1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m.; the agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Senate Chair.

Senate Chair JW Harrington’s written report is presented in attached {Exhibit A}.

Harrington reported orally on other issues. The Faculty Code (Chapter 22-60, Section B, Item 12) notes that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) “Shall act for the Senate during the period from the last Senate meeting in the Spring Quarter until the first meeting in the Autumn Quarter, and shall report such actions at the first Senate meeting in the Autumn Quarter.” He reported that given the number of issues the University faces and the need to ensure the possibility of official faculty input into continuing issues, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) has set dates for possible SCPB meetings, and dates have been set for possible SEC meetings during the summer. Meeting information will be sent to SEC members soon and will be posted on the Faculty Senate Website. He asked everyone to please put the dates on their calendars, and emphasized that these are contingent dates, if there are not pressing matters, the meetings will be canceled.

Harrington informed members that Human vs Zombies is taking place this week; just be aware.

At the March 10, meeting of the Faculty Senate, Senator Janelle Taylor asked about faculty oversight of online courses, in reaction to the recent news articles that the University plans to double online course offerings. At that meeting, Harrington indicated that he would look into the matter to determine whether a Council Chair, or two, should lead a discussion of this at the next SEC meeting (April 4).

Harrington went on to say that he had since asked Professor Taylor for more detail on her questions, and she replied: “My questions concern faculty oversight over curriculum standards & content, but also who is teaching these classes (tenure track faculty? adjuncts? graduate students?), their pay and workload and benefits and protections, and also the possibility that if the university is expanding its online offerings while contracting departments and programs and tenure track faculty positions, this may represent a real erosion of the tenure system and all it entails.”

Harrington formulated some specific questions for those who play key roles directly and indirectly in this process. They were John Schaufelberger, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards; Jan Carlene, Chair, Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning; Rich Christie, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, David Szatmary, Vice Provost for UW Educational Outreach; Doug Wadden, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Harrington’s findings follow.

This year, the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL) has discussed issues of CAI [computer-aided instruction] use, particularly with the strategy of using CAI to increase capacity without increasing faculty. There are a couple of individuals currently doing literature reviews in this area, and there likely will be further discussions in FCTL on these issues. The Council has developed its own questions in this area, but indicated now would be an excellent time for modification or addition to these topics.

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) addressed the curriculum issue. In order for a department to offer a course online, it must be approved by the University Curriculum Committee, even if it is a course that is currently offered in a classroom. The department submitting the course approval request must include a distance learning supplement with each course request.
While the University of Washington Educational Outreach (UWEO) has an online learning staff, an academic department is not required to go through UWEO to offer a course online. Many online instructors are regular teaching faculty who teach online as a part of their normal teaching load. Part-time faculty who teach online should be reviewed by department faculty in the same manner as part-time faculty who are appointed to teach on campus.

The policies for review of individual courses were established by FCAS, but FCAS reviews programs and not individual courses. Any course change must be reviewed by department faculty, a college curriculum committee, and the dean before being submitted to the University Curriculum Committee for approval. As far as is known, there is no centralized support for online courses, other than those offered in partnership with UWEO.

In answer to the question does UWEO still play a key role in online course offerings because of the medium of instruction, or does UWEO focus on the support of “fee-based” courses and programs, regardless of the medium, UWEO had this to say. This is not a clear yes or no. UWEO does focus on support of “fee-based” courses and programs, regardless of the medium. However, UWEO also still plays a key role in online course development because of the medium of instruction. UWEO has an online department that provides the essential services necessary to produce high-quality online courses such as instructional design, multi-media production, LMS [Learning Management System] hosting of courses and student services.

In addition,

1. UWEO provides the infrastructure support and administration for fee-based online credit and noncredit programs. Because the UW has very little state-supported infrastructure for online classes, the vast majority of online classes are fee-based and administered through UWEO. Additionally, the UW does have some central (e.g. Catalyst) and departmentally based educational technology support, though this differs from the infrastructure to develop and offer completely online courses.

2. The pilot to offer online classes to UW matriculated undergraduates through the time schedule has been vetted extensively with the Regents (twice), the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (three times), students, academic units and the administration. Since the Autumn of 2009, UWEO has offered 36 online course sections to 3,013 enrollees. As Council Chair Schaufelberger indicated, ALL of the academic aspects of the classes (faculty, curriculum, scheduling, etc.) are determined by the appropriate academic unit. We have surveyed the faculty and students about their experiences, and the majority in both groups found the courses to be satisfying and worthwhile.

Harrington indicated that the responses from UWEO were valuable in:
1. Reminding me that the basis of the “doubling of online courses” publicized in the press may well be our slow but growing movement to allow currently matriculated students to take online courses for a fee when other formats are full or not available.
2. Reiterating that it’s up to each academic unit (department or non-departmentalized school) to decide whether to offer online courses, and to decide how to staff them, and that the instructors of undergraduate online courses I mention above are paid for this work at a rate determined by the academic unit.
3. Providing multidimensional assessments of those courses.

Online Classes for Matriculated UW Undergraduates, via pilot program administered through UWEO:

15 (43%) Lecturer Part-Time
9 (26%) Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor
7 (20%) Predoctoral Instructor
2 (6%) Lecturer Full Time
2 (6%) Affiliate Assistant Professor
One thing to consider is to track course instruction by rank. Harrington will follow up with Professor Taylor on how to proceed with getting some kind of regular update.


President Wise began her report by announcing that the House budget was released today (April 4). However, she had not had time to look at the information prior to the meeting. The Senate budget is due for release next week. Obviously, there is still much to be reconciled before a final budget is approved. However, any final budget scenario will leave a very large gap in the University’s funding. The Legislature is scheduled to end on April 24, 2011, but it is unlikely their work will be completed by that date.

Provost Lidstrom has completed budget meetings with deans and is nearly completed meeting with vice provosts and vice presidents. She is currently collating the information for use in determining budget allocations. She was very rigorous in asking for information on specific programs within each unit, whether or not they were high quality, central to the mission, allowed for leverage in the program, and their affordability.

The University continues to move forward with the 2y2d initiative; an initiative “to ensure that our near-term actions are in line with our shared long-term strategic priorities. This includes near-term budgetary decisions.” The President and others are in the process of meeting with various campus stakeholders. To date, the group has heard from 3,700 people; meeting face to face with 1,000 people; by survey, receiving responses from 2,500 staff members. Work is also continuing on the three initiatives under the “2y” umbrella, they are the Sustainable Academic Business Plan, Program Evaluation Initiative and Organizational Effectiveness Initiative. The information derived from these initiatives is important for University budget planning.

President Wise announced the recipients of the Harry S. Truman, and Barry M. Goldwater scholarship awards. They are as follows:

The Harry S. Truman Scholar is Andrew Lewis, History and Political Science Major.

The Four Goldwater Scholars are:
Mark Bun, Computer Science and Mathematics Major
Conducting Research with James Morrow, Mathematics Department

Benjamin William Dulken, Bioengineering Major
Conducting Research with Suzie Pun, Bioengineering Department

Jane Hung, Physics and Mathematics Major
Conducting Research with Xiaosong Li, Chemistry Department

Cameron William Turtle, Bioengineering Major
Conducting Research with HAMM Lab working with Michael Regnier, Bioengineering Department

In answer to several questions, the President went on to say that the federal budget is not in any better shape than our state budget. The deadline to approve a federal budget is April 8. There are some in D.C. who would like to take the budget back to the 2008 levels. This would result in a huge decrease in federal funding. In a recent visit to Washington D.C., President Wise was able to meet with Washington State’s entire delegation, which is a rarity. In her discussions, she asked them to keep in mind that cutting the budget means cutting jobs. She also reminded them that the University of Washington is heavily dependent on federal funding for research.

The rancor in Washington D.C. was noted, and the question was asked, in regards to our State legislature, how well do the two parties work together. In answer, President Wise believes that the Higher Education Committees work very well together. She further noted that personal contact by the campus community with the Legislature has been in larger numbers this year. In addition there has been a Regents day and students are also meeting with legislators. In order to moderate the
transition of some students to increased tuition, the University has committed to Husky Promise, without changes, for another year. Some students will feel the full impact of the increased tuition while others will receive more help.

A final question was asked in regards to whether or not the legislature is aware of the concept of differential tuition. The answer is, yes. The University recently met with Paul Courant, the head of the University of Michigan Libraries, who was the Provost when Michigan began its Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) model. Since the University is moving towards an ABB model, it is important to note that Michigan does have differential tuition. However, there is not a great deal of difference between the first year’s tuition and last two. Michigan has direct admissions into virtually all their colleges. The UW is considering using this model of admissions in Autumn 2012.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty is presented in attached {Exhibit B}.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting: No written report. Committee Chair Bruce Balick explained that the reason there was not a report is that SCPB is working on gathering information and didn’t feel there was enough to present in a report. One of the things coming to the SCPB in the short term is several limited departmental RCEPs, which means they are assumed to be uncontested. They are in the pipeline, but none have officially made it to SCPB for consideration at this point. Balick went on to say that RCEP procedures are new and somewhat untested, but at the moment, the procedures seem clear.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative is presented in attached {Exhibit C}.

5. Invited Guests.

Faculty Involvement in International Activities, Steve Hanson, Vice Provost for Global Affairs.

At the January 10 meeting of the SEC, Míceál Vaughan brought up the issue of faculty oversight of international activities and global education. The issue was discussed again at the February 14 meeting when it was suggested to invite Steve Hanson, Vice Provost for Global Affairs, to come and help identify areas where faculty oversight might be appropriate and which faculty council(s) could be charged with this responsibility.

A few words of introduction for discussion were presented by Hanson. He began by stating that Global Affairs (OGA) has been deluged with global program proposals with cutting edge issues that may involve international partners. There is no official policy in place for processing these international program requests, although OGA and the Global Support group have begun a systematic review. The proposals vary considerably. They may include programs that are fee based for non matriculating students, international programs, exchange programs, or programs for matriculated students. Educational Outreach has been a key partner in responding to these proposals when there is a potential for bringing revenue to the UW.

Hanson briefly explained the process currently underway to create an engineering program in Abu Dhabi. The program, a regular matriculating program in engineering, has been discussed extensively, but has not been finalized. The program will be taught primarily in Abu Dhabi and has been endorsed by the department via a faculty vote. Three main assessments for academic quality are used: first, departmental deliberation, second, a review of the impacts to the program’s accreditation process, and three, provision for onsite UW instructors and adequate integration of the Abu Dhabi instructors into the UW A&A department to ensure program quality. Wadden affirmed the fact that the program curriculum did go through the University’s academic program process including approval by the department and college, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

There are currently three formal faculty advisory boards, stated Hanson. They are the Office of Global Affairs Advisory Council, made up of representatives of all school, colleges and campuses to advise Global Affairs about important trends and developments in international activities; the China Faculty Advisory Board; and the Rome Center Faculty Advisory Board.
Mícheál Vaughan clarified that the source of his recommendation to pursue this issue was a result of conversations with colleagues who are involved in study abroad and that his main source of concern after these conversations was that there is no official faculty body that advises the Vice Provost for Global Affairs. There is no formal faculty voice. Referring back to Hanson’s comments in regards to the process for creating a program at Abu Dhabi, none of them included the Faculty Senate or a Faculty Council. The assessments used were important, but he believes the University should be thinking more holistically. He stressed the point that an official faculty advisory group should not in any way impede the process, but to advise the administration in terms of setting policy and principles.

Various recommendations were identified. Which Faculty Council should be given responsibility for oversight of global affairs, is there one currently in existence; if not, should a new council be created? It was agreed that there should be one faculty body that is appointed by the Faculty Senate rather than a dean. A review of the role of a faculty advisory committee should be conducted to help define where faculty want to be engaged in the oversight of global affairs.

Vice Provost Hanson announced that he will be leaving the University of Washington for a similar position at the College of William & Mary.

In conclusion, a meeting to consider alternatives will be scheduled with Senate Chair JW Harrington, Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien and Vice Provost for Global Affairs, Steve Hanson.

6. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the February 14, 2011 Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the March 10, 2011 Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jim Fridley, Professor, Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as the 2011-12 Faculty Legislative Representative.
   d. Approve the April 21, 2011, Faculty Senate agenda attached in {Exhibit D}.

The Consent Agenda was approved with a comment that if Jim Fridley was present, a round of applause would be in order. They went on to ask that this message be conveyed to Fridley.

7. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.


   a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Title: Code Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Harrington referred members to legislation related to lecturer and instructor issues in {Exhibit E}. He went on to say Class A legislation changes the Faculty Code. After first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once, sends it back to the SEC and then has a second consideration. Although Legislation may be amended at either consideration by the SEC, it is only at the first consideration that the SEC can make substantive or major changes in legislation. Before making amendments, we ask you to remember that all legislation comes before the Executive Committee after considerable thought and review by your colleagues on Faculty Councils and Committees.

The motion was made from the floor; no second was needed since it came from a council. Discussion ensued.
Council Chair Rich Christie made brief comments denoted in the rationale of the legislation. He indicated that most changes were not substantive, but were proposed to keep the language consistent in the Code and to codify the existing practice.

Several errors were fixed in the document as shown in {Exhibit E} (The rationale sited a Code section incorrectly, in Chapter 21, Section 21-31, the word “instructor” was underlined and the “and principal artist in residence” was stricken after “the principle lecturers.” There was one amendment proposed and seconded, that after discussion failed. The motion proposed striking the newly added “or title” from Section A, Chapter 25-54 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 the promotion.” The concern was the legal implications of using the term “promotion” in regards to those who are in term appointments. New titles have been produced in recent years, and as a result the University has evolved the terminology of promotion in tactical terms. It was felt that it would not be wise to enshrine promotion with regards to the lecturer title. In its deliberations, the Council felt that there were sufficient safeguards in other areas of the Code to address this issue.

After discussion, the motion was approved to be considered by the Faculty Senate.

Compliments were given to Faculty Affairs members Zoe Barsness, Kevin O’Brien, Sandra Phillips, Lea Vaughn, and William Wilcock. Sarah Bryant-Bertail and Larry Ricker were on leave during the quarter this proposal was created.

b. Assessment of the New Faculty Senate Election Policies.

Another item of New Business was introduced from the floor by Senator Steve Buck representing Arts and Sciences. He explained how the college is struggling with the new Faculty Senate election policies implemented last Spring 2010. He asked if other schools, colleges or campuses were having similar challenges, and added that it might be helpful to conduct a forum for the various units to share their experiences in using the new process; in particular, identifying ideas regarding a format for small departments. He went on to say that the college is struggling to find nominees to run. The 23 nominees running this spring were not distributed across the college. Therefore, some units will not have sufficient representatives. Further, the new process no longer works directly with department chairs as was done in the past. This has broken the representative link to the chairs and will take serious work to get that system back in place. The danger is that it may be too late to reestablish that link. Members were reminded that the process of how Senators are elected rests solely in each college, school or campus’ elected faculty council.

Several proposals were suggested. The Senate leadership is meeting with Elected Faculty Council Chairs this spring, and one of the agenda items will be to discuss best practices for the new election process. Another was to conduct a discussion during the May Faculty Senate meeting under the agenda item “Good of the Order.” Buck stressed the fact that while these are all good proposals, the idea is to have those that may entertain legislation have a conversation among themselves, preferably in an informal setting outside of any formal meeting. There were concerns expressed that it is likely the turnout for such an event would be very low.

There were no comments or indication of similar struggles from other members.

10. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: JW Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, April 11, at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
JW Harrington, Professor, Geography

Please see my written report to the Faculty Senate for its 14 February meeting, for updates on several issues relevant to the Senate Executive Committee.

To read what I’ve been presenting to the UW Regents during those meetings’ time for commentary from the ex officio participants, see the posts of my remarks at the 17 February and 17 March meetings.

Yesterday, I received this communication from Phil Hunt, senior advisor in the Students Activities Office:

The registered student organization, UW Humans vs Zombies tag, intends to run our Spring Quarter game from the dates of April 4th to April 8th, with the sign up period to take place this week in Red Square on the 30th of March to the 1st of April.

The goal of our game has always been to provide a game that strengthens community ties while promoting a fun and safe environment. Due to events that occurred during our last game, we have made a couple amendments to our rule set. The first being to pause the game after dark (paused at 8:00 p.m. and to resume at 6:00 a.m. the next morning), and the second to ban clothing that could appear to promote violence or real life war scenarios.

We have always had players moderating the game, but simple human capacity ensures that we cannot be everywhere and observe everyone playing the game at all times. We therefore kindly ask for your help. If you observe a player of the game doing something you feel is contradictory to the rules, please ask for their name, and report them to us. In order to take action against the player in violation, we only need their name. We will then be able to look them up in our database, and from there we will be able to contact them and enforce our policies/rules. Please note that players:

- Will not play indoors
- Will not play after dark
- Will play with standard, brightly colored and easily distinguishable Nerf blasters

Listed below is the contact information for the administrators of the game. If you are interested in a full set of the rules, please email us. If you have any concerns, please contact us directly. Thank you

Eric Clapp, eclapp16@u.washington.edu, 253 797 5722
Justin Fernando, jfern2@u.washington.edu, 253 226 6256
Malcolm Badewitz, malk789@u.washington.edu, 206 458 0278
Sean Mack, seanmack@u.washington.edu, 360 798 3937
William Wassman, willwass@u.washington.edu, 253 232 4620

Looking ahead to the 21 April meeting of the Faculty Senate, Interim Provost Lidstrom will present the President’s report, and then will provide some summary of her interactions with deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts regarding budget planning. See the written statements from deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts – impacts of prior cuts, plans for further cuts, and lots of standardized data – linked to the Planning & Budgeting home page under “Budget Narratives for FY2012.”
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. **University Faculty Lecture**
   Nominations are currently being sought for the 2011-12 University Faculty Lecturer. Nominations will be accepted through Wednesday, April 22, 2011. This award, established in 1974, is intended to honor current or emeriti faculty whose research, scholarship, or art is widely recognized by their peers and whose achievements have had a substantial impact on their profession, on the research or performance of others, and perhaps on society as a whole.

   In addition to honoring the recipient, the award is designed to increase awareness, both within and outside the University, of the nature and significance of original work being done by outstanding faculty members. Accordingly, the recipient is asked to present a lecture open to the University community and the general public.

   Nomination letters should highlight the nominee's accomplishments and impact, speaking ability, ability to adapt his/her academic interest to a broad audience, and a list of important publications.

   Please send nomination materials to the Secretary of the Faculty, Box 351271, or secfac@u.washington.edu.

   Members of the nominating committee are:
   Marcia Killien, Nursing, Secretary of the Faculty, ex officio without vote
   Susan Astley, Epidemiology, Vice chair, Faculty Senate, ex officio without vote
   Ron Stenkamp, Medicine, Chair, Faculty Council on Research, ex officio without vote
   Mayumi Willgerodt, Nursing
   Eve Riskin, Engineering
   Jaime Olavarria, Arts and Sciences
   Jan Carlile, Medicine
   Borje Saxberg, Business
   Steve Paige, Public Affairs
   Joe Janes, Information School

2. **RCEP**
   At the March meeting of the Faculty Senate there were many questions about the procedures for reorganization, consolidation, and elimination of programs and schools/colleges. As a resource for faculty and administrators, a document: “RCEP: Frequently Asked Questions” has been developed by the Secretary of the Faculty with consultation from members of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations. This document is in progress and will be posted on the Faculty Senate and Governance website, and updated periodically.

3. **Senate and SEC Elections**
   Nominations for and elections of Senators for 2011-13 from the following Schools and Colleges are in process and should be completed by mid-April.


   The nominating committee for positions on the Senate Executive Committee has been appointed, consisting of: Norm Beauchamp, Medicine; Vandra Huber, Business; Dan Luchtel, Public Health; Linda Martin-Morris, Arts and Sciences.

   Elections for SEC members for 2011-12 will be held the week of May 23.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jim Fridley, Professor, Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering
April 4, 2011, Senate Executive Committee

Today is day 85 of the 105 day legislative session. It should prove significant for a couple of reasons:

First, this past Friday was the last day to pass bills out of the fiscal committees that are not deemed “necessary to implement the budget.” So, for the most part the legislature’s committee work related to considering, changing and passing policy bills is now done. Beginning today the work of the legislature will involve lots of meeting on the floor (i.e., the whole body as opposed to committees) as they seek final passage of many of the policy related bills. Quite a few of those bills stand to affect us at the UW so there will be lots of discussions and bill monitoring being done by various UW folks, including me. We have to watch closely for amendments that could create problems for us and we have to seek out opportunities to encourage (or discourage) activity to move, modify or stop bills as is appropriate. As the FLR one thing I have to do, and do well, is understand where faculty have enough standing to be able to chime in, in a meaningful way, on these bills.

Today is also the day that the first budget proposal from the legislature will appear. The governor made her budget proposal back in December, the State Economic and Revenue Forecast was released in March, and at noon today the House Ways and Means Committee will (we hope) roll out their budget proposal. They are planning to hold a press conference at noon and a public hearing this afternoon at 3:30, and they say they intend to pass it out of the committee on Wednesday. I’ve also heard that they hope to pass it on the floor of the House (and send it over to the Senate) on Friday but my guess is that Saturday or Sunday is a way more likely “soonest” guess.

Lastly, on a lighter note, today is TVW’s big fundraising dinner. TVW is the best way for YOU to follow the legislature on a day to day basis and they are an important part of how I do the same. I’ll attend the dinner and when the arm twisting begins I’ll no doubt give away enough of the Fridley kids’ tuition budget to create some good healthy friction in the Fridley house. One thing we faculty need to come to grips with is that some level of “citizenship” is needed to be a welcome participant in this town. The expectations for “the faculty” aren’t real high in this regard (we are “just faculty” after all) but, contrary to what you might hear, you actually do “have to be present to win.”

Lastly, Professor Harrington has indicated that he will revoke my UW Faculty Senate provided Hoity-toity Golf and Country Club membership (didn’t you read the paragraph above?) if I don’t provide this report before noon today. So I’m writing this report before the budget proposal is available… but I expect shockingly large cuts across higher education – including UW. Whether that happens or not I suggest that we should be patient because lots will change over the coming weeks. Tuition, financial aid, compensation reduction, retirement plan contribution reduction, health care plan contributions… nothing is really settled until the “get out of town” votes are being taken – perhaps on April 23, perhaps much later.

I’m trying to use the Faculty Senate Chair’s blog fairly frequently now, and Bruce Balick (Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting) and I will try to keep everybody informed as budget related information becomes available. Let me know if you think that I should be getting you more/different/better information. And, of course, “stay tuned!”
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of February 14, 2011, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
      ii. Approval of March 10, 2011, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   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.

5. Invited Guests.

6. Consent Agenda.
   Confirm Jim Fridley, Professor of Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as 2011-2012 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2011 and ending July 31, 2012.

7. Memorial Resolution.

8. Announcements.


   Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
   Rich Christie, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Title: Code Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.
   Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

   Motions involving Class C actions should be available in written form by incorporation in the agenda or distribution at the meeting. It is preferable that any resolution be submitted to the Senate Chair and Secretary of the Faculty no later than the Monday preceding a Senate meeting.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: James “JW” Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, April 28 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.
Class A Legislation
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Code revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.

Rationale:
This code revision originated when a principal lecturer pointed out that senior and principal lecturers were required (by that person’s college) to have an annual collegial evaluation of teaching, while associate and full professors were only required to have such an evaluation every three years. In addition there was some concern over whether lecturers were promotable, or were simply occupying appointed positions.

FCFA consulted with the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL) about the frequency of collegial evaluation of teaching for senior and principal lecturers. FCTL expressed the opinion that once every three years was a suitable interval for these positions. The code (24-57A) has been changed to reflect this.

Reviewing the code, it was clear that, although all lecturer positions are limited term appointments, it was still intended that lecturers could be promoted to senior lecturers, and senior lecturers could be promoted to principal lecturers. No substantive change was required.

However, the review also turned up a number of inconsistencies in the code related to lecturers and instructors. For example, principal lecturers were omitted from some places where they should have been listed, the term “instructor” was used where “lecturer” was more appropriate, etc. There were also inconsistencies in the use of the terms “rank” and “title”. Minor, non-substantive changes to correct these inconsistencies and reflect existing practice were made throughout the code.

During review of the changes, it was proposed that a title of “principal artist in residence” be added to parallel the principal lecturer title, since we have senior artist in residence and artist in residence titles that parallel the senior lecturer and lecturer titles. After input from the Divisional Dean of the Arts, we decided not to add this title. Principal lecturer is a title that can only be achieved by promotion from senior lecturer. The artists in residence and senior artists in residence are appointed, only, and are not promoted.

During review of the changes, we noted that the instructor rank is described in the existing faculty code as the first step in the tenure track ladder. That is, the code envisioned that someone could be hired as an instructor, and promoted to assistant professor. However, the University has not hired instructors for this purpose for some time, using assistant professor as the first step in the tenure ladder, so this use of the rank of instructor is defunct. We did determine that the Medical School, in particular, uses the title “acting instructor” for post-doctoral researchers who have run out the time limits on the research associate title, and also uses the affiliate instructor and clinical instructor titles. We decided to eliminate the instructor rank in the tenure track ladder and add the titles that are actually in use in the appropriate places (24-34 and other places).

Finally, in the course of reviewing the change language, FCFA noted that the existing language governing the initiation of a promotion process (24-54) actually requires a full promotion process (packet, letters, department faculty vote) for every faculty member below the rank of professor every year. Clearly we do not do this, nor should we. Although changing this language went well beyond the original purpose of the revision, the Council decided that a revision reflecting current practice was necessary. Our revision permits eligible faculty to forgo the promotion process, unless the case is mandatory, but ensures that a full case will go forward if the faculty member so desires.
Chapter 21

Section 21-31. Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

- the president,
- the vice presidents,
- the professors,
- the associate professors,
- the assistant professors,
- the instructors,
- the teaching and research associates,
- the principal lecturers,
- the senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- the senior artists in residence,
- the lecturers and artists in residence,
- the instructors,
- the artists in residence, the teaching and research associates,

whether serving under visiting, acting, research, clinical or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.


Section 21-32. Voting Membership in the Faculty

A. Except as provided in paragraph B of this Section the voting members of the University faculty are those faculty members holding the rank and/or title of:

- professor, 50% appointment or greater
- research professor, 50% appointment or greater
- associate professor, 50% appointment or greater
- research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater
- assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater
- research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater
- full-time instructor
- full-time principal lecturer,
- full-time senior lecturer,
- full-time senior artist in residence,
- full-time lecturer,
- full-time artist in residence, or
- a retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor during the Quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or
- a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor or research professor during the Quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.

B. Notwithstanding the rank or title held, the following are not voting members of the faculty:

- persons serving under acting or visiting appointments;
- persons on leave of absence;
- persons serving under clinical or affiliate appointments;
- persons of emeritus status unless serving on a part-time basis;
persons serving under adjunct appointments insofar as their adjunct appointments are concerned.

[For definitions of faculty titles, see Section 24-34.]

C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:

- Senior Artist in Residence
- Senior Lecturer
- Principal Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Associate Professor WOT
- Professor WOT


Chapter 24

Section 24-34. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment to the rank of instructor normally requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and the promise of a successful career in teaching and research.

2. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability beyond that ordinarily required of an instructor that evidences promise of a successful career.

3. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

4. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

3. Principal Lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.
4. Appointment to one of the ranks in Section A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of P professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a R research P professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years. (See Section 24-41, Subsection H). The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-41.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24-35.

5. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.

6. An affiliate appointment rank requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

7. An adjunct appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This title appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.

8. A joint appointment recognizes a faculty member's long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or
not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.

9. A clinical appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

10. Appointment with the title of teaching associate is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or shorter; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

11. The emeritus appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another State of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an administrator at the level of Dean or Vice President, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.

12. The acting title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons at in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as instructor or assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.

13. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a visiting title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting Lecturer.

14. The visiting scholar title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor's presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.

Section 24-41. Duration of Nontenure Appointments

A. The first appointment of an instructor is for one academic year. The dean of the instructor's college or school may renew this appointment annually at the same rank for a total period of not more than five years. If the instructor's appointment is to be continued beyond a fourth year his or her reappointment must be accompanied by either a notice of termination effective at the end of the fifth academic year at that rank or a recommendation to the President for an advancement in rank concurrent with the fifth year of his or her appointment.

B. 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 E. 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.

C. Instructor, 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.

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.

3. Except as provided in Subsection 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, instructor, 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 3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time instructor, 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 at the rank of lecturer, instructor, 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.

D. 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, artist in residence, or principal lecturer respectively.

E. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 24-41, Subsection B, 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.

F. The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50 percent 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 percent of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

G. 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.

H. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 24-41, Subsection H, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Section 25-51), for termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 25-52).
I. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Section 25-51), for termination of funding as defined in Section 24-41, Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 25-52).

J. 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 percent 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.

K. 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 Section 24-41, Subsection H.

L. 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 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.

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 24-54. Procedure for Promotions

Each member of the faculty below the rank of professor shall be considered annually for possible promotion. The procedure described below shall be followed.

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

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 the promotion. Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34 Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans are directed to study the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-32.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The voting faculty of the candidate's department (or college/school is if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record and to vote on the promotion question.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If this recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation.

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its
recommendations with reasons therefore to the dean. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter, and if the decision is favorable shall transmit his or her recommendation to the President.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995, S-A 100 April 25, 2000: all with Presidential approval. [See Footnote #1 on Documentation following Section 24-57]

Section 24-55. Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this Section, to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, university, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities.

The evaluation of a faculty member's merit and salary shall be arrived at after review of the individual's performance in relation to that of their colleagues and by comparison of individuals' present salaries to those of their peers. In evaluating a faculty member's eligibility for merit-based salary increases (Section 24-70.B.1 and 4; Section 24-71.A.1 and B.1) and for "market gap" salary increases (Section 24-71.B.2), the following procedure shall be followed.

A. In arriving at their recommendations for salary decisions the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, and deans shall each consider the following:

1. the cumulative record of the candidate, taking into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles;
2. the candidate's current salary;
3. documentation of the review conference required by Section 24-57.D ; and
4. any documents produced under Section 24-55.H

Salary recommendations shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of merit funds available over time, may be considered in making merit salary recommendations.

B. The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited.

C. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college, shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his/her recommendations the chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall seek the advice of the full professors according to a procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.

D. If the recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean with any supporting data the dean may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendations he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.
E. The dean shall review the department’s recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.

F. The dean of each college/school shall review the record and salary of the chair of each department and shall recommend an appropriate salary increase to the President.

G. The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.

H. At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit (as a result of reviews under 24-55), the chair of the faculty member’s department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his/her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within twenty-one calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 58, May 16, 1978; S-A 75, April 6, 1987; S-A 82, November 21, 1990; S-A 99, July 9, 1999: all with Presidential approval. [See Footnote #1 on Documentation following Section 24-57]

Section 24-57. Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit-based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University’s obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24-32.C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall
be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of instructor or assistant professor or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean or his/her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers and assistant professors. The chair (or dean or his/her designee) shall confer individually with the Associate Professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the Professors and principal lecturers at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24-55.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his/her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss 1) the department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments; 2) shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and 3) a shared strategy for achieving those goals.

The chair, dean, or his/her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32. The chair, dean or his/her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member's work.

D. Documentation

The chair, dean or his/her designee, shall, in a timely manner, document in writing, with a copy to the faculty member, that such conferences occurred, and shall list the subject matter discussed.

This conference document shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and responsibilities of the faculty member for the coming year(s) and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.
Should the faculty member not agree with the summary or statements in this conference document, he or she shall indicate so in writing. The failure of a faculty member to object in writing to the chair's (or dean's) conference document within ten days of receiving it (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the period is extended by the chair or dean) shall constitute his or her official acceptance of its terms and conditions.

If the faculty member disagrees with the conference document, the chair (or dean) shall either withdraw it and issue a revised one to which both parties can agree, or reaffirm the accuracy of the original conference document.

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference document, the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an un-departmentalized school or college) shall appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior (or in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member, or faculty members from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner. The faculty member and the chair, or dean, shall each select one member of the ad hoc committee and those two members shall select the third member. At its earliest convenience, the ad hoc committee shall review fully the records relating to the conference, meet with the faculty member, and meet with the chair, dean, or his/her designee.

The chair, dean, or his/her designee, and the faculty member shall then meet with the ad hoc committee to discuss the issues, with the purpose of achieving a resolution. In the event resolution is not achieved, the committee shall, in a timely manner, report in writing the results of its review to the faculty member, to his or her department chair or dean, and to the designee, if any. The committee's report and advice, if any; the faculty member's written response, if any; the response by the chair, dean, or his/her designee, if any; and any agreement between the faculty member and chair, dean, or his/her designee shall be incorporated into a written report that shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

A faculty member's record upon the stated duties and responsibilities in the conference document will be assessed in accordance with Section 24-55. Nothing in Section 24-57 is intended to alter the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.


Footnote #1: **Documentation for Recommendations for Promotions, Tenure, and Merit Increases**  In submitting to the President's Office a recommendation for promotion in rank or the granting of tenure or merit salary increase, the dean of the school or college is requested to present a detailed documentation of the recommendation. The primary data would originate from the department. Faculty and chairs are directed to give careful attention to all phases of the candidate's service to the school or college and the University. Characteristic types of contributions to the University are described in the following terms:

**Teaching.** An essential qualification for the granting of tenure or for promotion is the ability to teach effectively. Some elements in assessing effective teaching are: the ability to organize and conduct a course appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; the consistency with which the teacher brings to the classroom the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline; the ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments; the extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate within the course to enable students to articulate the ideas they are exploring; the availability of the teacher to the students beyond the classroom environment; the regularity with which the teacher examines or re-examines the organization and readings for a course and explores new approaches to effective educational methods. A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's ability to participate in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The faculty member's concern for the progress and well being of the students is an inseparable adjunct to the classroom.
Research. All members of the faculties must demonstrate scholarly ability and attainments. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods, and their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals. Attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation in the realm of constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the realm of the creative arts.

Service. The scope of the University's activities makes it necessary for members of the staff to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks, clinical duties, and special training programs. The University recognizes the value of its staff in rendering these internal services as well as extramural professional services to schools, to industry, and to local, state and national organizations.

Other Considerations. In arriving at recommendations for promotion or tenure, faculty and chairs are directed to study the whole record of candidates. To warrant recommendation for the granting of tenure or for promotion in the professorial ranks, a candidate must have shown outstanding ability in teaching or research, an ability of such an order as to command obvious respect from colleagues and from professionals at other universities; and substantial contribution in other phases. The qualifications of teaching and research must remain unequivocally the central functions of the faculty, but administrative and other internal and extramural professional services must also be recognized.

The factors with reference to the granting of tenure or for promotion thus far mentioned have to do with the qualifications of the candidate as an individual and may be regarded as the intrinsic factors. Consideration must also be given to the way in which the candidate will fit into the present and foreseeable future of the department. Does there appear to be a place for a candidate with these special interests? Will a given candidate help to bring the department into balance or throw it out of balance? It does happen that individuals whose performance would otherwise warrant the granting of tenure should not, and cannot, become tenured here because the special nature of staff requirements in the department makes it impractical.

Executive Order No. 45 of the President, June 1, 1972 (formerly University Memorandum No. 70, June 15, 1964); revised March 21, 1978; April 20, 1979.

Chapter 25

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 instructor or assistant professor in the University for a combined accumulation of 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:
1. under an acting appointment, or
2. under a visiting appointment, or
3. under any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, or
4. under any initial appointment specified to be without tenure, or
5. under an adjunct appointment, or
6. under a research appointment, or
7. under a clinical appointment, or
8. under an affiliate appointment, or
9. under 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 under C.4 above, are limited to not more than three years. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor "without tenure by reason of funding," as specified under C.9 above, are continuing appointments governed by 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 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.