Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, April 2, 2012, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: Evans, Nolen, Christie, Astley, Gregory, Stygall, Fridley, Killien, Young, Holland, McLean, Cauce, Taricani, Plummer, Vogt, Barsness

Guests: Erdly, Wadden, Lee, Dukes

Absent: Baker, Stern, Carline, Philipsen, Johnson, Giebel

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:33pm.

Senate Chair Susan Astley requested one change to the agenda. Due to discussions with the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations and comments just received from the UW’s Attorney General, the president’s office asked for additional time to review the current draft of the diversity legislation with SEC representatives. The diversity Class A Legislation will be postponed until the April 30 SEC meeting and the May 17 Faculty Senate meeting. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – Susan Astley. [Exhibit A]

Senate Chair Astley emphasized points from, and referred SEC members to, her written report.


President Young congratulated Senate Vice Chair Jim Gregory on his role in the successful Unemployed Nation collaboration of local institutions, including the Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies at the University of Washington; the King County Labor Council, AFL-CIO; and the city of Seattle that last week held hearings to listen to the stories of unemployed people and to get information and advice from experts in various fields that deal with employment.

The president provided information on freshman admission offers for 2013, commenting that there was a robust applicant pool and a diverse class was expected. He also shared that he is in discussion with presidents of other major research universities about a plan to collaborate on sharing data from research projects.

President Young provided an update on activities in the state legislature affecting the University of Washington and indicated he hoped there would be an approved budget by June.

There were no questions for the President. Provost Cauce was asked if there were any updates on proposed changes in the faculty retirement plan. She indicated that information about the timeline for changes would be coming to faculty soon and that faculty would not be asked to make any choices before Fall 2012, after opportunities to become fully informed.


a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. [Exhibit E]
e. Report of the Faculty Council Activities. [Exhibit F]

Senate chair Astley introduced Roland “Pete” Dukes to give his quarterly report in his new role as Faculty Athletic Representative. Pete is a professor of accounting and has been at the university since 1979. During his tenure, he has had an association with, and a keen interest in University athletics, one being a member of the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, serving as chair of that group for 3 years. President Young acknowledged Dukes’ contributions during the last seven months while serving as Faculty Athletic Representative. Professor Dukes described
the three main areas of his role: within the institution, with the PAC-12 Council, and working with National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Most of his time is spent focused on internal university matters. He referred SEC members to his written report. In response to questions from SEC members about scheduling of mid-week football games, he indicated that the UW does not have complete control over scheduling but that there will be no games this year on UW campus as games will be played on the Century Link Field. A question was raised about how tuition waivers related to Title IX compliance are funded. Professor Dukes indicated he would check on this and bring an answer back to the SEC.

There were no further questions about the reports.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the February 13, 2012, SEC minutes.
   b. Approval of the March 1, 2012, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   c. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit G]
   d. Approve the April 19, 2012, Faculty Senate agenda. [Exhibit H]

Secretary of the Faculty Killien and Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR) Fridley clarified that Fridley has agreed to continue in his FLR role through the November 2012 elections but then may resign and need to be replaced.

The consent agenda items were approved without further discussion.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.


There were three pieces of Class A legislation, all coming from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. Council Chair Rich Christie introduced each item for its first consideration by the SEC.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration. [Exhibit I]
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 24, Sections 24-52 and 24-53: Revisions Related to Delegation of Authority for Select Faculty Appointments.

The first item, concerning the delegation of authority for select faculty appointments, was discussed at length. Reservations were expressed about minimizing faculty involvement in hiring decisions. Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron suggested that this legislation was requested by the Board of Deans because some units have difficulty in getting a quorum of faculty to act on appointments in a timely manner and this may impede hiring, especially in emergency situations. After discussion an amendment was proposed to allow delegation to an elected faculty committee, but not to a department chair or dean. The legislation, as amended, was approved.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration. [Exhibit J]
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 25, Section 25-32: Revisions Related to “Without Tenure” Appointment Term Length.

The second item concerning changes to “without tenure” appointment term length raised questions for clarification by Vice Provost Cameron. She explained that this legislation concerns senior level appointments to tenure track positions that are made without accompanying tenure. This occurs when there is a desire to give both the candidate and the faculty time to make a tenure commitment. She
explained that these appointments are rare and usually occur in academic units such as Engineering where faculty may be coming from non-academic settings such as industry. An amendment was made to clarify the language of the proposed legislation. The legislation, as amended, was approved.

President Young raised a question about the need for review of the proposed legislation by counsel. Vice Provost Cameron suggested that any such review occur after all possible amendments had been made and approved by the various review bodies.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration. [Exhibit K]
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 24, Section 24-41: Revisions Related to Part Time Lecturer Appointments.

The third item concerned multi-year part time lecturer appointments. After clarifying that such appointments would need to be voted on by all eligible faculty in the academic unit, the proposed legislation was approved without change.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate
Joint Faculty Salary Policy Working Group Update

- President Young established the Joint Faculty Salary Policy Working Group on March 13, 2012, (charge letter). There are a total of 12 members (6 appointed by the Faculty Senate leadership and 6 by the Provost’s Office). The group’s charge is to examine the following 2 questions: 1) over the next 6-12 months, how should we proceed with wage increases under the current salary policy and revenue expectations, and 2) in the longer term, are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? The first meeting of the joint group is scheduled for April 11, 2012.

Class A Legislation, Proposed Code Revisions Related to Faculty Appointment and Promotion

- The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) presented Class A Legislation to the SEC on January 9, 2012. Their proposed changes in the Faculty Code in Section 24-32 are designed to allow that the work done by faculty in research, teaching, and service that enriches diversity at the UW be recognized in the processes of appointment and promotion.

- The Class A Legislation was presented to the Senate for first consideration at the January 26, 2012, meeting. Discussion ensued with members voicing both support and concern for the proposed legislation. After discussion, the Class A Legislation was referred to a committee. The committee was named by the Senate Chair and charged with bringing a revised motion for action at the March 1, 2011, Senate meeting. The revised motion was reviewed and approved by the Senate on March 1. The proposed legislation was approved by President Young on March 15, 2012, and is now before the SEC today for final consideration as Exhibit H.

Intellectual Property and the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form.

- New language regarding assignment of intellectual property has been placed in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form (Rev. October 2011). 

> "With this request for outside work, I acknowledge that I am bound by and I agree to comply with the University Patent, Invention, and Copyright Policy (Executive Order 36) (“Policy”), as it may be amended from time to time. In accordance with this Policy, I will disclose all inventions and discoveries I create to the UW Center for Commercialization, including any that I create in connection with any outside work. I agree to assign and I hereby assign to the University all my rights in any intellectual property to which the University has a right of assignment under the Policy, provided I created such intellectual property in the course of my University activities or responsibilities or with more than incidental use of University resources."

- Faculty members have expressed concern regarding the language, such as: Is this new policy? Why has this language been inserted into this form? Did faculty members with sufficient expertise in IP policy have an opportunity to review/comment on the proposed language prior to its insertion in the Form?

- In the course of looking into this matter, it was discovered that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Board (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010 and apparently no longer exists/functions. EO36 stipulates: "The President of the University will appoint an Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee to review periodically the policy set forth in this statement and recommend such changes to the President as the Committee deems desirable. The Committee will also advise on broader intellectual property issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. The Committee will report to the Vice Provost for Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer and consist of no fewer than five members, a majority of whom shall be chosen from the faculty." Discussions are underway to reinstate IPMAC.

- A meeting was held on March 26, 2012, between Senate leadership, the previous Chair of IPMAC, and administrative members. The group addressed the following agenda items: 1) Reinstatement of IPMAC; 2) The faculty’s request to suspend the “current assignment language” in the October 2011 revision of the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form until
faculty with the necessary expertise (e.g., IPMAC) have had an opportunity to review/comment; and 3) Discuss the reason(s) for insertion of the current assignment language into the form. Is the language consistent with EO 36? How does this language/policy compare with peer institutions? The group agreed to reinstate IPMAC as soon as possible (by mid-April, 2012). The first order of business for IPMAC will be to address items 2 and 3 on the agenda.

**Faculty Effort Certification and Distribution of Indirect Costs**
- Discussions are underway to further address faculty effort certification and policies for managing non-sponsored activity. This topic was first addressed in the SEC on January 9, 2006, (Exhibit B) and continues to be a topic of interest. With few exceptions, salary support for teaching, administration, service, clinical activity, institutional governance and proposal preparation effort must come from non-sponsored funds. One source of non-sponsored funds is indirect costs. A request will be made to review the current distribution of indirect costs as it relates to support of non-sponsored activity.
March 15, 2012

Professor Marcia G. Killien
Secretary of the Faculty
Box 351271

Dear Dr. Killien:

I have reviewed the legislation proposed by the Faculty Senate on March 1, 2012 to amend sections 24-32 and 24-54 of the Faculty Code related to appointment and promotion of faculty.

Although it is not clear that consideration of a candidate’s contributions to diversity and equal opportunity is impermissible without the proposed revisions, I fully recognize the important value of such contributions and acknowledge the possible benefits of highlighting this dimension of a candidate’s qualifications. For this reason, I approve the proposed legislation for consideration by the faculty.

Sincerely,

Michael K. Young

cc: Susan Astley, Chair, Faculty Senate
Ana Mari Cauce, Provost
Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff
Rebecca Deardorff, Director of Rules Coordination
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The following Schools/Colleges/Campuses will hold elections for Senators in Spring 2012, with voting for Senators within the academic units scheduled for April 9-16, 2012.

   UW Bothell
   Built Environment
   Education
   Information
   Law
   Medicine
   Pharmacy
   Public Affairs
   ROTC

2. Members of the Nominating Committee for the election of SEC members for 2012-13 are being finalized, SEC nominees will be announced at the May 17 Faculty Senate meeting.

3. Nominations for the University Faculty Lecture Award will be due April 20. Senators are urged to consider nominating colleagues. Detailed information about the nomination process and deadlines was sent to all voting faculty and to academic units on March 27.

4. The Office of University Committees is in the process of nominating members for the various Faculty Councils and committees for 2012-13. Please send nominations to the Secretary of the Faculty at secfac@uw.edu . We will contact all nominees to determine their interest in serving. All voting faculty have received a survey on which they can express an interest in serving on a Faculty Council or Committee.

5. The Secretary of the Faculty has been invited to several academic units this spring to talk with their faculty on topics of interest, including Academic Freedom and Shared Governance. The Secretary is happy to meet with the faculty in their academic units at any time.
SCPB has met three times since the last Senate meeting. SCPB heard from V’Ella Warren on February 27, 2012, on the LEAN program, the improvement and cost savings program for the administrative side of the university. The LEAN program has had the most impact on the financial division and facilities. Some savings achievements were gained through loss of positions, although some care allowed for most of the savings to be made through attrition was than direct job losses. Their website is [http://f2.washington.edu/fm/leaders/leadership-fm/lean](http://f2.washington.edu/fm/leaders/leadership-fm/lean).

The State Budget remains unknown at this point. Negotiations continue between the House and the Senate. At the March 5 meeting, we had the annual consultation with the Provost about faculty salaries, which are again subject to a state freeze. Provost Cauce discussed administrative plans for possible salary increases after this current fiscal year. Provost Cauce also reviewed her letter to deans about the necessary level of merit review. Merit review for all assistant professors and those anticipating promotion from the associate professor level should undergo a regular review. All others may undergo a less complicated review, possibly merit/no-merit only.

The Joint Administration and Faculty Salary Committee has been appointed and they will carry the discussion forward, being charged with developing both short and longer terms plans. The members, appointed by President Michael Young, are as follows:
- Provost Ana Mari Cauce
- Professor Susan Astley, Faculty Senate Chair
- Dean Thomas Baillie, School of Pharmacy
- Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron, Academic Personnel
- Professor James Gregory, Faculty Senate Vice Chair
- Professor Paul Hopkins, Department of Chemistry
- Mr. Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff, Office of the President
- Professor John M. (Jack) Lee, Department of Mathematics
- Interim Dean Robert Stacey, College of Arts and Sciences
- Professor Gail Stygall, Chair, SCPB
- Professor Miceal Vaughan, Department of English
- Executive Vice Provost, Doug Wadden

The members of the committee will keep SCPB, the SEC and the Senate updated on the committee’s work.

At the March 12 SCPB meeting, we also heard from Phil Ballinger, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment, on current projections for next fall’s entering class, which will look similar to this year’s class in size and make-up. We also received the quarterly report from Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron on retentions. Provost Cauce notified us that, because there are important budget considerations, the UW Faculty/Staff and Washington State Employee Exemption Program is being modified to allow for changes in the waiver policy for “financial or other considerations.” Several UW schools and colleges have reviewed the tuition exemption program for its fiscal impact. Several have significant numbers of students with waivers for tuition and would like to be able to adopt appropriate mixes of students. The policy was reviewed and adopted by the Board of Regents.

Finally, for the next several weeks, we will concentrate on trial budget proposals at various tuition increases and on budget narratives from the schools and colleges. I encourage everyone to read your college or school’s budget narrative, available on the website of the Office of Planning and Budgeting. These narratives may be found at the following URL:

[http://opb.washington.edu/content/annual-budget-discussions-provost-fy13](http://opb.washington.edu/content/annual-budget-discussions-provost-fy13)

If you have questions after reading your school or college budget narrative, please contact me, stygall@u.washington.edu.
This past November, facing severe cash flow problems, Governor Gregoire called the state legislature into a special 30 day session and asked them to immediately get to work on passing a supplemental budget. At the conclusion of that special session Marty Brown, director of the state’s office of financial management, proclaimed that the legislature had left themselves a very large budget problem to solve in the 2012 regular session – by addressing their most immediate problem not taking even just the “low hanging fruit” but instead by taking only “the fruit already lying on the ground.” So when the 2012 regular session ended with a sigh and a yawn, but no supplemental operating or capital budgets, around midnight on the evening of Thursday March 8, it seemed that Mr. Brown’s assessment had been pretty much right on. Without a new budget the state will be broke before the end of the biennium (June 30, 2013) so the Governor immediately called the legislature back to work for yet another 30 day special session. This one must be adjourned by April 10.

Throughout the final days of the regular session and the first two weeks of the current special session it has become evident that the legislature, perhaps mostly through their own drawing of lines in the sand, has gotten themselves stuck. The budget and its associated policy bills must pass both the state senate (requiring 25 votes) and the house (requiring 50 votes) and then be signed by the governor (as she likes to say requiring one additional vote). They don’t appear to be able to find a combination of budget and policy changes that will meet that amount of approval but legislators are people and getting unstuck really is as simple as just deciding to do so, so they could change their minds and come to an agreement tomorrow or they could take weeks and weeks to do so.

The good news for higher education and the University of Washington is that the conversation in the legislature has changed drastically from recent years and there is now good support for finally stopping the practice of cutting higher education to balance the state budget. This is almost entirely due to recognition that Washington’s higher education “system” is very efficient and effective, important to the state and of very high quality – its only real problem is that it is expensive and there isn’t enough of it. It currently appears that all “five corners” (house and senate “R’s” and “D’s” plus the governor) want a no-cuts to higher education budget. Getting “unstuck” will be a challenge for them though so we will see if they can hold to their “no cuts to education” budget plans or if they resort to solving the problem in the way that, as they have repeatedly shown us in recent years, they already know how to do.

During the regular session the legislature did pass a number of bills directly affecting postsecondary education in our state. A summary of these, copied from materials provided by the Senate Committee Services office is appended. As always, for concise and accurate information about legislative proposals for the budget I urge you to look at the briefs prepared and posted by the UW’s Office of Planning and Budgeting. Feel very free to call or email me if you have any questions about the budget proposals or any other bills before or passed by the legislature.

Respectfully submitted:
Jim Fridley
Professor and Faculty Legislative Representative
(MOST OF) THE BILLS RELATED TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION THAT PASSED IN 2012

All of the information below was copied verbatim from the Senate Committee Services website

SSB 5217: ALLOWING APPOINTMENT OF STUDENT MEMBERS ON THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
- Authorizes a college district board of trustees to establish a sixth trustee that must be filled by a student.

SSB 6121: REQUIRING THE OFFICE OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE A FINANCIAL AID COUNSELING CURRICULUM FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
*Signed by the Governor*
- Requires the Office of Student Financial Assistance to provide an online financial aid counseling curriculum to all higher education institutions participating in the State Need Grant (SNG) program by July 1, 2013.
- Requires the curriculum to include specific elements, such as an explanation of SNG program rules, an overview of student loan options and consequences, an overview of financial literacy, and student perspectives.
- Requires higher education institutions to take reasonable steps to ensure that each SNG recipient receives the financial aid counseling curriculum by referencing or linking to a website on the SNG Conditions of Award statement by the 2013-14 academic year.
- Allows institutions to also require non-SNG students to participate in the counseling.

2SHB 2156: REGARDING COORDINATION AND EVALUATION OF WORKFORCE TRAINING FOR AEROSPACE AND MATERIALS MANUFACTURING
- Requires the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, with certain training providers, to facilitate coordination and alignment of aerospace training programs.
- Requires an advisory committee of industry representatives, labor representatives, and training providers to perform certain duties, such as recommending training programs for review.
- Requires the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to evaluate certain training programs every year and analyze the results of the training system every four years.
*HB 2292 is incorporated in its entirety into 2SHB 2156, as described below:

- Makes available the Aerospace Training Student Loan Program to students enrolled in aerospace industry courses offered by Renton Technical College.

SHB 2254: ENACTING THE EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS FOR YOUTH AND ALUMNI OF FOSTER CARE ACT
- Extends the Passport to College Promise program from June 30, 2013, to June 30, 2022.
- Automatically enrolls foster children in grades 7-12, or ages 18-21 who have not graduated from high school in the College Bound Scholarship program.
- Requires the Department of Social and Health Services to contract with at least one nongovernmental entity to administer a program of education coordination for foster youth, to the extent that funds are appropriated. School districts must to work together to facilitate credit acquisition and on-time graduation for foster youth.
- Requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to report on the implementation status of the state’s plan for cross-system collaboration to promote educational stability and improve educational outcomes of foster youth in consultation with others by December 1, 2012, and annually through December 1, 2015.
- Transfers reporting requirements with respect to educational experiences and progress of students in foster care from SPI to the Education Research and Data Center.

SHB 2259: ELIMINATING CERTAIN DUPLICATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
- Repeals requirements in state law for institutions of higher education related to crime statistics reporting and campus safety plan development.

HB 2292: INCLUDING RENTON TECHNICAL COLLEGE IN THE AEROSPACE TRAINING STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
*HB 2292 is incorporated in its entirety into 2SHB 2156.

SHB 2313: CONCERNING THE MEETING PROCEDURES OF THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES AND BOARDS OF REGENTS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
• Restates that the governing boards of institutions of higher education must follow the procedures for open public meetings required under the Open Public Meetings Act.
• Requires the governing boards to provide time for public comment at meetings.
• Requires each governing board to make public its proposal for tuition and fee increases 21 days before the governing board considers adoption and allow opportunity for public comment. This requirement does not apply if the omnibus appropriations act has not passed the Legislature by May 15.

**SHB 2352: CONCERNING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES FEES**
• Requires institutions of higher education to annually post Services and Activities Fees expenditure information on their website by September 30. The information must be clearly visible and easily accessible.
• Requires the Services and Activities Fees budget information to include, at a minimum, all the major categories of expenditure and amounts expended in each category.

**ESSHB 2483: REGARDING HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATION**
• Creates the Student Achievement Council (Council) to propose goals for increasing the educational attainment in Washington and to monitor progress toward meeting those goals, propose improvements and innovations needed for educational attainment, and to advocate for higher education.
• Creates a nine-member council, made up of five citizens, one of which is a student, and one representative each from the following: the four-year institutions; community and technical college system; the independent, non-profit institutions; and the K-12 education system.
• Requires the Council to appoint an executive director, to be appointed by the Governor from a list of three names submitted by the Council.
• Moves the Office of Student Financial Assistance under the direction of the Council.
• Creates a Joint Higher Education Committee to review the work of the Council and provide legislative feedback; to create greater communication, coordination, and alignment between the higher education system and expectations of the Legislature; and provide recommendations for higher education policy. The Committee is made up of four senators and four representatives.

**3SHB 2585: CREATING EFFICIENCIES FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**
• Allows institutions of higher education to do the following: (1) make advance payments for equipment maintenance services to be performed up to 60 months after such payment, rather than the current 12 months; (2) implement compensation changes for health care special pay classifications and other identified health care classifications, without getting approval from the Human Resources Director at the Office of Financial Management; (3) require salary and wage payments via direct deposit or alternate payment methods such as payroll cards; and (4) use appropriate means for making and paying for travel arrangements.
• No longer requires formal competitive bidding processes for purchases or personal services contracts at institutions of higher education under $100,000. However, institutions of higher education must include quotations from at least three vendors and keep documented evidence of these quotations for audit purposes for purchases between $10,000 and $100,000.
• Makes local operating fee accounts subject to allotment procedures by budget program and fiscal year and requires allotments to be spent in such a ratio as to conserve appropriated funds.
• Requires institutions of higher education to report on the amount of savings from this Act and how such savings were used to promote student academic success by January 1, 2017.

**ESSB 6486: GRANTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR POSTDOCTORAL AND CLINICAL EMPLOYEES AT CERTAIN STATE UNIVERSITIES**
• Allows postdoctoral and clinical researchers employed by the University of Washington and the Washington State University who are excluded from collective bargaining as faculty to participate in collective bargaining under the provisions of the Public Employees’ Collective Bargaining Act.
The first seven months of my new role as the University of Washington Faculty Athletics Representative has been a fast paced learning experience. The role involves more day to day oversight of eligibility issues, academic performance issues, and medical issues than I would have expected. That said, I am confident and comfortable with performing these duties and more generally monitoring the world of our student athletes.

Thanks in large measure to prior efforts and initiatives by my predecessor, Professor Pat Dobel, and the senior leadership team at the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA), I can report that from my perspective, the welfare of our student athletes is well monitored and supported by the University and ICA. Procedures and policies are in place to ensure that student athletes are in compliance with University, Pac-12 Conference, and NCAA rules, regulations and requirements. Further, our student athletes are getting the advising and academic support they need to succeed as students. I appreciate that during this rapid learning phase of my assignment I have not had to deal with any major student, university or conference issues.

There are, however, issues that will require continued attention and assessment. These deal largely with Pac-12 Conference and NCAA changes that are being considered. Specifically, with the evolution of the Pac-10 into the Pac-12, there are new marketing, media and exposure issues that can and will affect our student athletes. The Pac-12 has entered into media contracts that will require Conference football and basketball programs to schedule midweek competitions. My fellow Pac-12 FARs and I are constantly monitoring this and are looking for ways to minimize the impact on our student athletes. For example, the senior leadership of ICA have requested that if Washington is scheduled for a midweek football game, that the game be scheduled in September before the start of Autumn Quarter. We will also be working to minimize the missed class time associated with midweek basketball games.

At the NCAA level, the former President of the University of Washington, Mark Emmert, is leading a number of initiatives that focus on improving the welfare of student athletes, that reduce the bureaucracy of rules of the NCAA, that increase the focus on having student athletes succeed academically, and that take aim at eliminating and, when appropriate, providing severe penalties to egregious situations of non-compliance with NCAA rules and regulations. Mark and his leadership team is attempting to implement several paradigm shift type changes by appealing directly to university presidents and other CEOs of member institutions rather than having such changes emanate from the normal membership driven Committees, Cabinets and Councils. The ICA senior leadership team and I are generally in agreement with supporting the initiatives that are coming from Mark Emmert and the university presidents. However, there is a great deal of resistance by some conferences and athletic departments at some institutions. Change will come more slowly than Mark would have expected and hoped for.

Nonetheless, I feel many of these changes are desirable and will be working to support them. Specially, there is an initiative that would allow institutions to provide financial support to student athletes that would cover the “full cost of attendance” at their institution. Currently costs that can be covered by student athlete grant-in-aids are: tuition and books, room and board. Every student, be they student athlete or not, has expenses beyond these four items. The NCAA is requesting that institutions have the option to include in financial support for student athletes a very modest allowance these other sundry costs, and in general cover these other costs associated with being a regular student beyond the four covered items listed above. This is a controversial topic with many NCAA member institutions, I believe in part because they cannot afford to do it and thus do not want other institutions to do it.

In general I am pleased with the academic success our student athletes are enjoying. Our graduation rates are second only to Stanford in the Conference, and our student athletes are performing at academic achievement levels very similar to our overall student body. To be this successful our student athletes need considerable academic support in the form of advising, counseling, and from time to time, tutoring. I am pleased that the senior leadership of ICA recognizes its responsibility in these areas and is providing the resources needed to support our student athletes. My primary efforts will continue to be looking out for the welfare of student athletes at Washington, working to help them succeed as students.
Report of the Faculty Council Activities  
April 2, 2012

**Faculty Council on Academic Standards**

In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:
1. Implementation of revised satisfactory progress policy
2. Enrollment restrictions imposed on students in fee-based programs
3. Potential diversity graduation requirement
4. Academic rigor

**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement**

1. Monitor proposed legislation related to benefits and retirement and provide feedback to the UW Benefits Office
2. Review benefits costs including health, life and long-term disability and retirement plan costs and personal cost options and ensure consistency and comparability with best practices for such plans
3. Provide through the faculty senate process information to faculty regarding benefits and retirement

**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

Current Agenda Items (Short Form):

1. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.

**Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs**

FCMA has drafted and proposed changes to the Faculty Code in order to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions. Additionally, FCMA has provided feedback to ASUW regarding their proposed Diversity Requirement for Undergraduates.

**Faculty Council on Research**

FCR is continuing to monitor and promote activities strengthening the research environment at the University (our goal as stated in October, 2010).

One of FCR’s activities is to review proposals from UW researchers containing restrictions of various sorts (publication policies, personnel, data transfer, etc). FCR dealt with one such proposal of this sort fall quarter and another during the winter quarter.

At FCR’s monthly meetings over the fall and winter, FCR has heard several presentations by the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Research personnel on items including challenges for the Research at UW, changes in the Grants Information Memoranda, conflict of interest training, revision of federal Human Subjects regulations, the impact of Activity Based Budgeting model on research, changes in compliance rules for human and animal research, the HHS Salary Cap, and the revised “Request for
Outside Work” form. Additionally, FCR received a report on the federal research funding environment from UW Federal Relations.”

---

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students, including recent topics on admissions policies and standards, campus renovations, revisions within the Student Conduct Code, student-athlete issues (sports psychology and missed class time), and the faculty appeal board.

---

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

FCTL continues to discuss strategies for faculty development in the use of educational technology, issues of using technology to increase class size, and increasing student engagement. Current agenda items include technology priorities across campus (Canvas, Tegrity and e-texts), competency based learning models, new IASystem (electronic course evaluation system), working to resolve Classroom Support Services issues and discussions with the Senate Chair and Provost on their sense of priorities in the area of teaching and learning.

---

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

1. Conducting a review of tri-campus information dissemination and faculty member representation between the three faculty governance structures
2. Examined processes for issues related to student conduct code violations and how they are disseminated and treated if/when student seeks cross-campus enrollment
3. Examination of processes for reviewing cross-campus degrees/minors
4. Coordinated Faculty Senate communication of tri-campus awareness regarding governance, policies, new issues, budget, etc
5. Budget and legislative representation related to tri-campus strategic planning

---

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services FCUFS continues to examine current construction projects, including the Stadium, HUB, housing west of 15th, Intellectual House, UW / Children’s Hospital Housing, and police relocation from the Bryant Building. Other topics have included the impact of Sound Transit at the edge of campus, the UW Smartgrid Project, 520 bridge expansion, bicycles, and the Burke-Gilman Trail.
Faculty Council on University Libraries

1. Implementation of the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence, as approved by the Faculty Senate. Fund website is located at https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift?source_typ=3&source=LIBFAC.
2. Facilitation of Open Access publishing at the UW. The FCUL will continue to seek to engage faculty and students in submitting documentation of their past, current, and future research (i.e., archival and grey literature) to the open access repository ResearchWorks.
3. Strengthening educational partnerships/ the development of a sustainable academic business plan. The FCUL will continue to investigate ways to bring emerging Libraries technologies and initiatives into UW courses. The strategic plan will consider a wide variety of issues, including fee-based and distance courses and programs.
4. Employment of multi-institutional approaches. The FCUL will provide input to continuing Libraries efforts to lead and leverage multi-institutional Libraries initiatives, related to e.g., the Hathi Trust, the Western Storage Trust, and Orbis Cascade activities.
5. Libraries issues related to capital projects. The FCUL will continue to monitor the Odegaard renovation and the provision of HUB services in the Libraries.
6. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009-2011 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.
7. General planning for collections, services, and staff. The FCUL will advise the Libraries on changes in collections, services, and staff in support of its strategic plan and necessitated by continuing budget constraints. Initial topics include the subject librarian framework, physical and virtual space planning, etc.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

1. Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty – Dissemination of the report based on last year's work of FCWA, and follow up with administration to pursue report recommendations.
2. Faculty Mentoring Program –
   a. Follow-up on creation of sub-committee on mentoring by Board of Deans, providing information gathered by FCWA in 2010-11 and supplementing that information as required
   b. Development of “Faculty Matters” memos relevant to all faculty, with emphasis on women, garnered from issues raised in FCWA surveys of both ladder and non-ladder faculty
3. Review of issues relevant to women on campus.

Reminder: Approved council minutes are always available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html
2011-2012 Representative (Ex-officio) Faculty Council and Committee Nominations

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 10:30)

- Diane Guerra, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)

- Deva Wells, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Legislative Representative

- Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Sciences and Mechanical Engineering, as the 2012-13 Faculty Legislative Representative.
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor James Susan Astley.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of February 13, 2012, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
      ii. Approval of March 1, 2012, Faculty Senate Minutes.
      iii. Report of the Faculty Council Activities.
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
   e. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative.

5. Consent Agenda.
   Confirm Jim Fridley, Professor of Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as 2012-2013
   Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2012 and ending July 31, 2013.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 24, Sections 24-52 and 24-53: Revisions Related to Delegation of
      Authority for Select Faculty Appointments.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the
      faculty for approval or rejection.
   b. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 25, Section 25-32: Revisions Related to “Without Tenure”
      Appointment Term Length.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the
      faculty for approval or rejection.
   c. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Title: Code Revisions to Chapter 24, Section 24-41: Revisions Related to Part Time Lecturer
      Appointments.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the
      faculty for approval or rejection.

10. Good of the Order.

11. Adjournment.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate
Delegation of Authority for Select Faculty Appointments
Class A Legislation Proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Chapter 24-52 and 24-53
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Rich Christie, FCFA Chair

Many academic units must make and renew hundreds of important, but limited or courtesy, faculty appointments, such as affiliate faculty, clinical faculty, research associate and part-time lecturer, each year. The option to delegate the authority for executing these appointment recommendations, because they are often individualized or time sensitive in nature, is viewed as providing desirable efficiencies in the appointment process.

The proposed changes to the Faculty Code §24-52 and §24-53 authorize the delegation of these appointment recommendations to the department chair or a committee of faculty. As a safeguard, the delegation must be annually authorized by a majority vote of the voting faculty members of an academic unit.

The language of the proposed change follows, with proposed additions underlined.

Section 24–52 Procedure for New Appointments

A. Faculty recommendations of appointments are ordinarily rendered through committees, and the procedure depends upon the level of appointment.

1. For recommendation of a departmental appointment other than that of chair, the department members act as an advisory appointment committee. A department may delegate this responsibility to a departmental committee.

2. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a department chair should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean of the appropriate college, or if the President so desires, by the President.

3. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a dean should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the President.

B. The duty of an appointment committee is to search for suitable candidates, to study and determine their qualifications (Sections 24–32 to 24–36), and to obtain and evaluate all data related to the problem of appointment. When, after such a study, the committee finds a candidate or candidates who appear to be qualified it shall transmit its information and recommendation to:

1. The department chair, if the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, or

2. The appropriate dean, if the appointment is to be one of a department chair, or

3. The President, if the appointment is to be one of a dean.

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The majority of the voting faculty of an academic unit may delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected departmental committee. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected college or school committee. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Recommendations in favor of appointment, based on a majority vote of such members or on the delegated authority of the faculty, shall be sent with pertinent information to the appropriate dean. If the chair concurs in the department recommendation, the dean shall make a decision.
concerning the appointment and, if it is favorable, shall transmit it together with the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President. In the unusual case where the chair does not concur in the department recommendation, he or she may communicate objections to the dean and may also submit a separate recommendation to the dean from among the candidates who have been considered by the department. If the dean concurs in the chair's recommendation, or has additional information which raises doubts concerning the department's recommendation, or finds that the President has such information, the dean shall refer the matter again to the department along with an explanation and comments. After considering the evidence, the department may then either reaffirm its original recommendation, or transmit a new one. If the department's final recommendation has been sent to the dean, the dean shall refer to the appointment and, if an appointment is to be recommended, shall transmit it together with the final recommendation of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President.

2. If the appointment is to be one of a department chair, the dean shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision. The department concerned shall be consulted in making the appointment, but a formal vote is not required.

3. If the appointment is to be one of a dean, the President shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 24, June 23, 1959: both with Presidential approval.

Section 24–53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24–41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non–renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24–34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The majority of the voting faculty of an academic unit may delegate authority to recommend the renewal of all affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected departmental committee. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected college or school committee. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24–41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.

D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non–renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 41, April 3, 1972; S–A 60, June 25, 1979; S–A 81, January 30, 1990; S–A 94, October 24, 1995; S–A 124, July 5, 2011: all with Presidential approval.
Changes to “Without Tenure” Appointment Term Length
Class A Legislation Proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Chapter 25-32
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Rich Christie, FCFA Chair

The Faculty Code §25-32 presently provides that appointment as associate or full professor “without tenure” is for a term of not more than three years. While this term has proven sufficient for faculty hired from other institutions who have existing academic research programs, some units find that “without tenure” hires from industry need more time to transition to academic research and properly establish their research program.

Recognizing the value to the University of faculty with significant industrial experience, the proposed change to the Faculty Code will allow “without tenure” faculty appointments to be made either for a term of not more than three years, as at present, or for a term of three years with a possibility of renewal for another three years.

Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

A. Unless he or she is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:
1. He or she is a professor or associate professor; or
2. He or she has held full-time rank as assistant professor in the University for seven or more years and has not received the prescribed notice terminating his or her appointment.

B. Generally, recommendation for tenure (Section 25-41) is made concurrently with recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor (except in the circumstances listed in the subsequent paragraphs of this section.) Only under exceptional circumstances may a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor be recommended for tenure without promotion.

C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:
1. An acting appointment, or
2. A visiting appointment, or
3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, principal lecturer, or
4. Any initial appointment specified to be without tenure, or
5. An adjunct appointment, or
6. A research appointment, or
7. A clinical appointment, or
8. An affiliate appointment, or
9. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment. Each appointment governed by this provision shall contain notice whether tenure may or may not be acquired.

D. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor “without tenure,” as specified in Subsection C.4 above are limited to not more than three years. They at the time of appointment shall be limited to not more than three years. In the alternative, at the time of appointment a “without tenure” appointment may provide for the option of a second three year appointment if renewal is granted. In such case the appointment provisions in Section 24-41A are applicable. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor “without tenure by reason of funding,” as specified in Subsection C.9 above, are continuing appointments governed by Chapter 24, Section 24-41.
E. A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of his or her appointment with the agreement of his or her department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in his or her part-time appointment.

F. A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Chapter 24, Section 24-45 accumulates eligibility for tenure under Subsection A of this section.

G. Time spent on leaves of absence from the University does not count in the accumulation of time toward tenure.

Multi-Year Part Time Lecturer Appointments
Class A Legislation Proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Chapter 24, Section 24-41
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Rich Christie, FCFA Chair

There is a desire in an academic unit to make a multi-year part-time offer to one or more lecturers. The unit believes that a multi-year offer will be more competitive with outside competition for high quality candidates.

FCFA sees no reason not to permit this, with certain safeguards, and proposes changes to the Faculty Code section 21-41B to permit longer appointments. There are no very obvious reasons for the one year appointment limit currently in the Faculty Code, and the idea of improved lecturer quality is attractive.

Multi-year offers require greater attention to the search process than shorter appointments. The proposed change requires these appointments to be reviewed by the Provost to ensure that the proper search process is employed.

The language of the proposed change follows, with additions underlined and deletions with a strikeout.

Section 24–41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

A. The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in Subsection D. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three–year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a full–time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. Appointment as a part–time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less.

   The normal appointment period of a part–time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.
2. Appointment as a full–time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost. Appointment as a part–time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less.

The normal appointment period of a part–time senior lecturer, principal lecturer or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24–53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Part–time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24–53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

C. A full–time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

D. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state–appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state–appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

E. The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50% of full–time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than 50% of full–time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

F. The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three–year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or
b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended
to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research
assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor,
associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure;
b. The appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases b
and c the appointment is extended by one year.

4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second
appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide
whether:
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor,
associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or
b. The appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.

5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to
this section.

G. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, research assistant professors are subject to
removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25–51), for
termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25–52.)

H. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of
their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25–51), for termination of
funding as defined in Subsection I, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section
25–52.)

I. Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain
funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University
is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.

J. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when
there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that
the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall
be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research
grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall
be converted to initial three–year appointments in conformance with Subsection G.

K. The procedures prescribed in Section 24–53 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24–54 for
Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 31, December 28, 1966; S–A 41, April 3, 1972; S–A 42, June 9, 1972;
S–A 49, December 4, 1975; S–A 62, December 2, 1980; S–A 64, May 29, 1981; S–A 67, December 5,
1983; S–A 68, April 19, 1984; S–A 81, January 30, 1990; S–A 98, May 12, 1998; S–A 102, July 7, 2000;
S–A 108, June 21, 2002: all with Presidential approval; RC, June 19, 2008; S–A 124, July 5, 2011 with
Presidential approval.