Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, May 4, 2015, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Present: President Cauce, Provost Baldasty, O’Neill, Beauchamp, Lee, Hopkins, Fong, Storti, Wood, Shen, Astley, Resnick, McKinley, Janes, Rosenfeld, Killien, Taricani, Xiao, Popejoy
Absent: Stroup, Gharib
Guests: Marisa Nickel

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair O’Neill called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien moved to add five nominees to item c. of the consent agenda. The motion passed and the agenda was approved as amended.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – Kate O’Neill. [Exhibit A]

O’Neill pointed members to her written report and thanked them for their service on SEC.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. (No written report.)
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit B]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit C]
   d. Faculty Council on Academic Standards report to the SEC. [Exhibit D]
   e. Faculty Council Activities. [Exhibit E]

Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani provided a brief update on the legislative session. Taricani reported that little progress had been made since the previous Faculty Senate meeting. Budget writers from each caucus were meeting but were not expected to come to a timely resolution. Taricani was hopeful that more progress would be made toward the end of May.

Astley asked what the next revealed budget would look like. Taricani responded that the next budget would likely be agreed to by both parties before final tweaking.

Astley asked how late the budget could come out in order for raises to go into effect in July. Cauce responded that if a budget were to pass by May 31st the university could implement a July 1st raise deadline. Otherwise, the next likely implementation would be September, 2015.

Duane Storti asked about faculty input on the location of the Computer Science Building and what other sites were available. He believed that there was not adequate input into the decision about siting for that building. Cauce did not believe that the site decision had been finalized. O’Neill vowed to follow up on Storti’s concern and the process for site selection. Lee mentioned that SCPB and FCUFS were involved at various stages throughout the process but that the site decision did not go to SCPB.

O’Neill commended the work of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and pointed members to Exhibit D.

There were no additional questions.


President Cauce provided comment about her involvement in the legislative discussions about funding for the education of medical students in Washington State. She expressed frustration about the delay in decisions about funding for higher education. On a positive note, she acknowledged that there was increased attention and interest in higher education among the legislature. She planned to advocate for more
long term planning for legislative efforts by the UW. Given recent hikes in tuition, Cauce added that a priority would be to raise private donations for financial aid for middle class students.

President Cauce commented on her recent talk on race and equity and ideas for moving initiatives forward. She encouraged the faculty to consider ways to address student concerns about microaggressions. Another area of focus would be to investigate ways to support childcare needs.

Lastly, President Cauce mentioned a decrease in the yield rate, or the number of students with offers accepting admission, for in-state and non-resident domestic students. The yield rate for international students, however, continued to increase.

Vice Chair Norm Beauchamp commended Cauce’s long term planning initiatives.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the April 6, 2015, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
   b. Approval of the April 23, 2015, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for 2015-16 faculty councils and committees. [Exhibit F] Sent under separate cover.
   d. Approve nominations for 2015-16 Senate Executive Committee positions. [Exhibit G] Sent under separate cover.
   e. Approve 2015-16 schedule of Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meetings. [Exhibit H]

The consent agenda was approved without objection.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Discussion items:
   a. Sustainable Academic Business Plan: Mobilizing the Faculty Senate. [Exhibit I]

Chair O’Neill introduced the Sustainable Academic Business Plan, a project led by Marisa Nickel, Dean Bob Stacey, and Interim Provost Gerald Baldasty. Provost Baldasty was excited to see buy-in from faculty members and hoped the SABP would result in students being able to better recognize what they learn and articulate that to those who want to understand it. Departments in engineering and environment, among others, are piloting the project to customize templates.

Astley commented that we are responsible for training the next generation of citizens entering jobs in Washington State. She thought it would be interesting to know what industry is looking for in different fields and to match that to what we provide. Jeff Wilkes responded that some data is available, and that many departments have industry experts on faculty or advising them.

Rob Wood asked how much of the focus was on undergraduate students. Nickel responded that the main focus was at the undergraduate level, but that there was no desire to leave out graduate students. None of the initiatives are expressly limited to undergraduates.

Joe Janes commented that the Faculty Senate is in a good position to support administrative initiatives. Student outcomes are important and the I-School’s accrediting body requires public posting of outcomes. More generally, Janes had some objections to quantifying learning.

Resnick mentioned progress in undergraduate learning goals at UW Bothell.

Popejoy spoke in favor of expanding the focus on graduate students and asked if they previously had input in the process. Nickel responded that the Husky experience is a larger umbrella and that the learning template was one of seven projects. She added that the initiative was most likely to gain traction with undergraduate units, but promised to work on getting more graduate students involved.
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O’Neill hoped to filter the discussion to relevant committees and suggested that faculty councils be asked to give input.

b. Faculty council structure.

Chair O’Neill introduced the issue and asked SEC members to consider if the current faculty councils are addressing the most important needs for faculty and shared governance. Astley raised the issue of overlapping agendas among administrative and faculty councils. She questioned if multiple councils should work on complex issues. In contrast, Tueng Shen voiced concern that coordination of multiple committees could be challenging.

To encourage collaboration, members suggested more coordination and sharing of council agendas early in the year. Best practices for council leadership and management of agendas would be helpful. Wilkes offered that unclear policy boundaries could be helpful if strong coordination and communication are present.

O’Neill asked if there were any issues the Senate should consider that were not currently addressed.

Cauce suggested involving faculty more actively in the UW’s legislative agenda and community engagement, and added that the faculty voice is an important part of the UW’s external strategy.

Janes expressed concern over the shift of public perception of higher education as a public good to a commodity or a “ticket to jobs.” Taricani defended the value of an educated populace and suggested more efforts to highlight the contributions of higher education institutions to the state and the world.

Other members were concerned about the impact of ABB on graduate programs and departments and questioned if the model adequately supports graduate education.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

   Approve the May 21, 2015, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit J]
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.

10. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien

Approved by: Kate O’Neill, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Kate O’Neill, Professor, Law

I want to begin by thanking everyone who has participated in the Senate Executive Committee this year: Members, Council Chairs, Student Representatives, Ex-Officio administrative representatives, the President and Provost, and our various guests.

There are lots of pots bubbling on the Senate’s stove and many cooks in the kitchen as we approach the end of the academic year. I would love to end my year as Chair by declaring that “dinner is served.” Instead, I’m just going to try to keep hope alive by giving a progress report and soliciting your advice on how to tee up some issues going forward.

Sustainable Academic Business Plan (SABP) & Faculty Council Agendas for 2015 – 2016

I mentioned this in my last report and I’m asking you to do some reading for our upcoming meeting. The SABP is an evolving plan – or really a process – for identifying strategic goals in the short and long term, developing action items and establishing metrics for assessing outcomes. It informs key decisions, especially at the Provost’s level. Norm Beauchamp and I want to know if the SEC wants to try to align some council activities to engage constructively with the Plan.

To begin, we have attached a summary of one key component of the SABP, along with data on who has participated in SABP. This component presents a vision of the UW’s teaching mission – and thus it should interest all faculty. I urge you to read it and consider the following issues.

First, do you agree with the vision of how we can advance our students’ learning and opportunities during and after their time here?

Second, achieving this vision depends crucially on faculty participation and support. What do you think of the sample template?

Third, how should the Senate’s councils engage with SABP development and implementation constructively? For example, should the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning be charged with evaluating and possibly promoting the teaching template? Should other councils, like Student Affairs or Faculty Affairs, be involved? Should Senate leadership be reaching out to Elected Faculty Councils?

By posing these questions, I don’t mean to limit the discussion to them. I welcome your thoughts.

Faculty Council Jurisdiction and Agendas

The discussion of the SABP leads into a broader issue of how we can use the Senate’s councils and committees most effectively next year. In part, Norm and I wanted to bring the SABP to your attention because it suggests a basic issue about effective shared governance. Obviously, the Senate acts to express and protect faculty interests, but should we be trying to be more proactive in shaping the UW’s future? There are, obviously, administrative initiatives all over our three campuses. Do we know what they are and are the councils and committees aligned to deal with those initiatives in a timely and effective manner? Do we want to promote initiatives of the faculty’s? How best to do that?

Ideally, I think that when the administration or the faculty identifies a need or a goal, there ought to be a faculty council with relevant jurisdiction to deal with that initiative. Instead, both the administration and, to a lesser extent, the SEC has set up new task forces. Now I understand that the administration has the prerogative, as does the SEC, to set up groups that report to each entity. Nevertheless, I think it might be more efficient and possibly more collaborative if the default process was to send an initiative first to a faculty council – assuming that the council had the appropriate jurisdiction and bandwidth.

We have examples where administrative initiatives went to administrative task forces and committees – perhaps because there was not a faculty council with appropriate jurisdiction or the council’s process was perceived as too slow. So, for example, a previous administration created IPMAC, and, in reaction to it,
we created a SCIPC; we have had a task force on on-line education while we have a council on teaching and learning; we have an ABB task force to review ABB effects while we have the SCPB; we had a task force on lecturers, while we have a council on faculty affairs; we have a new task force on bias while we have councils on multicultural affairs and on women in academia.

My point is not to criticize the administration for setting up task forces; my point is that the relative rigidity of the faculty councils’ jurisdiction – and perhaps some failure on leadership’s part to plan agendas well in advance – means that the key institutions of faculty governance are often reactive rather than proactive, responding to reports and proposals rather than collaborating when the reports and proposals are first drafted. We are, perhaps, also straining faculty and student volunteers and administrative representatives by proliferating the numbers of bodies that work on closely related issues.

Therefore, I would suggest (for next year after I am no longer chair – ha!) that SEC take a close look at council jurisdiction and alignment with faculty needs and goals and with known or foreseeable administrative initiatives. Are there neglected topics? Councils with too much work? Councils with too little? Councils with overlapping concerns that should be consolidated in a new council? Having encountered some difficulty in assigning tasks to councils this year and rationalizing agendas, I would also suggest that the SEC consider revising the descriptions of councils’ jurisdiction, now fixed in Class A legislation, to make it easier for the SEC to assign novel issues to existing councils.

Presidential Search

The faculty leaders of all three campuses, including Norm Beauchamp and me, participated in a conference call with Kenyon Chan, chair of the search committee. The process he outlined is very similar to the one Regent Bill Ayer recently described in a message to the University.

At this point, there are three issues for faculty to focus on. One, obviously, is the composition of the search committee Kenyon Chan told us that he anticipates five faculty members of a committee that will have “upward” of 20 members. He anticipates that the Regents will appoint three faculty from Seattle and one each from UW Tacoma and UW Bothell.

At the last Senate meeting we discussed how faculty members should be selected. There was a consensus from senators that the only representative criterion would be election to the Senate or the campus faculty organizations. After discussing the issue with my senate leadership colleagues here in Seattle, I wrote to Dr. Chan nominating Norm Beauchamp, incoming Chair, JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, and myself to represent Seattle’s campus. We expect that the faculty organizations at UWT and UWB will nominate their own faculty.

The second issue concerns giving direction to the search committee on what the UW’s goals and needs are and what qualifications and experience we think the next President should have to achieve those goals and meet those needs. The Regents are holding various listening sessions to gather the views of stakeholders. Anyone can also send written suggestions and comments.

The third issue concerns the degree of confidentiality or openness of the search process. There are, as far as I can tell, widely divergent views among the Regents and among the faculty on the relative merits and the definition of an open search. In any case, however, a faculty senate resolution states a position in favor of openness. As chair, I have expressed that view and will continue to do so unless and until the faculty senate alters its position.

Salary Policy

As I reported last time, my colleague Jack Lee has been working with senators from units that had concerns about the salary policy proposal as it was presented to this body and the Senate last winter. Jack believes that he may have reached a compromise with those groups that will permit units to vary the percentages of raises. Under the terms of this compromise, variations from the default raise percentages must involve consultation among faculty and deans and chairs, must be approved by faculty vote of the affected unit, and are conditioned on Provost approval. I have told the Senate that the Senate office will conduct a poll of faculty of each department. Faculty can rank their preferences for three options: the
compromise salary policy proposal, a less ambitious “tweak” to the code that would allow more flexibility to address compression and inequities than the present code seems to permit, and leave the present system as is. If there is strong support for either the new proposal or the tweak, we will polish that up and put it through the vetting process – by the administration and Attorney General and by the Code Cops. Barring unforeseen difficulties, I would expect a salary policy proposal to be presented to the SEC and the Senate in Autumn 2015.

In closing -- Thank you all for your hard work and support! I have enjoyed my year as Chair, in large part because of all the wonderful people, like yourselves, who have taught me lots of things about the University and who have been so generous in volunteering their time and counsel.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

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

Here are the topics that SCPB has discussed since my last report to the Senate. Documents and data related to these discussions are posted on the SCPB website, www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/scpb.

Library Trends and Digital Initiatives

We received a report from Betsy Wilson, Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives and Dean of University Libraries, about the current state of the libraries and prospects for the future. We learned that usage of the libraries, in terms of both in-person visits and online access, has been steadily increasing. In a recent survey, users expressed an extraordinary level of satisfaction with the services provided by the libraries (95% “very satisfied”).

Most of our conversation focused on trends in academic publication, especially open-access textbooks and journals. Faculty and students alike appreciate open-access materials, but a number of concerns were expressed. With regard to journals, some concerns are the cost to authors of publishing in truly open-access journals, and the reluctance of researchers to move away from the established high-prestige commercial journals, even though the cost of access can be extremely high. With regard to textbooks, some concerns are quality control and how faculty authors can be compensated for the effort of writing textbooks if not through royalties. This is a rapidly changing landscape, and the UW Libraries organization seems to be doing a superb job of staying on top of new developments. Faculty will need to pay close attention to these developments.

Unit Adjustments

SCPB reviewed data on departmental salary gaps between UW and AAUDE peers, and advised the provost on what to say to deans, chancellors, and college councils about applying for unit adjustments under Section 24-71, Subsection B.2 of the faculty code. Because unit adjustments are the primary vehicle for providing flexible salary adjustments above and beyond the uniform “regular merit” and “additional merit” categories, SCPB members urged the provost to allow schools, colleges, and campuses to apply for permission to give unit adjustments based on more flexible criteria than simply the gap between overall average salaries in the UW unit and those in peer departments. Provost Baldasty accepted our advice, and has sent out a letter to deans and chancellors inviting proposals for unit adjustments in units where there is at least a 9% salary gap with peers, even if that gap occurs only among faculty of a specific rank; and inviting deans or chancellors to propose a different adjustment threshold or comparison model for consideration if those guidelines don’t fit. The elected faculty councils in the schools, colleges, and campuses should be consulted about whether unit adjustments are justified.

One Capital Plan

We received a report from John Seidelmann (Director of Capital and Space Planning) and Rich Christie (Chair of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services) on the draft revision of the One Capital Plan. This is a unified list of all capital projects that are in process or contemplated, arranged into three tiers: Tier I is fundamental projects that must be funded if at all possible; Tier II is projects for which funding potential has been identified; and Tier III is projects that have been requested, but for which no funding source has yet been identified. The current version of the plan can be seen on the Capital Planning website: opb.washington.edu/oua/capital-planning.
University Advancement

We spoke with Connie Kravas, Mary Gresch, Greg Sheridan, Lisa Thomas, and Walt Dryfoos from University Advancement about the current campaign and about how return on investment is measured. The goal of the current campaign is to raise $4 billion by FY 2020, and to establish a new sustainable annual contribution total around $350 million. We learned that UW currently has the second-highest annual contribution total among public universities (second only to UCLA), and the fifth-highest alumni participation percentage. There was an extensive discussion about why there is not a big push to raise funds for annual operating expenses (including faculty, staff, and TA salaries) as is done at some private universities; the answer seems to be that most large donors are not inspired by that kind of request, and we expect to raise considerably more money overall by focusing on funds targeted to specific projects that donors want to support. One such project is financial aid, and any funds contributed to support student financial aid can free up some of the tuition funds that are currently returned to aid, resulting in more overall funds available for operating expenses.

We also discussed the current brand campaign (“Be Boundless”). The return on this investment is more intangible and harder to measure (it’s not simply a ratio of dollars donated to dollars spent), but the goals of the branding campaign are to attract and develop the most promising students, grow public and private support, be a destination for world-class faculty and staff, and grow internal passion for what the University stands for.

Parking Rates

Because of widespread questions about the justification for proposed new parking rates, we invited Josh Kavanagh, Director of Transportation Services, to discuss the proposed new rates before they are sent to the regents for approval. This is the first proposed parking rate increase since 2011, and the first proposed U-Pass rate increase since 2010. We learned that the primary driver of rate increases for the faculty/staff U-Pass program is increasing fare rates and increased services that are becoming available through the pass, as new bus and light rail options come to campus; and parking rate increases are being driven by increased maintenance costs and a shift from paying for these items through reserves to paying through debt financing.

We focused particularly on the balance between SOV parking rates and other rates that encourage fewer SOV trips such as the U-Pass. One limitation on how far SOV rates can be raised is that commercial parking areas in the U-District have not been raising rates as quickly as they did in the past, so raising UW parking rates any faster might drive more people to find parking off campus, thus resulting in no net increase in revenue or decrease in trips. Because of cost increases in the U-Pass program, we discussed the possibility of switching to a universal U-Pass charge for faculty and staff, like the universal charge now paid by students. An obstacle to making that switch is the number of different bargaining groups among classified staff; but Transportation Services is exploring the possibility of switching to a universal charge one group at a time.

Draft Regents Budget

We got a preview of the 2015-2016 budget proposal that will go to the Regents as an information item at its May 14 meeting. Because of the uncertainties of the state budget, the current version of the budget proposal is somewhat speculative, based primarily on the budget proposal passed by the House of Representatives. Once the budget proposal is finalized, it will be available on the OPB and Regents websites.

Legislative Updates

We continue to receive regular weekly legislative updates from Assistant Vice Provost Sarah Hall and Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani. For information about the legislative session, see the Legislative Representative’s blog (catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/taricani/45456/328307, UW NetID required) and the OPB issue briefs (opb.washington.edu/content/opb-issue-briefs).
Here are some topics we plan to discuss in the remaining meetings this spring. For agendas, see uw.edu/faculty/senate/scpb/agendas.

- EO & online degrees
- Research funding, RRF
- Activity Based Budgeting
- Infrastructure costs in the operating budget
- Sustainable Academic Business Plan
- Learning Spaces Project
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative  
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor and Chair, Music History Program  
olympia@uw.edu

At the time of writing this report, the Legislature is starting its first (hopefully only) special session on April 29. Any update on negotiations will be provided in person at the Senate Executive Committee meeting. Below is a comparison of the House and Senate budgets as passed by each chamber; the final budget will be a negotiated budget between the two, and will be a balanced budget, with all needed revenue agreed to by House and Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward</td>
<td>$518,962,000</td>
<td>$518,962,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (resident undergraduate), per academic year</td>
<td>$10,740 (2012-13 level)</td>
<td>$9,474 for 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,561 for 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment (new funding)</td>
<td>$ 76,642,000</td>
<td>$155,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases, faculty/staff</td>
<td>3.0% (2015-16); 1.8% (2016-17); full funding for ratified SEIU/WFSE contracts</td>
<td>$1,000 per FTE per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New enrollments; high-demand</td>
<td>$4,250,000 in CSE</td>
<td>$4,000,000 in STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWAMI Spokane reallocation</td>
<td>$9,360,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical residencies</td>
<td>$4,900,000 to create 69 additional residency slots</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Need Grant</td>
<td>$53,000,000</td>
<td>Subtracts $17,527,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Bound</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>Probable reduction; unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) regarding recently adopted policies by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)
Patricia Kramer, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) recently adopted 2 new policies that the Council feels should be brought to the attention of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC): a change to the distance-learning (DL) designation and establishment of procedures for the evaluation of new course creations and course modifications.

DL designation: the Student Regulations requires that DL courses be reviewed differently than, and internally designated and tracked separate from, non-DL courses. DL courses do not count for residency. Despite these substantive consequences of the designation of DL, the Student Regulations do not define DL. UW policy has been to require the DL designation for any course with greater than 50% of its instructional content delivered online. This policy is based in wording from a document of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) that dates from greater than a decade ago and uses such phrases as "predominately online" to define distance-learning. The Council, recognizing that this 50% policy is difficult to operationalize and that the learning environment has changed in many ways since the early 2000's, created an ad hoc subcommittee to review the current DL policies. The principal charge was to determine if the DL designation should continue, and if so, should any changes be made to it.

The subcommittee recommended that the designation be maintained for courses that are truly or essentially online. After much discussion among members of the subcommittee and the Council at-large, we developed some language that detailed in the attached policy. Essentially, only those courses that have no required campus presence are deemed DL. Courses that use online learning as part of a traditional, campus course are not DL. This is a substantive change to policy, but one that the Council feels is necessary.

This guideline applies only to the Seattle campus, but the chair of FCAS has discussed this with representatives of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. The representatives of both campuses expressed interest in this change and will be looking at their policies in light of this change on the Seattle campus.

Of note: this change in curricular policy will require some administrative changes to meet state reporting requirements. The Council has consulted with the Office of the University Registrar regarding this.

Requested action by the Senate Executive Committee: FCAS requests that the SEC investigate the use of the $350 DL fee imposed on (some) DL courses offered to generally admitted UW students.

Course approvals: in recent years the number of questions/conflicts over courses between Colleges/Schools has risen. Many of these conflicts involve questions regarding course content – both who should teach certain content and how that content should be taught. The college curriculum committees are unable to mediate these questions/conflicts, so they come to the University Curriculum Committee (UWCC). The UWCC is not, however, equipped to mediate curricular issues. FCAS is charged with this task, but no transparent process or procedures exist. Consequently, in consultation with UWCC, FCAS produced the attached policy.

Essentially, the policy strongly recommends that units engage in civil and collegial conversations and produce course creation or modification forms that reflect this conversation. If units cannot agree on curricular goals, FCAS, in consultation with the Provost, will decide whether or not the course creation or modification under discussion will be approved.
Faculty Council on Academic Standards Policy on DL (distance learning) designation for UW Seattle courses

A course or section of a course in which students can participate fully without being physically present on campus must be designated as a “DL” course or section. This includes courses in which some, but not necessarily all, offerings of the course are online, such as courses that are offered with different technologies in different quarters (i.e., one quarter on campus and another quarter online) and courses where, in a quarter, one section of the course is on-campus and another section is online. A DL course may have occasional meetings on campus for the purposes of organization, evaluation, or group presentations.

However, courses that make extensive use of online teaching tools but also have regular recurring meetings (i.e., weekly), such as labs, discussion sections, studios or other on campus offerings, do not typically require the DL designation, even if these meetings are for shorter duration than those traditionally encountered in on-campus courses.

The DL designation is obtained via the course creation/change process. Courses designated DL do not count for residency and must be re-approved after 3 years, in accordance with Student Regulations Chapter 115.1.I.

Approved by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards March 20, 2015
Faculty Council on Academic Standards Policy on Oversight of Courses

In order to make the process of course approval transparent, this set of guidelines and principles was created by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) in consultation with the Office of the University Registrar. The aim is to document current practice, place that practice within the existing faculty governance structure, and provide a pathway toward course approval upon which University units (which includes departments, programs, and any other group of faculty that offers courses for University credit) can depend.

The University of Washington Curriculum Committee (UWCC) is a semi-independent committee composed of individuals whose primary missions are to represent the Seattle, Tacoma and Bothell faculties; the Graduate School; Undergraduate Affairs; FCAS, and the Office of the University Registrar. In terms of faculty governance, UWCC reports to FCAS, as FCAS is charged with “…inter-institutional academic standards.” In terms of administrative oversight, it is housed within the Office of the Provost. It is (semi-)independent in that most of the business of UWCC can be conducted without consultation with either the Provost’s office or FCAS. These matters include routine approvals for course creations and changes. It is only semi-independent in that the FCAS members of UWCC (with support from the Office of the University Registrar) will provide a monthly summary to FCAS for notification purposes and will bring any courses about which questions arise to FCAS for review. This semi-independence allows the committee to maintain its largely administrative function, but also clearly to establish faculty governance over curricular matters. As with all issues of concern to academic standards, FCAS will consult other councils, committees, offices and units on an as needed basis.

Guiding principles:

1. Curricular content—what is included in a course and how that course is taught—is best established by the unit that “owns” the course (i.e., “owns” the prefix, course number, and title). Ownership here refers to the unit that originally proposed the course and can usually be established by the prefix, e.g., ANTH belongs to the Department of Anthropology and ENGL belongs to the Department of English (but see below for more information). The Faculty in a unit are the subject matter experts and are best able to assess the appropriateness of the materials and methods associated with the course, especially given that pedagogy and content need to be aligned with trends particular to disciplines.

2. Just as departmental Faculty members are knowledgeable about course content and pedagogical concerns, so too are the Registrars subject matter experts on curriculum management (e.g. registration, transcripts, etc.). While a Faculty member’s relationship with a course often ends when the course grade is submitted, the Office of the University Registrar maintains records indefinitely. The office interacts with students, some of whom are currently enrolled while others were enrolled decades ago. Transcripts are the record of a student’s University work and are often read and assessed by agencies with no affiliation to the University of Washington, such as potential employers or graduate schools. Frequently, course prefixes, numbers and titles are the only information available to these outside entities when attempting to establish the educational attainment of our students, because the instructor of record is not available or no longer can provide a relevant syllabus. Consequently, course prefixes, numbers and titles are critical curriculum management elements and the Registrar’s perspective is, of necessity, long-term— with an emphasis on stability and clarity. While faculty may have insight into transcript elements, it must be recognized that transcript/student record elements are not inherently pedagogical and thus the Registrar’s long-term perspective is of great benefit and is not an attempt to influence pedagogical content.

3. In the past, disciplinary boundaries were more easily defined, but more recent trends have focused on the value of inter/transdisciplinarity in approaching academic content. While offering much insight into the academic content and delivery side of the University, such intersection can cause questions of ownership to arise among units on the curriculum management side. For instance, does the Department of Statistics “own” all introductory course(s) in statistical analysis?

Ownership: the unit that initially proposes a course and obtains approval owns the course. Ownership implies rights to change all aspects of it, including credit hours, course description, and
delivery methods, via the course change process. Owners can also eliminate courses. With the rights of ownership come the responsibility of notifying units that depend on the course for such things as prerequisites and requirements of admission to, and graduation from, the major. In some cases, these dependent units may be obvious, while in other cases, the course might be so broadly utilized that a general announcement to the University is appropriate. The Office of the University Registrar can be of help in determining which other units should be contacted.

4. Beyond ownership of courses, other issues have arisen more recently among the campuses that can be sorted into two basic issues: equivalency and overlap.

a. **Equivalency:** University of Washington courses are deemed “equivalent” when the content is sufficiently alike that one course can substitute for another in all instances (e.g., as prerequisites, as transfer articulated courses, or as major/degree requirements). Equivalency is established at the discretion of the units that own the courses. A unit is not required to accept an equivalency proposal from another unit. If one course is changed, equivalency is broken, although it can be restored if all affected units agree. Equivalency needs to be established in the curriculum management system, but is encoded into the Degree Audit (DARS) and, therefore, equivalent courses automatically count as prerequisites and admission or graduation requirements throughout the University. Units that use, but do not own, courses cannot refuse to accept the judgment of equivalency made by the courses’ owners. Equivalency is not applicable to courses offered by units on the same campus; in these cases, joint—listing is appropriate.

b. **Overlap:** courses that share some content, but are not sufficiently alike to be equivalent, can have overlap. Like equivalency, overlap is determined by the units that own the courses. Courses with overlap are established so that students do not receive “double—credit” for the same content. Overlap acknowledges that courses can be substantially similar without being equivalent.

While FCAS and the Office of the University Registrar can facilitate conversations among affected units regarding equivalency or overlap, the decision rests with units. In the situation where units cannot agree on equivalency or overlap, the courses are deemed to be different (not equivalent and with no overlap) and coded appropriately. These different courses, then, do not automatically count as prerequisites or for admission or graduation requirements. Even if courses are deemed non—equivalent by the units which own them, other units can establish courses as satisfying their own prerequisites and requirements.

5. Courses offered by different units on the UWS campus should not overlap in content to the extent that the units determine that students should not get credit for both courses, with acknowledgement that the extent of the overlap is often not fixed for courses, but rather variable and specific to each offering of the courses. If multiple UWS units want to collaborate to offer courses that use interdisciplinary methods or examples, joint—listing is appropriate. Generally, UWS units should not offer the same content under a different course number and name, but rather should seek joint status.

6. Courses are approved for units to offer, not for individual faculty to teach. Thus, a UWS unit proposing a new course should provide to the UW Curriculum Committee a complete new course application including detailed analysis of a) how the new course fits into the pedagogical mission of the unit, b) how the new course is similar to, and different from, other courses within the unit and across the Seattle campus, and c) how the unit has interacted with other potentially affected units with regard to course development. Signatures from the chairs/directors of all affected units and, when affected units are in different Colleges or Schools, the appropriate deans are required and indicate concurrence of all affected units. The Office of the University Registrar, because it is experienced in managing the curriculum of the University, can be an invaluable source of advice about potential other units with similar curricular interests. The responsibility for contact and negotiation rests, however, with the initiating unit. When there is substantial course content overlap, or use of words/phrases that might imply content ownership by a different unit, the proposing unit is required to share course development ideas with the potentially impacted unit and to seek agreement from the potentially affected unit and Dean’s office about the new course. Submission of course creation paperwork without evidence of collaboration with other affected units in the form of signatures will be returned to the initiating unit.
7. In cases where an agreement among affected units cannot be made, the UW Curriculum Committee will refer the application to FCAS, which will make a binding ruling. FCAS looks unfavorably on units which do not fully participate in pedagogical discussions centered on student learning. Defending historical turf or perceived ownership of words is not adequate reason to deny creation of new courses, nor should a unit propose creation of a course for non-pedagogical reasons.

8. In order to facilitate communication among units regarding courses, the Office of the University Registrar will maintain a database of courses that are currently in the approval pipeline. The initiating unit will enter the course into the database after approval by the unit and other units will be able to review the proposed courses. If a unit encounters a newly proposed course with which they believe an existing course overlaps substantially, then the overlapped unit should contact the initiating unit. If conflict over ownership and/or overlap cannot be worked out among affected units, as a last resort, FCAS, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, will make a binding decision.

9. In addition to the elements of approval described above, the University has established basic standards for courses for which the UWCC checks as part of its review. These are generally University level requirements and so are germane to all units on all campuses. These include:

   a. Required credits (also called General Education requirements): Established by the University in the Student Regulations (Chapter 114.2.B), the requirement to earn credits in these courses is applicable to all UW students seeking baccalaureate degrees. Consequently, maintaining accurate designations is a critical function of the Registrar’s office.

   b. Course numbering: Because course numbers may be the only indication of the level of academic content of a course long after it is taught and because some units have admission and graduation requirements that specify the number of credits students may or must have at certain levels, consistency across the University is necessary. In other words, a 100-level course (1xx) indicates introductory material described in the course title, while a 400-level designation with the same title indicates advanced undergraduate content. What content is characterized by “introductory” or “advanced” is often discipline specific, but general consistency across the university is important.

   c. Learning goals and learning assessments: University policy requires learning goals and learning assessments to be clear, appropriate to the course level, and provided to students who are registered for the course.

   d. Attendance/participation: Unless required for accreditation purposes, University policy does not allow attendance to count toward or against the final grade. Participation may count in the calculation of the course grade, but if faculty intend for it to contribute >15% of the total course grade, the method of assessing participation needs to be clearly delineated.

   e. Interaction: Although how instructors interact with students and students with other students may vary substantively among disciplines, interaction among students and between instructors and students is an essential component of course design. Originally raised in the context of distance learning, the issue of assuring that the framework for appropriate interactions exists has become a relevant University requirement for all courses.

10. The questions and wording on the forms used for course creation and change are managed by UWCC in consultation with FCAS, FCTL, and the Office of the University Registrar. Changes to those forms must be approved by FCAS.

Approved by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards on March 20, 2015
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:

Recently adopting 2 new policies that the Council feels should be brought to the attention of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC): a change to the distance-learning (DL) designation and establishment of procedures for the evaluation of new course creations and course modifications.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

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

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

FCMA is holding joint meetings with the Faculty Council on Women in Academia to address specific issues that impact faculty demographics, including:

- Tenure demographics
- Lecturers
- Mentoring
- Data
- Faculty salary policy

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

FCFA has continued to work on language to revise the Faculty Code regarding the proposed faculty salary policy, with a goal to send to the Senate and the faculty in Autumn Quarter 2015. We have also been examining revisions to Code chapter 26 on Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs, also for 2015-16 Senate consideration.

Faculty Council on Research

The primary focus of the FCR during winter quarter was drafting a Class C Resolution on developing a world class open access repository for peer reviewed scholarly works from the UW faculty staff and students. The FCR worked jointly with the Faculty Council on University Libraries and the Senate Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization to put together a resolution that was passed by the Faculty Senate on April 23, 2015. The FCR also discussed with David Eaton, Dean of the UW Graduate School, the problems that small departments and programs are having with continuation of their PhD degree programs. The potential for joint alignment of these departments and programs for mutual admissions and interdisciplinary teaching and research and what financial investments would be needed was considered. The FCR also discussed and voted on waivers on restricted publication for contracts to the APL that have security concerns and for an additional contract from the Medical School for an Alzheimers drug trial. In the future, the FCR will be discussing the barriers to interdisciplinary research imposed by ABB and working on helping the UW research community access the resources that are available to investigators for dealing with compliance with federal, state, and local regulations required for conducting research at the UW.
Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs (FCSA) is “responsible for all matters of policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare.” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-38.)

The FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students. The major issues that have come before the Council so far this year are:

- Student Mental Health;
- Diversity;
- Enrollment Management;
- Quality of Student Life;
- Student Athletes;
- Student Financing & Debt.

29 April: The council is currently in the process of reviewing proposed changes to the Student Conduct Code.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

1. Update on FCTL Report on Hybrid Online Learning: On April 4, 2013, former FCTL chair Jan Carlile transmitted to President Young the council’s report on hybrid online learning. At its January 9, 2014, the council hosted Jim Gregory, co-chair of the UW Task Force on Online Learning, to learn the scope of its work and its relevance to FCTL’s mission. On February 25, 2014, President Young responded to the 2013 FCTL letter (a copy of the letter was forwarded to the Senate leadership and Faculty Secretary). The president thanked FCTL for its efforts, then went on to cite several UW teaching-with-technology success stories. At the same time, the president indicated that he shares FCTL’s concerns about maintaining quality and monitoring faculty effort with regard to online teaching and recognized there “is considerably more work to do.” In response to FCTL’s recommendation for supplemental faculty funding for support of hybrid courses, he indicated that he and the provost are giving it “serious consideration,” indicating that such support is central to their vision in the 2Y/2D initiative and in the Center for Teaching and Learning. During winter quarter 2015, council members including chair Jeffrey Wilkes worked collaboratively with members of FCAS to alter the Distance Learning designation and FCAS policy.

2. FCTL continues to address faculty concerns over access to student course evaluations outside UW. In 2012, Nana Lowell (UW-OEA) learned that students from the Information School had provided public access to results of student evaluations of courses they obtained from a web site accessible only to those with a UW NetID. The practice of giving access to these evaluations only to individuals with NetIDs had been put in place based on discussions in the former Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, after consulting the Attorney General’s office. This was done because of two concerns, the first being potentially inappropriate use of faculty evaluations by individuals not affiliated with the university, and the second being restrictions on the publication of evaluations of teaching assistants included in the bargaining agreements with their union. An inquiry about this matter was referred to the Attorney General’s office for advice, but the AG’s office has ignored the request. At its February 2014 members of the FCTL supported adding a disclaimer to the web site for faculty teaching evaluations warning that the information is intended solely for the use of individuals within the University of Washington community and that redistribution to anyone who does not have a current UW NetID is prohibited.

3. FCTL provided advice on a number of teaching and technology issues this year, including the move to paperless online course evaluations (and its possible effect on response rates), use of anti-plagiarism software, transition to the Canvas learning system, possible transition from Tegrity
to Panopto and the possible integration of e-Texts and Catalyst. The council also approved a plan to move snapshots of course evaluation results to the web-based student tool – MyPlan.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

1. Embarking on a massive effort to review the Tri-campus system and define a vision for how the campuses relate to each other
2. Conducting a review of tri-campus information dissemination and faculty member representation between the three faculty governance structures.
3. Reviewing issues related to student conduct code violations and how they are disseminated and treated if/when student seeks cross-campus enrollment.
4. Examination of processes related to cross-campus degrees/minors and role of UW Curriculum Committee.
5. Coordinated Faculty Senate communication of tri-campus awareness regarding governance, policies, new issues, budget, etc.
6. Budget and legislative representation related to tri-campus strategic planning.
7. Discussion of potential issues related to “UWS/B/T” self-sustaining and distance learning degree programs and cross-campus implications.
8. Examination of variations/changes to faculty handbook that affect UWT/UWB faculty.
9. Cross-campus faculty research activities/opportunities – and an examination of selection processes related to limited submission research applications from the University of Washington.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

Classrooms: In general there are enough classrooms, although some are not well located. New classroom space will be active learning classrooms. Several are likely to be built. Existing classrooms are being renovated at a rate of 80 per biennium. We could really use a very large (ca 1000 seat) lecture hall.

Learning Assessment report: FCUFS reviewed this report. We agreed with reducing the number of unique classroom schedule patterns, but were skeptical about changing to 15 minutes between classes.

South Campus Study: A planning study is underway for the South Campus area (Health Sciences).
Child Care: FCUFS has been actively advocating for increased child care services for the past two years. This effort, in conjunction with other Councils and other stakeholders on campus (students, staff) has generated significant movement on the issue within the administration, in particular an increase in the priority of child care in capital planning. As part of this effort, FCUFS passed a resolution encouraging continued effort in this area. The resolution was joined by FCWA and FCSA, and was recently passed by the Senate after minor modifications.

Classroom Security: FCUFS heard suggestions for increasing classroom security by providing relatively inexpensive wedges and door restraints (straps) for classrooms, for use in, for example, the horrific event of a campus shooter. This issue has been discussed with Classroom services.

Transportation: FCUFS conducted its annual review of Transportation services including parking. We reviewed the proposed rate increases closely, and ended up generally concluding they were adequately justified. We also noted the continuing funding issue with the faculty/staff UPASS program.
Capital Planning: FCUFS reviewed the One Capital Plan and provided input on project priorities, notably child care. Through FCUFS the SCPB has learned about the One Capital Plan and started its own oversight activity with a primary focus on the financial aspects, where FCUFS looks more at the projects.
Sound Transit: FCUFS heard a report on Sound Transit plans. Tunneling under the campus (from the north) will begin in the next one or two years.

Northeast Campus Housing: FCUFS reviewed the initial phase of the Northeast Campus housing project, in which three new buildings will be built around Denny Field (tennis courts) and McCarty and Haggett demolished and McMahon evacuated. Plans for the new dorms have been modified to have some areas with lower room rates after prior input from FCUFS, among others. Future use of McMahon is undecided.
Future Issues:
We will hear about the Burke Museum replacement before the end of the quarter. Next year important issues will be: Continuing the momentum on child care and classroom security, monitoring new construction including the NE campus dorms and the new CSE building, and our annual reviews of transportation, classrooms, Sound Transit and the One Capital Plan.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

The FCUL met in January, February, March, and April 2015. A major agenda topic for discussion has been the faculty-driven Open Access resolution, which was passed at the April 2015 Faculty Senate meeting. A presentation from Dr. Ben Marwick, Faculty Council on Research was given at the January meeting. In the intervening meetings, updates from the Chair regarding discussions of the Resolution as it worked its way to the Senate Executive Committee and then the Faculty Senate at large were provided. Dr. Jevin West, a member of the FCUL and of the UW Information School has been providing both ‘faculty-perspective’ and ‘information-science’ perspective. Tim Jewell will present an update of Libraries’ work on the realization of Open Access at the May 2015 meeting. The FCUL is thus being kept well-informed and well-positioned to advise the libraries and other leaders involved in the Open Access repository work that has now received Faculty Senate resolution status.

The FCUL continues to observe and advise, as requested, on infrastructural work by UW Libraries. The FCUL met in, and were provided with a tour of, the newly-opened Data Science Studio in the former Physics/Astronomy library space at its January 2015 meeting, and visited the recently refurbished Odegaard Library at its April 2015 meeting. The new Director of the Odegaard Library, John Danneker, and Amanda Hornby (Teaching and Learning Program Librarian), provided a brief overview presentation of activities planned and ongoing in the new spaces, followed by a walk-through tour.

The FCUL anticipates discussion of Open Access issues around the availability of other teaching/learning materials (video and movies for example) in an upcoming meeting, either during this academic year or in the fall of 2016.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

FCWA is meeting jointly with FCMA; please see updates under FCMA.

Approved council minutes are available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/.
2015 – 2016 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

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

- Patricia Kramer, College of Arts and Sciences, Anthropology, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Patricia Kramer, College of Arts and Sciences, Anthropology, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Don Janssen, College of Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, as a retired member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Champak Chatterjee, College of Arts and Sciences, Chemistry, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, Finance and Business Economics, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- John Mittler, School of Medicine, Microbiology, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 9:30)

- Gordon Watts, College of Arts and Sciences, Physics, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Gordon Watts, College of Arts and Sciences, Physics, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Kurt Johnson, School of Medicine, Rehabilitation Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Mondays at 12:30)

- Rachel Chapman, College of Arts and Sciences, Anthropology, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Brett Rubio, Army ROTC, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Sadaf Bhutta, School of Medicine, Radiology, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

- Michael Rosenfeld, School of Public Health, Environmental and Occupational Health, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Cecilia Aragon, College of Engineering, Human Centered Design and Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

- Chuck Treser, School of Public Health, Environmental and Occupational Health, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
- Chuck Treser, School of Public Health, Environmental and Occupational Health, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Mabel Ezeonwu, UW Bothell, Nursing, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Christopher Laws, College of Arts and Sciences, Astronomy, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

• Richard Jeffrey Wilkes, College of Arts and Sciences, Physics, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.
• Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges, College of Arts and Sciences, English, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Daniel Turner, Foster School of Business, Marketing and International Business, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Brenda Zierler, School of Nursing, Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

• Bill Erdly, UW Bothell, Computing and Software Systems, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2016.
• Kyle Crowder, College of Arts and Sciences, Sociology, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

• Rich Christie, College of Engineering, Electrical Engineering, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2016.
• Rich Christie, College of Engineering, Electrical Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2018.
• Bruce Balick, College of Arts and Sciences, Astronomy, as a retired member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2016.

Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30)

• Dianne Lattemann, School of Medicine, Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2016.
• Dianne Lattemann, School of Medicine, Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2018.
• Carole Lee, College of Arts and Sciences, Philosophy, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Trent Hill, Information School, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Randall Leveque, College of Arts and Sciences, Applied Mathematics, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Julie Nicoletta, UW Tacoma, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.

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

• Susan Astley, School of Public Health, Epidemiology, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2015, and ending September 15, 2016.
• Michael Fialkow, School of Medicine, OBGYN, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Geethapriya Thamilarasu, UW Bothell, Computing and Software Systems, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
• Jessica Robles, College of Arts and Sciences, Communication, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
Adjudication Panel

- Susan Herring, School of Dentistry, Orthodontics, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Joseph Janes, Information School, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Edward Lin, School of Medicine, Department of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Russell McDuff, College of the Environment, Oceanography, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Ronald Stenkamp, School of Medicine, Biological Structure, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Thaisa Way, College of Built Environments, Landscape Architecture, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Sara Jane Webb, School of Medicine, Psychiatry, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Sarah Shannon, School of Nursing, Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
- Jeffrey Edelman, School of Medicine, Department of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2015 and ending September 15, 2018.
## Nominations for 2015-16 Senate Executive Committee Positions

### Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position 1</strong></td>
<td>Mark Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gautham Reddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positions 2</strong></td>
<td>Kelly Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tueng Shen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position 1</strong></td>
<td>Fred Brookstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Martin-Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position 2</strong></td>
<td>Gail Stygall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janelle Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duane Storti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other health science colleges¹ – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Astley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Built Environments – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Carrie Dossick, Richard Keil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Schools² – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ming Fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brett Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Townsend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Council Nominations

1. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
2. Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
3. Faculty Council on Student Affairs

**Nominating Committee:** Leah Ceccarelli, Arts and Sciences, Mark Haselkorn, Engineering, Carol Landis, Nursing, Brett Rubio, ROTC.

¹ Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work
² Business, Education, Evans, Information, Law, ROTC
Charge

Nominate at least one candidate for each of the eight Executive Committee positions and the three Faculty Council Chairs.

Section 22-63 of the Faculty Code provides guidance: “The Chair and immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate shall appoint a nominating committee that shall nominate at least one candidate for each Executive Committee position. Nominations of Faculty Council Chairs shall consider the relationship of the Council’s work to the Senate’s upcoming agenda. The nominations as a whole shall provide broad representation across academic disciplines, such as Health Sciences, Arts and Sciences, and other schools and colleges, and shall endeavor to balance continuity and turnover of representation.”

How Nominees were selected

Executive Committee seats were allocated on the basis of academic geography. The eight elected SEC positions were allocated as follows:

- School of Medicine – 2 positions
- College of Arts and Sciences – 2 positions
- College Engineering – 1 position
- Other health science colleges (Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work) – 1 position
- College of the Environment and College of Built Environment – 1 position
- Professional schools (Law, Business, Education, Evans, Information, ROTC) – 1 position

The Nominating Committee sent a request for nominations to all current and incoming Senators, listing the eight contested positions; self-nominations were received, all were placed in their corresponding positions. The Committee then added to the list as needed.

The faculty council chairs were selected based on a list of upcoming issues that were given to us by the faculty senate vice chair.
### 2015-2016

#### Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn Quarter, 2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter, 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>January 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>February 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Quarter, 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 19</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.
- **Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
The Sustainable Academic Business Plan

The Sustainable Academic Business Plan is the result of the 2y2d initiative and serves as the UW’s Strategic Framework. It was developed with input from members of the UW community, including 444 faculty members, 65 of whom were faculty senators or council members. It’s represented in graphic form and outlines the goals and related activities that will keep the UW strong and well-positioned for the future. More details are available at: http://www.washington.edu/2y2d/plan/
Faculty participation continues to be key to UW strategic planning & initiatives
Faculty perspectives were essential in the development of the Sustainable Academic Business Plan and each of the initiative committees includes at least one Faculty Senator or Faculty Councilmember along with Deans, Vice Provosts and Vice Presidents. These faculty bring valuable contributions to the initiatives and serve as liaisons between the initiative work and faculty leadership, sharing updates, vetting proposals, and eliciting council feedback.

Faculty Senate leadership is partnering with the Office of the Provost to increase awareness of these efforts and to help advance efforts where faculty are essential to shaping and driving initiative success.

The Husky Experience
The Husky Experience is a key Sustainable Academic Business Plan initiative. The Husky Experience began as a number of small grassroots efforts and has since added support from the top (led by Jerry Baldasty) to gather together and encourage even more activity. It’s a big tent with room for local actions and creativity with great work taking place in academic departments and student support units.

The goal is to better prepare students for life after graduation because...
- There’s a gap between what students know (or know they know), and the skills they need to succeed—in life, in work, and in their communities.
- We have a responsibility as a public institution to close the gap and ensure ALL students succeed.

We asked employers, community leaders, alumni, faculty and others what our graduates need to succeed. We heard back: Graduates need a degree and more.
- A degree: deep, curricular learning in a field, major, or degree (including interdisciplinary work)
- And more: capacity to adapt, think in multiple ways, analytical problem-solving—broad skills that will serve grads in life, community, careers...AND the ability to articulate skills and knowledge to employers

Faculty are the front line to help students see the connections between what they’re learning in class and how it applies to life after graduation. One important effort coming out of the Husky Experience Initiative is the Student Success Template project.

Student Success Templates
Recent efforts around student success have enlisted faculty and advisers to customize templates that show students the rich foundation that academic work provides for careers. The goal is for students to be able to recognize and articulate the value of their coursework and course activities to employers. Eight departments, to date, have customized the template, with more coming soon: http://careers.uw.edu/Faculty/Faculty-Department-Examples

Together with the provost, faculty senate leadership is leading this effort, to better ensure student success and to demonstrate the value of a UW education to the community. An example of a customized template for History, as well as a sample resume that a student might draft as a result, are on the following pages along with a blank template.
What the Husky Experience means in the classroom: Take History, for example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic assignment</th>
<th>Career-relevant skills learned while doing the assignment</th>
<th>What students put on their resume without guidance</th>
<th>Faculty guidance: How faculty can make the career relevant skills developed within the major clearer to students and help them prepare for life after graduation</th>
<th>What students put on their resume with guidance / How it could translate to careers in or out of History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 page research paper on the French Revolution</td>
<td>Research skills, including database search  Analysis, synthesis of sources, perspectives Writing Responding to feedback (draft)</td>
<td>History major Studied the French Revolution Wrote papers</td>
<td>TELL THEM 1. Point out the skills behind the assignment—in class, in the assignment instructions, on the syllabus. Explain how they’re useful in professional settings (e.g. businesses use teams all the time) 2. Tell students what skills they could put on their resumes as a result of the assignment. 3. Invite the Career Center and/or alumni to visit to discuss the link between their education and professional lives.</td>
<td>History major  Able to develop well-researched reports based on analysis and synthesis of a variety of sources  Experience with database search  Seeks out constructive criticism and implements change based on feedback  Meets deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group project with in-class presentation on China in the 20th Century</td>
<td>Working in a team Time management Presentation skills Public speaking</td>
<td>History major Studied modern China Delivered presentations</td>
<td>ASK THEM 1. Ask students to reflect on the assignment (5 min or so) and what non-History, professional skills they learned. 2. Ask students to draft a few lines they could add to their resumes based on the skills they learned from the assignment</td>
<td>History major  Experience working successfully in teams on complex, extended projects  Time-management skills in individual and teamwork settings  Experience developing presentations and speaking publicly to large groups  Meets deadlines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For departments: Consider building in to the curriculum reflection through portfolios, internships, experiential learning, or career relevant skills-building in partnership with the Career Center.*
Jordan Smith  
1234 Main Street, Seattle, WA 98103  
js@gmail.com | 425.555.5555

My UW experience has prepared me to be a nimble, productive and conscientious individual. I have built skills in and out of the classroom preparing for work in a complex and culturally diverse professional environment. I am equipped with critical thinking and problem-solving skills, possess a deep curiosity and interest in continuous learning, and seek the opportunity to be an effective member of an industrious team.

Education

B.A., History and French, University of Washington Seattle, Washington, June 2014  
- UW Honors Program and full academic scholarship  
- Consistently on the Dean’s list (GPA above 3.5)

Skills Enhanced through Academic Majors and Co-curricular Activity
- Able to write well-researched reports based on analysis and synthesis of a variety of sources derived from database search results and to produce effective persuasive writing
- Seeks out constructive criticism and implements change based on feedback
- Sees situations from multiple perspectives
- Experience working successfully in teams on complex, extended projects
- Time-management skills in individual and teamwork settings, including meeting all deadlines
- Experience developing presentations and speaking publicly to large groups
- Fluent in English, French

Travel Abroad
Study in Paris, summer 2013, Immersion Language Program

Husky Leadership Initiative
Completed Leadership Certificate – requiring demonstration of skills and abilities as a leader

Community Service & Internship Experience

Community Outreach Intern, Northwest Non-Profit Foundation, Seattle, WA 6/12-9/12
- Assisted in organizing major annual fundraising events; raised $50,000
- Organized and coordinated volunteers for 3 Seattle community events
- Gathered data, interviewed stakeholders, and wrote reports
- Revised and maintained organization’s web pages

Research Experience

University of Washington, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute, Seattle, WA  
Research Assistant, Measurement and Assessment of Risk on the Street (MARS), 10/13-present
- Interview homeless youth and young adults in three Seattle drop-in centers
- Co-manage data collection coordination
- Support the Downtown Emergency Service Center and the UW Addictive Behaviors Center

Work Experience

Ian’s Domain, barista/cashier, September 2010 – May 2011  
Operated cash register, prepared and served food and beverages, customer service

O.D. & Associates, technician, July 2011 – August 2011  
Responsible for scheduling appointments, answering phones, filing, faxing
What the Husky Experience means in the classroom **TEMPLATE: (your department here)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic assignment</th>
<th>Career-relevant skills learned while doing the assignment</th>
<th>What students put on their resume without guidance</th>
<th>Faculty guidance: How faculty can make the career relevant skills developed within the major clearer to students and help them prepare for life after graduation</th>
<th>What students put on their resume with guidance / How it could translate to careers in or out of History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TELL THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASK THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPORT THEM*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Year to Two Decades (2y2d) Focus Group Participation as of 4/7/11

### Who Was Asked?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-10 2y2d Focus Groups</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Research &amp; Education</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (*33 of 75 total participant details captured)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>568</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty 2010-11 2d Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th># invited</th>
<th># attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Faculty Lunch, October 2010</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Faculty Lunch, November 2010</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Faculty Lunch, December 2010</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Faculty Lunch for Faculty Senators, January 2011</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Faculty Lunch for Chairs &amp; Assoc. Deans, February 2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student 2010-11 2d Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th># attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASUW Senate, November 2010</td>
<td>≈40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Student Association, November 2010</td>
<td>≈50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPSS Senate, December 2010</td>
<td>≈30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWTacoma Executive Council, January 2011</td>
<td>≈10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>≈130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Stakeholders 2010-11 2d Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th># attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Foundation Board &amp; UW Alumni Association Board, September 2010</td>
<td>≈100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences Advisory Board, November 2010</td>
<td>≈20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>≈120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UW Staff Survey

- Catalyst survey to all UW staff, February 2011: 2690
- **TOTAL:** 3068

---

**TOTAL PARTICIPATION = 3594**

### TOTAL PARTICIPATION BY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Total Faculty Senate & Council Participation** (including anticipated Jan-Feb 11 figures & not including repeat participation in initial focus groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial focus group participation:</th>
<th>Participation in President Faculty Lunches:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=30</td>
<td>≈35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited to President Faculty Lunches:</td>
<td>=64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor Kate O’Neill.

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


5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of May 4, 2015.
   a. Approval of the April 6, 2015, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the April 23, 2015, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Faculty Council on Academic Standards report to the SEC.
   d. Faculty Council Activities.
   e. 2015-16 schedule of Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meetings.

6. Presidential Search – Regent Joanne Harrell and Kenyon Chan, Chair, PSAC.

7. Memorial Resolution.

8. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve nominees for 2015-16 faculty councils and committees.
   b. Approve nominations for 2015-16 Senate Executive Committee positions.

9. Announcements.

10. Invited Guests: Annual Intercollegiate Athletics report – Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics and Frank Hodge, Faculty Athletic Representative.

11. Discussion items:
   a. Update on Faculty Demographics – Jim Gregory, member, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and Susan Astley, Faculty Senator.
   b. Faculty Senate and council agenda setting for 2015-16.


   *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.*

14. Good of the Order.

15. Adjournment.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien
   Approved by: Kate O’Neill, Chair
   Secretary of the Faculty
   Faculty Senate

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, May 28.