MINUTES FOR THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
October 8, 2007, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall


Guests: Niccolls, Kornberg, Quarfoth, Janssen

Faculty Senate Chair Dan Luchtel called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. and welcomed participants to the first Senate Executive Committee meeting of the academic year.

1. Approval of Agenda. Approved.

2. Approval of Minutes.
Chair Luchtel reported that the minutes of the May 7, 2007, SEC meeting and the May 24, 2007, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by the Senate Executive Committee via e-mail over the summer.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.
Dan Luchtel, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Chair Luchtel reported that he had completed a series of meetings with individual chairs of all the Faculty Councils (with one exception) and had found them stimulating. He anticipates a very productive year for the Councils and the Senate.

He thanked President Emmert for his support and defense of the challenge to Pediatrics faculty research by the Walt Disney Corporation with regard to UW findings that infants exposed to too much “educational” video develop language skills less quickly than those who are not. Both the journals Nature and Science have endorsed the University of Washington stand regarding the Walt Disney Corporation.

Meetings have also been scheduled with each of the Group Reps over the next couple of weeks. In addition to new issues, two carry-forward issues from last year still require action: The first involves the Faculty Effort Certification issue, and the Chair invited Professor Cathryn Booth-Laforce to review the status of that issue on the UW campus.

Professor Booth-Laforce referred Committee members to the handout that had been provided to her by Sue Camber, Assistant Vice President for Research Accounting and Analysis. Apparently the issue is coming under increasing scrutiny and is becoming a very sticky issue.

With regard to the UW, in Spring of 2007 colleges developed plans to address non-grant activity (proposal writing, administrative activity, etc.) for highly funded research faculty. Then in Summer/Fall of 2007, the top five colleges (based on volume of effort reporting) were asked to develop outreach plans tailored to their units to continue to address the work begun in the Spring. Some have reported to the Office of Research Accounting and Analysis, and some have not yet completed their plans. All will be asked to share the results at a discussion this month with the Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team which includes FCR (Richard Wright) and Faculty Senate (Susan Astley) representatives. Some (e.g. the School of Nursing) have started taking action.
In Fall of 2007 a letter will be sent to all faculty receiving effort reports providing updates, contacts and links to information – pending another round of input from the Effort Reporting Compliance Advisory Team. In addition, a letter to Deans listing all faculty members who submitted proposals while they were 100% funded on grants is being developed. Data collection is taking a bit more time than Camber had hoped, but expects to have this completed this fall after the advisory team concurs with the letter. The team concurs with the approach and the Deans are committed to resolving the issues and communicating with the Chairs and PIs.

At the national level, an effort-reporting paper titled “Compensation, Effort Commitments and Certification” was published by COGR (Council on Governmental Relations) and shared with the AAU (Association of American Universities). Discussions continue with AAU on which issues to bring forward to the federal government jointly and separately. Meanwhile, in response to both internal (NSF) and community questions, NSF is doing an internal analysis of their approach to summer salaries which may be followed by discussions with COGR and/or AAU. Currently a working team is identifying VA/University efforts reporting issues to determine if and how federal agencies should be engaged.

The second Group Representative issue to emerge from last year has to do with the installation of seat belts in University-operated buses. Eric Stern reported that this issue was discussed in the SEC in January and February of 2007. Elizabeth Cherry, Director of Risk Management for the UW, addressed the committee and left members with the impression that in addition to there not being a law that requires seatbelts, in fact in a bus they would do more harm than good. Stern was not convinced and expressed his hope that the issue could be reopened to SEC consideration in view of the fact that every 15 minutes there are buses full of unrestrained UW faculty, staff, students and patients speeding along I-5 at 60 miles per hour.

Chair Luchtel agreed that this would be on the agenda for the next meeting. In response to a request from the President, Luchtel will be forwarding information about last winter’s discussion on seatbelts.

In addition to the above two issues of concern to Group Reps, there are two Class C resolutions, both approved by the Faculty Senate last spring, that are moving through the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to determine their financial feasibility. One concerns converting the current “opt-in” policy regarding retirement options at various stages in an employee’s career to an opt-out policy. The other concerns the provision of a 50% tuition benefit for the immediate family of faculty and professional staff. Provost Wise explained that they need more data on the costs of these two proposals. Once the data are in, then the SCPB can consider whether funds should be spent on these proposals.

Robert Bowen, Chair of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement, will be invited to attend the SCPB when these two proposals (which originated in his Council) come up for discussion.

Finally, Luchtel reported that over the summer, he and Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen had discussed, among themselves and with other colleagues, the possibility of re-thinking the structure of the Senate and the SEC. Luchtel cited a dispiriting letter from a south campus department chair reporting the widespread feeling among faculty that the Senate was a waste of time. He invited Philipsen to introduce the topic with a handout distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

Philipsen reported on his meetings with colleagues to begin conversation about the structure of the Faculty Senate. At this point it is not so much a proposal as it is a stimulus for discussion to be opened today in this body. He also intends to raise the issue in other fora throughout the year with hope of developing draft legislation by the end of the year.

He and his colleagues question if the size of current senate is conducive to good deliberation. They question who should be in the ideal Senate and have considered that other constituencies might be brought in – e.g. representatives of College and School Councils. Any consideration of the structure of the Senate would also impact the structure of the SEC. One scheme – simply intended as a
talking point – is outlined in the handout – including the idea of at-large members. If there were only 16 Senate slots open to “at-large” faculty might faculty actually campaign for one of those positions?

Luchtel requested that SEC members consider the ideas raised in the handout and send them to the Senate office in writing to be compiled as a discussion item for the next SEC meeting. He stressed that at this point in the discussion we should be focusing on the big picture – how to make the Senate more engaged – not details.

In response to a number of requests from the membership, Luchtel will explore the possibility of setting up a list-serve or on-line discussion group to take up this conversation. He will notify SEC members by e-mail once something has been set up.

4. Report from the President
Mark A. Emmert, President

After welcoming the Committee members to the new academic year, the President reported on several issues that had been percolating over the summer:

The first was a review of the status of on-going searches. These include the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Law School, and the Schools of Pharmacy and Nursing, and well as for a Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting.

*College of the Environment*: This proposal has been the focus of much discussion over the summer including an intense “charrette” style discussion in June among thirty important internal and external stake holders. The issue will come to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents in October, and the President and the Provost hope to have a plan in place by the beginning of next year. The plan will amount to a substantial new organization that will include several existing programs. It would be a new and very unusual college. The UW is very strong in environmental research and scholarship, but he feels that no university has successfully pulled together such a college of the environment in a really successful way. He and the Provost are focused on creating something that is truly interdisciplinary and inclusive of our three campuses. Planning is still in the very early stages. His conviction is that we will do this only if we can do so successfully. Fundraising will be important, because he and the Provost will not take away from existing programs to fund a new college.

*UW North Sound*: The Governor’s office and a UW group are currently working together to evaluate sites. There are now four official sites under consideration: Lake Stevens, Marysville, and two in Everett. This is a politically challenging situation, but there’s not much news to report since last June. There is still no budget for facilities or for operations for this proposed campus.

*Potential 2008 State Supplemental Budget Request Items*: The President asked Gary Quarfoth to comment on the handout distributed. He began by reporting that the UW (and WSU) received a budget cut in 07-08 – reducing support for graduate education. The UW and WSU were the only agencies in state to receive a cut which seems curious if not unfair during a time when the State is in such good shape financially.

*Advisory Committee on Violence Prevention Report*: The President requested that the Committee review the report distributed and to contact him or Mindy Kornberg, Vice President for Human Resources, with any questions or concerns.

*Concern about Husky Stadium*: The bowl of the stadium was built in 1928 and it’s in serious need of repair. Stadium repair and expansion projects at universities typically engender a lot of discussion. Although this will be paid for externally, there will be ample opportunity to discuss plans. This will not be a part of any budget request to the legislature. It needs to resolve quickly, because Sound Transit will begin construction in 2009. At that point there will probably be a need to move a football season to Seahawks field. In any event, it will be done sanely and will not interrupt real work of UW. In response to a question about the impact of funding of athletic rather than academic facilities, the
President responded that statistics are ambiguous at best. Many donors go both directions and many go strictly to one or the other. “It all depends.” The reality is that winning in sports makes everything else at the University easier -- even recruiting faculty -- because it promotes name recognition.

The President then opened the session to questions:

The first question had to do about the sex offender housing situation in the University District: The President thought that the article in the Times was fairly accurate. Registered sex offenders are currently living in very close proximity to the UW fraternities and sororities. There are five boarding houses which provide lodging to sex offenders, some of whom have been living there for up to seven years. The houses are owned by a woman who inherited them, and she seems to be managing them responsibly, but the situation creates a very high concentration of sex offenders in any one neighborhood. Common sense would suggest that this is not a good thing, but so far no problems related to those particular neighbors have been identified. The President has discussed the situation with the Governor, and it’s become a great concern to him and students. The President will be notifying students in the area by mail about the situation – as soon as addresses are available (in a few days). The Only about half the people are under supervision – others are past penalties and restrictions. The University does not want to put the landlord out of business, and is prepared to buy houses at fair market value. The bottom line for the President is the safety of students and employees.

In response to a question about the status of locating a joint UW/Seattle police station in the University district, the President responded that it is still under consideration. The UW Police are now reporting to Eric Godfrey, Vice Provost for Student Life, and a search is on for a replacement for Vicky Stormo, Chief of UW Police, who has announced her retirement. These two transitions may slow down the process of establishing the joint station.

The issue of the SR 520 bridge replacement status also came up. The President reported that the legislature, at the last session, formed two committees to address the issue. They have met extensively with UW and seem very attentive to issues of concern to the UW. Scott Woodward, Vice President for External Affairs, is representing UW on one of these committees and the President is sitting on the other. Scott also has an internal advisory committee and Senate Vice Chair David Lovell serves on this. The President added that even if the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) package is approved, there is not nearly enough funding available for the “better bridge” – it is inordinately expensive. But it may resurface and some resolution is needed. The UW is promoting alternatives.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
Gail Stygall, Immediate Past Faculty Senate Chair and Committee Chair.

SCPB Chair Gail Stygall reported that budget and salary discussions with Gary Quarfoth will be ongoing at weekly SCPB meetings through the Month of October. In November, V’Ella Warren will talk to the SCPB about University Investments and in mid-December Randy Hodgins (Director, Office of State Relations) and Quarfoth will discuss the Governor’s proposed budget.

David Lovell, Senate Vice Chair, for J.W. Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Vice Chair Lovell stated that there are currently several items on the Faculty’s legislative agenda, including graduate tuition subsidies and retention and recruitment salary funds. Discussions of these topics have included the President. JW Harrington (who was unable to attend today’s meeting) is working together with other members of the Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) on a legislative agenda for the coming year, and several items can be highlighted here:
1) Increasing legislators’ awareness of a) faculty salaries (levels, assessment processes, and overall policy) and b) how faculty are assessed and held accountable for their work; both as part of the merit salary process and as part of our regular peer reviews.

The most significant development over the summer is that the Chair and Ranking Member of the House Higher Education Committee have been touring campuses and asking to meet with faculty about faculty salaries, and he and Harrington have been providing data and descriptions in response to the Chair’s request for more information.

2) Supporting the goal of Washington Learns – educating more people to higher levels – and suggesting useful ways of achieving that goal to legislative committees, budget leaders, Governor’s staff, and HEC Board.

3) Increasing communication and coordination (where possible) with institutional and statewide organizations representing students, university administration, and faculty unions at the other higher-education institutions. There have been occasions when one group has acted without consultation with the others. In addition to preventing such diffusion of energy, we also hope to work positively to increase our collective influence.

4) Working with legislators, Governor’s staff, and within UW to devise mechanisms for beneficial information flow between faculty and Boards of Regents and Trustees. It has not yet been decided whether the CFR will continue to pursue legislation to place faculty on institutional governing boards, but in any case we will work to promote a better understanding of our concerns among Regents.

5) Ensuring that development of a North Sound campus does not detract from activity on our three existing campuses.

Lovell also noted the following upcoming event: A public forum on the Higher Education Coordinating Board’s draft “strategic master plan,” Thursday, 1 November, at North Seattle Community College, 3:30 p.m.

7. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.
Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

Philipsen reported that with the help of Council Chairs, the Councils are now very nearly completely staffed, but he encouraged Chairs to contact him if that is not the case, or when there are changes in membership throughout the year. He also gave a status report on the Adjudication Panel, the importance of having that Panel completely staffed and the time commitment Adjudication Procedures require of the Secretary of the Faculty, the staff in his office, the Chair of the Adjudication Panel, as well as faculty members appointed to Panels. Over several years, the Conciliation Board, which theoretically could take some of the pressure off the Adjudication Panel, has become defunct. Philipsen reported that he and the Ombudsperson, Lois Price-Spratlen, are working together to revive the Board, and he hopes to have a slate of Conciliation Board nominations for your consideration at the next meeting or shortly thereafter. He encouraged SEC members to contact him with suggestions for possible Board members.

8. Group Representatives: Concerns and Issues.
Chair Luchtel noted that he had covered the two issues listed under this agenda item during his opening remarks.


Luchtel reported that [Exhibit A], attached to the agenda, is a list of the nominations sent to the SEC over the summer for appointment, acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate.
[Exhibit B] is a list of nominations for faculty council and committee members for the SEC’s approval and ultimate for Senate appointment. In response to his request for nominations from the floor, Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen directed the Committee’s attention to the handout distributed at the outset of the meeting marked “Addendum.” This lists additional nominations to be considered. A motion was made and seconded to send these nominations to the Senate for appointment, and was approved unanimously.

10. Reports from Councils and Committees.

A motion was made to approve the formation of an ad hoc Committee on Academic Quality and Rigor [Exhibit C]. (No second was needed as the proposal came from a Council.) Don Janssen, a member of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ), spoke on behalf of the chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, George Dillon, who was unable to attend the meeting. Janssen began his presentation by saying that once a course is approved, it is rarely ever reviewed again. It’s easy to document that the content of a course shifts significantly in many cases as it is taught by different instructors over time, so the rigor of a course is not necessarily the same over time either. More recently, the Council has been looking at special admits through the athletic department. Courses taken by student athletes are often concentrated in certain courses. The Council feels there’s a need to review these courses and determine the reasons for such concentration. In addition, many independent studies courses are taken by student athletes from specific instructors. Since there’s currently no mechanism for reviewing courses, the Council recommends the formation of a task force to explore if this is really a problem.

In response to a question about the review of courses at the level of schools and colleges, Janssen said that reviews at the college and school level are not handled in a consistent manner across the University. Some do review their courses; some do not. But this is the kind of question the task force would include as it explores the best way to handle its charge.

The motion was approved by a vote of the Committee members present, with two abstentions.

11. Information: There was no information to convey.

12. Announcements: There were no announcements to convey.

13. Unfinished Business. There was no unfinished business.

14. New Business

a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration [Exhibit D]
Jan Sjåvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Title: Procedures for Removal of Faculty Senate Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty
Action: Decide whether to forward legislation for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Luchtel told the Committee that there are three items of new business, and the first proposes changes concerning the procedures for removal of Faculty Senate Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty. He explained the process required to approve Class A legislation and asked for a motion to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for its consideration. A motion was made, but no second was required since the proposal came from a Faculty Council. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs Chair Jan Sjåvik explained that the proposal grew out of work from last year, changing the way the Secretary of the Faculty is appointed. Under the old system, the Secretary of the Faculty served at the pleasure of the President. Now the secretary of the faculty is elected by the Senate Executive Committee and his or her appointment is confirmed by the Faculty Senate. Once this change was in place it seemed prudent to put into place some mechanism to remove not only the Secretary of the Faculty, but also the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, before the conclusion of his or her term if such an action seemed necessary. FCFA initially considered a long list of faculty leaders who might be
subject to possible removal, but it ultimately decided that the procedures should only apply to positions with terms of two or more years. The Council felt it set the bar high enough to avoid frivolous attempts at removal, at the same time not making it too difficult. The proposal would allow faculty to take emergency steps in emergency situations.

Three friendly amendments were proposed and accepted by Sjāvik:

1. Instead of “Faculty Officers” in the title line, it should read, “Faculty Senate Officers.”

2. Section 22-57-A should read: “The Faculty Senate Chair, the Senate Vice-Chair, and the Secretary of the Faculty may each be removed from office during their term of service.

3. Section 22-56-C should read: “When the petition comes before the Faculty Senate, a spokesperson for the petitioners and the responding faculty officer or his or her designee shall be provided an opportunity to address…”

The proposal was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee members present.

b. Class A Legislation – First Consideration [Exhibit E]
Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

Title: Proposed housekeeping changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Section 22 of the Faculty Code

Action: Decide whether to forward legislation for Faculty Senate consideration.

At the Chair’s request a motion was made and seconded. Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen suggested this was straightforward as to what’s on the page. The changes are required to reflect the current reality. The Director of the Libraries is now the Dean of University Libraries, and the new department of Global Health is given a place among the Faculty Groups. (Pathobiology still exits for another year.)

The proposal was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee members present.

c. Action: Review draft of October 25, 2007, Faculty Senate Agenda

The Chair asked the committee to refer to the Senate agenda attached as [Exhibit F] and asked if there were any additions or revisions to the agenda. Hearing none, he declared approval of the agenda as written.

15. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was made at 4:38 p.m., seconded and approved by a unanimous vote of the committee members present.

PREPARED BY: Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate
Acting for the Faculty Senate between Spring Term 2007 and Fall Term 2007, the following nominees were approved for appointment to University Faculty Councils and Senate Committees.

Faculty Member Appointments to University Faculty Councils and Senate Committees.

**Academic Standards**

**Educational Technology**

**Faculty Affairs**

**Multicultural Affairs**

**Research**

**Student Affairs**

**University Facilities and Services**

**University Libraries**

**University Relations**
Stuart Sutton, Group 1, Information School, for a term September 16, 2007 – September 15, 2010.

**Women in Academia**
Cindy Simmons, Group 2, Communication, for a term September 16, 2007 – September 15, 2010.

**Adjudication Panel**

**Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations**
Sandy Silberstein, Group 1, English, for a term September 16, 2007 – September 15, 2010.

**Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**
**ASUW Ex officio Members of Faculty Councils (for a one-year term, ending June 15, 2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>Jenny Hahn</td>
<td>Michelle Trudeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Retirement</td>
<td>Andrew Everett</td>
<td>Marjorie Reeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Outreach</td>
<td>Inigo Esteban</td>
<td>Lavelle Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Anne Byrne</td>
<td>Elizabeth Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Jenny Hahn</td>
<td>Lynn Bazarnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Quality</td>
<td>Jenny Hahn</td>
<td>Paul Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Tyson Johnston</td>
<td>Judith Yarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Anne Byrne</td>
<td>Ethan Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Jenny Hahn</td>
<td>Brooke Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Campus Policy</td>
<td>Shawn Fischer</td>
<td>Lynda West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Facilities and Services</td>
<td>Jenifer Pesicka</td>
<td>Paul Zuchowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Nataly Bankson</td>
<td>Jeanette Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>Nataly Bankson</td>
<td>Tom Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Academia</td>
<td>Selma Dillsi</td>
<td>Marjorie Reeves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007-2010 Faculty Member Appointments to University Faculty Councils and Senate Committees:

**Faculty Council on Educational Technology**

**Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs**

**Faculty Council on Research**

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

**Adjudication Panel**

**Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**

**Representative members of Faculty Council and Committees:**
Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and committees for terms ending September 15, 2008 with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the Faculty Councils:

**Representatives of the Retirement Association:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Department/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Retirement</td>
<td>J. Ray Bowen</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>David Foster</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Edgar Winans</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Campus Policy</td>
<td>Bill Weitkamp</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addendum

Appointments to University Faculty Councils and Senate Committees:

Representative members of Faculty Council and Committees:
Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and committees for terms ending September 15, 2008 with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the Faculty Councils:

Representatives of the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>Cynthia Fugate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits &amp; Retirement</td>
<td>Charles Chamberlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Outreach</td>
<td>Lauren Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Anjanette Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Julie Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Quality</td>
<td>John Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Laura Lillard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Susanne Redalje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Kathleen Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Campus Policy</td>
<td>Charles Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Facilities &amp; Services</td>
<td>Paula Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Deepa Banerjee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>John Bolcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Academia</td>
<td>Pamela Yorks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative of the Professional Staff Association:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Bayta Maring (replacing Elizabeth Campbell as alternate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formation of an *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Quality and Rigor

This committee will report to the Senate Executive Committee with oversight by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality.

Committee Charge:

- Evaluate the need for the regular review of courses at the University level;
- determine appropriate criteria for evaluating appropriate level of academic challenge in courses;
- develop a method for identifying heavily-subscribed independent study courses, as well as a procedure for evaluating the appropriateness of the amount of credit for such courses which have not had their actual content approved at the University level.

Committee Membership:

2 members representing the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (one current; one past)
2 members representing the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (one current; one past)
1 member representing the Office of Academic Assessment

Committee Chair and members will be appointed at the November SEC meeting.
Section 22-57. Procedures for Removal of Faculty Senate Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty

A. The Faculty Senate Chair, the Senate Vice-Chair, and the Secretary of the Faculty may each be removed from office during their term of service.

B. The removal procedure is initiated by the submission to the Senate Executive Committee of a petition signed by no less than twenty-five voting members of the Faculty Senate. Upon receipt of such a petition, the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee shall immediately provide a copy of the petition to the named officer. The Senate Executive Committee at its next scheduled meeting shall place consideration of the petition on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate. The officer named in the petition shall have the right to submit a written rebuttal of the petition to the Senate Executive Committee. The petition and the rebuttal, if one has been submitted, shall be distributed with the meeting agenda to the members of the Faculty Senate.

C. When the petition comes before the Faculty Senate, a spokesperson for the petitioners and the responding faculty officer or his or her designee shall be provided an opportunity to address the Faculty Senate and answer questions. The petition shall fail unless approved by two-thirds or more of the voting members of the Faculty Senate present.

Section 22-57 58. Office of University Committees.

Rationale: Currently the Faculty Code contains no procedures for removal of faculty officers. A recent change in the appointment procedures for the Secretary of the Faculty, who previously served at the pleasure of the President of the University but who is now appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by the Faculty Senate, made it desirable to establish such procedures. These procedures are drafted to apply to all faculty officers with appointments exceeding one year.
Proposed Housekeeping Changes  
Volume Two, Part 2, Section 22 of the University Handbook

Section 22-41. Composition of the Senate.

D. Deans of schools and colleges and the Dean of University Libraries who are not elected members of the Senate, and the presidents of the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate shall be \textit{ex officio} members of the Senate with right to speak but without vote.

Section 22-42. Establishment of Faculty Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Seven:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Occupational Health Sci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genome Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education and Biomedical Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical History and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Rationale:} These changes reflect the current reality.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2007
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Faculty Senate Orientation – Professor Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

2. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

3. Introductory Comments – Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate.


5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Gail Stygall, Committee Chair.


8. Announcements.

9. Requests for Information.
   Senators are encouraged to submit requests for information in writing to the Senate Chair prior to meetings. Responses will be provided by the appropriate persons.

10. Nominations and Appointments.
    Action: Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

11. Memorial Resolution.

    a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
       Jan Sjåvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
       Title: Procedures for Removal of Faculty Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty.
       Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection.
    b. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
       Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.
       Title: Proposed housekeeping changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Section 22 of the Faculty Code.
       Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit this 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.


PREPARED BY: Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on Thursday, November 1 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.