent works. The charge of the Scholarly Communication Committee was “to draft a resolution about open access and faculty authors’ rights.”

Increasing appreciation of differing publishing cultures across academic disciplines resulted in alteration of the Committee’s initial approach. Journals with the most egregious pricing policies tend to be concentrated in the sciences, technology, and medicine – the same fields in which the importance of immediate availability of information together with potential publishing support from funding agencies make open access most practicable. Open access publishing is arguably less feasible in the arts and humanities in which generally lower journal costs place less of a financial burden on libraries and authors’ publication expenses are unlikely to be offset by funding agencies. The committee therefore broadened its advocacy to promotion of faculty members’ awareness of journal pricing and publishing alternatives and of the impacts of their choices of publishers (by writing, reviewing, and editing) on the cost, availability, and dissemination of their work to scholars and other interested individuals around the world.

The resolution also seeks to promote faculty members’ awareness of mechanisms they can use to retain rights to their work, such as adding an addendum delineating those rights to publishers’ publication agreements (example attached). Included among these may be the right to deposit publications in a freely accessible institutional or discipline-based repository, such as the Libraries’ “ResearchWorks at The University of Washington” <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks>. In support of this activity, the resolution calls upon the Libraries and the University of Washington administration to further develop, publicize, and facilitate faculty authors’ use of ResearchWorks.

The resolution has been unanimously approved by the Scholarly Communication Committee and its two parent councils, the Faculty Council on University Libraries and the Faculty Council on Research, and unanimously endorsed by the Libraries Cabinet.

**ADDENDUM TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT**

1. THIS ADDENDUM hereby modifies and supplements the attached Publication Agreement concerning the following Article:

\_\_\_\_\_ (manuscript title)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (journal name)

2. The parties to the Publication Agreement as modified and supplemented by this Addendum are:

\_\_\_\_\_ (corresponding author)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Individually or, if one than more author, collectively, Author) | \_\_\_\_\_ (Publisher)

3. This Addendum and the Publication Agreement, taken together, allocate all rights under copyright with respect to all versions of the Article. The parties agree that wherever there is any conflict between this Addendum and the Publication Agreement, the provisions of this Addendum are paramount and the Publication Agreement shall be construed accordingly.

### Resolution Concerning Citation Practices

WHEREAS, the University of Washington has legal and ethical responsibilities to teach students about appropriate use of intellectual property; and

WHEREAS, excessive use of sources on the internet confuses a student's ability to properly cite and honor intellectual property; and

WHEREAS, online plagiarism checking tools can help in finding missed or improper citations; and

WHEREAS, plagiarism checking tools could be an integral component of the University's endeavor to make academic conduct a matter of achievement and skill acquisition **PRIOR** to the evaluation of student work product rather than relying on an environment of policing and punishment once work has been submitted; therefore

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

1. The University will provide access to online plagiarism checking tools which are instrumental in enabling self-checking of citations.
2. Faculty is advised to make students aware of such instruments and to require that students submit a plagiarism report that has been produced by these applications along with their assignment.

*Submitted by:  
Werner Kaminsky, Chair  
Faculty Council on Educational Technology  
April 6, 2009*

### Rationale: Resolution Honoring Intellectual Property

With the increasing prominence of the Internet in the life of students and faculty alike, improper use of this technology has drastically increased. Estimates range from 30% to 50% of all students who use information from the internet to do so without proper disclosure of their sources. Included in these estimates are students who make use of fraudulent "paper mills" to represent their own original work (COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM June 2006/Vol. 49, No. 6 **23**). Of even greater concern, plagiarism among faculty has also increased. In general, a growing number of members of university communities fail to understand how or when to appropriately cite references or to recognize the importance of intellectual property and potential consequences of copyright violation. However, cases of plagiarism reported in newscasts outside the secured university environment indicate that the general public judges plagiarism much more seriously.

The University has an important legal and ethical responsibility to teach students about appropriate use of intellectual property, implications of copyright, and the consequences of violating University rules on these issues. We also have an opportunity to take a leading role among our peer institutions to establish a culture of citation that faculty and students learn from and participate in.

Institutional failure to do so could harm the reputation of the University thereby diminishing the value of a UW degree. It could indeed have larger legal consequences if no active anti-plagiarism measures are taken, and the institution is challenged as the "home site" of increasing numbers of students and faculty who fail to observe the rules of copyright. A failure to instill ethical conduct, provide training, and create acceptance of intellectual property rights among our students will also negatively impact our graduates' future careers and ethical behavior.

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology recommends the use of plagiarism detection tools by students to help in creating and maintaining proper scholarly standards. Some online tools are available at no costs, others may charge for their services.

**Class C Resolution Concerning Student Photo Class Lists**

WHEREAS, the mission of the University is to promote the continued improvement of teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, research has shown that having student photos available to faculty allows faculty to learn student names and thereby produce a more welcoming and safe environment for student learning to occur; and

WHEREAS, Alexander Astin stated in What Matters in College (1993) that two things that made the biggest difference in getting students involved in the under-graduate experience were greater faculty-student interaction and greater student-student interaction, and although learning student names may seem a trivial matter in the entire university enterprise, it is a powerful means to foster both of these interactions; and

WHEREAS, student photos are already taken for the student ID card and stored on UW computers, this photo data could be tapped and photo class lists made available as an option for the faculty at their MyUW teaching page (which is a password protected site). Faculty would be informed to treat student photos with the same degree of confidentiality as they do all student information (student ID numbers, grades, etc.); and

WHEREAS, adding student photos to class lists would promote a greater sense of community and identity among the faculty and students which in turn would create a stronger and more vibrant community of scholars at the University of Washington; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate strongly endorses the University's effort to supply a photo class list as an option to all teaching faculty.

*Approved by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Submitted by:  
Mary Pat Wenderoth, Chair  
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality  
April 6, 2009*

*Approved by:  
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality  
January 15, 2009*

**Class C Resolution in Support of the University of Washington Hosting Tent City III**

WHEREAS, a resolution in support of the University of Washington hosting Tent City passed 03/01/05 by the Associated Students of the University of Washington (R-11-25); and

WHEREAS, according to a King County Survey, an estimated 8,000 people are homeless on any given day; and

WHEREAS, approximately 6,000 people are faced with finding shelter night after night, or are on waiting lists for transitional housing programs; and

WHEREAS, 30% of the single individuals who are homeless are women; and

WHEREAS, 30% of the people who used King County shelters/transitional housing were children; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, the annual One Night Count found 2,827 sleeping outside without shelter, and of that group, 30% spent the night in their cars; and

WHEREAS, South King County homeless population increased by 68% more than last year; and

WHEREAS, throughout King County only 32.4% of rental housing is affordable for low-income families. Only 12.6% of rental housing in Bothell is affordable, and 9% of rental housing in Kirkland; and

WHEREAS, Tent City III offers a temporary fix to the problem of homelessness here in King County by providing temporary housing to those without housing for a minimal cost; and

WHEREAS, an August 2004 report made by the Citizens' Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments (CACHE) to King County officials said that tent cities are a necessary, yet temporary fix to the greater problem of homelessness that King County has not yet fully addressed; and

WHEREAS, Seattle University hosted Tent City III in February 2005; and

WHEREAS, Tent City III has moved 35 times since 2000 to different host places; and

WHEREAS, Tent City III is currently staying at St. Mark's Cathedral in Seattle, Wa; and

WHEREAS, Tent City III will soon need a new host to allow them use of land on which to live for a period of time not to exceed 90 days; and

WHEREAS, as faculty at a major public university located inside of King County within the greater state of Washington, we are intimately involved with the problems of poverty and homelessness; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE -OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, that in an effort to promote social justice and community outreach, the faculty of the University of Washington support the university in hosting Tent City III for a period of time between 30 and 90 days; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the decision on where to locate Tent City should involve significant faculty input from across the campus community.

*Submitted by:  
Josephine Ensign, Faculty Senator, Group Eight  
Associate Professor, School of Nursing  
April 6, 2009*

Sponsors: Health Services Class 572: Lauren Applewood, Chami Arachchi, Emiko Atherton, Noah Barclay-Derman, Shelan Debesai, Sage Emry-Smith, Richa Kumar, Odile Lallemand, Tracy Lantow,

Marisa Laufer, Jamie Lee, Shannon Marsh, Maggie Milcarek, Jessica Nguyen, Kathlyn Paananen, Abigail Pearl, David Smolker, Amanda Wysocki.

**AGENDA**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, 23 APRIL 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:** Confirm Jim Fridley as 2009-2010 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2009 and ending July 31, 2010.

10. Memorial Resolution.
11. Unfinished Business.
  - a. Class A Legislation – Final 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 II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.  
**Action:** Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
  - b. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration.  
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:** Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
  - c. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Faculty Salaries and Budget Cuts.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
12. New Business.
  - a. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Scholarly Publishing Alternatives and Authors' Rights.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
  - b. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Citation Practices.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
  - c. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Student Photos on Class Lists.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
  - d. Class C Resolution: Resolution in Support of the University of Washington Hosting Tent City III.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
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, March 19 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.*