Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, January 11, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: President Cauce, Norm Beauchamp, Zoe Barsness, Kate O'Neill, Marcia Killien, Chuck Treser, Kelly Edwards, Janelle Taylor, Gordon Watts, Marcie Lazzari, JoAnn Taricani, Interim Provost Jerry Baldasty, Richard Keil, Bill Erdly, Jeffrey Wilkes, Susan Astley, Mike Townsend, Duane Storti, Linda Martin-Morris
Absent: Tyler Wu, Gautham Reddy, Abe McClenny
Guests: Rich Christie, Elizabeth Cherry, Vikram Jandhyala, Rachel Chapman

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Beauchamp called the meeting to order at 2:35pm.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Norm Beauchamp.

Chair Beauchamp commented on President Cauce’s birthday and SEC sang a rousing musical version of “Happy Birthday.” Beauchamp reminded the committee about the faculty forum on unionization on Wednesday, January 13. He also acknowledged the great amount of work that went into the faculty salary policy.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit A]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit B]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit C]

Taricani provided brief comments noting the start of the state legislative session today. Storti asked about a cap on the percentage of UW faculty who can be on leave at any time. Taricani said Genesee Adkins, Director of State Relations, was looking into it.

Storti also asked about the Secretary of the Faculty’s report indicating postponement of the 2nd consideration of the FSP legislation. Killien responded by suggesting that this would be discussed under the new business item on the agenda.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce commented that she is working on building positive relationships with state legislators and other communities. She is requesting that the legislature backfill budget deficits and also fund the computer science building. She indicated she is fine with having a faculty member as a member of the Board of Regents. There has been minor discussion on Initiative 200. UW would like to see it repealed, but that is unlikely.

The search is beginning for a new athletic director upon the resignation of AD Scott Woodward to take a position at Texas A & M; there will be internal candidates. UW also has to replace Johnese Spiso, Chief Medical Officer for UW Medicine, who left for UCLA. Both are leaving for much higher salaries at other institutions.

Cauce commented on how well the process worked for the Faculty Salary Policy; there was open and respectful debate. She and the Provost are working on the Faculty Salary policy executive order and implementation issues. She has concerns about some issues including delegation of performance reviews to small committees. Interim Provost Baldasty said that they are looking at the flexibility in the policy and how well it will work.

It would have been Cauce’s preference to say some words before the faculty forum, but the executive committee decided against it.
Questions from SEC members to the president followed.

Q: What were the objections of other Presidents to the repeal of I-200?
A: Cauce—Another President was worried about stigmatization of hires from affirmative action. Cauce was hired when there was affirmative action and she did not feel stigmatized. The Supreme Court decision on affirmative action may make this discussion moot anyways.

C: Chair Beauchamp said faculty would like to have a voice in the search for a new Athletic Director and recommended faculty athletic representative Frank Hodge.
A: Cauce—Yes, we are discussing the best way of doing a search. She indicated she was already speaking with Hodge about the search committee composition. She would like to look at internal candidates.
Q: Should athletics income be treated in a manner parallel to grants; is it appropriate to change their payment structure?
A: Cauce—There will probably be a presentation on athletics and the budget at the Board of Regents in April. Most of athletics’ income is from gifts. She believes the budget arrangements at the UW were more favorable to the university than other universities.

Q: One senator said he noticed there was a $150 one-time cost to grants for RAs this year and he wanted to know the origins of that payment.
A: Cauce—There was a discussion about it but not sure about details. She will look into it.

C: Taricani complimented Cauce on her effective advocacy for higher education with alumni and other constituents. UW impact held an advocacy meeting last week for state legislators. The point the legislators made was how valuable it is to hear from their constituents. You need to go to your town halls and reach out to your legislators to have the biggest impact. We are all focused on the 2017 session and we need to be an advocate before then.
C: Cauce—Legislators told her that when they get an actual letter written by someone, they value it more.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the November 16, 2015, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the December 3 and December 10, 2015, Faculty Senate minutes.

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

8. Invited guests:
   a. Compliance Support Platform – Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services. [Exhibit D]

Chair Beauchamp invited Elizabeth Cherry to present to the committee.

Cherry spoke to the handouts in her exhibit. The environment is becoming increasingly focused on regulations and documentation of compliance. There are two parts of compliance: structural and substantive. The presentation she focused on structural compliance as a new emphasis with a goal of decreasing burdens and making compliance easier.

Questions from SEC members followed.

Q: Will there ever be one website for faculty to go to in order to learn what they need to do related to compliance? How do faculty learn what is mandated?
A: Cherry—Yes, in an ideal world every job description would tell you what compliance is necessary. Right now, you can look at employment civil rights and see the training that is available.

C: Can we get a list of the committee members so we know who to go to on these things? In order to engage faculty, it needs to go through faculty governance and not be purely administrative.

Q: Is there a large standing committee that will investigate all things?
A: Cherry—No, it will be a group of qualified investigators we have identified ahead of time so we can select an appropriate firm when we know we need an independent investigator.

Q: What things do faculty members need to do and how do we know what to do? What are the consequences of not participating?
A: Cherry—That is cycle two of our program. We are building that. Right now, there needs to be an administrator on top of it or through an investigation by a regulatory agency.

C: I have no idea what I’ve already been trained in. A database would be something you want to provide.

C: Cauce—This has always been a moving target for faculty. We find out new training that we need all the time and, of course, it needs to be done tomorrow.

C: A presentation at faculty meetings at the department level would be a good use of time, such as “TED talks” telling faculty to think about certain issues and letting them know where to go.

C: Gordon Watts—Do you have examples of what would trigger a call out to an independent firm for an investigation? I’ve had to work a lot with the faculty code and one section of it deals with what happens when things go wrong. How does the independent investigation interact with what the code says?
A: Cherry—Penn State is a good example and North Carolina. North Carolina was giving athletes grades for classes they didn’t take. The cover up is the key.
C: Cauce—These come up when the issue is with central administration. Systemic problems.
C: Cherry—Some topics need specific forensic capabilities.

C: Areas that faculty might need additional information relate to Title IX, supervision of student employees. The slides might be modified to more clearly identify the areas of concern/interest to faculty.


Chair Beauchamp introduced Vice Provost Vikram Jandhyala and invited him to share his work at GIX.

Vikram Jandhyala referred to materials in Exhibit E and provided an update. The GIX degree will be reviewed by the Graduate School Council shortly and then go to the Board of Regents. Teaching will be done by regular tenure-track UW faculty, beginning with Seattle campus and expanding to all UW campuses. The first students are planned to begin in 2016. A new building for the program is planned for the Spring District in Bellevue, through a UW collaboration with Microsoft. Fundraising is occurring both in the UW and also in China. Microsoft provided $38 million to fund the start of the program. The degree will be a self-supporting master’s program.

Questions from SEC members followed.

Q: Why does a curricular plan have a CEO?
A: We cannot call this person a dean or chair since it is not a new department. There is a deliverable at the end that is not a report or thesis. A very different outcome from a normal academic program.
C: It worries me that the university is creating an academic program with a CEO.
A: Jandhyala—CEO is not necessarily the title.
C: Jandhyala—As this goes, we will probably change the titles.

Q: Townsend—Are there intellectual property (IP) issues here for what the students are creating?
A: Jandhyala—There is already a well-defined IP law. We are following the same model.
C: Cauce—Every part of this curriculum is owned by the academic departments. There is nothing different there than what we already do.
C: Townsend—It is a little different to setup a program where the desired deliverable is a product.
Q: Who will be advising students and whose IP model?
A: Jandhyala—UW will do the advising and GIIX will have its own staff to work with students. The outcome of this project is open source. Most projects will be like that. We are starting from scratch and no one owns the IP from the beginning. There may also be some companies who are interested in fully funding the IP from students.
C: Cauce—The world is changing. It would never have occurred to me to think of a new questionnaire as an IP. If I were doing it now, I would be thinking of those things. Students aren’t doing anything different than before, but they are thinking differently.

C: If we are giving big companies license to things, that is anti-innovation.
A: Jandhyala—We want to educate students about what decisions to make. The most common IP will be open source.

C: How are the students advised and the deliverables judged?
A: Jandhyala—A pool of advisors. Instructor within the university will make the decision.

Q: Will the rest of campus have access to the Bellevue building?
A: Jandhyala—Yes. We are open to that and looking at how to use it.

C: With a cohort of foreign students we need to be focused on cultural integration.

C: Where will the degree be offered and is there oversight?
A: Jandhyala—A variety of departments. Yes, there will be an oversight committee to make sure it fits.

   a. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code regarding conflict of interest.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

Beauchamp reminded the SEC that revisions may be made to this legislation only within its first consideration by the SEC and Senate. He made a motion to consider the legislation and it was seconded.

Gordon Watts, chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs introduced the legislation and summarized the introductory comments provided with the proposed legislation.

Q: Does this just refer to individuals or might conflicts of interest with organizations also be involved?
A: This legislation only deals with individuals.
Q: Who would be consulted about this?
A: Refer to EO 32, state law, for guidance.

No further discussion. Motion passed.

   b. Class A legislation – Second Consideration.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code regarding faculty salary policy.
      Action: Vote to delay the second consideration until the February 22, SEC meeting.

Beauchamp asked for a motion to delay the second consideration of the policy until the February 22nd meeting and it was seconded.

During discussion, Storti raised the issue that this was a violation of the deadline for Presidential response. Are we setting a precedent?
C: (O’Neill) The Code is protective of the faculty. The faculty can waive its own rights
C: (Treser) The role of SEC is to protect the faculty. The delay will enable this since legislation is very complex.
C: Killien cited two prior occasions of similar delay.
C: Christie indicated that extra time has already helped the Code Cops in identifying some unintended consequences. FCFA chair Gordon Watts supported this. He urged SEC to make a decision because it is thoughtful, not to adhere to a timeline.
C: Storti suggested we should start anew with first consideration.
C: Townsend (member of Code Cops). Legislation is very complex and it is hard to review in a way the Code cops can fulfill their review responsibilities as it involved integrating two chapters of the Code.
C: O’Neill suggested a process wherein if the Senate voted it down at 2nd consideration, it could return again as new legislation (1st consideration) within this year.

Treser called the question and it was seconded. Vote on the call to question passed.

Vote to delay the second consideration of the Faculty Salary Policy until the February 22nd SEC meeting. Motion passed with one negative vote.

Chair Beauchamp

c. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit G]
   Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and Faculty Council on Women in Academia
   Title: Resolution concerning a black lives matter statement
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

   Chair Beauchamp introduced Rachel Chapman, chair of FCMA, and she introduced the legislation. She quoted MLK Jr. the day before his birthday and brought forward a black lives matter resolution. Technology has allowed us to see evidence of police brutality. We have broken our contract with some communities. This resolution invites UW faculty to display that they have some understanding of the effects of racism and violence on all of us.

   The committee read the statement aloud.

   Cauce spoke in favor of the resolution.
   O’Neill made an amendment to add a reference to the Tacoma and Bothell police departments in the third “be it resolved” statement.

   Vote on the amendment was taken and passed.

   The resolution was approved as amended.

d. Approval of the January 28, 2016, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit H]
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

   The agenda was approved as amended.

10. Adjournment.

   The meeting was adjourned at 5:04pm.

   Prepared by: Marcia Killien  
   Approved by: Norm Beauchamp, Chair
   Secretary of the Faculty  Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Tuesday, January 19 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The vice chair nominating committee is accepting nominations for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2016. Please consider nominating colleagues you believe could serve in this important faculty leadership position. Final candidates will be presented to the Senate Executive Committee at its February 22, 2016, meeting.

2. The second consideration of Class A legislation No. 136, faculty salary policy, has been postponed to the February 22, 2016, SEC meeting to allow the President’s office and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations sufficient time for a thorough review of the proposed legislation.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Kate O’Neill, Professor, Law

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budget, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions.

SCPB has met twice since my last report. In that limited time, we have completed our review of the basic planning and budgeting process, and we have moved now to considering proposals for Provost Reinvestment Funds (PRFs). The committee concurs with Interim Provost Baldasty on basic priorities for use of permanent funds: improved faculty compensation, efforts to improve faculty diversity and retention, and investments to meet critical compliance risks. There are insufficient funds to meet more than a fraction of the PRFs submitted. In the coming weeks, we will move on to consider unit budget proposals. We will be meeting with some key administrators and deans to delve into long-term strategic planning issues.
The 2016 legislative session begins on January 12, 2016. Aside from adjusting the biennial budget with a supplemental budget, the Legislature is expected to address various policy issues in legislative committees: access and affordability of higher education, cost of textbooks, protected speech on campuses, and long-range projections of growth and planning in higher education.

The main event that has occurred in the past month has been the release of the Governor’s proposal for the supplemental budget, which will adjust portions of the approved budget for 2015-17. It changes very little of the University of Washington budget. The University had requested full “backfill” of the tuition revenue that would have occurred absent the reduction of tuition for 2015-17; most of that amount is provided in the full biennial budget, but now that the Autumn enrollment is finalized, a slight increase is needed. Also, the University had requested full funding for the construction of the next phase of the Computer Science and Engineering expansion, but the Governor made no adjustment to the biennial allocation that funds the project partially through direct appropriation and partially through the use of university funds that otherwise would be directed toward renovations. The Governor’s budget did include an increase of $250,000 in additional ongoing funding for the Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement (MESA) program beginning in FY17. MESA currently has a budget of approximately $1.5 million per year.

There will be new proposals from the House and Senate in March, and the final adjustments to the 2015-17 budget will occur before the 2016 session of the Legislature concludes. For details about the Governor’s budget, please see this summary provided by the Office of Planning and Budgeting:

Compliance Support Platform – Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services.

Dear Senate Executive Committee,

I look forward to presenting to you on January 11th to discuss UW’s newly developed Compliance Support Program. Briefly, the discussion is designed to solicit your perspective on how the program can be meaningful and useful to the faculty. I will be presenting the attached slides to stimulate conversation, comments and questions. In addition, I have attached a recent paper published by the National Association of College and University Attorneys about considerations for organizing compliance activities in higher education today. It’s not essential that you read it, but you might find it of interest.  

There are two specific areas where I would particularly appreciate your input:

1. How can we best engage faculty in the planned compliance assessments and mitigation activities?
2. How do faculty currently obtain information about compliance with the laws and regulations applicable to their work?

Thanks, and see you next week.

1 Please follow link to document.
For the University of Washington
Senate Executive Committee
January 11, 2016

The New
UW-wide Structural
Compliance Program

Elizabeth Cherry, JD, CCEP-I
Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services

Structural Compliance Program
Regulators Look for the Implementation of an Effective Compliance Program

- Identified priorities
- Capacity to self-monitor
- Systematized compliance functions

- Defined metrics
- Evidence of compliance activities
- Linkage between compliance goals and the institution’s mission

THE LANDSCAPE

UW Leadership

Board of Regents

1st Line of Defense
Operational Units Substantive Compliance
- Own and manage identified risks
- Implement appropriate controls
- Demonstrate continuous improvement

2nd Line of Defense
Compliance Support Structural Compliance
- Assess, monitor and report
- Facilitate solutions and coordinate resources
- Identify best practices

3rd Line of Defense
Internal Audit
- Prepare financial reports and audits
- Measure operational effectiveness
- Conduct periodic testing

External Auditors

Regulators

Structural Compliance Program
Structural Compliance

- Respond to regulators, accreditors, sponsors and grantors
- Monitor the regulatory environment for trends, patterns, changes
- Minimize disruption to research and scholarly activities
- Reduce administrative burdens

Structural Compliance Program
Structural Compliance Program

**Research Compliance**

- Institutional Review Boards
- Animal Welfare Act
- Controlled Substances Act
- Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act

**Civil Rights/Employment Compliance**

- Title IX
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- EEO and Affirmative Action
- Age Discrimination Act
- Family and Medical Leave Act
- Civil Rights Act
- Employee Retirement Income Security Act
- Employment and Training of Veterans
- Fair Pay Act
- Immigration Reform and Control Act
COMPLIANCE PLATFORM

Operational Units with Subject Matter Experts across UW

COMPLIANCE STRUCTURE: LEADERSHIP AND OVERSIGHT

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

Structural Compliance Program
7 ELEMENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

1. Leadership and oversight
2. Standards of conduct, policies and procedures
3. Education and outreach
4. Monitoring and auditing
5. Receiving reports and investigating
6. Response and prevention
7. Accountability, incentives and corrective action
REGENTS REPORT

- Introduction of subject area
- 3-5 priorities with associated mitigation plans
  - Relevant laws, regulations
  - Analytics and data
  - Individuals involved
- Achievements
- Updates: environmental scan
- Additional resources

STRUCTURAL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

- TONE AT THE TOP
  - Oversight, direction
- TONE IN THE MIDDLE
  - Leadership, coordination, facilitation
- COMPLIANCE STRUCTURE
  - Policies, controls, investigations, resources, education and outreach
- CULTURE OF COMPLIANCE
  - Norms, expectations, values, attitudes
CYCLE ONE DELIVERABLES –
STRUCTURAL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

✓ Convene Compliance Working Committee
✓ Convene Compliance Steering Committee
✓ Regents orientation session, confirm proposed report format and content
✓ Present quarterly reports to Regents
✓ Leadership orientation sessions, program overview

- Survey compliance requirements
- Regulatory response standards, system
- Issue RFQQ for Independent Investigator Pool, develop appropriate standards for use
- Roll out education program and strategy
- Develop metrics to measure success

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

Questions?

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
UPDATE ON GIX  
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
JANUARY 11, 2016

1. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
   a. MSTI is about ready for review by Graduate Council—will happen January or February.  
      i. Once approved by Regents, we can market it.  
      ii. Interdisciplinary Faculty Committee chaired by Shwetak Patel.  
      iii. MSTI curriculum will integrate hardware/software, design thinking, and entrepreneurship, with the initial track focusing on connected devices.  
      iv. Curriculum is divided into three phases—Prepare, Practice and Launch. Heavily project- and team-based throughout.  
      v. Graduate school proposal includes a general framework that should allow new tracks (such as mobile health) to be introduced quickly.  
      vi. Working out MOUs with departments to provide teaching resources. Most teaching will be done by tenure track faculty. Financial model is being developed to help participating departments hire additional tenure track faculty.  
   b. MSTI will admit students on a stand-alone basis and as part of a dual master’s degree where students will complete additional work with Tsinghua (in Beijing primarily) and receive a second masters from Tsinghua.  
      i. Under the planned format, students will complete the MSTI, then add 6 months of study.  
      ii. To capitalize on enthusiasm for GIX in China and at Tsinghua, we will get students (mostly Chinese) involved in September 2016 with a cohort that will start at Tsinghua. For this one group only, they will study in Beijing for one year and then join the MSTI program when it starts in September 2017.  
      iii. Shwetak has been working with THU on setting standards, evaluating students, and helping THU create a curriculum that dovetails with MSTI.  
   c. Next track for UW MSTI will be mobile health. Norm Beauchamp will lead the faculty group developing it.  
   d. Clean Energy is a separate collaboration at this time, but we continue to look for connections with GIX.  

2. SPRING DISTRICT BUILDING
   a. Ca. 100K SF building planned in new development in Bellevue.  
      i. Developer Wright Runstad building it to meet requirements we have set.  
      ii. Microsoft will lease it, UW will sublease from them. This is how Microsoft will subsidize the cost to GIX as part of their gift.  
   b. Options for future buildings built into lease with Wright Runstad.
3. TSINGHUA RELATIONSHIP
   a. Two MOUs.
      i. June 2015: established GIX as a collaboration between UW and Tsinghua.
         1. No separate/new legal entity at this time.
   b. Engaged in joint fundraising.
      i. Return trip in January, building on contacts developed during November trip related
to the Innovation Summit.
      ii. Joint efforts providing access to new prospects.
   c. Regular conference calls with key Tsinghua staff.

4. ORGANIZATION
   a. 5-person leadership team.
      i. Vikram Jandhyala and Mary Lidstrom co-CEOs.
      ii. Shwetak Patel Chief Technology Officer.
      iii. David Maddox Chief Operating Officer.
      iv. Lara Littlefield Chief Advancement Officer.
   b. 2 support staff recently hired.

5. FUNDING
   a. Microsoft gift of $39M.
      i. $28M subsidy for facility.
      ii. $10M endowment.
      iii. $1M planning gift.
   b. Anonymous gift to fund most costs for the first three years.
   c. As a self-supporting professional master's degree program, tuition will be a large part of the
financial model.

6. OTHER PARTNERSHIPS
   a. Universities: continuing to work on identifying a UK partner.
   b. Corporations: looking both in China and US for more major corporate partners on the scale of
Microsoft.
      i. Building a funded consortium and project model.
Class A legislation concerning conflict of interest:

**Section 24-50 Conflict of Interest Regarding Appointment, Employment, and Academic Decisions**

A conflict of interest exists when a person participating in a decision has a substantial connection or interest related to individual(s) affected by the decision that might bias or otherwise threaten the integrity of the decision process or that might be perceived by a reasonable person as biasing or threatening such decisions. This includes, familial, romantic, or sexual relationships and financial conflicts of interest. This may also include some professional relationships. No list of rules can provide direction for all the varying circumstances that may arise; good judgement of individuals is essential.

The procedures set forth in this chapter shall apply in all cases, except that no faculty member, department chair, dean or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, or other status or interest of such person's parent, child, spouse, household member, sibling, or in-law a faculty or staff member with whom he or she has a conflict of interest. [See also Executive Order No. 32.]

In addition, no faculty member, department chair, dean or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, promotion, academic status or evaluation of a student with whom he or she has a conflict of interest.

**RATIONALE:** This section is updated to clarify policy on conflict of interest.

The first paragraph is added to define conflict of interest. The second paragraph is modified from existing language to add salary as a decision that may be affected by conflicts of interest.

The third paragraph is added to the Faculty Code, based on Class C legislation passed by the Senate in 1992. (The Class C resolution had been transferred from the University Handbook into the electronic Faculty Code and Governance as a footnote in Section 24-33 (A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility). The content was judged to be a better fit in this section, 24-50, on Conflict of Interest. Because the footnote in 24-33 was not the result of Class A legislation, it is not shown here as existing Code language. It remains on the Senate website as previously approved Class C legislation.

If Class A legislation #136 (merging chapters 24 and 25 of the faculty code and changing the faculty salary policy) is approved, this section (if approved) will be renumbered as Section 24-25.
Class C Resolution Concerning “Black Lives Matter” Statement:

WHEREAS, inherent in the tenets of our mission and values, we as University faculty know that “Black Lives Matter” and support the ideals of social and racial justice and human dignity for ALL including our students, staff, faculty and the communities we serve; and

WHEREAS, the continuing deaths of African American citizens and citizens of African descent at the hand of law enforcement officers raise questions about whether justice and equality are possible for young, impoverished and people of color; and

WHEREAS, what has been ongoing since conquest and slavery, but has recently become high profile – police killings of people of color across the United States – underscore the growing socio economic and social equity gap that threatens the current and future well-being of our students, staff and faculty and communities of color; and

WHEREAS, we as faculty recognize the value of law enforcement institutions engaging in efforts to improve relationships with communities of color and young people, we also acknowledge that problems still exist and immediate improvements are needed on and off campus in order to protect the lives of all students, staff, faculty and communities of color; and

WHEREAS, we believe that the growing income and economic gap between rich and poor in America undermines efforts to increase equality and justice in our criminal justice system, our schools, and our economy here in the United States; and

WHEREAS, we express support of protesters both locally and across the nation who endeavor to express peacefully their concern and frustration at the extra-judicial police killings of people of color; and

WHEREAS, the entire University of Washington community is impacted by racism, poverty and inequality present in our classrooms, offices, streets and communities, and many staff, students and faculty experience the campus as segregated; and

WHEREAS, our students are way out in front of faculty on these matters, and have seen the need to organize, demonstrate and bring their concerns, vision and demands regarding these issues to the University Leadership concerning how the University of Washington can better protect, promote, preserve and support the history, lives and futures of our historically under-represented students, staff and faculty, especially those who are African American and of African descent; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that:

We, the University of Washington faculty as a whole encourage members of the University of Washington Leadership, administration, faculty, staff and student body to explore the concepts of equal justice under the law, racial justice, and institutional racism in their classrooms and other academic settings; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University of Washington leadership support “Black Lives Matter” forums, teach-ins, community meetings, and related peaceful demonstrations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University of Washington as part of its Race and Equity Initiative started by President Cauce reach out to University of Washington Police Department and the Seattle, Tacoma and Bothell Police Departments to promote dialogue between educators and police officers in support of our University community; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that following the examples of Yale, Brown, Columbia and NYU*, the University of Washington immediately commit to desegregating and move towards fully integrating its faculty across all units, by establishing a substantial fund to hire, retain and promote a diverse and inclusive faculty; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the University of Washington Leadership through the Initiative on Race and Equity and any other relevant UW groups that exist or need to be created seek long-term partnerships with other UW and community groups to work towards the following vision: 1) create a campus, community and national model for community policing and review, 2) increase innovative and well-funded programs that identify and address institutional racism in the university setting, 3) dedicate more resources for campus collaborations that provide a path for marginalized young people in the communities we serve into academic and career programs, and 4) work to end institutionalized racism in our criminal justice and educational systems.

*More Colleges ‘Commit’ to Diversity Initiatives*


Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Faculty Council on Women in Academia
January 11, 2016
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Norm Beauchamp.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   a. Approve the November 16, 2015, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the December 3 and December 10, 2015, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Compliance Support Platform – Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.

9. Invited Guests
   a. HR Payroll Modernization Update, Kelli Trosvig, Vice President for UW-IT and CIO, UW Information Technology.
   b. Transforming Administration Program (TAP) Presentation: Paul Jenny, Senior Vice President, Planning and Management and Ruth Johnston, Associate Vice President & Chief of Staff, Planning & Management.

10. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class A legislation – First Consideration
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code regarding conflict of interest.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

   b. Class A legislation – Second Consideration
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code regarding faculty salary policy.
      Action: The second consideration will be acted on at the February 22, 2016 SEC meeting.

   d. Class C Resolution
      Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and Faculty Council on Women in Academia
      Title: Resolution concerning a black lives matter statement.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

12. Good of the Order.

Prepared by:  
Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by:  
Norm Beauchamp, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, February 4 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.