Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, April 8, 2013, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: Gregory, Lee, Astley, Cauce, Killien, Dillon, Stygall, Baird, Joseph, Morrison, Treser, Evans, Olmstead, Shen, Taricani, Smith, Turns, Giebel
Absent: Young, Stern, Sherman, Fridley
Others present: Cameron, Ginorio, Schmidt, Gibbons

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Meeting was called to order at 2:34. The agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – James Gregory. [Exhibit A]

Chair Gregory explained the full agenda and the need to move efficiently. Gregory also introduced new Faculty Council Support Analyst Grayson Court. Gregory went on to discuss the work of the Faculty Senate with the administration on intellectual property. Leadership and the administration will be looking to see what other universities are doing with regard to changes to intellectual property policy.


In the absence of President Young, Provost Cauce presented the report. Provost Cauce agreed with Gregory that administration and faculty have worked well together, and that some spirited discussions are taking place regarding intellectual property policy. She explained that she believes there is agreement on the ultimate goal, but not how to get there. She also expressed that she believes graduate students need to be more involved in these discussions. The administration is disappointed in the proposed budget from the state Senate, but believes the Governor’s budget gives the University something to work with. There is also great concern regarding the proposed 20% international student fees that would go back primarily to the state’s general fund, and not the University. The Senate also is showing resistance to faculty salary increases. She reported that the three campus committees are working on policies related to lecturer faculty issues. She emphasized her belief in the need to have faculty and staff raises this upcoming year.

Discussion occurred regarding some perceptions that the University did not suffer as much as state agencies during the economic downturn. Olmstead reported that FCWA hopes the administration will recognize Ombudsman Emeriti Lois Price Spratlen who died this past weekend.

   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. [no report]
   d. Faculty Council Activities. [Exhibit D]

   There were no questions

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the February 11, 2013, SEC minutes.
   b. Approval of the February 28, 2013, Faculty Senate minutes.

   The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

   There were no announcements.
7. Unfinished Business.
Class A Legislation – First Consideration.  [Exhibit E]
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Title: Changes to 24-54 Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process.
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

This legislation was first introduced at the February 11 SEC meeting, and after discussion, was sent back to Faculty Affairs for clarification of all the changes being proposed. Discussion began on the revised legislation and remained on the floor at its first consideration.

The legislation proposes changes to promote openness in the promotion and tenure process. Gail Stygall, chair of FCFA, presented the legislation and discussions taken place since it was last presented to the SEC. She reiterated the rationale for the legislation. She mentioned that the Provost had asked to remove disclosure of the chairs' recommendation from the process. Then, the Board of Deans and Provost's office asked for disclosure of the recommendation of the college councils to also be removed. Stygall reported that FCFA had agreed to some compromises in order to secure the Provost's acceptance of the legislation, but that it was no longer accurate to title the legislation "openness." Stygall acknowledged the Provost's efforts to work with her on the legislation.

Several amendments were moved and after discussion all were approved. One removed the disclosure of the department chair's recommendation from the process. A follow up amendment clarified that the department chair may, at his or her discretion, disclose the chair recommendation. And a final amendment indicated that if a non-mandatory promotion was denied by the dean, a response letter from the candidate, if written, would be sent to the Provost. During the discussion it was decided that the title of the legislation would be changed to omit "openness" from the title.

The legislation in Exhibit E, as amended, passed by a large majority.

8. New Business
a. Class B Legislation.  [Exhibit F]
Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
Title: Limited Admission Students.
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Gregory explained the process to approve Class B legislation. FCAS Chair Dillon gave a brief background on the legislation. Discussion occurred as to how this legislation would affect students. Policy implications of creating two categories of matriculated students were discussed. An amendment to add the term "competitively" to limited admission category was approved. The amended legislation was approved.

b. Class B Legislation.  [Exhibit G]
Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
Title: Proposed Diversity Undergraduate Graduation Requirement.
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Gregory introduced FCAS Chair Dillon who introduced the legislation and gave a brief background and 25 years of history of efforts for a diversity requirement for undergraduate students. Vice Chair Lee immediately moved to substitute legislation that provided additional detail about the requirement in the legislation. The motion was seconded and passed. Olmstead proposed an amendment to the legislation that represented discussions among students working on the diversity requirement. The motion was seconded and discussed. ASUW president Evan Smith reported that ASUW had endorsed the amended legislation. Discussion ensued about the inclusion of military status, and political beliefs as examples of diversity. A motion to add the term, "creed" to the examples of diversity was made, seconded, and passed. The legislation, as amended, was approved.
Faculty Senate Chair Gregory and Provost Cauce each thanked the students for their perseverance and all others who worked on this legislation. Provost Cauce urged everyone to discuss the legislation with colleagues as there are more steps ahead before the requirement is fully approved.

c.  Approval of the April 25, 2013, Faculty Senate Agenda.  [Exhibit H]
   Action:  Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

   The April 25, 2013, Faculty Senate agenda was approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:52pm.

Prepared by:  Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by:  James Gregory, 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 15 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
James Gregory, Professor, History

We have a busy and consequential meeting ahead with three items of legislation to consider, all of them potentially complicated. We will resume consideration of the Openness in Promotion and Tenure Process Class A legislation under Unfinished Business, and then consider a Class B change that defines students admitted to a program that has limitations on their enrollment options. Finally we consider Class B legislation that establishes a diversity course graduation requirement.

Here are updates on some other issues that we have been following.

Salaries:

We remain hopeful that the salary freeze will end with next year’s budget. The legislature is still a long way from finishing its work and we may not have a budget until June. In the meantime, we have an agreement with Provost Cauce about how new funds, if available, will be handled. The top priority is a 2% raise for all faculty members evaluated as meritorious. Some further amount will be allocated as “additional merit.” Three-quarters of that additional merit amount should be awarded to all meritorious faculty, except in the case of a recent retention offer or other unusual circumstances. Thus if a total of 4% is available for both regular and additional merit, individual meritorious faculty will generally receive 3.5% raises. The remainder will be used by departments to fund selectively higher raises.

On a separate track the Joint Faculty Salary Working Group is moving ahead with discussion of replacing our ad hoc raise practice with a promotion ladder that includes steps or levels within the professorial ranks (and lecturer ranks). We are modeling a version that would make faculty of all ranks eligible for a level increase every four years following a thorough merit review. Expect more details in the very near future.

Intellectual property negotiations:

We have been engaged in spirited negotiations in response to administration proposals to change intellectual property rules. The Senate leadership and the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC) are concerned about some of the terms and documents drafted by the Center for Commercialization including an Intellectual Property Agreement that all faculty, staff, and graduate students would be expected to sign. The IPA (and proposed revisions to Executive Order 36) includes language that establishes UW ownership of any patentable products that we might invent in the future where current policy requires us to disclose and convey ownership at the time of invention.

The Senate leadership questions whether this aggressive approach is the only way to protect the University’s legitimate interest. We have asked the administration to examine other options. And we have objected to some draft provisions that seem to change the definition of scholarship and potentially interfere with academic freedom. The Faculty Senate will hear more about these negotiations in upcoming meetings. There is more information on the SCIPC website.

Online degree completion programs:

The Senate and its committees (Faculty Council on Academic Standards and Senate Committee on Planning and Budget) have approved an online degree program in Early Childhood and Family Studies that will begin next fall. This pilot program, which mirrors an existing BA degree in the College of Education, will be the first fully online UW Bachelor of Arts degree. It is expected to enroll several hundred students in its first year, most of whom are currently employed in head start and other early childhood education centers.
Still under consideration is a much larger online program that would deliver a BA degree with a Social Science major. Social Science Divisional Dean Judith Howard is expected to report on the planning progress at one of the spring Senate meetings.

**Status of lecturer update:**

At its January 31 meeting, the Senate engaged in a vigorous discussion about lecturers who are hired year after year without any hope of longer contracts. Provost Cause signaled a desire to look at policies and practices and see what steps might be taken to insure that most lecturers are hired through a competitive search and thus become eligible for promotions and to also consider how to move forward with those who have already served for years without having been hired in a competitive process. She has since authorized the creation of three taskforces, one for each campus, to evaluate these issues. The UW Tacoma committee has completed its report. The others are due soon.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. It is with great pleasure that I am announcing that we have hired a new Council Support Analyst to fill the position recently vacated by Jay Freistadt. Mr. Grayson Court started in our office at the end of spring quarter. Grayson is a graduate of Western Washington University (BA, Political Science, 2006) and the UW Evans School (Master in Public Administration, 2009). He has experience supporting public programs for state and local agencies and performing legal assistance for law firms. He also has held intern positions with U.S. Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell and has been an active volunteer with community groups including King County Explorer Search and Rescue. Please join me in welcoming Grayson as he begins his work supporting the Faculty Councils.

2. I am also happy to announce that the Faculty Senate Elections are nearly complete and all of the schools, colleges, and campuses have elected senators. With that complete, the SEC Nominating committee is up and running and accepting nominations for the 2013-14 SEC.

3. This spring, the Faculty Leadership will be meeting with the University Faculty Council Chairs and School/College/Campus Elected Faculty Council Chairs. With the completion of the Faculty Senate elections, my office will begin recruiting for the Faculty Councils. If you are interested in serving on a faculty council, or would like to nominate a colleague, please contact my assistant Alex Bolton (bolt@uw.edu).
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting  
Susan Astley, Professor of Epidemiology and Pediatrics

The SCPB advises the administration and informs the Faculty Senate on long-range planning, preparation of budgets, and distribution of funds, with a particular focus on faculty concerns. The Committee consults with the Executive Committee and the Senate on matters of policy. The Spring 2013 Agenda will soon be posted on the Senate website. A number of issues came before the Senate last year that will continue to be addressed in the SCPB this year. And new issues will arise as the year progresses. Below is a summary of the key issues we are currently addressing. For each issue, I will present a brief history followed by the most recent updates.

**Faculty Salary Policy:** At our first Senate meeting in October, 2011, Senator Giebel proposed a Class C Resolution “Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy” that was approved by the Senate in December and led directly to the establishment of the Salary Policy Working Group (SPWG) in March 2012. I served as the Co-Chair of this committee from March-Dec 2012. As I approach the end of my 3-year Senate leadership role, Jack Lee, Senate Vice Chair was selected to serve as Co-Chair starting Dec, 2012. I will remain a member of the SPWG. The group’s charge is to examine the following 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? These topics are paramount as we slowly move out of this recession, face our 4th and hopefully final year of salary freezes, and fully implement Activity Based Budgeting. Working under the presumption that salary increases will be awarded in 2013-14, the SPWG spent March-Oct 2012 drafting guidelines for the allocation of these funds. Drafts of these guidelines were shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on 11/19/12 and the SCPB on 01/07/13 and 01/14/13 to solicit comments. The SPWG Advisory Group includes all faculty members of the SCPB, SEC, Jim Gregory’s Cabinet, Faculty Council Chairs, and Chairs of the Bothell and Tacoma Faculty. The Provost distributed her 2013-14 Guidelines for Salary Adjustment February 20, 2013, (attached). The SPWG’s met on January 17, 2013, and began addressing question 2: “Are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? A proposal currently being discussed is a salary system that would add “steps” to the promotion ladder at the full professor rank (and possibly at the associate professor rank). This concept was shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on February 25, 2013. The Senate will be consulted in spring quarter. This will be my last update on this topic. As I no longer serve as the chair of this salary policy committee, I will leave it up to the faculty Chair of the committee, Jack Lee, Faculty Senate Vice Chair to keep you abreast of the committee’s progress. I also refer you to the Jim Gregory’s reports to the Senate and SEC for brief summaries of progress to date.

**Online Learning:** One need only read the headlines to see the impact online learning will have (is having) on all forms of education across this country, not just higher education. Jan Carline, chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, shared the Council’s year-long evidence-based review of the strengths and limitations of online learning with the Senate in December, 2011. The implications of online education on access, quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, even intellectual property are broad. The potential benefits of online learning are unlimited, if implemented strategically and guided by an evidence base. This year we will address the most recent developments in online education at the UW: the Proposed Online Learning Undergraduate Degree Completion Program Pilot, MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses), and Coursera (a platform to offer MOOCs). The Degree Completion proposal was discussed at length at the October 15, 2012, SCPB meeting and October 25, 2012, Senate meeting. Discussions will continue as the details of this proposed program coalesce. This topic is scheduled to be addressed again in the SCPB on April 22, 2013.

**Intellectual Property (IP):** As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate’s attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. This discussion led to the discovery
that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, IPMAC has been reinstated by the President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In September 2012, Ana Mari established a work group to revise the "Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation" form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. The workgroup revised the Compensation Form and submitted it to the Senate Leadership on 11/14/12 for their review. The revised Compensation Form was addressed at the November 26, 2012, SCPB meeting and was reviewed by the newly established Special Committee on IP and Commercialization (SCIPC) on November 27, 2012. The establishment of the SCIPC was approved by the SEC on November 5, 2012. SCIPC is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty Intellectual Property, including its management and commercialization. These policies are broadly outlined in EO 36 and APS 59.4, and managed in part through the Center for Commercialization (C4C). Any proposed changes to such policies/practices shall be brought to this Special Committee as a part of shared governance. This special committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members (voting) and a presidential designee (nonvoting). One of the faculty members will be the Chair of the Faculty Council on Research. Members will normally serve a three year term, but the initial terms will be staggered. Members include: Susan Astley, School of Public Health (serving as Chair); Kate O’Neill, School of Law; Matthew Sparke, A&S; Duane Storti, College of Engineering; Tueng Shen, School of Medicine; and Gerald Miller, Physics and Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, and Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff, Office of President (serving as the Presidential designee). SCIPC meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes are posted on the SCIPC website. SCIPC’s proposed revisions to the revised Compensation Form are posted on the SCIPC website. We learned at our Jan 29, 2013 SCIPC meeting that our recommendation to remove the IP language from the Compensation Form has been followed. But the administration now proposes to accompany the Compensation Form with a separate IP Agreement Form (which requires revision of EO36: UW IP Policy). This proposed IP Agreement Form would be distributed to all faculty, not just those submitting the Compensation Form. The IP Agreement would require all faculty to assign to the University all their right, title, and interest in all future inventions. Language in the IP Agreement form attempts to define and distinguish inventions from scholarly work. Scholarly work belongs to the faculty; inventions ‘belong’ to the University. But with advancements in technology, how does one distinguish between scholarly work and inventions? Why are they distinguished and treated differently? For example, software is currently classified as an invention, thus a faculty member is required to sign it over to the UW. But to a faculty member in science, their software is as much their scholarly work as a musical composition is to a faculty member in music. Along these same lines, who owns the content of faculty websites or online courses? Who owns the copyrights and patents when multiple faculty are involved in a project? What role does the Center for Commercialization (C4C) have in helping faculty protect and commercialize their innovations? How can C4C best meet the faculty’s needs? Faculty are state employees, but what aspect of our duties are ‘works for hire’? Academia is not private industry, but what happens when a faculty member engages with private industry? These are important questions to address that have tremendous impact on faculty, thus faculty must be involved in these discussions. Two groups of faculty were solely established to address/discuss these issues: IPMAC and SCIPC. These issues are also being addressed in some of the Faculty Councils. But it is time to engage a broader segment of the faculty. The senate leadership is bringing these issues to the SEC, SCPB, and Senate this quarter. We will post core documents central to this discussion on SCIPC’s website. I encourage all faculty to avail themselves of this information. With today’s technology, matters of copyright, patents, trademarks, and licensing impact the full spectrum of faculty from the sciences to the arts. We need to educate ourselves on these matters.

Gender Equity in Faculty Promotion and Tenure: In my final report to the Regents in June, 2012, I addressed the topic of gender equity at the UW. The timing of my report coincided with the week Congress failed to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; an Act requiring equal pay for comparable work. Overall, women in the U.S. make 77 cents to a man’s dollar. I shared with the Regents that I could not help but notice some compelling statistics presented in the University of Washington 2011 Facts for Academic Personnel, included in their meeting notes for the day. While 53% of students (undergraduate
through professional) are female, only 38% of the faculty is female. This statistic becomes more troubling as you compare the proportion of female faculty across the ranks (Lecturer 58%, Assistant Professor 45%, Associate Professor 43%, Full Professor 27%). There are even a handful of departments at the University of Washington that have never promoted a woman to full professor in the history of the department. Among the Tenure/Tenure Track faculty, the proportion of women has increased by only 5 percentage points over the past ten years (2001 29% women, 2011 34% women). The New Hire statistics for 2011 may help explain, in part, why so little progress has been made in the past ten years. Only 44% of Professional Faculty new hires were female. The percentage of female hires drops precipitously as one advances up the ranks (47% of Assistant Professors hired were female; 36% of Associate Professors hired were female; and only 18% of Full Professors hired were female). Of the 3,899 professional faculty in 2011, 52% are tenure/tenure track, 38% WOT, and 10% Research. Of the tenure/tenure track positions across the schools in 2011, many schools had less than 25% of their tenure positions held by women (Public Health 23%, Pharmacy 25%, Medicine 21%, Environment 25%, Foster 19%, Engineering 20%). The proportion of assistant, associate, and full professors who are female within each department in 2012 is posted on the Senate website. These statistics do not bode well for gender equity in faculty rank and underscore the importance of a thorough review of gender equity in salary compensation. It will be important to identify and minimize factors that may be impeding women from advancing to or being hired into full professor positions. This topic was addressed at the November 29, 2012 Senate meeting and the January 7, 2013 SCPB meeting. The Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed A Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographics that requested all units and departments “make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year”. Resources to help that discussion are posted on the Senate website under Issues Under Consideration. I am pleased to report that faculty from the School of Public Health (my school) are responding to the resolution by bringing the topic to the School’s Faculty Council, the School’s Diversity Committee, and identifying the issue as a Strategic Objective to address in the School’s Self-Study March 2013 report in preparation for accreditation. I encourage all schools/colleges to actively address this important issue.
Faculty Council Activities
Senate Executive Committee
April 8, 2013

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. Diversity graduation requirement.
4. Review of Distance Learning Supplement for Course Change and New Course forms.
5. Student Effort versus Credits Earned in courses.
6. UW Educational Outreach Degree Completion Initiative.
7. Proposed Humanities Major in the College of Arts and Sciences.
8. Proposed Bachelor of Science degree in Integrated Sciences from the College of Arts and Sciences.
9. Definition of students – “regularly admitted” vs. “limited admitted”
10. First on-line degree completion program in Early Childhood, etc.
11. Writing skills proficiency requirements for majors.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

1. Advocate changing increased faculty contributions at age 50 from “opt-in” to “opt-out.”
2. Provide through the faculty senate process information to faculty regarding benefits and retirement.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

1. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.
2. Consideration of proposed Class A Legislation to strengthen Academic Freedom in the Faculty Code.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Last year, FCMA 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. Currently, FCMA is working with the ASUW regarding their proposed Diversity Requirement for Undergraduates and assisted the Faculty Senate Leadership to address concerns on faculty demographics.

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 last year.

This quarter FCR will hear presentations regarding challenges for the Research at UW, an update on Federal Budget Sequestration, Human Subjects Division Post Approval Verification and Education Program, the impacts of Sound Transit’s tunnel below campus, and Intellectual Property issues.

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 of the Student Conduct Code, the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative, 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, MyPlan and e-texts), efforts to assist faculty in “flipping the classroom,” online course evaluations, working to resolve Classroom Support Services issues and discussion on the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative.

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. Reviewing 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 related to cross-campus degrees/minors and role of UW Curriculum Committee.
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.
6. Discussion of potential issues related to “UWS/B/T self-sustaining and distance learning degree programs and cross-campus implications.
7. Examination of variations/changes to faculty handbook that affect UWT/UWB faculty.
8. Cross-campus faculty research activities/opportunities – and an examination of selection processes related to limited submission research applications from the University of Washington.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) continues to monitor construction, including the Stadium, the police station, the Animal Research and Care Facility, Fluke Hall, Odegaard Library, the Intellectual House, and the Burke Museum. FCUFS has also focused on the West Campus circulation plan and student housing. Transportation issues include the Burke-Gilman Trail, bicycles, parking, Rainier Vista, Sound Transit stations, and 520 expansion. Childcare for the UW community, the UW Smartgrid Project, and classroom upgrades have rounded out the agenda.

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. For example, the FCUL will continue to monitor the Odegaard renovation.
6. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009-2012 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. Efforts to inform and support the actions of the Faculty Senate regarding improving faculty demographics:
   a. Develop input to the overhaul of human resources computer system that will improve its ability to enable longitudinal studies and demographic disaggregation of data;
   b. efforts to inform and support development of more childcare opportunities for UW faculty, staff and students.
2. Follow-up on 2011 Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty to address report recommendations.
3. Efforts to improve mentoring on campus through 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.
4. 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
Class A Legislation
Faculty Code Section 24-54. “Openness in Promotion & Tenure”
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Introduction:

FCFA is sending proposed legislation to the Senate Executive Committee that will modify the procedures for promotion and tenure in two areas:

1. Require additional disclosure of and reasons for the recommendations of the department chair, dean, and Provost to the candidate.
2. Change the timing of and provide one additional opportunity (after the dean’s decision) for candidates to respond to recommendations.

Reasons for proposed changes:

- The goal is to encourage best practices in promotion and tenure communication.
- Inconsistent practices among the departments, schools, colleges, campuses in what candidates are told about the recommendations being made at each level of the promotion process.
- Candidates who aren’t informed of recommendations and rationale may have unrealistic expectations about the level of support for their advancement or may be unduly anxious. Annual reviews vary in the level of honest and clear feedback provided to candidates, and may be limited to department level perspectives that could differ at the school/colleges/campus/university level.

Background:

- Discussion began in Fall 2011 in FCFA and occurred at nearly every meeting through the present.
- Proposed legislation was discussed with chairs of elected faculty councils; those present were supportive of the proposed changes.
- Discussed with Provost Cauce and Board of Deans/Chancellors chair Testy last year. Concerns were raised about 1) impact of disclosure on chairs of small departments, 2) added burden on chairs & deans, 3) potential added delay in meeting promotion deadlines set by the Provost’s office.
- In response, FCFA conducted survey of chairs of small departments and found the majority did not have concern about the changes being considered by FCFA. FCFA addressed the above concerns, among others, in crafting the legislation.

Substantive changes being proposed:

At department level:

- In departmentalized units, chairs will verbally share the departmental faculty discussion & recommendation with the candidate, then prepare an independent analysis and optional chair’s recommendation and share this written report that includes both the faculty recommendation and the chair’s analysis and recommendation, if made, with the candidate.
- The timing of the candidate’s opportunity for response is moved from after the departmental vote to after the departmental and chair report/recommendation. (Note: this response is forwarded to the Dean’s advisory committee, there is no opportunity provided for a “re-do” of the faculty or chair’s recommendation).

At dean/chancellor level:

- If the faculty committee advisory to the dean’s recommendation is unfavorable or the dean’s recommendation is unfavorable, the dean (or designee) is required to discuss and disclose the recommendation(s) and reasons to the candidate.
• If the decision is mandatory & the dean’s recommendation is not favorable, the candidate has an opportunity to send a written response to the dean’s decision to the President (Provost). Again, no opportunity to “re-do” the dean’s decision.

After the Provost’s decision:

• The Dean is required to inform the candidate in writing of the result and provide reasons if the result is unfavorable.
Section 24–54 Procedure for Promotions

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 shall consider 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 specific attributions 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 if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

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 specific attributions 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 the faculty 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. The chair may at his or her discretion, share the chair’s recommendations with the candidates.

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 therefor to the dean and to the candidate. For purposes of
confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. 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.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean’s designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

and, if the decision recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate’s response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost President.

E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

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; S–A 124, July 5, 2011; S–A 126, June 11, 2012: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]
Class B Legislation: Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 101, Admissions
Proposal to add limited admission student
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Background and Rationale

A recent proposal for an on-line degree completion program in Early Childhood Education envisions a
status for their students which does not correspond exactly to either of the two types of students
recognized in the UW Policy Directory, Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 101, Admissions
and elsewhere in the Washington Administrative Code. The Student Governance and Policies recognizes two
status: matriculated (paragraph E) and non-matriculated (paragraph F).

E. A matriculated student is one who has been admitted into one of the University's schools or
colleges to pursue a program of study that normally leads to a degree.

F. A non-matriculated student is one whose educational objective does not include a University of
Washington degree. Permission to enroll as a non-matriculated student implies no commitment
on the part of the University for subsequent admission as a matriculated student.

Since this program is one leading to a degree, students admitted to it would qualify as matriculated
students. However, these students do not compete with all other applicants for admission to the
University; they apply only to this one program and will be restricted to enrollment in only this one
program; they may not change programs, change major, double major, and may have other limitations.
Evening degree students are also matriculated but subject to various restrictions. It is anticipated that
there may be other new programs (online or on campus) in the future that also limit admission to a single
program.

Accordingly, FCAS, working with the assistance of Rebecca Goodwin Deardorff, Director of the
University's Rules Coordination Office, and Marcia Killien, our Secretary of the Faculty, has concluded
that the definition of student in the Student Governance and Policies and in other places where the term
"student" is used needs to be modified to recognize the status of limited admission for these students and
that is the proposal we place before you today.

Implementation

If the Class B legislation is approved by the faculty, it will be necessary to work through existing
regulations and other documents that use the word student to make explicit whether the reference is to all
students or only regularly admitted ones. According to Rebecca Deardorff, there are a number of these,
including regulations mentioning students in Professional and Continuing Education that have previously
escaped notice. All of these will need to be made consistent and coherent, and this work should be done
before creating further programs with students of uncertain status.

At present, one online program—that of Early Childhood and Family Studies—has been approved by
FCAS, and that approval is conditional on passage of this Class B legislation. Further, so concerned is
FCAS about this need to put our house in order that we have resolved not to approve any other online
degree programs until the various codes and regulations have been brought into conformity.
Student Governance and Policies, Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 101, Admission

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

E. A matriculated student is one who has been admitted into one of the University's schools or colleges to pursue a program of study that normally leads to a degree.

1. Regularly admitted student. A regularly admitted undergraduate student is one who is competitively admitted to one of the University of Washington campuses. The student may seek admission to any program, major or degree at that campus.

2. Limited admission student. A limited admission undergraduate student is one who has been competitively admitted to a specific degree program and must choose from a limited number of courses specifically identified in their program. Admission is restricted to this program and does not qualify the student for admission to other degree programs of the University of Washington. To be admitted to other degree programs, the student must separately apply to be a regularly admitted student, or apply to another limited admission program. The student shall be informed by the program of any additional restrictions related to their enrollment.

F. A non-matriculated student is one whose educational objective does not include a University of Washington degree. Permission to enroll as a non-matriculated student implies no commitment on the part of the University for subsequent admission as a matriculated student.

Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 114, Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement

2. Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree

I. Degrees with Double Major

Regularly admitted students may choose to earn bachelor's degrees with double majors. Majors may be earned within the same college or from different colleges. A single degree with a double major is appropriate when both majors lead to the same degree objective (e.g., BA or BS). If students desire to pursue double majors, they shall complete all degree requirements in accordance with the satisfactory progress policy (Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 116, Satisfactory Progress). The student must submit an application for each major that is to be approved by the department, school, or college granting the major. Both majors will appear on the student's permanent record.

3. Two Bachelor's Degrees at the Same Time

Two differently named bachelor's degrees may be granted at the same time to a regularly admitted student, but the total number of academic credits shall reach a minimum of 45 credits in excess of the number normally awarded for the first bachelor's degree. Two bachelor's degrees will not be awarded when both majors lead to the same degree objective (e.g., BS or BA); in these cases a single degree with a double major will be awarded. Exceptions to this rule are at the discretion of the dean of the college or school awarding the degree and only on a case-by-case basis; if the two majors are in two different colleges or schools, both deans must approve.

4. A Second Bachelor's Degree

A. A second bachelor's degree may be granted to a regularly admitted student, but there shall be required for this degree a minimum of 45 additional credits in residence.
Class B Legislation: Student Governance and Policies
Chapter 114, Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement
Addition of a Diversity Requirement
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Background

The University of Washington currently does not have diversity studies as part of the general graduating requirements for undergraduate students. Since 1988, efforts have been made by faculty members, students, and University administration to incorporate diversity studies as part of the general graduating requirements.

Previous proposals encountered resistance to adding general education course requirements for graduation as well as concern that there might not be enough places available in existing courses that would satisfy such a requirement. This year FCAS received a proposal from the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs which originated by coalition of students last year and was substantially revised this year. This proposal requires no new courses and no added hours of graduation requirements. Rather, it proposes that each course bearing an Area of Knowledge designation (VLPA, I&S, NW) be reviewed by the Curriculum Committees of their Schools and Colleges to determine whether more than half of the course's content is devoted to issues of diversity (to be defined below under Implementation); if so, it should be given a 'Di' designation. (New courses would be reviewed at the time their possible designation as an Area of Knowledge course is determined.) The proposal then is simply that at least 3 of the 40 credit hours taken to satisfy a student's Areas of Knowledge requirement bear the designation 'Di' as well as 'VLPA', 'I&S' etc.

Accordingly, at its March 8th meeting, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards approved Class B legislation that would amend Student Governance and Policies: Scholastic Regulation, Chapter 114 Section 2.B.1a to require that 3 of the 40 credits taken by a student and categorized as Areas of Knowledge carry the sub designation “Diversity”, and it is that proposal that we bring before you today.

Rationale

As one of the University of Washington's stated six values, creating a diversity requirement will further align the University's values and curriculum. The requirement is meant to help students develop an understanding of the complexities of living in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world culture. The University of Washington must prepare students for the new demands and expectations that they will encounter as successful graduates. Current course requirements that fall under Areas of Knowledge introduce students to the arts, the study of individuals and society, and the study of the natural world. This change will ensure that students are also exposed to the diversity of human experiences. The definition of “diversity” is broad and covers many courses and topics such as:

- Political, economic and sociocultural diversity at local and global scales
- Cross-cultural analysis and communication
- Historical and contemporary inequities

Many Colleges and Departments have already taken steps to include diversity issues within their own curriculum. This change ensures that all students at the University of Washington have the opportunity to be introduced to diversity issues as part of their general educational experience.
2. Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree

A. Required Grade Point

To be eligible for the bachelor's degree, an undergraduate student must achieve a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.00. Only resident credits and credits from DL courses will be used to compute the graduation grade-point average.

B. Required Credits

To be eligible for graduation from the University with the Bachelor's degree, a student shall satisfy all other specific requirements and shall offer a minimum of 180 academic credits.

1. The requirements for graduation shall include:

   a. No fewer than 40 credits of general education courses approved by the appropriate school or college, including no fewer than 10 credits in each of three areas of study: The Natural World, Individuals and Societies, and The Visual, Literary, and Performing Arts;

   b. No fewer than 12 credits of writing consisting of 5 credits of English Composition and two additional writing-intensive courses (the latter may be satisfied through several options: "W" courses, senior seminars, senior thesis, or courses for which students and faculty contract for a substantial amount of writing);

   c. No fewer than 5 credits of courses devoted to reasoning skills (courses to fulfill this requirement include quantitative, symbolic, or formal reasoning which may be satisfied within the discipline).

   d. No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on the topics of power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.

2. Courses taken to fulfill the writing, reasoning, diversity, and major requirements may apply as appropriate to the general education requirements.
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 25, 2013, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor James Gregory.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the February 11, 2013, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the February 28, 2013, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. 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.

5. Consent Agenda.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Title: Changes to 24-54, Promotion and Tenure Process.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.
   b. Class B Legislation.
      Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
      Title: Limited Admission Students.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   c. Class B Legislation.
      Faculty Council on Academic Affairs.
      Title: Proposed Diversity Undergraduate Graduation Requirement.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

10. Good of the Order.

11. Adjournment.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: James Gregory, Chair of the Faculty Senate

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