MINUTES
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, May 2, 2011, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
   The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m.; the agenda was approved.

   Senate Chair JW Harrington’s written report is attached {Exhibit A}.
   Harrington reported orally that the employment contract for President-designate Michael Young was finalized by the Board of Regents earlier in the day. He also noted that this was the last SEC meeting of this academic year and expressed appreciation to members for their service, especially noting the contributions of the chairs of the university faculty councils and committees.
   There were no questions from the SEC for Harrington.

   President Wise began her report by noting that President-designate Young was on campus and in Olympia last week. President Wise was in Asia last week for a conference and met with a number of UW alumni. She noted that the UW’s reach in Asia is impressive and faculty should be proud.
   The Washington State legislature is now in special session to address a number of bills, including those addressing higher education, but the budget decisions will be delayed later than usual.
   President Wise announced that Debra Friedman has accepted the position of Chancellor at UW Tacoma and will start July 1. The 2011 UW Seattle Commencement speaker will be Kathleen Sebelius, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.
   In answer to several questions about how the UW is handling fiscal year budgeting along with the transitions in administration and lack of a state budget, President Wise indicated the UW is working with estimates and asking the legislature for local flexibility in how budget cuts will be taken.

   a. The written report of the Secretary of the Faculty is attached as {Exhibit B}.
   b. The written report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting is attached as {Exhibit C}.
   SCPB chair Bruce Balick was asked if any RCEP proposals had been received since the last meeting. He announced that SCPB today had approved moving forward with a limited RCEP procedure to move MEDEX Northwest Physician’s Assistant program, from the Department of Medical Education and Biomedical Informatics to the Department of Family Medicine. He also noted that the Provost has announced that she will not pursue the consolidation or elimination of either the Evans School or the Information School. Other RCEPs may be proposed in the fall in response to budget cuts.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative: No report was submitted or given.
   d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. {Exhibit D}
   Faculty Athletic Representative Patrick Dobel extended his written report by remarking that many major universities experienced issues in their athletic programs this past year. In contrast, the UW’s athletic program has strengthened its integrity during the past decade; the faculty athletic representative played a significant role in compliance. External audits have also been helpful in
monitoring activities. In addition, the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics whose membership is appointed half by the Senate and half by the President plays a major role. Dobel believes that the UW does a good job of developing and implementing best practices; he has observed this pattern across three presidents and three athletic directors.

Dobel was asked who has responsibility for making decisions about suspending a player. He responded that legal issues and the student conduct code are considered. Coaches have to be careful about releasing or suspending players until formal charges have been brought. Decisions almost always include the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs and the President.

In response to a concern expressed about future weekday athletic games, Dobel said that if there are other weekday football games, there likely would be only one game scheduled and played before UW’s Autumn Quarter begins. However he expressed concern that there may be an increase in weekday basketball games and that care will be needed to find effective ways to lessen the academic impact on vulnerable students.

President Wise announced that Professor Dobel has accepted a university endowed chair and will be leaving his position as Faculty Athletic Representative. She invited nominations for this position. Senators expressed appreciation for Dobel’s service, transparency and detailed reports.

e. Report of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.  {Exhibit E}

Senate Chair Harrington thanked Bill Rorabaugh, chair of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services, and Stephanie Rempe for their report.

f. Report of Faculty Council Activities.  {Exhibit F}

5. Invited Guests.

There were no invited guests.

6. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the April 4, 2011 Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the April 21, 2011 Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve 2011-12 Faculty Council Nominations for Faculty Senate Consideration.  {Exhibit G}
   d. Approve 2011-2012 Schedule of Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Meetings.  {Exhibit H}
   e. Approve the May 19, 2011, Faculty Senate agenda.  {Exhibit I}

Secretary of the Faculty Killien requested the removal of item 6.c. The item was moved to unfinished business.

7. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.
   a. Class A Legislation – Second Consideration.  {Exhibit J}

   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Title:  Code Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.
   Action:  Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation to the faculty for approval or rejection

Harrington explained the procedure for considering the proposed legislation. At the second consideration, amendments based on reviews by the President and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations can be considered but the SEC cannot make substantive or major changes in legislation.

The motion was made from the floor. Discussion ensued.

Harrington began the discussion by informing members that the president had two minor changes. The first was necessary renumbering to reflect updated changes in Chapter 24, and the second, removal of a change in Footnote #1 that is actually Executive Order 45. As such it is not subject to the Class A
legislative process. However the president will ask Rules Coordination to effect the minor wording change as a housekeeping revision concurrent with her approval of these proposed Faculty Code revisions.

There were no suggested changes in the legislation proposed by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations. However, the chair of the advisory committee noted that the justification in paragraph 5 of Exhibit J mentions the promotion of lecturers but nothing in the code states that senior/principle lecturers can only be promoted. The chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs proposed to change the rationale to reflect this. It was further noted that the version of the legislation attached to the agenda had not been updated to reflect the amendments made at the April SEC meeting. The amendments were reiterated prior to conducting a vote.

After discussion and amendment the legislation was approved unanimously as shown in Exhibit J.

b. Approve 2011-12 Faculty Council Nominations for Faculty Senate Consideration.  

The Secretary of the Faculty moved to amend the nominations as follows:
Remove Bruce Balick’s nomination to membership on the Faculty Council on Tri Campus Policy.
Remove the affiliation, “History”, from Balick’s nomination to membership on the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.

Senator Baker asked that her name be listed as “Margaret” Baker.

The nominations were approved as amended.

   There was none.

10. Adjournment.
   The meeting was adjourned at 3:35pm.

Prepared by:  Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by:  JW Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate
I’m writing this report less than a week since the last Senate meeting, and less than four weeks since the last SEC meeting, so there’s not a great many things to update.

The big news for the next several years of the University is the Regents’ naming of a new President. My summary, as a member of the advisory search committee: they made the right choice. We gave them unranked names of folks about whom we were quite excited and had no substantial qualms. For me, Michael Young’s (i) scholarly, administrative, and international experiences combined with (ii) his observable and reported proclivity to listen to people and weigh evidence before making a decision, and (iii) his reported respect for faculty, faculty governance, and students to put him at the top of my personal list.

I had interviewed him twice during the winter, in a small group and later in a larger group, and I was very pleased when the Regents made their announcement. I was even more pleased during the past few days when colleagues turned their full research skills onto the task of discovering more, and have uncovered many good things and minor sources for concern. The proof of all of our hopes and potential concerns is in the next few years.

I was also pleased that my colleagues in the faculty leadership had such positive reactions to our meeting with President Young (he’s UW’s President-designate, but since he is a current university president, I’ll refer to him by that title), this week. In order to keep my mouth shut as much as possible during that brief meeting (brief, but the same length as his earlier meeting with 35 vice presidents, deans, vice provosts, and me), I waited until the end to hand him and everyone a letter from me. I’ve appended that letter to this report.

Other reports, in brief:

- I met with the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning on 7 April, to get input for my involvement in a statewide group focused on the assessment of prior and experience-based learning.
- I have begun to follow up on SEC conversations about faculty oversight or consultation of the university’s international activities.
- I provided an overview of the University faculty and shared governance to the senior administrators overseen by Finance & Facilities Vice President V’Ella Warren, and offered to make similar presentations to the senior staff of their individual units.

I will provide more summary and prospective comments in my last report to the Senate, in just a couple of weeks.
27 April 2011

Dear President Young:

Congratulations and welcome to our community. The faculty will ask a lot of you, and are eager to work with you in the following ways.

- Together, we need to articulate a vision of the university as a force for the transformation of students, society, knowledge, and practice.
- We need you to engage students and faculty to make that vision compelling for recruiting students, supporters, and faculty.
- We ask you to listen actively and critically to faculty with vision. All colleagues, like everyone in an organization, have complaints, but it’s the tumble of competing and complementary visions that will build this university.
- We ask you to distinguish between policy decisions and the development of innovative ideas. Policy in the areas of curriculum, faculty roles and responsibility, budgets, and academic organization must develop in consultation with official faculty bodies or representatives. Innovative ideas come from many sources in an institution of highly trained staff, eager students, and brilliant faculty.

To be successful, our future must protect and build on the university’s assets: the quality of teaching, research, and clinical care on which its reputation is based; its tenured and non-tenure-stream faculty; its three academic campuses; its loyal and beleaguered staff; and 319,000 alumni with a stake in its future.

To be successful, our future must include structures and resources that facilitate and sustain international collaboration, because the United States does not have a lock on inventive scholarship.

To be successful, our future must invest in technology to leverage creativity and collaboration, not primarily to increase student/faculty ratios.

As President of the Faculty, you are responsible for maintaining the letter and the spirit of the Faculty Code. The Secretary of the Faculty should be among your closest allies and counselors.

Respect and responsibility go hand in hand. If the faculty and its bodies are respected, if our joint rules are followed, and if our decisions and counsel are heeded, we will rise to the challenge of responsible stewardship, based on our roles as researchers, teachers, and leaders within and across our fields.

With best wishes,

James W. Harrington, Jr.
Professor of Geography
Faculty Senate Chair
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. University Faculty Lecture
   Nominations for the 2011-12 University Faculty Lecturer closed on Friday, April 22, 2011. Seven nominations were received and are being reviewed by the selection committee.

   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 Carline, Medicine
   Borje Saxberg, Business
   Steve Paige, Public Affairs
   Joe Janes, Information School

2. RCEP FAQs
   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 has been posted on the Faculty Senate and Governance website, and will be updated periodically.

3. Senate and SEC Elections
   The following Schools and Colleges have elected Senators for the 2011-13 term: Arts & Sciences, Business, Dentistry, Environment, Nursing, Public Health, Social Work, UW Tacoma; one College has yet to complete their election. The roster of Senators for 2011-12 will be attached to the May Senate agenda.

   Nominations for the 2011-12 SEC have been received from the nominating committee, consisting of: Norm Beauchamp, Medicine; Vandra Huber, Business; Dan Luchtel, Public Health; Linda Martin-Morris, Arts and Sciences. Nominations are included on the May Senate agenda. Elections for SEC members for 2011-12 will be held the week of May 23.

4. Council membership for 2011-12
   Nominations for membership in the various faculty councils for 2011-12 are being accepted. If you are interested in serving on a council, please contact Alex Bolton at bolt@uw.edu.
The House and Senate passed their versions of state budgets for 2011-13, prior to the adjournment of the 2011 regular session on Friday, April 22, 2011. The first special session of 2011 is scheduled to begin on Tuesday, April 26, 2011, when the House and Senate will continue their budget reconciliation. The House and Senate budgets are quite close in most respects, including the Higher-Ed budgets. However, the process will likely not reach completion until sometime in May. At that point we'll know our state allocation for the next biennium. We'll also know about permitted tuition rates for resident undergraduates and we will have internal agreements on other tuition rates. A comparison of the budgets is available from the Office of Planning and Budgeting at http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/pdf/briefs/Comparing-the-Senate-Chair-Budget-and-the-House-Engrossed-Budget_4-13-11.pdf.

The regents have the authority and responsibility to set tuition rates within the Legislative restrictions. So the revenue picture will not be formally completed until June at the earliest. It's only then that our revenue picture is set.

Jim Fridley, our Faculty Legislative Representative in Olympia, and I continue to send "budget headlines" to all faculty by email as major budget events unfold.

SCPB has worked closely with the Provost on budget priorities and design philosophy, all of which was described in a letter from the Provost (30 March, http://www.washington.edu/discover/leadership/provost/message-provost-3-30-11 ). The Provost has completed 40 interviews with deans, vice provosts and vice presidents on their plans for budget cuts next year. Each of them was given a set of target figures and asked to describe how they would incorporate the cuts while preserving quality and building a sustainable revenue plan for the future. This isn't easy in the best of times. Add the complexity of the implementation of Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) is starting to divert the bulk of tuition revenues from the Provost's office to the sites of actual instruction.

The revenue picture is already in sufficient focus that informed budget scenario planning is in progress by the Provost and SCPB discussions can proceed. Interim Provost Mary Lidstrom will bring formative budgets to SCPB for joint discussion in the weeks ahead. As the budget-planning discussions with deans conclude, SCPB will preview and discuss College/School-level budgets for UW Seattle along with an analysis of their impacts on our overall academic program. Please note that SCPB considers only the College-level allocations; it does not displace the function of Elected Faculty Councils to look deeply into spending within the units in consultation with their deans.

Activity-Based Budgeting: A Status Summary

An overview ABB document was released last month (http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/pdf/abb/ABB-Overview_March-2011.pdf ). On April 13 the ABB Steering Committee met to approve the final plans for the largest policy issues. This went smoothly. A variety of detailed issues remain to be resolved, and swatting the emerging devils is making progress. The final roll-out of ABB will come from the Office of Planning and Budgeting, perhaps in late May or June. The current state of ABB planning will be reviewed during spring quarter.

In brief, ABB will divert 70% of undergraduate and graduate tuition revenues directly to the units of instruction. The funds will be apportioned using a simple formula based on course enrollments and degree majors registered within each college. The current balance of college funding will evolve as a result. The remaining 30% of the tuition revenues plus all of the state allocation will continue to flow to the Provost to cover the costs of infrastructure (such as libraries, IT, admissions, and police), fixed costs such as power, central investments in academic programs, the costs of administration, and other university-wide needs, as in the past.
Reorganizations, Consolidations, or Eliminations of Programs ("RCEP"s)

An RCEP from Dean Martha Somerman and Interim Provost Mary Lidstrom to merge the departments of Oral Biology and Dental Public Health Services in the School of Dentistry was considered by SCPB on April 18. After consultation with the Provost, the SCPB advised Provost Lidstrom "As required by Section 26.41-B.1 of the Faculty Code, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting consulted with the Provost on 18 April 2011 regarding the proposed RCEP from Dean Martha Somerman of the School of Dentistry dated 28 March 2011. The SCPB concurs with Dean Somerman and the Provost that a limited RCEP is the appropriate process for the consideration of the proposed RCEP. Furthermore, the SCPB concurs with Provost Lidstrom that further investigation is warranted into the consultation that occurred between the Dean and her elected School council."

Certain ambiguities in the wording of RCEPs for academic units (Code 26.41.D.1) were uncovered at the Senate Meeting of March 10, 2011. I assembled a list of questions regarding the intent of this part of the Code as well as 26.41.D.6. Working with Secretary Marcia Killien, Mícheál Vaughan, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations and Rich Christie, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. They provided an informal interpretation. I have requested that the Secretary of the Faculty consider necessary steps to formalize these clarifications.

Faculty Merit Raises for 2012

As required by Executive Order 64, the Provost has informed SCPB and explained why funds for minimum 2% merit raises will not be available for the next academic year. SCPB has reviewed the budget and heard that the Legislature will soon freeze or cut salaries of all state employees for at least a year. (Indeed, our salary budget is being cut by 3% in the budgets of the House and the Senate, but UW will absorb these cuts through layoffs and retirements and not pass them on to remaining employees in 2012). SCPB acknowledged that merit raises seem infeasible for 2012 but it may review the decision in the unlikely event that the state budget and UW's allocated budget and tuition revenues unpredictably increase beyond current expectations.

Other SCPB Activities

In summary, SCPB is in the early stages of discussions on differential costs of tuition (undergraduate tuition variations by discipline or student degree status at UW) and direct admission to selected majors. It has just started a discussion about the optimum college structure for UW Seattle -- a discussion that is highly abstract and oriented towards the long term. Finally it will review the emerging recommendations of the 2y2d strategic planning effort (http://www.washington.edu/discover/leadership/provost/initiatives/2y2d) after the internal budget discussions conclude. Our schedule of meetings is posted at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues.html.
I. The Academic Challenges of Intercollegiate Athletics

In the last year the following Universities have experienced major violations and NCAA investigations: Michigan, North Carolina, University of Southern California, Ohio State University, Princeton, Auburn, Alabama, Tennessee and Florida. This is a partial list.

The violations have encompassed everything from: illegal coaches working with players; illegal gifts from agents to players; illegal contact between players and outside third parties; favored treatment or paper writing for students athletes in the classroom; players selling their own possessions gained as part of NCAA activities; coaches lying to the NCAA, Presidents, Athletic Directors. In addition a recent and widely contested news article reported that 6 percent of the football players at the Top 25 football teams had arrested, indicted or convicted felons on their teams.

We all know too well how a cascade of problems with coaches, athletic directors or administrators can entangle and humiliate a university.

So I thought this would be a good time to review the systems in place at the University of Washington that seek to maintain integrity in academics and compliance with the rules.

The integrity system begins with the Faculty Athletic Representative.

II. The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR)

Every NCAA school (all 1400 of them) possesses a FAR. It is a mandated faculty position that reports directly to the President. The FAR serves at the will of the President and traditionally served for very long terms. (The Oregon FAR has served for 25 years, the old USC FAR 19 years and the UCLA FAR 18 years).

More recently the FAR has been appointed in many schools for renewable terms. The general term is five years renewable. The FAR job is complicated and involves a tradeoff between the steep learning curve and advantages of experience and presence at the NCAA and PAC-10 level and the possibilities of being co-opted by the athletic department or just getting lazy. Most effective FAR positions require release time to enable the professor to accomplish the job.

The FAR has very few formal responsibilities but is charged to oversee the academic and compliance integrity of the athletics program, but needs real release time to do the job. At a large number of lower division schools the FARS exercise very little effective oversight or control because they receive not release time or support in their tasks.

Each FAR functions differently, but the core functions are:

1) Serve as the President’s eyes and ears in athletics. To bring a university academic perspective to deliberations in the athletic department.

2) Provide honest advice to the President and be an early warning person where possible. Meet regularly with the President to ensure the President is informed and Presidential priorities are being implemented.

3) Serve as a primary regulator to work with and ensure compliance with NCAA and conference rules by working with the compliance and academic support offices.

4) Bridge the gap between academic and athletic institutions and cultures. Try to build and ensure a strong level of Presidential and faculty oversight on the academic and compliance issues.

5) The FAR casts the UW vote at the PAC-10 Council which decides votes on most NCAA legislative matters and PAC-10 Bylaws.

The UW FAR position involves the following:

1) The FAR signs off on all eligibility decisions and players cannot play without the FAR signature. This forces the FAR to review all student athletes’ academic status. It also means coaches take the FAR seriously.
2) The FAR signs for the President on request for academic and compliance waivers.
3) The FAR sits on ACIA and reports twice a year to the Faculty Executive Committee and once a year to the Faculty Senate.
4) FAR sits on the Admissions Appeal Committee, the Compliance Team Committee, the Head Coaches’ Committee, the Legislative Review Committee and meets with the Executive Committee periodically.
5) The FAR sits on the PAC-10 Council along with the AD and the Senior Woman’s Administrator (SWA). Casts the institutional vote.
6) The FAR sits on relevant PAC-12 committees. At present I sit on the PAC-10 Selection Committee, the Faculty Athletic Representative Council and Chair the Intra-conference transfer rule committee and the Resources Committee.
7) The FAR can sit on NCAA committees and cabinets. These groups formulate policy for the NCAA as an organization. I presently sit on the NCAA Academic Cabinet that makes recommendations to the NCAA membership on all academic legislation and issues. (The NCAA is broken up into 12 Cabinets that review and propose legislation in various areas.)
8) There are two major groups of FARS who have organized to try and develop a more effective voice for the academic side in the NCAA. One is FARA and the other is the D1A FARS. Neither is particularly successful, but the UW FAR has traditionally worked with one of these groups. I have been asked to sit on the Executive Committee of the Diversion 1A Athletic FARs. These are the 123 schools that dominate intercollegiate football by size and quality.

III. University of Washington Athletics Integrity System

The University has in place an autonomous cluster of accountability systems independent of the athletic department to address academic and compliance issues.

A. Yearly audit of ICA:
The audit focuses upon finance but has a rotating emphasis upon looking into the compliance office’s record keeping and keeping track of NCAA fine print. It looks at issues such as record keeping for phone calls or travel as well as issues rules governing expenditures on athlete visits.

B. Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) (Appendix A)
This is the President’s formal advisory committee. This committee serves as the major mechanism for faculty interaction with athletics and the major device for the President to ensure this occurs. The ACIA was inactive and toothless for many years but President Emmert reinvigorated it with regular staffing and a series of strong chairs.

The President appoints all ten faculty members as well as one special presidential appointee. Half the faculty members are direct President appointments and half are made from nominees submitted by the President of the Faculty Senate. Ten other members serve ex officio. (See appendix for charge and present composition).

ACIA yearly reviews the academic progress of student athletes with special attention to the fate of special admits. It reviews relevant NCAA legislation. It makes strong recommendations on oversight issues to the President, Provost, Athletic Director and relevant faculty and administrative groups. Recent recommendations and investigations involved admissions, oversight of student support and the Student Athlete Code of Conduct. (See appendix for Student Athlete Code of Conduct).

The Chair of ACIA has become a serious partner with the FAR in ensuring faculty voice and oversight of the athletics department. Over the last six years the Chair of ACIA has taken part in many of the serious deliberations around admissions, eligibility and structure of accountability.

C. Faculty Athletic Representative
(See above)
D. **The Senior Associate Athletic Director:** (John Morris)
   Oversees compliance and academic support and has a dotted line of accountability directly to the President to ensure his or her autonomy. Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance: (Kyle Pifer)

   Oversees daily compliance office of four people and provides education, advice, and investigation of issues that impact compliance in any area such as financial aid, admissions or eligibility. The assistant director also has dotted line report to the FAR to encourage independence.

E. **The Associate Athletic Director for Student Advancement** (Kim Durand)
   Has a dual reporting role to the Athletic Director/Senior Associate Athletic Director and to the Dean of Undergraduate Education/Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
   Oversees the provision of academic support to all student athletes such as tutoring or travel issues or meeting eligibility and degree progress requirements.

F. **The Vice President for Student Affairs:**
   Coordinates all issues involving potential legal violations and investigations.

   The VP for Student Affairs oversees the Admissions, Registrar and the Financial Aid office. All three offices are deeply involved in vulnerable points serving student athletes. These include certifying eligibility and certifying and disbursing financial aid. The athletic department now funds a half time person in Registrar’s office to certify eligibility. The ICA and financial aid work together but with ICA doing most of the work to disburse financial aid.

   The VP for Student Affairs oversees the Office of Admission to insulate the Director of Admissions from any undue influence from the President, Provost, Athletic Director, Boosters and associates.
   i. ACIA has proposed and the Faculty Council on Academic Affairs has accepted a series of criteria and time lines to govern the admissions process.
   ii. The Director of Admissions may reject student athletes and Athletic Director may request an appeal. A faculty appeal committee (Chair of ACIA, Dean of Undergraduate Education; FAR, one other member of ACIA) hears the appeal. There are approximately 3-6 a year usually involving high profile athletes.
   iii. The admissions process hinges upon a limited number of student athletes who get in as:
      1. **Priority admits**—student athletes who would have in the past been normally accepted to the university. Academic Index of 20-65.
      2. **Special admits**—extremely at risk student athletes with very low admission indices and who are admitted only 20 a year; must attend a special summer course (LEAP); and need an academic plan to guide them. Academic index 0-20.

G. **Independent University Decisions on Athletics Processes**
   a. The athletics department has attempted to minimize conflict of interests and increase the integrity of decision making by moving decisions and staffing around: eligibility determination; admissions assessment; financial aid determination and disbursement out of the athletics department into the university system.
      i. Over the last five years the athletic department has worked with the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Provost to ensconce these functions in the university. At this point athletic eligibility is determined by the registrar’s office, and all admissions assessments are performed by admissions department staff.
      ii. The department is presently working to take the final piece of these functions and move them to the university financial aid office.
      This process provides maximum integrity for the decisions and minimizes potential conflict of interest where athletic department employees make decisions that impact athletes so a greater level of independence is assured.
IV. Continuation of Process
It is important to remember that a constant friction exists between the academic and teaching mission of the university and some of the university imposed goals of modern athletic departments. The Universities have invited this with the insistence upon self-supporting athletics and the drive to commercialize revenue streams to enable this to happen. The revenue demand, of course, drives the aggressive quest to win in high profile sports like football and men’s basketball.

This pressure coupled with the interest of boosters, high money stakes and the migration of money and profits into high school and AAU teams creates a necessity to be constantly vigilant around issues of recruitment, admission, eligibility and various other aspects of student athletics.

The UW has a number of strong systems in place and they depend upon strong and committed individuals who are supported by the President and faculty to provide independent and honest decision-making and support in their areas of expertise.

This means that the University needs to pay constant attention to maintaining the independence of admissions and eligibility and academic progress determination and keep these insulated from any external influences that could undermine the standards of the university. It also means constant independent regulation from inside the department through its compliance and academic divisions.

A. Pacific Twelve Conference Issues on the Horizon

1) The PAC-10 has undergone a major sea change in governance. With the hiring of Larry Scott, the Presidents asserted more control over the conference. Larry Scott has worked directly with the Presidents in unprecedented ways. A governance structure now has a strong President’s Executive Committee. Meetings that used to involve the FAR and AD now only involve the Presidents.

2) The major issue is the hard push by the Presidents and the Athletic Directors to position the conference for a renegotiated television football contract in 2011. The Presidents believe that the PAC-12 is now at a significant monetary disadvantage with major rival conferences such as the Big10 and above all the SEC. The SEC schools get 18 million dollars per school off the top for the TV contract. The Big 10 has created its own network with the Presidents as the Board of Directors. The Networks generates about 9-12 million per year but has a very high upside.

3) The Conference must decide whether to create its own network or to strike a multi-million dollar deal with a network.
   i. The major concern is the networks are demanding that football and basketball play during weekdays rather than weekend schedules. This means more missed class time and rougher travel schedules which place greater stress upon student athletics. This is a major issue for faculty and FARs and will play out in terms of money versus academics.

4) The new PAC-12 would like to create a greater academic component to the conference. No one knows how, but the SEC has created set asides to support academic support for student athletes and the Big-10 have self-consciously met as Presidents and marketed themselves as an academic conference and brand. They even used this as a screen in securing new schools. In the Big 10 the Presidents, Deans and Provosts often meet to discuss academic issues under the umbrella of the Big 10.
Appendix A

Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

Mandate

The Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (“the Committee”) advises the President of the University of Washington on all matters pertaining to (1) institutional control of the athletic program; (2) the academic and financial integrity of intercollegiate athletics; (3) the academic and personal well-being of student-athletes; and (4) the accountability of the athletic department to the values and mission of the University of Washington.

Membership

The committee consists of the following voting members: the Faculty Athletic Representative and nine additional faculty members, and two representatives from the University of Washington Student Athlete Advisory Council. The faculty members shall serve staggered three-year terms that are renewable.

The President shall appoint the faculty members. Half of the faculty members shall be appointed from nominees from the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall elect its own Chair who may serve renewable terms.

Ex-officio members (non-voting) of the Committee include: the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, the Vice-Provost for Student Life, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs or his or her designee, a Presidential representative, the Director of Admissions, and senior athletic administrators as designated by the Committee.

Relationship to the Faculty Senate

The President appoints the Committee in collaboration with the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Chair of the Committee is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Faculty via the Faculty Senate Chair. The Committee Chair is also responsible for apprising the Faculty Senate Chair in a timely manner of any Committee actions requiring Faculty Senate action. The Faculty Senate Chair will refer such matters to the appropriate Faculty Senate Council.

Faculty Athletic Representative

The Faculty Athletic Representative is selected by the President of the University of Washington and serves a renewable five-year term. The President will select the Faculty Athletic Representative with the advice of the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Faculty Senate Chair and the Athletic Director.

Authorized by University of Washington President Mark Emmert, with the concurrence of Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell
University of Washington
Student-Athlete Code of Conduct

The Washington Way

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics at the University of Washington expects its student-athletes to conduct themselves at all times in a manner that embodies and reflects the values and traditions associated with the University of Washington. This is “The Washington Way.”

Participation in intercollegiate athletics is not a right. It is a privilege and opportunity accompanied by important responsibilities. Student-athletes are high-profile representatives of the University of Washington, and their behavior is closely scrutinized by their peers, the campus community, the citizens of Seattle and the State of Washington, and the media. The actions of a single student-athlete can reflect positively or negatively on both the individual student-athlete and his or her team and coaches, the Athletics Department and the entire University. Student-athletes should represent themselves and the University with honesty and integrity at all times and in all of their pursuits – in the classroom, in competition and in the community.

Student-athletes shall abide by this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct, the Athletics Department’s Student-Athlete Handbook and the University of Washington Student Code of Conduct, and they should support and encourage each other in their efforts to do the same. Student-athletes are encouraged to ask questions of the coaches, Athletics Department staff and University staff before engaging in any activity that might jeopardize eligibility or violate this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct. A student-athlete who violates this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct may be subject to disciplinary action from both the University and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.

Academic Responsibilities

Student-athletes at the University of Washington are students first and athletes second. The Athletics Department expects student-athletes to make academic success their top priority and carry out all of their academic responsibilities with integrity and character. The Athletics Department encourages student-athletes to explore all of their areas of intellectual interest and take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the University to grow as people and students.

General Academic Expectations

The academic responsibilities of each student-athlete include:

- Making satisfactory progress each academic quarter towards earning a degree and remaining in good academic standing under all University, Pac-10 and NCAA policies, rules and regulations.

- Preparing for and attending all classes; arriving on-time and staying until the end of each class. Student-athletes may not miss class for practice (unless related to team travel) or for any other athletic department-sponsored activity (e.g., banquets, community outreach activities).

- Preparing for and attending all scheduled tutoring appointments, advising/coordinating appointments and other academic-related meetings.

- Conducting themselves in all academic settings (e.g., classroom, tutoring sessions, computer lab, study halls) in a manner that demonstrates a sincere dedication to learning and promotes a positive learning environment. This includes paying attention, actively engaging in class discussions and refraining from distracting behavior.

- Satisfying all academic expectations outlined by the course instructor for each class even with the additional time demands related to practice, competition and team travel. This includes submitting all
assignments on time, striving for academic achievement, investing the time and energy necessary to create high-quality academic work and contributing to the overall learning environment.

- Communicating with course instructors before or during the first week of classes each quarter regarding team travel and arranging to take exams or complete class assignments.

- Abiding by the Student-Athlete Handbook and all academic policies of Student-Athlete Academic Services.

**Academic Integrity**

Academic integrity is the foundation of education. University of Washington student-athletes commit to conducting all academic pursuits with honesty, fairness, respect and responsibility. Student-athletes shall maintain the highest standards of academic conduct and abide by the letter and the spirit of all academic honesty policies of the University.

Student-athletes shall neither participate in nor condone any form of cheating/academic dishonesty. Academic violations include:

- **Plagiarism.** This includes using another writer’s words, ideas, structures without proper citation; failure to use quotation marks to credit the work of others; using a paper written by another individual or writing service; writing a paper for someone else; or presenting another individual's computer code as your own.

- **Cheating on exams/course assignments.** This includes copying from someone else’s paper; unauthorized use of notes during exams; altering an exam for re-grading; obtaining an advance copy of an exam; using or serving as a surrogate test-taker; falsifying data; or unauthorized collaboration.

- **Assisting others in any form of cheating/academic dishonesty.**

- **Falsifying reasons for taking a make-up exam or submitting assignments late.**

- **Submitting the same paper or other coursework for credit in two different classes.**

It is each student-athlete’s responsibility to know and follow the University of Washington Student Code of Conduct and its academic honesty policies. Ignorance of the rules is not a defense to a charge of academic dishonesty. **Note:** Discipline resulting from violations of the academic honesty policies may be administered by the Athletics Department under this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct that are separate and independent from any discipline administered by the University.

**Social and Community Responsibilities**

Student-athletes shall conduct themselves as responsible members of the university and local community. Student-athletes must abide at all times by: (i) the sport-specific team rules established by their coaches; (ii) the rules, regulations and policies of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, the University, the Pacific-10 Conference and the NCAA; and (iii) all local, state and federal laws.

Student-athletes must not participate in or condone participation by others in any activity that violates these rules, regulations, policies or laws. Examples of impermissible activities include hazing, gambling, discrimination, sexual harassment or misconduct, possession or use of illegal substances, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, physical abuse/fighting, public intoxication, and unlawful use of alcohol. Any violation of another person’s human rights, including harassment, that is based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or any other personal characteristic or preference will not be tolerated.

The social and community responsibilities of each student-athlete include:
• **Notice Requirement:** Student-athletes must immediately notify their head coach or sport administrator of any incident that involves: (i) an arrest or charge of any misdemeanor or felony criminal offense by UW campus police or any other law enforcement agency; (ii) an actual or alleged violation of any University of Washington policies or procedures (including residence hall policies). This notice requirement applies year-round and regardless of where the incident occurs.

• **Alcohol/Drugs:** The use of alcohol or drugs by student-athletes while involved in any team-related activities (e.g., practices, competitions, banquets, team travel) is prohibited, regardless of whether the student-athlete is of legal age. Student-athletes must be familiar with and abide by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Education Policy adopted by the Athletics Department. Student-athletes of legal age must handle the consumption of alcohol responsibly and in a manner consistent with the policies of the team, the Athletics Department and the University.

• **Gambling:** Student-athletes are prohibited from participating in any gambling or sports wagering activities that would violate NCAA gambling rules, state and federal gambling laws or the Athletics Department’s Gambling Policy. Student-athletes are responsible for knowing and abiding by the Athletics Department’s Gambling Policy.

• **Hazing:** Student-athletes are expected to foster a team environment that encourages trust, safety and respect between team members. Hazing can destroy a positive team environment and may result in physical, emotional or psychological harm to individuals or a team. Hazing is a misdemeanor criminal offense in the State of Washington. Student-athletes are prohibited from participating in, encouraging or condoning any form of hazing. Student-athletes should understand that hazing includes any act that, as a condition for being a member of the group, endangers the mental or physical health or safety of an individual, causes personal degradation or humiliation, or damages/destroys public or private property. Some examples of hazing include forced physical contact or exercise; sleep deprivation; public humiliation; forced consumption of food, drink or other substances; indecent exposure; personal servitude; forced acts that are illegal or unethical.

• **Recruiting:** Responsible recruiting helps attract outstanding student-athletes who will continue the University of Washington tradition of academic and athletic achievement. Student-athletes who participate in recruiting activities must act with the highest standards of behavior in all aspects of the recruiting process. This is especially important with unofficial and official visits by prospective student-athletes. Student-athletes are expected to know and follow at all times the NCAA recruiting rules and the Athletics Department’s Recruiting & Official Visits Policy. Examples of violations of the Recruiting & Official Visits include providing alcohol/drugs to prospects or encouraging the use of alcohol/drugs by prospects; using sex or any type of adult entertainment in recruiting; providing cash or impermissible benefits to prospects.

• **Internet/Social Networking:** Almost anything a student-athlete posts on a social networking site may be viewed by others, and both the media and the general public are more likely to view the social networking profiles of student-athletes than the profiles of other students. Information posted on these sites has the potential to influence the public’s view of the University and the Athletics Department jeopardize the personal welfare and safety of student-athletes. Student-athletes using social networking sites must do so responsibly, safely and in a manner consistent with the Athletics Department’s Student-Athlete Social Networking Policy.

**Sportsmanship & Athletic Responsibilities**

All student-athletes are obligated to represent themselves, their team, the Athletics Department, the University and their communities with the highest level of sportsmanship. Members of the community, and especially young boys and girls, admire student-athletes and look up to them as examples. Student-athletes must conduct themselves according to the following ideas and principles:

• Treat teammates, opponents, coaches, officials, media and fans with respect, fairness, civility and courtesy.
Accept victory humbly and without boasting;
Accept defeat graciously and without complaint;
Take advantage of opportunities to develop oneself as a skilled competitor; train hard and strive for the highest degree of athletic achievement;
Exert maximum effort within the rules of the game;
Maintain self-control in both language and action;
Admire earnest effort made fairly in pursuit of victory;
Never use the prospect of defeat as an excuse for unethical or unsportsmanlike behavior; and
Accept the role of a public figure and embrace that role to set a positive example for others.

Disciplinary Process

Violations of the Student-Athlete Code of Conduct will be handled on a case-by-case basis, and the discipline imposed for a violation shall depend on the specific facts and circumstances of each case. The discipline process administered by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is separate and supplemental to the University’s discipline process. Possible sanctions by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics include warnings, reprimands, mandatory counseling, community service, probation, suspension from team activities, dismissal from the team, and revocation/reduction/non-renewal of athletically-related financial aid.

When a student-athlete has been arrested or charged with a violation of criminal law, the student-athlete will be placed on administrative suspension from all team activities pending further investigation. If the alleged criminal activity would constitute a misdemeanor offense, the head coach may lift the administrative suspension after obtaining the approval of the sport administrator. If the alleged criminal activity would constitute a felony, the administrative suspension may be lifted only upon authorization of the Director of Athletics.

Coaches and all Athletics Department staff have a duty to report immediately any known or suspected violations of the Student-Athlete Code of Conduct to the Director of Athletics or the appropriate sport administrator. If the violation has any potential to violate the University’s Student Code of Conduct or otherwise falls under the jurisdiction of the Office of Student Affairs, the Director of Athletics or sport administrator shall inform the Vice President and Vice Provost for Student Affairs as soon as possible.

The sport administrator shall be responsible for investigating promptly any alleged violation. A meeting with the student-athlete ordinarily will occur before any discipline is imposed, but in extenuating circumstances, the sport administrator may suspend the student-athlete before the meeting. A student-athlete’s refusal to participate and cooperate in an investigation of a possible violation of this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct may itself constitute a basis for disciplinary action. Upon completion of the investigation the sport administrator shall determine, based on a preponderance of the evidence, whether a violation of this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct has taken place. The sport administrator shall decide the appropriate disciplinary action and shall inform the student-athlete, the head coach and the Director of Athletics of the sanctions imposed.

If the student-athlete disagrees with the decision or the severity of the sanctions, the student-athlete may submit a written appeal to the Director of Athletics. The Director of Athletics shall review the written appeal and conduct a meeting with the student-athlete, the head coach and the sport administrator. Whenever possible, the student-athlete shall attend the meeting in-person, but a telephone conference may occur if necessary. The Director of Athletics shall render a final decision after the meeting, and there
shall be no further right to appeal.

[Note: Student-athletes have the right under the Athletics Department’s Grievance Policy to contact the Ombudsman if a student-athlete feels that he or she is being discriminated against or otherwise treated unfairly or unlawfully.]

******************************************************************************

**Links to policies referenced in this Student-Athlete Code of Conduct**

The University of Washington Student Code of Conduct:

The Student-Athlete Handbook:

The Substance Abuse Education and Prevention Policy.

The Gambling Policy:

The Recruiting and Official Visits Policy:

The Social Networking Policy:

The Grievance Policy may be found at the following web address:

[Last Revised: 4/2/10]
April 27, 2011

To: JW Harrington, Faculty Senate Chair

From: William J. Rorabaugh, FCUFS Chair

Re: Post-Mortem/Plans Concerning Non-Saturday Football Games

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services devoted about 45 minutes of its meeting on April 14, 2011 to this topic. FCUFS heard a presentation from Stephanie Rempe of Intercollegiate Athletics; her main points are covered in two attachments. We also heard from Robert Stacey, Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities and Chair of the UW Advisory Committee in Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA). Bob nicely summarized the problems and what was learned, and he has expressed this in his attached letter, which many members of FCUFS thought offered a fair conclusion about this event. We also heard from Joshua Kavanagh, Director of Transportation Services, whose role was to implement parking policies. FCUFS, of course, also had a long and thoughtful general discussion.

The November 18, 2010, Thursday football game turned out to be a learning experience for everyone concerned. The main conclusion is that when such large-scale events are being planned an enormous amount of advance notice is needed to the entire UW community. For example, one unnecessary awkward fact was scheduling a major Kane Hall outside speaker at game time, while the Central Garage was effectively not available for attendees to that event.

Contrary to perceptions, Intercollegiate Athletics lost money on the game because expensive commercial buses had to be rented to move fans to the Stadium. On Saturdays, much cheaper Metro buses are available, but they cannot be used during a weekday rush-hour. On the other hand, UW did gain a lot of free publicity: The TV audience was two million.

Everyone involved recognizes that better advance planning is the key to making this kind of unusual event take place in a smooth way. Given the realities of TV contracts, future non-Saturday games are likely in future years.

See attachments:
Report on November 18, 2010, Evening Football Game, Bob Stacey, Chair, ACIA
ICA Summary
ICA Timeline
April 26, 2011

Professor William Rorabaugh
Chair, Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
Faculty Senate

Dear Bill,

As you know, disruptions to the University’s normal operations resulting from the November 18, 2010 evening football game (start time: 5:00 pm on a Thursday) called forth a considerable amount of concern and complaint from faculty and staff. Both the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services were asked by Faculty Senate Chair J. W. Harrington to look into the planning of this event, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate. Rather than producing two separate reports, you and I agreed that ACIA would report to you, as Chair of FCUFS, on our conclusions and recommendations, so that you could convey these recommendations, together with FCUFS’ own judgments, to the Senate. This letter is that report.

I will not rehearse the schedule of decisions that led up to the November 18 game. That is clearly set out in the Timeline (attached to this report) prepared by Stephanie Rempe, Senior Associate Athletic Director in ICA, who was designated by Athletic Director Scott Woodward to be the “point person” on arrangements having to do with this event. Nor will I repeat the points made in the attached evaluation of the planning for this event authored by Ms. Rempe. Both documents make clear how complex a logistical undertaking it is hold a football game - ANY football game – but especially on a weekday night. ICA, Parking Services, and many other UW offices deserve praise for how well they managed this event, given the challenges they faced. I would venture to say that very few of us, and certainly none of us in ACIA, had any real appreciation before this event of just how difficult and complicated it would be, or how much the logistical arrangements would affect campus life.

Given the cost and complexity of hosting this game on a weeknight during the academic year, ICA is not enthusiastic about repeating this experiment. As Ms. Rempe notes in her evaluation, ICA may work to plan a Thursday night game during the 2012 season, when the team is playing at Qwest Field; thereafter, ICA has promised to try to schedule weeknight games, when they occur, during September, before the UW academic term begins. That said, however, we should not be naïve. The new television contract currently being negotiated between the PAC-12 and the networks will almost certainly involve more weekday games, and the terms of that contract are not likely to allow us to “opt out” of such games even if we wished to do so (though of course at this point this is all speculative, as no contract has been signed). It is worthwhile nonetheless to ask ourselves now, “What could we have done better?” just in case we do wind up doing this again. Here are our conclusions.

1. Faculty and staff should have been notified of the decision to schedule this game as soon as the contracts were signed, which is to say in April 2010. This would have given faculty time to rearrange syllabi to accommodate likely disruptions, and faculty and staff would have known far enough in advance so that they could have avoided scheduling competing public events on that night into venues such as Kane Hall. ACIA was notified of this decision in April, but we simply failed to understand how much disruption this would cause (in particular, it did not occur to any of us that hosting a weekday evening game like this would involve closing on-campus parking lots to faculty, staff, and students). And the Faculty Senate was not informed or consulted on this decision at any stage in the process. FCUFS and the Faculty Senate Chair should have been invited into these discussions in January and February 2010, when the possibility of hosting a weekday football game was first being discussed, rather than in October 2010, when we were all in “damage control” mode.

2. The Office of the President really should have taken the lead in informing the campus community of this event and in mobilizing faculty, staff, and student support and understanding during the spring of 2010. Unfortunately, this did not happen. President Emmert had just announced his resignation, and everyone’s attention was on the transition to new leadership in that office. ICA proceeded with its own organizational preparations throughout the spring, but shaping campus
opinion is no part of ICA’s responsibilities, nor should it be. Presidential leadership and faculty senate leadership was required; for different reasons, both were absent.

3. The team ICA assembled to handle the logistical arrangements for the game did an excellent job of planning how to move football traffic to and from the stadium and around the University District. None of the members of that team, however, anticipated the extent to which faculty and staff would perceive these logistical arrangements (particularly the repurposing of parking areas from faculty and staff to football parking from noontime on) as a statement that the University cared more about its football fans than it did about its faculty, staff, and students and, by implication, than it did about its academic mission. In no sense was (or is) this ICA’s view of the position of football at this University. ICA made clear right from the beginning that there was never any consideration whatsoever that University classes should not meet, or that general University operations should be suspended on November 18 (as regularly occurs when weekday football games are held on some other university campuses). But because of the lack of communications leadership noted in #2 above, this message was not effectively communicated. Instead, ICA found itself trying to deal with a very different set of perceptions that had already taken shape, leaving a “bad taste” in everyone’s mouths.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Stacey
Professor of History
Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities
Chair, Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
University of Washington Department of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Thursday, November 18, 2010  
UW v. UCLA Football Game Recap

Overview
On Thursday, November 18, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. the University of Washington hosted a football game against UCLA. In order to accommodate a Thursday night football game there were several concessions made throughout the university community, the campus neighborhoods and by Husky ticket holders. The planning was extensive and communication was critical. Although the disruption was felt throughout the campus and surrounding community, the result was a well executed event that resulted in intangible benefits for the university and athletics department. More than two million people watched the game on ESPN. The university received national media exposure and enhanced the relationship with ESPN that will benefit future negotiations with the media partner.

Parking and Transportation
Throughout the summer the athletics department spent extensive time on the parking and transportation logistics. There was a significant financial commitment to ensure a smooth transportation experience for the fans. Metro was not able to provide the inbound service for a Thursday night game because of their regular weekday service. As a result numerous parking lots throughout Seattle and the surrounding communities were secured to create a park and ride system similar to a Saturday game utilizing charter and school busses for transportation. Although the system of shuttling fans to the game was different from a standard Saturday game and the costs were significantly more, the fan experience was positive.

Football parking permits for ticket holders, ICA and game day staff were significantly reduced. In order to accommodate the reduced number of permits, ICA and Commuter Services worked to secure all parking east of Montlake and an additional 1500 spaces on campus for football game day parking. Commuter Services worked to communicate the altered daily transportation plan to faculty, staff and students and to provide incentives to change employee commute behavior on November 18th. Many campus constituents who drove to campus were asked to park in alternate lots to accommodate the football parking permits.

Campus Planning
Support from the University Medical Center was crucial. From the initial meeting and phone conversations with UWMC, there was significant support to helping make the Thursday night game a success. UWMC worked internally to determine a work schedule. UWMC worked with university human resources to manage the employees and Commuter Services to manage the parking concerns.

A task force was created to provide progress updates for alternative transportation, work schedules for employees and campus facility schedules. This group helped develop a campus communications plan to manage the messages to faculty, staff and students. The task force representatives from human resources, commuter services, student affairs, police, community relations, UWMC, facilities, Educational Outreach, ACIA, and undergraduate education attended the weekly meetings.

Communication
Communication was crucial to ensuring a smooth event day. ICA, Community Relations and Commuter Services utilized numerous resources to communicate with campus constituents, fans, ticket holders and area neighborhoods.

The communication plan for campus contained messages from university representatives to faculty, staff and students. Emails, signage, websites, campus newspaper, radio, television and social media outlined the transportation plan, the work relief options available for employees and the emphasized the importance of the national exposure the university would receive. Commuter Services directed employees to a website to pledge to change behavior. With a goal of getting 4,000 employees to pledge, resulting in behavior change, 5,500 employees pledged. Email messages were sent directly to employees with specific parking permits with instructions on how best to navigate campus on November 18th. Flyers and signage were distributed well in advance of November 18th to warn campus constituents of the impending event.
The communication plan for fans emphasized three points: plan ahead, arrive early and Beat the Bruins. In addition there were strong efforts to direct fans to www.gohuskies.com to register for the shuttle service. Communication for fans took place in the summer and all football season through www.gohuskies.com, social media efforts, local media outlets, direct emails, mailings, public address announcements at games, video board messages, special feature stories, etc.

The communication plan for neighborhoods included working with CUCAC, Seattle City Council and King County Council to get the information to the area residents. Thousands of area residents received post cards inviting them to the game with redeemable vouchers for tickets. 786 tickets were issued through the postcard program.

The media blitz by the local news outlets proved successful from the enormous decrease in commuter traffic surrounding the stadium.

Future planning
Additional opportunities for the University of Washington to play a football game on Thursday night may be presented. The university and athletics department will attempt to minimize the impact on the campus, neighborhoods and fans. ICA will work to plan a Thursday night game during the 2012 season while the team is playing at Qwest Field. After 2012 ICA will make efforts to schedule any potential Thursday night games prior to the academic quarter's first day of classes when possible.

Once a future week night game contract is signed, immediately notifying the academic, facility and event units is paramount. Allowing these units to plan class schedules, facility usage and other campus events with minimal conflict around the game is crucial. Of note, November 18th was a Thursday night between Veteran's Day and Thanksgiving, therefore Thursday classes were affected three weeks in a row.

Although the task force was very effective, it is important to engage this group earlier in the planning.

It is important to note that 60,500 tickets were distributed for the game. The scanner count of tickets taken at the gate was 45,000. If 70,000 fans arrived at Husky Stadium on November 18th the outcome may have been vastly different.

Commuter Services will work to secure parking locations that minimize disruption.

Summary
Although the event was well-executed logistically with minimal issues on game day, the impact on campus units leading up to November 18th was extensive. There is no way to quantify the financial impact from the national exposure nor the impact of the loss in productivity. The decision to host a Thursday night game was done with thoughtful deliberation and any future decisions about Thursday night games will be done with thoughtful deliberation as well.
University of Washington Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
Thursday, November 18, 2010
UW v. UCLA Football Game Summary Timeline

January 2010
Discussions initiated by ESPN with the University of Washington, UCLA and the Pac 10 Conference regarding moving the November 13th game to November 18th. Internal discussions began between ICA and the President, Mark Emmert and between ICA and Transportations Services.

February 2, 2010
The first meeting was called by athletics to discuss the scenarios with the university administration. Attendees included Scott Woodward, Eric Godfrey, Mindy Kornberg, Theresa Doherty, Patty Riley, Ralph Robinson, John Vinson, Charles Kennedy, Stephanie Rempe and OD Vincent. In addition, ICA contracted with Seattle Hospitality Worldwide (SHW) to determine feasibility of transporting fans due to Metro's inability to operate their regular game day service.

February - March 2010
Discussions continued between Transportation Services and ICA to determine feasibility of managing a Thursday night game from a parking perspective. SHW shared their findings on the feasibility to manage transporting fans.

April 2010
The contract between ESPN and the University of Washington was signed. ICA internal meetings were scheduled to share the communication and logistics plan for the game. April 26th was the press conference announcing the game. Immediately following the press conference a meeting was set for the same group of campus constituents from the February meeting.

May - August 2010
Meetings detailing the communications and logistics plans continued. Information was shared throughout the summer with various constituent groups. SHW and ICA secured park and ride options for fans by securing numerous parking lots throughout Seattle and the surrounding communities.

September 2010
A task force of campus constituents began regular meetings to provide progress reports from campus departments. The task force consisted of representatives from university media relations, educational outreach, transportation services, health sciences, human resources, ICA, regional relations, UAA, student life, UWMC, provost office, arts and sciences dean's office, ACIA and faculty senate. The transportation website was launched. UCLA parking pass requests were due. Key message points were delivered through website, social media, email blasts, in game video boards, media outlets, etc.

October 2010
The Commuter Services communication plan was implemented including email messages, website launch, pledge promotion, signage notification. Post cards were sent to neighborhoods offering free tickets.

November 18, 2010
The University of Washington beats UCLA. Post mortem meetings were scheduled with the ICA internal staff, the task force, faculty senate chair and ACIA.
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:

a. Developing policy for handling students enrolled in programs selected for termination or that have been terminated.
b. Enrollment restrictions imposed on students in fee-based programs.
c. Impact of Activity Based Budgeting on academic programs.
d. Policy for handling Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credits.
e. Policy for formal Tri-Campus course equivalency process.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

a. Will work with the Provost and Fund Review Committee to review a Request for Proposals for University of Washington Retirement Plan changes.
b. Monitoring proposed legislation related to benefits and retirement

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Current Agenda Items (Short Form):

1. Adjudication Issues in response to SEC resolution. Three sub-issues have been identified:
   a. Interaction of EO61 (OSI) and the informal dispute resolution process in the Faculty Code.
   b. Ability of Deans to assign disciplinary measures without adjudication.
   c. Notification of rights during dispute resolution process, and rights of appeal.
      FCFA is currently in the issue discussion
2. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.
3. Adjudication Revision – A general reworking of the adjudication process, with ties to item 2, but broader in scope. This is presently in the hands of a task force and will come to FCFA for review.
4. Senate Restructuring Cleanup – Alternate delegates for Senators, SEC nomination process, SEC Faculty Council Chair elections, double Senators (elected and ex officio).

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

FCMA is continuing review of implementation of Diversity Blueprint in schools and colleges, having most recently met with Dean Archibald of the Evans School of Public Affairs. Next is a meeting with Dean Uehara of the School of Social Work on May 11.

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 winter quarter. Thus far, no others have been forthcoming.

At FCR’s monthly meetings this fall and winter, FCR has heard several presentations by the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Research personnel on items including changes in the Grants Information Memoranda, changes in the compliance rules for human and animal research, and changes
in the visa applications. We have several similar issues lined up for discussion with administration officials through spring quarter. The April meeting included federal budget updates and a review of proposed changes to Grants Information Memorandum 34, Guidelines for Classification of Sponsored Projects and Gifts.

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students, including recent topics on admissions policies and standards, student-athlete issues (sports psychology and missed class time), and the faculty appeal board. Future agenda items include graduation rates for student-athletes.

**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. Future agenda items include e-books, and discussions with the Senate Chair and Provost on their sense of priorities in the area of teaching and learning.

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

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

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

FCUFS most recently held a post-mortem on the November 18, 2010 Thursday football game, a detailed report of which is available in this SEC packet. The council has also recently reviewed plans for the Husky Stadium renovation, the West of 15th campus plans, the Intellectual House, the Sound Transit light rail station on Brooklyn Avenue, and the Montlake Triangle project, including the Burke-Gilman Trail and the Husky Stadium light rail station.

**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. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The Council will continue to follow up on the 2009-2010 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.
3. 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.
4. The provision of HUB services in the Libraries. The FCUL will continue to monitor the Library provision of services in support of the HUB renovation, including for example ATM and extended food services in Suzzallo and a reduced service bookstore in Odegaard.
5. 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.

6. Co-sponsored address by Paul Courant, Dean of Libraries at University of Michigan.

7. Discussion of various library issues. Recent topics have included reference desk task force and the Research Commons. Future meetings will address library outreach services support for fee-based and distance programs.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

1. Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty – continued review of data collected in survey. Report will be prepared.

2. Faculty Mentoring Program – meeting with leadership around campus, including Board of Deans, to determine where a faculty mentoring program could be placed; developing priorities on what a program should include.

Reminder: Approved council minutes are always available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html
Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30 p.m.)

- John Schaufelberger, Construction Management, College of Built Environments, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30 p.m.)

- Gerry Philipsen, Communication, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 9:00 a.m.)

- Kevin O’Brien, Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011 and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Research (Meets Wednesdays at 9:00 a.m.)

- Ron Stenkamp, Biological Structure, School of Medicine, as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.
- Susan Spieker, Family and Child Nursing, School of Nursing, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 1:30 p.m.)

- Brian Fabien, Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering, as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.

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

- Jan Carline, Medical Education, School of Medicine, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.
- Matthew Yeh, Pathology, School of Medicine, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.
- Richard Jeffrey Wilkes, Physics, College of Arts & Sciences, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.
- Jamie Olavarria, Psychology, College of Arts & Sciences, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00 a.m.)

- Barbara Endicott, Information School, UW Seattle, as a renewing member for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00 a.m.)

- William Rorabaugh, History, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.
- Bruce Balick, Astronomy, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014.
Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30 p.m.)

- Joyce Cooper, Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering, as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Mondays at 12:30 p.m.)

- Marjorie Olmstead, Physics, College of Arts & Sciences, as a renewing member, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2014, and as chair, for a term beginning September 16, 2011, and ending September 15, 2012.
### 2011-2012
#### Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter, 2011</td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>October 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>November 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>November 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>December 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter, 2012</td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>January 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>January 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>February 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter, 2012</td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>April 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Continuation Meeting</td>
<td>May 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Senate meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.*

*Executive Committee meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in 142 Gerberding Hall.*

---

1 Continuation meetings will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished or special business of the SEC or Senate.
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the April 4, 2001, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
      ii. Approval of April 21, Faculty Senate Minutes.
      iii. Approval of the 2011-2012 Schedule of Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Meetings.
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.
   e. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative.

5. Invited Guests.
   Herb Simon, Chair, University of Washington Board of Regents.

6. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Approve Nominations for 2010-11 Senate Executive Committee Positions.
      Chairs of 3 Faculty Councils: Benefits and Retirement, Faculty Affairs, Teaching and Learning.
      Eight senators chosen from the elected members of the Faculty Senate: Seat 1 – Eric Stern
      (Medicine), Constance Lehman (Medicine); Seat 2 – Hazel Taylor (Information School), Laura
      Evans (Evans School); Seat 3 – Sandra Bordin (Dentistry), Margaret Baker (Nursing); Seat 4 –
      Susan Nolen (Education) (Running unopposed.); Seat 5 – Diane Morrison (Social Work), Kristiina
      Vogt (Environment); Seat 6 – JoAnn Taricani (Arts & Sciences), Sarah Stroup (Arts & Sciences); Seat 7 –
      Steve Buck (Arts & Sciences), Christoph Giebel (Arts & Sciences); Seat 8 – Kurt
      Johnson (Medicine), Soo Borson (Medicine).

7. Memorial Resolution.

8. Announcements.

   Class A Legislation – Second 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 final review of proposal to submit legislation 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,
May 26 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. At present, Academic Human Resources practice is that 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 professors, 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 G). 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. Appointment with a **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 24–40. Faculty Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT)

A. A professor or associate professor without tenure by reason of funding (WOT) is qualified for tenure by virtue of rank. Such a faculty member holds his or her appointment on a continuing basis. The term of appointment of an assistant professor WOT is governed by Section 24–41, Subsections B A and E D.

B. Faculty appointed WOT do not hold tenure because all or part of his or her annual University–administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same. Except for termination of funding as defined in Section 24–41, Subsection K J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25–52), such faculty members are not subject to removal, or discriminatory reduction in salary, except for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25–51.)

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 D. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

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

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

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

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 C B 4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer, 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 C B 3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time instructor, lecturer, 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 as 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. C. A full-time lecturer, or 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, or senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer respectively.

E. D. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 24-41, Subsection B A, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. G. 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. H. 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. L. 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. J. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Section 24-41, Subsection H G.

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


Section 24–45. Appointment of Part-Time Professors

A. The University may appoint faculty to professorial or research professorial ranks (see Section 24–34, Subsections A.2 1 through A.4 3 and Subsection B.3) on less than a full–time basis. The percentage of appointment at the time of hire shall be documented by the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) and clearly communicated in writing to the faculty member.

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 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. 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.
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.