

MINUTES FOR SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
November 17, 2008, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: Lovell, Balick, Ahmad, Rahn, Wilcock, Harrington, Zahorjan, Chew, Van Voorhis, Landis, Jaffe, Schaufelberger, Demorest, Breitner, Kaminsky, Sjøvik, Haselkorn, Primomo, Rorabaugh, Wilkinson, Silberstein, Luchtel, Killien, Wise. Guest: James Fridley.

Absent: Emmert, Huber, Forman, Wenderoth, Fabien, Odegaard, Bennett, Faleschini.

Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. and welcomed participants to the meeting.

1. Approval of Agenda.

Chair Lovell mentioned that there would be an addition to agenda item number ten, Reports from Council and Committees. Mark Haselkorn, Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, will update the Committee on the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER) issue.

2. Approval of Minutes.

On behalf of Group Representative William Wilcock (who would be arriving late to the meeting), Marcia Killien proposed the following change to the minutes of the October 6, 2008, Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, page four, first paragraph:

“Wilcock responded that it appears that another committee is now being convened to produce a recommendation by the end of the quarter. He stated that it is the first representative committee of the units that have been slated to join. He is concerned that one quarter is not long enough to accommodate hearing the concerns of the number of people who will be affected by this change. He is ~~also concerned about~~ that the composition of this committee has not been announced. Although he is a member of one of the affected colleges, he has ~~heard no call for possible members not even heard informally who the members are.~~ If units vote against joining the college, will administration still run an RCEP to force the issue? Certainly that would be a cause of confusion and anxiety, and it would be useful to have some clarity about the process as well as sufficient time for discussion.”

Sandra Silberstein requested a correction of the spelling of her name in the SEC minutes.

The minutes were approved with the addition of the proposed corrections.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.

David Lovell, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate Chair Lovell reported that the Committee concerning the College of the Environment mentioned in the correction of the minutes (above) has begun meeting. It seems clear that if Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) procedures are to be initiated this year, they should be underway by the middle of January 2009. Ensuring that the concerns of all those affected by the proposal to establish a College of the Environment will be heard continues to be a high priority for the Committee.

Lovell reported having been at an Information Technology retreat the previous Friday to discuss the situation that came to light last summer regarding the budget deficit in UW Technology. Retreat participants reviewed the report and recommendations of the UW Technology Working Group, charged by the President to “provide more definition to the financial and organizational questions raised (during the preliminary investigation of the situation).” Lovell assured SEC members that faculty would participate in the re-design and governance process for Information Technology overall

– including UW Technology as one part of that operation. The report of the UW Technology Working Group will be posted to the Faculty Senate Website under “Issue under Consideration.”

In response to recent exchanges on the AAUP Listserv regarding the athletic program, Lovell assured Council members that he has heard nothing about a \$6 million figure for hiring the new football coach. He is quite certain that no such decisions have yet been made. In response to those concerns, as well as other concerns that surround the athletic program (funding for the program, the stadium and issues concerning student athletes), the Senate has invited Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics, to address the Senate at its meeting of December 4. Lovell encouraged group representatives to alert their constituents about this discussion and encourage those who are interested to attend.

Finally, Lovell introduced and welcomed a new member of the Faculty Senate Office staff, Kelly Baker, who will be serving as Council Support Specialist for seven of the fourteen Faculty Councils.

4. Report from the Provost and Executive Vice President.
Phyllis Wise.

Chair David Lovell introduced the Provost, explaining that he had recently received a call from the President who had been delayed in his travels and would not be able to attend the meeting. The Provost then spoke for the President.

The re-election of Governor Gregoire is a good thing for the UW if for no other reason than it will mean that the budget will come out on time. It would have been a considerable challenge for a new administration to produce a budget for the State during its first days in office. These will be tough budgetary times for any administration. Reports from Olympia last week recorded a shortfall in projected income of \$52 million for the month of November. OFM is currently working on projections for the biennium and will be meeting with the Governor in the middle of December to begin serious budget discussions.

The Provost has met with the Board of Deans, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), and the University Budget Committee (UBC) to discuss how to think strategically about the budget and how to focus on continuing support of high-priority initiatives going forward. She assured Committee members that both she and Dan Luchtel, chair of SCPB, would be reporting regularly about budget discussions held in SCPB and the Board of Deans.

She announced that John Vinson has been selected as UW chief of police. He is currently undersheriff for the Isabella County Sheriff’s Department in Mount Pleasant, Michigan, and he will start at the UW in February 2009. The search process was very thorough and the Committee received lots of input. Vinson was their first choice, and they are very pleased that he accepted the offer.

The announcement of the appointment of the new Vice Provost for Global Affairs will be made by the end of the week, and the search for a new Dean of the Graduate School will begin soon.

To follow up on Chair Lovell’s remarks about the College of the Environment, the Provost reviewed the vote by the Board of Regents to establish the College last summer, the extensive discussions that have taken place with affected units, and units that have voted to join the college, including Marine Affairs, Atmospheric Sciences, the College of Forest Resources, the Joint Institute for the Study of the Atmosphere and Ocean (JISAO) and the Program on the Environment (POE).

Discussions continue about how and when RCEPs will be initiated to bring these programs into the College.

The Provost reported that about \$10 million had been raised so far for the College, primarily for endowed chairs and scholarships. The UW’s budget request to the State includes provision of \$2 million for the College for each year of the biennium.

In response to a question about funding for initiatives to increase faculty diversity, the Provost replied that there has never been a line item in the budget for diversity – but administration is very careful about taking diversity into consideration when recruitment and retention of faculty are concerned. Colleges need to step in first to provide funding needed to ensure diversity, but central administration can be tapped as well if needed.

In response to another question about the UW Police Department, the Provost acknowledged that there has been a morale problem within the Department, but the interim chief has done much to improve the situation. She trusts that the new chief will continue with those efforts and bring new energy and ideas to the post.

Finally, the College of the Environment was brought up once more, and the Provost assured the Committee that units would not be forced to take votes prior to adequate internal discussion.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
Dan Luchtel, Faculty Senate Past Chair and Committee Chair.

SCPB Chair Dan Luchtel reported that despite the prevailing gloomy economic news, there is some good news: the Governor was re-elected. SCPB continues to look hard at the biennial budget and also at the financial condition of the University. It will be essential to come to some agreement on priorities. SCPB has narrowed (by way of a straw vote) their priorities to two:

1. Core funding (salaries, increases in student funding), and
2. Increase funding for child care for faculty and staff.

He expressed dismay about the report from the UW Technology Working Group. Despite new management and a significant reduction in staff, spending continues to be very high. He found this to be surprising and disturbing. He also questioned how a problem that has evolved over the past five or six years could not have been recognized and addressed earlier. This has led him to wonder if there are other units on campus that may also be running “hidden” deficits that are yet to be discovered.

The Provost acknowledged that given the importance of technology in everything we do, the situation is certainly discouraging, but she assured Luchtel that new efforts have been made to monitor overspending in any and all UW units. She also noted that the problem evolved more quickly than the past five to six years. In fact, the deficit ramped up very quickly during the prior eighteen months (due to accelerated recruitment of high-level new staff) before it was discovered. Rate increases for services are being explored, but rates won't be increased radically or immediately. Services will also be examined to ensure they are really necessary.

In response to a question about across-the-board cuts, the Provost responded that she is looking for efficiencies and working at establishing priorities. A strategic approach will lead to doing differential cuts, but there have been no decisions made yet about what units might be cut and how that might be managed. Those discussions will take place between the Deans and the Provost – and then with the SCPB.

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

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington also started with the good news for the Governor -- that Washington's gubernatorial results were not as close as was forecast. For her efforts, Governor Gregoire gets a budget mess. She's been quoted as saying recently “I'm not going to love the budget I propose” in mid-December. Democrats have very slightly increased their majorities in the Legislature.

State Representative Hans Dunshee, the vice chair of House Appropriations and one of two contenders for the chairmanship of that committee, is predicting a \$4.6 billion biennial shortfall between revenues and the expenditures that reflect just carrying the state's current policies forward. That's 8% of the size of the current biennial operating budget – much of which is driven by what's called "case load" -- how many people are eligible for K-12 education (23% of the budget), social services and prisons (36%) and debt service (4.7%).

Six weeks ago, legislators from both parties were wondering whether they would be able to pass the salary increases already negotiated between the Governor's office and unionized employees. These amounted to 2% per year. However, all discussions are colored by (a) uncertainty and (b) politics: The truly determinant revenue and case-load forecasts won't be available until March, and until then most discussion of these issues are attempts to lay political groundwork.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget is where faculty sit down weekly with the Provost and the Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting. The faculty on the committee (chaired by immediate past Senate Chair Dan Luchtel) have taken a straw poll to prioritize the University's budget requests passed by the Regents in June and submitted to the Governor. The Committee's priorities are for core funding, including:

- maintaining the scope of what is done currently with the \$390 million annual state funding (though it's very likely that adjustments may have to be made with or without cuts);
- the requests for salary adjustments ("competitive compensation" in the UW's budget request, to allow 5% salary increase packages in each of the two years); and
- additional STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) enrollments as called for by state legislation in 2007 and reiterated in the draft performance agreement submitted to the state in August.

The Committee agreed that all of the more specialized operating-fund requests (except, perhaps, improving campus safety, and support for child-care for students, faculty, and staff) are much less important given the big picture.

There's been much discussion among the faculty, including but definitely not limited to Senate leadership and the legislative committee, about "Husky Stadium." The request for the Legislature to allow King County to decide what to do with future streams from the hotel-motel and car-rental tax is not a budget proposal, it's a policy proposal. However, in a year in which the Legislature will not be able to fund anything, they may have a sense of "Let's throw something to UW -- this one won't cost us anything." This policy change is not a faculty priority. Harrington does not perceive that this is going to get very far in the Legislature – and certainly not unless the King County legislative delegation says strongly that it's something they want from their colleagues.

Another policy request that Harrington feels is key for the UW is renewing the University's authority to set tuition for programs and students except resident undergraduates. Each of the five universities plus Evergreen State College was given that authority for six years, ending this fall. This is more important financially to UW than to the others, and he feels the University should strongly back this request.

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

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien reiterated Lovell's welcome to Kelly Baker, the Senate Office's new Council Support Specialist. The office is now fully staffed and all fourteen Faculty Councils are benefiting from in-house support. She encouraged all the Council chairs to help support Kelly as she learns all the intricacies of faculty governance.

Anticipating the possibility that RCEPs will ramp up in January, she remarked that there will be a need for faculty members to serve on the review committees required for each RCEP. She will be asking Committee members to consider service on one of these committees and to recommend

colleagues they feel would be able to contribute to these discussions. She encouraged Committee members to contact her with any information or expressions of interest.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.

Chair Lovell reported that he had received no notice of concerns or issues from any group representatives.

9. Nominations and Appointments. {3:30 p.m.}

a. Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit A}**

Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

There were two additional nominations made from the floor, both as representatives from the Graduate and Professional School Senate:

Katherine Thornton for the Faculty Council on University Libraries
Coleen Carrigan for the Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The nominations as listed on Exhibit A were approved as amended.

b. **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jim Fridley, Professor, Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering as the 2008-09 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative. **{Exhibit B}**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the nomination of Jim Fridley as Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative. JW Harrington spoke in support of his nomination, recounting the number of roles he has played over the past several years in faculty governance. That, in addition to Fridley's experience as a private citizen working with the legislature, makes him an ideal candidate. David Lovell also expressed support for this nomination and noted that he looks forward to working with Fridley.

The motion was approved.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees. {3:35 p.m.}

a. Faculty Council Issues as of November 17, 2008. **{Exhibit C}**

Chair Lovell recommended that Committee members, particularly Council Chairs, take note of Exhibit C, listing current issues under consideration from each of the fourteen Councils. This document will be updated and attached to every SEC agenda from now on, as a means for Councils to be aware when issues overlap among the Councils and to encourage coordination and collaboration among Councils whenever possible.

Committee members felt this was a good idea and suggested it would be good information to provide the faculty at large. Group Reps were encouraged to share the document with their constituents. Lovell was asked if this information could be posted to the web. He replied that he would work with staff to see how best to post the information on the Senate Website.

b. Support for Faculty who use On-line Instructional Tools.

Leslie Breitner, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Outreach. **{Exhibit D}**

Faculty Council on Educational Outreach (FCEO) Chair Leslie Breitner then drew Council members' attention to Exhibit D, a request for support for faculty who use on-line instructional tools and a cover letter for that request from Kate, O'Neill, the previous chair of FCEO. Having been sent to Senate leadership in June of last year, the Council is now wondering what action, if any, has this request elicited. Breitner added that given the current economy, she would assume that most requests for funding would be tabled for now. In any case, for future reference, she wanted clarification on how recommendations from the Faculty Councils are handled and what

Councils can expect in response to the work they do throughout the year.

On behalf of Senate leadership, Chair Lovell apologized for this oversight. This is a process issue. Requests such as these should receive an immediate acknowledgment. If it involves funding it should be transmitted to the SCPB. Other recommendations might be brought to the SEC for further consideration, and from there, they may be transmitted to the Senate for discussion at that level.

From process issues, discussion turned to the merits of the request from the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach. Many faculty have chafed under the responsibility of having to create their own information technology infrastructure for their courses. Due to the relatively recent and very rapidly evolving nature of these technologies within higher education, there is very little data on the actual costs savings this technology has brought to the University, if any. All agreed that upfront costs would be significant and then would decrease with time. All agreed that it would address, to some extent, the critical shortage of classroom space at the UW. Some reported that they found on-line courses required two to three times the amount of time a traditional classroom course would require; some reported the opposite. Any approach to the legislature will need to be supported by data justifying the cost of the request.

University of Washington Educational Outreach is fully staffed with experts in the technology of on-line course design. But all courses provided by Educational Outreach are provided on a for-fee basis. The organization is entirely self-sustaining. Students electing to take for-credit courses through Educational Outreach must pay a fee in addition to regular tuition and associated student fees.

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington will be attending a meeting of a legislatively mandated "E-Learning Work Group" on December. He invited all interested parties to contact him with input prior to that meeting.

- c. Update on the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER) issue. Mark Haselkorn, Chair, Faculty Council on Research.

Faculty Council on Research (FCR) Chair Mark Haselkorn first reviewed the history of this issue. A faculty representative of the AAUP executive council had initiated a request for information to Senate Chair David Lovell and President Mark Emmert last month with concerns stemming from the fact that at the time of the establishment of this grant-supported Institute, a review by the FCR was not initiated. This review is routinely provided by the FCR any time a grant involves working with classified, proprietary or restricted information. At the time the Institute's grant was under review, for whatever reason, the box indicating that INSER would be involved with classified or restricted information was not checked.

Haselkorn invited both the AAUP representative and the INSER Director to the last meeting of the FCR. Each made statements, followed by a question and answer session. The outcome of that discussion is that the Director would welcome a post-award review of INSER, and Haselkorn will initiate that review.

A second issue of discussion was about the process that triggers a review of grants that involve working with classified, proprietary or restricted information. The Council will continue work on the possibility of revising and improving that procedure.

Lovell brought up the concern that students traveling abroad under the support of funding related to intelligence agencies might be at risk – and the programs that coordinate their travel may be at risk as well. Haselkorn responded that if the concern is possible jeopardy to students and their programs, he questions whether FCR is the right Council to consider that concern. Haselkorn and the FCR are committed to all issues directly related to research, but other implications would be better explored by other Councils.

This issue is very complex and includes the question of whether there are agencies from which the UW should decline to accept funding. Further discussion was inconclusive, but it was agreed that more research and deliberation was needed to identify more clearly the nature of the concerns, especially as they relate to students traveling abroad.

Senate Chair Lovell commended Haselkorn and the work for the FCR, and asked the SEC to get in touch with him by e-mail with any input on where to take this complex set of issues.

11. Information.

There were no requests for information.

12. Announcements.

There were none.

13. Unfinished Business.

There was none.

14. New Business.

December 4, 2008 Faculty Senate Agenda. {4:00 p.m.}

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

Mark Haselkorn, Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, suggested that the wording on agenda item number nine of the Senate Agenda be changed to read: "Concerns about the Institute...". (instead of "Establishment of an Institute...")

The agenda was approved as amended.

15. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

2008-2011 Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees.**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement**

Steven Demorest, Group 2, Music, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2009.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Jim Burke, Group 3, Mathematics, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

Randy LeVeque, Group 3, Applied Mathematics, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

Radha Poovendran, Group 6, Electrical Engineering, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

Barbara Endicott-Popovsky, Group 1, Information School, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

2008-2009 Representative Faculty Council Nominations:

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

Graduate and Professional Student Senate

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Academic Standards-----	Gus Jespersen
University Libraries-----	Katherine Thornton
Women in Academia-----	Coleen Carrigan

Associated Students of the University of Washington

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Academic Standards-----	Phuong Nguyen
Educational Outreach -----	Kyle Albert
Faculty Affairs -----	Phuong Nguyen
Instructional Quality -----	Phuong Nguyen
Research -----	Richard Lum
Student Affairs-----	Phuong Nguyen
Tri-Campus Policy-----	Chris Paredes
University Relations-----	Nathan Snyder

University of Washington Retirement Association

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Benefits and Retirement -----	J. Ray Bowen (Mechanical Engineering)
Research -----	David Foster (Bioengineering)
Tri-Campus Policy-----	William Weitkamp (Physics)
University Facilities & Services-----	Robert Albrecht (Electrical Engineering)
Women in Academia-----	Bertha Barriga (Dentistry)

James L Fridley Ph.D., P.E.**Education**

Ph.D. 1984 Mechanical Engineering University of Washington
M.S. 1981 Agricultural Engineering Michigan State University
B.S. 1979 Forest Engineering University of California Davis

Recent Positions

Professor, Forest Res. and Mechanical Engineering, Univ of Washington, 1988-present.
Senior Science and Engineering Advisor, Forest Concepts LLC, 2002-present.
Assistant Professor, Agricultural Engineering, Auburn University, 1985-1989

Research Interests

My current interests fall in three main areas: ecological restoration, woody biomass feedstock (materials collection, handling, processing; technology and logistics), and ecological engineering design. Across the three I am interested how people have and are designing systems or system components and how design can be done to better meet the needs or opportunities of the motivating situation and/or stay within the intended limits or boundaries on the design.

Professional Activities

At current time I teach courses related to ecological restoration design but over the past several years I've taught a wide variety of courses in engineering, forest/ecological engineering, mechanical engineering, industrial engineering, quantitative sciences, and environmental sciences and resource management collaborating with a large number of colleagues in the colleges of forest resources and engineering. My research interests are described above. Professors Kern Ewing and Jon Baker and I are writing a book "Restoration Design and Management" for publication in 2010. I have recently served on the University's Senate Committee on Legislative Matters, the Faculty Council on University Relations and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. I also serve as the Science and Technology Advisor to Forest Concepts, LLC in Auburn Washington and serve on the board of the League of Education Voters and as an officer of Schools First. I am a licensed professional engineer in the State of Washington (#0030813 – mechanical engineering).

Sample Publications

1. Dooley J.H., D.N. Lanning, C. Lanning, and J.L. Fridley. 2008. Biomass Baling into Large Square Bales for Efficient Transport, Storage, and Handling. Council on Forest Engineering 2008: 31st Annual Meeting, June 22-25, 2008 Charleston, SC.
2. Lanning, D.N., C. Lanning, J.L. Fridley, J.H. Dooley, and M.S. DeTray, 2008. Mode of Failure Model for Cutting Solid Section Biomass. ASAE Paper No. 085111.
3. Linnell, N+, R. Anderson, J. Fridley, T. Hinckley and V. Razmov+, 2007. Supporting Classroom Discussion with Technology: A Case Study in Environmental Science, ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education 2007.
4. Bolton, S.M., S.D. Bergen and J.L. Fridley. 2001. Design Principles for Ecological Engineering. Ecological Engineering 18(2)201-210
5. Safoutin, Michael+, Cynthia J. Atman, Robin Adams, Teodora Rutar Shuman+, John Kramlich, and Jim Fridley. 2000. "A Design Attribute Framework for Course Planning and Learning Assessment," IEEE Transactions on Education Special Issue on Assessment, 43(2), 188-199 (2000).

Faculty Council Issues
For Distribution: November 17, 2008
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 is developing proposed policies relative to English language proficiency and proposing additional resources for students needing support in improving their English skills.
 - c. Proposal to establish a curriculum committee for the University Honors Program.
 - d. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
 - e. Review of Handbook language relative to graduation and application for degree process.
2. Benefits and Retirement
 - a. Conversion of opt-in system for UWRP contributions to an automatic-enrollment (opt-out) system (i) upon initial employment and (ii) for the increase in contributions from 7.5% to 10% at age 50. The University has decided to convert to automatic enrollment at 10% for those turning 50 (requires SCPB follow-up.). The council feels that one can still opt-out, but would be a bad idea financially as one would give up the University match on the incremental 2.5% contribution. The group was also told that the auto-enrollment at initial employment was meritorious but too expensive to implement at this point.
 - b. Continue to advocate the council's proposal that dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians receive a discount in the base undergraduate UW tuition.
 - c. Review a communication plan for the supplemental benefit.
 - d. Review retirement fund options, possibly meet with fund reps, and review the committee charged with evaluating such funds.
 - e. Explore ways to better understand communicate the "total compensation" faculty receive, that is, the value of their salary plus benefits.
 - f. Look into an easier way for faculty to distribute their salary and benefits contributions over 12 months.
3. Educational Outreach
 - a. FCEO Charge: A challenge the Council faces this year is deciding where to focus its attention. The challenge results in part from the fact that there may be overlapping issues among Councils. Council chairs will meet this fall to discuss potentially common issues. It may be that the Faculty Senate leadership will wish to consider whether the Council's charge is still appropriate.
 - b. Identification of University-wide "outreach programs" through development of a database of all fee-based, state-funded, degree/non-degree, and certificate programs with a goal of developing the means to support distance learning.
 - c. Departmental level support for faculty using instructional technology. This would be different from the proposed support for faculty who teach distance learning courses through UWEO.
 - d. Concern about what happens to the work of each year. For example, there is no indication of what happened to the request from last year's work, summarized in the Annual Report, and submitted to the Chairs (current and incoming) of the Faculty Senate as well as the Provost.
4. Educational Technology
 - a. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology requests a stable source of financial support for contemporary teaching technology to be made available for the 'Technology Consortium'* to innovate teaching capabilities to meet and satisfy student's and faculty's expectations and learning experience as well as sustain the University of Washington's position as a center of teaching excellence. * The Teaching Consortium consists of: Classroom Support Services; Health Sciences Classroom Services; University Libraries; Catalyst.

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

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

13. University Relations

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

14. Women in Academia

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

University of Washington School of Law
William H. Gates Hall
353020, Seattle, WA 98195-3020
Phone 206.543.4550, Fax 206.543.5671
www.iaw.washington.edu

June 30 2008

Professor Dan Luchtel
Professor David Lovett
Professor Bruce Balick
University of Washington
Faculty Senate Office
36 Gerberding Hall
Box 351271
Seattle, WA 98 195-1271

Dear Dan, David and Bruce:

On behalf of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, I attach a letter advocating departmental-level support for faculty who use instructional technology. The Council believes this is an issue of great importance to faculty but one which is "under the radar" right now. The Council specifically hopes that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting will attend to our recommendations in formulating the budget for the next and future biennia and that the Administration will develop a strategy for dealing with the looming demand for on-line instruction.

Thanks for your consideration and for all your work on behalf of the faculty. I wish you all a fine summer.

Sincerely,

Kate O'Neill
Associate Professor
206-543-0928 office
206-660-6894 cell
kateon@u.washington.edu

cc: Provost Phyllis Wise (Box 351237)
Susan Folk (Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty)

Attachment

TO: Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate 2007-08
Professor David Lovell, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate 2007-08
Professor Bruce Balick

CC: Provost Phyllis Wise

FROM: Associate Professor Kate O'Neill, Chair,
Faculty Council on Educational Outreach 2007-08

DATE: June 30, 2008

RE: Support for Faculty who use On-Line Instructional Tools

Summary

The members of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach believe that the University now lacks an adequate system, or a strategic plan, to provide appropriate support for faculty and staff who develop courses and course materials that use on-line instructional tools. The problem afflicts instructors and courses in every department: distance-learning courses, hybrid courses that involve some on-site and some distance-learning, and traditional on-campus classroom courses, most of which now have significant on-line content.

Inadequate support for faculty who adopt on-line instructional tools is a de facto tax on faculty compensation and an increase in workload. Inadequate support diverts faculty time to tasks staff can do, and that undermines faculty productivity and the University's reputation and competitiveness. These problems aggravate faculty retention issues, and they undermine traditional and non-traditional student access. Additionally, quality online courses and resources would give the UW a distinct competitive advantage in the academic marketplace because of high demand from students for online courses and course materials.

We advocate three things for next year:

- 1. The University administration should vigorously press for more state dollars to support efficient use of instructional tools;**
- 2. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting should make support for use of instructional tools a line-item in the budget; and**
- 3. The Senate Executive Committee should work with its councils and the Administration to ensure that, whatever the funding for instructional tools may be, more of it is directed to the department level.**

Discussion

We think the Faculty Senate and Administration should focus on ensuring staff support at the department level for instructional design and management of on-line course materials. Instructional design is the practice of arranging media and content to transfer knowledge and develop skills most effectively. We think support at the department level is the best way to make more efficient use of faculty time and to build institutional memory and expertise in development and management of on-line course materials.

We are not concerned with development of on-line instructional technologies, per se. Excellent tools exist; the critical issue is whether the University is enabling its faculty to select and use them efficiently.

Despite substantial demand from students for on-line and distance-learning opportunities, and considerable stated enthusiasm for such courses and materials by the Administration, the HEC Board, and the Board of Regents, the University has not yet recognized the real costs to faculty of adopting instructional tools and the lost opportunity costs to the University of failing to fund them adequately.

Failure to provide adequate staff support diverts faculty time from generating appropriate content for courses, interacting with students, and engaging in research.

The University must invest in effective new strategies to provide the tools faculty need to maintain the University's competitiveness and relevance to students, whether they study on campus or at a distance. There is a common misconception that use of on-line instructional tools and on-line courses saves instructors' time. In fact, many instructional tools increase the amount of time faculty spend interacting with students and, in any case, materials must be constantly updated.

The University's present system does not support faculty who want to adopt effective new tools, and so many faculty will rationally choose to avoid them. Faculty should be content-providers, but in the present system, faculty must use a significant amount of their time on the simple mechanics of preparing and maintaining online course materials, whether for distance learning courses or traditional classroom courses. Substantial time must be spent learning to use tools available at the UW (such as Catalyst products), or faculty must develop their own tools in those situations where a suitable product is not available commercially or from campus resources.

There are significant costs to the University in using faculty this way — costs that faculty bear but that are hidden from budget. Time devoted to designing and maintaining tools must be subtracted from research or teaching. Even if faculty are able and willing to devote time to design and maintenance of instructional tools, such efforts are unlikely to count toward promotion and tenure. Faculty are not now compensated for the design or maintenance of new instructional tools, unless such efforts are grant-supported.

Moreover, when the grants run out, the University has no general commitment to maintaining the tools by supporting departmental budgets for that purpose. An effective tool may be lost because a department or a faculty member is unable or unwilling to keep supporting it. The University has no integrated system for gathering and sharing data on what tools work for what purposes, despite a recommendation from ATAC that one was needed. Too often, individual faculty start from scratch when adopting instructional tools; too often, a worthwhile on-line course initiative simply lapses when the grant ends or the instructor's energy dries up; too often, the knowledge and experience gained from developing and managing the course also lapses.

At present, the only centrally-funded technology is Catalyst. Its budget does not allow design or maintenance support for individual instructors. Faculty must teach themselves —and their students — how to use the tools, and they must keep abreast of a steady flow of new and updated tools. This year, FCEO has emphasized to Catalyst managers the importance of simplicity and backward-compatibility, and Catalyst managers are attentive to faculty needs and input. But even if Catalyst can make all its tools stable, transparent, and easy-to-use, no centrally-designed instructional technology will be sufficient or flexible enough for all teaching needs. Many faculty in many different departments will need to purchase or develop their own tools, and it would be a mistake to discourage exploration of the myriad tools developed by software companies and other universities.

The University could improve efficiency and morale by providing instructional design and maintenance support at the department level. It would be far more cost-effective for the University to devote whatever funds it does have to hire appropriate staff personnel or to fund additional TA positions, as appropriate, than to use faculty time for these purposes. A study of faculty technology-related priorities, commissioned by ATAC less than two years ago, proposed this cost-effective and much-needed solution in a pilot project. Unfortunately, the proposal was not adopted and, as far as we know, only Educational Outreach systematically provides faculty teaching in its programs with instructional design support. UWEO's practice provides an example of efficient, instructor- and course-centered support for the design, selection and maintenance of instructional tools. The University should fund similar practices in each department.

The bottom line is that we are paying a heavy price for the current inefficient use of faculty time — a price in faculty hours not devoted to the content of instruction or to research, a price in terms of faculty retention, and a price in lost information about effective tools. In addition, enhanced delivery of classes or class materials on-line might hold down capital costs.

In conclusion, the Council members think increased support for faculty using instructional tools is a critical issue for the University's future. Additional support must be delivered locally, in the departments, where support staff involved can make sure individual faculty are aware of appropriate tools, and can provide direct assistance in learning to use them. Top-down support does not work in practice, because its effect is to increase rather than decrease the demands on faculty time. Although we recognize that there are many demands on the budget, and that any new demands are often pitted against salary raises, we think that this is an unrecognized compensation issue, and we urge the Senate and Administration to focus on it.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2008
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
2. Introductory Comments – Professor David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate.
3. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – President Mark A. Emmert.
4. Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative – Professor Patrick Dobel.
Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics.
5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Dan Luchtel,
Committee Chair.
6. Legislative Report – Professor James “JW” Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.
7. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of November 17, 2008.
8. Announcements.
9. Requests for Information.

Concerns about the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER).
10. Nominations and Appointments.
 - a. **Action:** Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
 - b. **Action:** Confirm Jim Fridley as 2008-2009 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning immediately and ending July 31, 2009.
11. Memorial Resolution.
12. Unfinished Business.
13. New Business.

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, December 11 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.