Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 14, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Absent: Rick Keil, Janelle Taylor, Casey Mann
Guests: Bill Covington, Carol Diem, Bart Pietrzak, Rich Christie, Vikram Jandhyala, Mary Lidstrom

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Barsness called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. Amendments to the agenda were proposed, at the request of the chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) the Class C resolution concerning equity, access, and inclusion training for promotion and tenure evaluators (Exhibit J on the agenda) was removed and the Class C resolution adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington was moved from new business to the reports and opportunity for questions section. In response to a question, Bill Covington, FCMA chair, explained that the removal of the Class C resolution was to accommodate a request for information on the part of the Administration.

The agenda was approved as amended without objection.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Zoe Barsness. [Exhibit A]

Barsness referenced her written remarks, but spoke specifically on fostering an inclusive community among the faculty. Last week, President Cauce held a forum for faculty, and there was a broad turnout and good discussion. It was focused on how we can facilitate all different viewpoints on campus. The Senate Leadership is working on creating a webpage with resources to help faculty foster inclusiveness in the classroom. The Leadership also is looking at a listserv for faculty to share best practices. The ASUW representative said that students appreciate the work faculty are doing to foster inclusivity.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report and update on the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice. [Exhibit D]
   d. Council Activities Report. [Exhibit E]

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke to her report. There is only one seat in State races where the outcome is unclear. No matter the result, the Democrats will have the majority in the House. The Republicans will retain their majority in the Senate (there is one nominal Democrat who votes with the Republicans). In the recent survey of Faculty Senators, the most important topic was faculty compensation, second was student financial aid, and third was funding for the University as a whole. UW and Washington State University will move forward with Faculty Regent legislation this year, but without the regional institutions.

Taricani next spoke to a request from the regional institutions for a “matching professorship fund” which would allow for up to five tenure-track positions at each institution, provided via state funding, that would be matched by new money and positions at each institution. Taricani said that this request does not make sense for UW because UW is much bigger and has a higher salary scale.

Questions were asked about the openness of the new intellectual property committee (ACIPPPP). Barsness discussed different models that the committee could follow with respect to minutes, agendas, guest participation, etc. Members of the SEC expressed concern about faculty and students having ongoing information and opportunities for input. Barsness said that the committee has not been fully formed, and these issues will be addressed as we move forward.
Class C Resolution regarding adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington. [Exhibit I]

A motion was made and seconded to submit to the Faculty Senate, a Class C resolution concerning adding a faculty member to the UW Board of Regents. Taricani went over the wording of the resolution. She commented in particular on the proposed three-year term, noting that this length of time would give the faculty regent time to develop relationships and fulfill the role of representing the people of the state of Washington by bringing a faculty perspective to the Board. The senate chair would remain an ex-officio member with the responsibility of representing the UW faculty. There is still an uphill battle with the legislation, especially with the state Senate.

Would the time commitment make it difficult for clinical or WOT faculty to take on this role? Taricani said that it’s a volunteer position and the legislation did not restrict which faculty members were eligible; indeed, the Faculty Code says that WOT faculty have the same rights and responsibilities as tenure-track faculty. A question was asked if administrative faculty would be eligible for the faculty regent position. Taricani said that this it is not something that will be put into legislation. The faculty will make those decisions when making nominations.

An amendment was approved in response to concerns about the scope of recusal with respect to tenure discussions. Taricani expressed concerns about any further tinkering with language that has already been vetted.

The motion was approved as amended.


Provost Baldasty gave his remarks because President Cauce was in Olympia.

The new Executive Vice President will start December 5. The Office of Planning and Budgeting will remain under the Provost.

The Race and Equity Initiative has special significance given recent events in our community. We are taking a second look at the question about criminal behavior that was added to the undergraduate application in the last few years, and we expect to remove that question by the 2018 cycle. A bias reporting tool was rolled out, and there have been trainings and workshops on race and equity. We have had training for over 450 faculty and staff and hope to double that number. The UW police have also asked for training with regard to race and equity. The regents have a new committee on diversity, equity and inclusion. The committee’s major focus will be the diversity blueprint. In Winter Quarter, there will be trainings and workshops for department chairs on hiring and retaining diverse faculty. We are gathering data on differences in promotion and tenure. We also are doing an analysis comparing job pool diversity to actual diversity across various disciplines.

In response to recent events and a number of faculty inquiries relating thereto, the Administration and Senate Leadership have sent messages out about issues of diversity/inclusiveness and coming together.

There were no questions.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the October 3, 2016, SEC minutes and the October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes. [Exhibit F]
   b. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]

The consent agenda was approved.
6. Announcements.

Mike Townsend, the Secretary of the Faculty, announced that the search for Vice Chair nominees has begun and to contact secfac@uw.edu if you have anyone you would like to nominate.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.


a. Official Request for Faculty Code Interpretation. [Exhibit G]

   Interpretive issues with respect to Chapter 29 Amendment of the Faculty Code.
   Discussion item: First review of the advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

   During the discussion of the faculty salary process last Spring, a request was made for clarification on Chapter 29’s provisions for amending the Faculty Code. The SEC, who has ultimate interpretive authority under the faculty code, directed a number of questions to the Code Cops who, in their advisory capacity, responded, but also suggested that appropriate specific language be added to the Code whatever interpretations were ultimately adopted by the SEC. Townsend discussed the specific questions given to, and answers received from, the Code Cops. The issue will be revisited at a future meeting. A small group of the SEC will be formed and report back to the SEC their recommendations.

b. Discussion item: Faculty Demographic Dashboards Final Report.
   Carol Diem, Director of Institutional Analysis and Bart Pietrzak, Business Intelligence Solutions Architect.

   Carol Diem discussed the release of Faculty Demographic Dashboard information.

   In response to a question, Diem noted that, except for FTE and job code, the information is self-reported. A question was raised about whether or not this information can be made public. You need a UW NetID to login, but, once logged in, you are able to print out or take a screenshot of the data. You are then able to share with anyone you would like. A warning is provided when you access the data, and further guidelines may be forthcoming. The administration feels that there are confidentiality issues and if people abuse the system, then it may have to be taken down.

c. Class B legislation — Chapter 102 Scholastic Regulations. [Exhibit H]
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

   Barsness described the process for Class B legislation. A motion was made to submit the legislation for Faculty Senate consideration.

   Sarah Stroup, FCAS Chair, provided more information on the legislation. Students, faculty, and staff are able to change their names in classroom settings or on e-mails. This legislation will formally change it for the scholastic ranks. This will not change the name on the transcript, but class lists will show preferred names.

   A comment was made that there was an advantage to foreign students keeping their given names—namely, it would force faculty members to learn them. The GPSS representative supported the legislation and outlined reasons why foreign students might like to select a different preferred name.

   The motion passed.
d. **Discussion Item:** Global Innovation Exchange (GIX) Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research and Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy. [Exhibit J]

Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, and Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy, discussed the GIX program, a global partnership between the University of Washington and Tsinghua University in China with funding from Microsoft. The campus will be in Bellevue. It will employ a tuition/philanthropy-driven model with no additional University funds. The first degree offered will be a Continuum College MSTI (Master of Science in Technology Innovation). It is an interdisciplinary degree with faculty from various departments, and overseen by an interdisciplinary committee that will report to the Graduate School Council. The funding will come from GIX either on pay-as-you-go with existing faculty (Law School and Business School) or through GIX support for the hiring of additional tenure-track faculty (College of Engineering). GIX will pay 60% of salaries and benefits for the new faculty to defray the cost of their participation in GIX; if GIX were to fail, there would still be money in the GIX endowment to continue the support for the new faculty. GIX will also pay for TA’s, and there may also be hiring of full-time lecturers and professors of practice. The deans are happy with the arrangements because of the funding and the advantages, such as networking, that GIX will bring.

A question was asked about competition with master’s degrees at UW. The new masters of entrepreneurship is using existing technology and the MSTI is creating new technology and GIX has a global focus. GIX envisions its students as those who would not otherwise pursue a master’s degree. The goal of the program is a startup and not the degree per se. GIX does not want to take students away from existing programs.

e. **Approval of the December 1, 2016, Faculty Senate Agenda.** [Exhibit K]

   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was amended to remove the Class C resolution concerning equity, access, and inclusion training for promotion and tenure evaluators. The agenda was approved as amended.

9. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Zoe Barsness, Chair
Faculty Senate

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, November 21 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Dear Colleagues,

The year is off to a busy, yet productive start.

The Senate and University leadership remain committed to making substantive progress on shared concerns in regards to the existing faculty salary. We have focused our initial efforts on (1) strengthening the tools we already have available and (2) identifying areas where the current policy and compensation planning practices might be improved.

As part of our efforts to strengthen our existing faculty salary tools, a working group comprised of Senate leaders, representatives from the Board of Deans and Chancellors and senior university leadership worked on revisions to Executive Order 64 over the summer. We focused on two areas: (a) increasing promotion raises to help sustain salary progression and (b) on revising the Executive Order 64 language to facilitate use of the unit adjustment tool to address a breadth of compensation and salary needs, both reactively to address existing problems such as compression or inequity (even individual instances of these) and proactively to sustain faculty salaries at competitive rates relative to peer institutions.

- The proposed revisions to Executive Orders No. 64 (Faculty Salary Policy), along with the newly proposed Executive Order No. 54 (Employee-Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest) were released to the Faculty Senate on September 28 for review and comment.
- This open comment period will close on November 28, at which time the Secretary of the Faculty will summarize the concerns and comments raised and communicate these to the President. The President stressed in her comments both to the SEC and full Senate in October that she believes this must be a collaborative process. It therefore, behooves us to review the proposed Executive Orders carefully and provide timely substantive feedback to her on each of them.
- To ensure a comprehensive review of each of the proposed Executive Orders, we have done the following:
  - Executive Orders 54 and 64 were distributed via email to all Senators with a request for review and comment.
  - Executive Orders 54 and 64 were discussed at the October 3, 2016, SEC meeting and an offer to discuss them was made at the October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate meeting. However, senators asked no questions nor offered any discussion of either executive order at the senate meeting.
  - FCSA, FCFA, FCTCP and SCPB were explicitly requested to review these orders closely.
  - Both orders were distributed to the chairs of the school, college and campus elected faculty councils and these groups were also requested to review the orders closely and provide comment.

As part of our efforts to support more robust compensation planning efforts and discussion at the unit level, Senate leadership and the SCPB are partnering with the provost to engage the deans, chancellors and elected faculty councils in the schools, colleges and campuses to review their compensation planning practices and processes. On October 19, 2016, the Senate leadership team met with the elected faculty council chairs (EFCs) from each of the schools, colleges and campuses. Provost Baldasty attended this meeting to discuss Executive Order 64 and share information with EFCs about the budget planning process for 2016-2017. He highlighted what he’s asked the deans and chancellors to do in this process (i.e., consult with their EFCs). We also discussed plans to move forward in regards to facilitating and sharing of information and best practices across schools, colleges and campuses. A review of all unit bylaws was prepared that identified the advisory / consultation role on unit budgets and strategic planning for each council. We plan to meet again during winter and spring quarter.

William Covington, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, was appointed to the Board of Regents Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Advisory Committee. He will serve a 3-year term representing the faculty in advising the Regents on matters relating to diversity, equity and inclusion for faculty, students, staff, and in procurement and contracting.
Tri-Campus Relations task force launched on September 29, 2016. The group is charged with identifying ways to work together more effectively across the breadth and diversity of three unique campuses. Work is progressing. We are currently brainstorming and identifying emergent themes. The committee next meets on December 13.

New language and proposed investigative and adjudicative models of the Student Conduct Code are currently being presented and reviewed by the Faculty Council on Student Affairs and the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy. Plans are to bring an updated Code, reflective of these changes, to SEC for review and approval at the January 9, 2017, meeting.

Faculty nominees and membership of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy, and Practice (ACIPPP) has been pulled together and is on the agenda for today’s meeting. With the help of Provost Baldasty and Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost of Research, we have secured resources to support its work. The committee plans to meet and begin its work by the end of autumn quarter, 2016.

On October 26, 2016, in response to a request of the SEC, faculty meeting a set of criteria were provided access to an interactive academic personnel demographic dashboard. The information contained in this dashboard is that which is also published annually as part of the UW’s Affirmative Action Plan. Access to such data will support our collective efforts to identify faculty needs and make substantive progress on meeting our diversity, inclusion, equity, and other important workplace goals on our campuses, in our schools and colleges, and within our departments. We will be reviewing the demographic dashboard at our meeting today.

The Senate leadership is continuing to partner with the Provost Office’s office, deans and chancellors to support the UW Leadership Program. This two-year leadership development program is focused on enhancing skills and fostering collaboration among faculty who are passionate about advancing change at our institution. Faculty participants have been nominated by deans, chancellors and Senate leadership. This fall members of the first UW Leadership Program cohort are engaged in a number of different initiatives and projects. In November, we welcome the second cohort to the program.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. The Senate Vice-Chair Nominating Committee will soon be formed and will be seeking nominations for next year’s vice chair. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the University and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the Faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact the Nominating Committee, c/o Jordan Smith in the Faculty Senate Office. The Nominating Committee expects to recommend candidates to the Senate Executive Committee at its February meeting.

2. Elections have been held to fill the two remaining elected seats to the Senate Executive Committee. Please welcome Theo Myhre, School of Law, and Richard Keil, Oceanography, College of the Environment.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Music History

Greetings – this report is submitted just as the results of state elections are rolling in, so an update will be provided at the SEC meeting. Updates are available at http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia, under the category of “Election results 2016” in the left-hand menu.

Majorities for 2017-19: As I write this, it appears that the current majorities of a Republican Senate and Democratic House will continue. There are still three or four House races that are within a one percent margin, so outstanding ballots that arrive in the week following the election could change the initial projection of those seats. At this website link above, I will update the close races until the results and the majorities are clear. We are fortunate that both parties in both chambers continue to appreciate the value of excellent institutions of higher education, and that both parties understand the need to balance student cost while maintaining institutional funding. As I have noted previously, this will be a challenging balance in 2017.

Faculty priorities: As I am sure you remember, we polled the Faculty Senate between May and October regarding faculty legislative priorities, and also included newly elected Faculty Senators in the survey. The results were presented at the October Faculty Senate meeting, and now are posted on the website linked above, under “UW Faculty: Legislative Priorities 2017”. As some of you suggested, a few of the separate items and issues are combined, such as the linkage of student financial aid along with the request for funding to improve student access to the university.

Faculty regent legislation: In a separate resolution, we are asking for SEC and Faculty Senate endorsement of moving forward with legislation that would create a faculty Regent on the Board of Regents. This idea has been proposed five times in the Legislature since 2007 and has not succeeded. One change in this attempt will be to proceed with only Washington State University as a partner. Although all the four-year universities agreed a year ago to undertake the local preparation and coordination needed for this legislation, only the UW and WSU have reached a point where we have arrived at common concord among faculty governance, administration, and between our institutions. The regional four-year universities (Eastern, Central, Western, and The Evergreen State College) will continue to work on this proposed legislation for introduction later in the session, or in the following year. The resolution included in this packet for the SEC meeting reflects discussions held in the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs last year and this Autumn, and also contains the provisions that had been presented as information at the October SEC and Faculty Senate meetings.

One new item needs attention: The faculties of the regional universities are preparing a special budget request, separate from the institutional budget request, for five tenure-track positions at each institution, provided via state funding, that would be matched by new money and positions at each institution. The intent is to protect the status of tenure-track lines. The UW and WSU had not been part of this discussion, but learned recently that our universities have also been added to this proposed special budget request. The dollar amounts requested by the regional universities are below the level the UW would need for new positions, so I am working on identifying an equivalent level of funding that would make this more agreeable to the UW. Our scale is much more substantial than the regional universities: last year, over 200 faculty searches were approved at the UW, and already in the current year, over 100 faculty searches are underway, and many could be classified as “new”. Some of the questions that have arisen in discussions are: Does asking for matching funding for tenure-track positions align with our ongoing efforts to improve the conditions of lecturers on the UW campuses? Would this smaller special request have an impact on our larger request for faculty compensation? Should we ask to amend this to take the UW salaries and scale of searches into account, or should we ask to be removed from this request? There has not been time to discuss this in the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, so I will appreciate your reaction and advice on this new proposal.
Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice (ACIP³)

Committee charge

ACIP³ is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty intellectual property, including its management and commercialization.

Direction and priorities

- Review Executive Order 36 to bring up to date and align with new practices.
- Big picture:
  - How best to compensate stakeholders for their contribution to development of IP assets? What is the appropriate allocation of ownership rights within bounds allowed by the state?
  - How to disseminate information, intellectual assets generated at UW?
  - How most effectively to educate stakeholders, appraise them of their rights? How best to provide access to resources they need to inform themselves about those rights and leverage them?
- Prioritize focus on GiX and Open Access as two lenses through which many of the emergent IP issues can best be examined and addressed, e.g.,
  - Private/public co-ownership (e.g., w/Microsoft @ GiX).
  - Group, student, faculty, institution (UW/International partners), private sector relationships.
  - Emergent copyright, digital issues, not just patents.
- Other potential topics, areas of exploration:
  - Online/hybrid courses.
  - MOOCs – massive online courses.
  - Software development.

Administrative support

- Website: The Office of Research will host the committee’s web site.
- Provost has agreed to provide $5,000 in administrative support to be used, e.g., staff support, meeting room costs, copying, etc.

Membership

SEC nominees:

- Robert Gomulkiewicz, Professor and committee chair, Law School.
- Tueng Shen, Professor, School of Medicine.
- Jim Gregory, Professor, Arts & Sciences.
- Pierre Mourad, Professor, Engineering & Mathematics at UWB.
- Foster School of Business (position pending).
- Humanities (position pending).

President’s nominees:

- Ed Lazowska, Professor, Computer Sciences & Engineering.
- Fiona Wills, Director, UW CoMotion Innovation Development.
- Clark Westmoreland, Assistant Vice Provost & Executive Director of Operations, Continuum College.
- Carol Rhodes, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Office of Research.
- Nancy Hovis, Senior Director of Business & Regulatory Affairs, Health Sciences/UW Medicine.

Ex officio positions:

- Chair, Faculty Council on Research, Mike Rosenfeld, Professor, Public Health.
- Secretary of the Faculty, Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, Law.
- Representative from ASUW, vacant.
- Representative from GPSS, Mikel Ruterbusch.
- Committee’s legal counsel, UW division of the attorney general’s office.
Motion to constitute a new committee structure for reviewing revising, and reporting on UW Intellectual Property policies and management, approved by SEC on April 4, 2016.

Formal motion: That the Senate Executive Committee take the following actions:

1. Terminate the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC), effective on the date that the President terminates the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC);

2. Authorize formation of and participation of faculty members in a new advisory committee, to take effect when SCIPC and IPMAC are terminated. A suggested name is Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice: ACIPPP! The new committee will have the following characteristics:
   
   A. The committee will have dual reporting obligations to the SEC and to the President;

   B. The SEC and the President may each appoint up to six voting members; the Graduate and Professional Students may appoint one voting member; the Provost may appoint an ex-officio member to advise on budget issues.

   C. The SEC may appoint up to six faculty members. The Chair of the Senate will nominate faculty members based on their expertise or significant experience regarding intellectual property policy, management, or commercialization, including previous service on IPMAC or SCIPC, and their willingness to serve. The Chair and SEC shall make every effort to ensure that faculty appointees represent diverse disciplines with diverse interests and needs regarding IP policy, management, and commercialization. To the extent possible, faculty members should represent the following disciplines or units:
      
      i. Health Sciences
      ii. Engineering
      iii. Social Sciences
      iv. Humanities
      v. Law
      vi. Business

   D. The President may appoint up to six members to represent administrative or academic units, such as:
      
      i. The Office of Research;
      ii. Educational Outreach;
      iii. CoMotion;
      iv. UW Libraries
      v. Health Sciences/School of Medicine

   E. The University of Washington Division of the Attorney General’s Office will serve as the committee’s legal counsel.

   F. Except for the GPSS member, voting members’ appointment terms will be three years and are renewable. GPSS may appoint a member for a term up to three years in length.

   G. The President and the Chair of the Faculty Senate will consult and jointly appoint the chair of the committee. The chair’s term will be one year and is renewable.

   H. The Senate leadership with work with the Provost to secure support staff for the committee, comparable to what has been provided to IPMAC.

3. Authorize the Chair, Vice Chair, and Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to
consult with the President, and with the current members of SCIPC and IPMAC, among others, on the elements of and deadlines for the charge to the new committee. We anticipate that the charge should be developed no later than June 15, 2016, and may include elements such as the following.

A. A recommendation, after consultation with the Open Access Task Force, regarding an “Open Access” policy for faculty research;

B. A recommendation of policies and practices designed to lower the cost of textbooks for UW students and other course materials;

C. A recommendation for policies and management of faculty, staff, student, and university intellectual property rights involved in on-line courses, on-line programs, and third-party on-line learning management systems;

D. A recommendation for policies and practices for managing intellectual property interests generated during collaborations between or among UW faculty members, staff, and students;

E. A recommendation for policies and practices for managing faculty, staff, student, and university intellectual property rights generated during or as a result of partnerships between the University and other entities, including private for-profit and non-profit entities and academic institutions;

F. A review of, and recommendations for, policies and practices governing mandatory licensing or assignment agreements required by the UW as a condition for granting permission for outside work by faculty, staff, or students;

G. A tri-campus assessment of ongoing or emerging needs, opportunities, or impediments to efficient and equitable management of intellectual property generated by UW faculty, staff, and students, and their external partners;

H. A comprehensive review of and proposed revisions, as necessary, to Executive Order 36 – deadline TBD.

I. Recommendations of a plan and method for educating faculty, staff, and students about their intellectual property rights, responsibilities, and opportunities on an ongoing basis.

**Rationale:**

I have consulted with the members of SCIPC, IPMAC, the faculty senate leadership, and the President’s office concerning the desirability of establishing a joint faculty/administrative committee on intellectual property policy and management that has a refreshed charge and dual reporting obligations to the SEC and to the President. All have agreed that this is a good idea.

Novel intellectual property issues crop up regularly at the UW. Our basic IP policies, which were set forty to fifty years ago by EO 36, do not necessarily cover every issue, nor do our practices necessarily promote the UW’s collective mission as effectively and transparently as we might hope. We are all aware of technological changes that affect both research and teaching methods and materials, many of which require faculty, staff and students to contract about and manage patents, copyrights, and trademarks in keeping with public law, university rules, and the requirements of external partners and funding sources. We are aware of increasing numbers of inter-disciplinary and collaborative research agendas. We are also aware of new funding and revenue-generating models, including partnerships with private and foreign entities, such as those involved with the Global Innovation Exchange.

Now is a good time to energize a renewed, joint, SEC and administrative focus on intellectual property rights and management. The goals of a joint effort should be to:

- Provide greater and faster public access to UW research through broader, easier open access depository and ultimately R1 depository consortia
- Join with other R1 universities in a long-term effort to reduce monopolistic publisher pricing effects on
library collections cost
- By encouraging open access policies for research and for teaching materials, and
- By gradually reducing private publisher influence over peer review and P&T criteria
- Encourage use of lower cost teaching materials, if needed quality is available
- Encourage best practices for on-line teaching materials and programs
- Be a leader in open access policies; recognize the inroads the internet has made on traditional IP practices; acknowledge open access policies of public and major private, non-profit grantors
- Identify best business/licensing practices for private/public partnerships
- Encourage intra-UW research and teaching collaborations by providing transparent templates, adaptable to multi-disciplines
- Educate faculty about what can be done; increase transparency, and efficiency
- Recognize the implications of the shift from C4C to CoMotion
- Create policies and practices that support a culture of trust, fairness, and mutual advantage for the UW, faculty and graduate students, the business, non-profit and philanthropic communities
- Update policies to comply with changed laws in certain areas.

Why is a joint SEC/administration committee with a refreshed charge desirable now?

IPMAC has worked long and hard, first to advise prior Presidents on IP policy and commercialization, and more recently to conduct a thorough review of Executive Order 36 and to engage in university-wide dialogues about emerging issues and needs. However, no formal proposals have emerged from that body recently. Meanwhile changes that involve significant IP interests and issues continue apace. Other IP-related initiatives -- such as the Open Access Task Force -- were prompted by a Senate Resolution. ASUW and the state legislature are interested in lowering the costs of textbooks. C4C has been reconfigured as CoMotion with a significantly different mission and funding model. A significant new partnership -- GIX -- has been launched.

From a faculty perspective, it was problematic that IPMAC did not report to a faculty body. SCIPC was constituted several years ago in reaction to the perception that IP issues were not necessarily handled transparently or in a manner consistent with the UW’s public mission or the faculty’s best interests. Even though IPMAC’s recent leadership has tried valiantly to operate openly, the effect of having two bodies reviewing IP policies and practices has not been particularly efficient. IPMAC feels it must consult SCIPC; SCIPC has not developed its own agenda so much as waited for IPMAC or the administration to propose changes. To be fair, the process has been slow, not through the fault of either committee, but simply because the issues are numerous and sometimes very complex.

A joint committee could at least be more efficient. A committee with dual reporting obligations makes it more likely that the SEC will learn of important administrative initiatives that involve IP and that the administration will hear of faculty interests and concerns earlier. Now, with a (relatively new) administration, this may also be a time when a freshly charged committee can address the many and novel IP issues with a collaborative spirit and renewed energy. It is an open issue whether the committee should begin by attempting comprehensive review and revision of UW IP policies or whether it might begin by addressing specific, contemporary issues and then build toward a comprehensive review and revision of EO 36, for example. It may also be the case that the new committee should focus less on traditional IP ownership and licensing of patents in the context of tech transfer, and more on developing and disseminating best practices that serve the UW’s contemporary mission and strategies across the board.

In any event, my goal in recommending a joint committee is to commit both the faculty and the administration to managing inevitable, novel IP issues by creating a shared governance body that can hold institutional memory, develop relevant expertise, review existing policies and practices, and advise on emerging issues relatively quickly and transparently.

Proposal

- Create a fresh body – an advisory committee with dual reporting obligations to Senate and President. (Model is Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics).
- Reconstitute a smaller membership (than the sum of both SCIPC and IPMAC) based on relevant knowledge, experience and expertise; attend to disciplinary diversity; ensure help from law and business, as needed, but perhaps not lead with legal considerations; consider providing graduate student researchers and staff with voice.
- Use and disseminate, as appropriate, data and analysis already done by IPMAC, SCIPC, OR, and C4C to new committee.
- Charge deans and EFCs with gathering data on discipline-specific needs and reporting to advisory committee. (Information in.)
- Consider a fresh charge to the new committee.
- Consider charging committee to tackle particular issues rather than a global reform of IP policy across UW.
- Focus first on recommending best practices to accomplish goals rather than on allocation of IP ownership.
- Revision of EO 36 would be an outcome, not initial focus.
- Foster intellectual engagement about these issues – e.g. invite prominent speakers; encourage a symposium or two. (Information out.)
- Set firm deadlines for accomplishing certain tasks.
- Provost provides staff support.
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to the normal business of reviewing curricular changes, the following are policy issues that FCAS is undertaken or has recently completed:

- The council has discussed the offering of W-credits (Additional Writing) in language courses and decided that the W-credit was designed and intended to be granted for writing in English (to encourage training/practice in writing at the UW).
- FCAS has been asked to weigh in on a discussion relating to the departmental sign-off process for issues of course and program overlap.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

The council has had one meeting in 2016-2017, and discussed the upcoming Open Enrollment for Benefits and changes to life insurance. The council also addressed its 2016-2017 charge letter, which includes expected activities for the academic year. These activities include:

- Complete a “Benefits Comparison Chart” of UW peer institutions through a robust gathering of institutional benefits data from 11 institutions.
- Review current policy on UW Tuition Waivers.
- Review and evaluate parental leave policies with special emphasis on assessing issues of equity (e.g. paid maternity vs. leave for adoption).
- Consider mechanisms to recognize, acknowledge, and celebrate the contributions made to the university by retiring UW faculty.
- Evaluate potential mechanisms to utilize engagement of retired faculty at the UW

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs / Faculty Council on Women in Academia

- Reviewed the draft “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices” from the Center for Teaching and Learning and voted to approve dissemination of the document in spring 2016.
- Developed a Class C Resolution on Equity, Access, and Inclusion Training for Promotion and Tenure Committees (currently within the Class C ratification process).

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

The council is continuing a robust investigation of lecturer issues at the UW with an aim to potentially consider changes to the Faculty Code, once completed.

Faculty Council on Research

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the FCR is working on improving institutional support structures for Postdoctoral Researchers at the UW. The council plans to advance a Class C resolution to disseminate information on the initiative to the wider faculty in winter quarter 2017.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students. Currently, the council is instrumental in reviewing Phase II changes to the UW Student Conduct Code, and will eventually advance Class B legislation to cement the policy changes at the UW and within the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

The FCTL is currently breaking up its membership into subcommittees to address areas of interest relating to pedagogy at the UW. The areas the council has identified include:

- Teaching Effectiveness
- Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges
- Diversity and Equity-Informed Pedagogies
- Teaching and Learning Effectiveness for PT Lecturers
- Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The FCTCP has met once during academic year 2016-2017 and is currently interested in evaluating and potentially revising the university-wide curriculum approval mechanism of "Tri-Campus Review." Other areas of interest the council has identified include:

- Examining the impact of Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) on cross-school/college/campus program enrollment at the graduate level
- Completing review of Masters/Grad degree approval process(es) begun 2015-2016

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

FCUFS began the 2016-2017 academic year by altering its meeting schedule to meet twice a month (every two weeks). In addition to reviewing the One Capital Plan, Campus Master Plan, and other presentations from university administrators relating to capital project development, the council has expressed an interest in facilitating additional faculty review of capital developments at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

FCUL has yet to meet in academic year 2016-2017; the council has an ongoing interest in advancing the university-wide Open Access Initiative, supporting the development and review of a new policy on digital scholarship, and continuing to offer feedback and support for the Open Textbooks Initiative at the UW.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The FCWA has identified a new chair, and has yet to meet in academic year 2016-2017. As a starting point, the council is expected to address two Class C resolutions which were formulated by members during the previous academic year:

- A Class C resolution concerning Faculty and Staff Training on Assault and Relationship Violence.
- A Class C resolution concerning Faculty Power to Reform Sexual Assault Resources at UW.
2016-2017 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)
- Tom Halverson, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00)
- Jan Whittington, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)
- Angelisa Paladin, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Angelisa Paladin, School of Medicine, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice
- Robert Gomulkiewicz, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Jim Gregory, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Pierre Mourad, Engineering & Mathematics, UW Bothell, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Tueng Shen, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Adjudication Panel
- Margaret Adam, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Chris Hague, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Gail Stygall, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Kristiina Vogt, College of the Environment, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Conciliation Board
- Kelly Edwards, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Janine Jones, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Barbara McCann, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
Request for official code interpretation

To: SEC members
From: Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty
Re: Interpretive issues with respect to Chapter 29 (Amendment of the Faculty Code)
Date: November 1, 2016

Last year in connection with the debate on the faculty salary policy, several questions arose about the amendment process as spelled out in Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations ("Code Cops") considered the issues and provided "opinions for consideration by the Senate Executive Committee." Their response is attached.

The SEC has ultimate interpretive authority per Section 22-60.B.9. Because of the importance of these issues, the Code Cops “recommend[] that whatever interpretations the SEC adopts be codified explicitly by amendment of the Faculty Code.” The Secretary recommends that the SEC provide definitive interpretations with respect to these questions and start the formal amendment process by requesting that the Code Cops draft appropriate language pursuant to their responsibility under Section 22-61.A.3.a.

Members of the SEC should carefully read the Code Cop memo, but a brief precis, as I see it, of the key questions and the Code Cop responses is provided below:

1. The Code Cops were asked whether the SEC may, as part of its first consideration of Class A legislation submitted to it, decline to forward the legislation to the Faculty Senate. Their answer was that the SEC may not decline to forward such legislation. They went on to say: "[T]he SEC could, in theory, delay that introduction indefinitely, effectively voting it down without explicitly declining to forward. However, given the requirements for ‘submission to the Senate’ in 42-33A or to ‘introduce’ in Subsection 29-32B and the ‘next meeting’ timelines for proposed legislation elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the SEC could reasonably interpret the Faculty Code to require that it submit or introduce proposed legislation at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting or at a special Faculty Senate meeting."

2. The Code Cops were asked whether the SEC may at such a first consideration amend the language of submitted legislation before forwarding it to the Faculty Senate. With respect to legislation submitted by faculty petition, the Code Cops said: “Since the SEC must introduce the proposed legislation ‘submitted to it in appropriate written form,’ a reasonable interpretation would be that the SEC may not amend, alter or decline to forward the proposed legislation. The SEC may reasonably request that the proposed legislation be revised into appropriate written form (see, e.g., Subsection 29-32C).” With respect to legislation submitted by a Faculty Council, the Code Cops said: “A reasonable interpretation of the text of the Faculty Code would be that the SEC may recommend amendments to proposed legislation submitted by a Faculty Council to the Senate, but may not implement them, i.e., that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from a Faculty Council to the Senate substantially in the form in which it was received, perhaps with minor changes to format and grammar but without substantive changes to meaning, along with any recommended amendments, which the Senate may then adopt or alter as it chooses. This would not preclude the SEC making recommendations to the submitting Faculty Council, and that Faculty Council choosing to revise the proposed legislation in view of the recommendations, prior to resubmission to the Senate through the SEC.” However, the Code Cops noted: “[T]his is not how the SEC has proceeded in recent times.

3. The Code Cops noted a potential inconsistency in the way legislation may be introduced through the SEC by faculty petition. In particular, Section 29-32.B describes a request in writing by 1% or more of the voting members of the faculty, but Section 22-60.B.3 describes a request in writing by at least 10% of the voting members of the faculty.
4. The Code Cops were asked what changes could be made by the SEC at the second consideration of Class A legislation. Their response was that the SEC is limited by Section 29-34.A.3, which states that the SEC:

"3. May make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:
   a. To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and
   b. To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or with other provisions of the Faculty Code, and
   c. To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President."

5. Finally, the Code Cops were asked what changes, if any, the Senate, may make during the second consideration of Class A legislation to the original proposal (i.e. the proposal that resulted from the Senate's first consideration) or the alternate that results from the operation of 29-34.A.3. They responded: "[N]o change in the [alternate] proposed legislation is permitted. … [T]he most reasonable interpretation is that consideration of the original proposal at second consideration is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty, and amendments are not permitted. … [T]he Senate may reject the original proposal and then reintroduce either proposal for first consideration, including amendment."

Advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

March 25, 2016

Dear Marcia,

In response to your letter of March 8, 2016, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has considered the issues you raised and offers the following opinions for consideration by the Senate Executive Committee, should it desire to make a formal interpretation of the relevant sections of the Faculty Code.

A note on vocabulary. The Faculty Code refers to 'a proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code.' We are then asked to consider the process for amending these proposals for amendment of the Faculty Code. In our discussion we follow your practice of referring to what the Faculty Code calls 'proposal(s) for amendment of the Faculty Code' as 'proposed legislation,' and discuss amending the proposed legislation.

In the preamble to the issues, you state:

*If the Senate approves the legislation at this 'first consideration', the matter is sent (back) to the SEC to consider any amendments made by your committee and the President ('second consideration'), as described in Chapter 29, Section 29-33 and Section 29-34.*

In fact, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations does not make amendments to proposed legislation. Per 29-33E, it

1. **Examine(s) the proposed amendment, with reference only to its form and its consistency with other provisions of the Faculty Code, relevant statutes, resolutions, and executive orders; and**

2. **Report(s) to the Executive Committee at its next regular meeting any suggestions which may arise from its examination of the proposal.**
Also, the President does not make amendments to proposed legislation. Per 29-33D,

A. The President shall consider the proposed amendment and within 14 days shall notify the Executive Committee of his or her approval or disapproval of the proposal. If the President disapproves it, reasons for so doing shall be stated.

While the President’s reasons may reasonably contain suggestions as to changes that would earn Presidential approval, these are not amendments to the proposed legislation.

You first ask

1. Section 29-32 provides for the SEC to introduce a proposed amendment to the Senate. Frequently the proposed legislation is brought to the SEC by a Council or a member of the Senate or SEC. Is it consistent with the Faculty Code for the SEC at this “first consideration” to make changes to the proposed legislation? May the SEC decline to forward the legislation to the Senate (ie. (sic) “vote it down”)? Under what conditions may an individual faculty member or group of faculty introduce a Class A proposal directly to the Senate for “first consideration”?

Taking the questions in turn:

Q1A. Is it consistent with the Faculty Code for the SEC at this “first consideration” to make changes to the proposed legislation? May the SEC decline to forward the legislation to the Senate (ie. (sic) “vote it down”)?

Proposed legislation reaches the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in three ways: From Faculty Councils, by petition of the faculty, or originated in the SEC itself. When originating proposed legislation under Section 29-32A the SEC may clearly alter it in any way it sees fit, including deciding not to submit it to the Senate.

Proposed legislation from Faculty Councils is governed by Section 42-33A.1 and A.3:

42-33A.1. (Faculty Councils) (s)hall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee all legislative proposals pertaining to matters set forth in Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection A;

42-33A.3. (A Faculty Council) (m)ay on its own initiative prepare legislative proposals or resolutions for submission through the Executive Committee to the Senate;

Since the Faculty Code calls for submission of proposed legislation to the Senate through the Executive Committee, the clear interpretation is that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from Faculty Councils to the Senate, and cannot ‘vote it down.’ The question is then to what extent the SEC may alter the proposed legislation prior to such submission. Section 22-60A says that the SEC ‘(is) to assist the Senate in the discharge of its legislative duties.’ Section 22-60B.4 states:

22-60B.4. (The SEC) (s)hall make recommendations to the Senate concerning proposed legislative actions;

The question then is whether making recommendations extends to amending the language of proposed legislation.

As a matter of text and structure, we consider the SEC to be a “non-plenary” committee, i.e., with no more powers than those specifically granted. Major alterations made by the SEC to legislation proposed to the Senate by a Faculty Council, prior to submission to the Senate, would appear to be closer to ‘supplanting’ the legislative duties of the Senate than to ‘assisting’ them. A reasonable interpretation of
the text of the Faculty Code would be that the SEC may recommend amendments to proposed legislation submitted by a Faculty Council to the Senate, but may not implement them, *i.e.*, that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from a Faculty Council to the Senate substantially in the form in which it was received, perhaps with minor changes to format and grammar but without substantive changes to meaning, along with any recommended amendments, which the Senate may then adopt or alter as it chooses. This would not preclude the SEC making recommendations to the submitting Faculty Council, and that Faculty Council choosing to revise the proposed legislation in view of the recommendations, prior to resubmission to the Senate through the SEC.

However, this is not how the SEC has proceeded in recent times. The legislative flowchart at www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/05/class_a_flowchart.pdf clearly envisions the SEC amending proposed legislation. An interpretation based on historical practice could interpret ‘recommendations’ as including making substantive changes to proposed legislation from Faculty Councils. However, this flowchart does not envision ‘voting down’ legislation proposed by a Faculty Council.

Proposed legislation from faculty petition is governed by Section 29-32B:

29-32B: *When requested in writing to do so by 1% or more voting members of the faculty, the Executive Committee shall introduce a proposed amendment of the Faculty Code which has been submitted to it in appropriate written form.*

Proposed legislation forwarded to the SEC under the provision of Subsection 29-32B, *i.e.*, accompanied by a written request signed by 1% or more of the voting members of the faculty, must be ‘introduced’ by the SEC. Although 29-32B does not explicitly say so, the proposed legislation clearly must be introduced to the Senate. Since the SEC must introduce the proposed legislation ‘submitted to it in appropriate written form,’ a reasonable interpretation would be that the SEC may not amend, alter or decline to forward the proposed legislation. The SEC may reasonably request that the proposed legislation be revised into appropriate written form (see, *e.g.*, Subsection 29-32C).

As an aside, Section 22-60B.3 states:

22-60B.3. *(The SEC) (s)hall include on the agenda any item requested in writing by at least 10% of the voting members of the faculty;*

Yet Section 29-32B requires only 1% of the faculty to introduce proposed legislation. We view proposed legislation as a special case of ‘any item.’ However, we consider that one or the other of these numbers may be in error.

There is no explicit time limit on introduction of proposed legislation from Faculty Councils or from petition of the faculty by the SEC to the Senate, so the SEC could, in theory, delay that introduction indefinitely, effectively voting it down without explicitly declining to forward. However, given the requirements for ‘submission to the Senate’ in 42-33A or to ‘introduce’ in Subsection 29-32B and the ‘next meeting’ timelines for proposed legislation elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the SEC could reasonably interpret the Faculty Code to require that it submit or introduce proposed legislation at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting or at a special Faculty Senate meeting.

Q1B. *Under what conditions may an individual faculty member or group of faculty introduce a Class A proposal directly to the Senate for “first consideration”?*

Subsection 29-32A provides that any Senator may introduce a ‘proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code,’ *i.e.*, Class A proposed legislation, at any meeting of the Faculty Senate, presumably under the New Business agenda item, provided that the proposed legislation is in written form and that it conforms to the form required in Subsection 29-33C, *i.e.*, it is a resolution to submit the proposal to the faculty. There is no requirement or provision for Senate Executive Committee review or amendment of such proposed legislation prior to its introduction to the Faculty Senate.
A single individual member of the faculty who is not a Senator may not introduce proposed legislation directly to the Senate. Section 29-32B, as discussed above, provides for a request to the SEC to introduce proposed legislation accompanied by the signatures of 1% or more of the voting faculty.

Your second issue was

1. **Section 29-34, subsections A, B, and C describe what we call the “second consideration” of the proposed legislation by the SEC. May any changes be made to the proposed legislation by the SEC other than those recommended by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations or the President?**

Section 29-34 requires that the SEC consider the statement of the President and the suggestions of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations concerning proposed legislation. However, the SEC is neither bound by nor limited to these inputs. The SEC does not, however, have a totally free hand to make changes to proposed legislation at this point in the process. The SEC may decline to make any specific suggested change, and may make such other changes as it chooses, provided that the changes can be justified as meeting one or more of the requirements of Subsection 29-34A.3, which states:

2. **(The SEC) may make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:**
   
   a. To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and
   
   b. To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or with other provisions of the Faculty Code, and
   
   c. To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President.

Your third issue was:

3. **Section 29-34, subsection D describes actions to be taken at the Senate’s “second consideration.” May any changes be made by the Senate to either the “original proposal” or the “alternate proposal” at this meeting or must they be voted on as submitted by the SEC without further amendment?**

Subsection 29-34D states that if the SEC has altered the proposed legislation resulting from first consideration in the Faculty Senate, the ‘first question’ for the Faculty Senate is to approve or disapprove submitting the revised proposed legislation (the ‘alternate proposal’) to the Faculty. Thus no change in the revised proposed legislation is permitted before this determination is made. If the revised proposed legislation is rejected, i.e., the Faculty Senate votes not to submit it to the Faculty, then the Faculty Senate ‘shall then consider’ the proposed legislation approved by the Senate at the first consideration (‘the original proposal’). The question is whether the term ‘consider’ includes amendment of the proposed legislation.

The structure of the double-consideration framework of proposed legislation by the Faculty Senate seems to be aimed in large part at avoiding sending to the full faculty a proposal that is “flawed” because of conflicts with other parts of the code, executive orders, relevant state law, or administrative support. If the Senate were able to reject the alternate proposal and then freely amend the original proposal and send it to the faculty without further review by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, and without further Presidential review, flawed proposals are far more likely.

Moreover, if this were intended there would be no need for the double-consideration framework as it exists. It would have been simpler to allow the Senate to freely amend the SEC’s alternate proposal.
Thus the presence of the double-consideration framework strongly implies that consideration of the original proposal is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty. As a matter of historical practice amendments of the original proposal have not been allowed. Indeed, the flow chart does not have an "amendments" input on the second consideration. Therefore, the most reasonable interpretation is that consideration of the original proposal at second consideration is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty, and amendments are not permitted. As we have seen, the Senate may reject the original proposal and then reintroduce either proposal for first consideration, including amendment.

Because of the importance of these issues the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommends that whatever interpretations the SEC adopts be codified explicitly by amendment of the Faculty Code.

Richard D. Christie
Chair, Advisory Committee on the Faculty Code and Regulation
Class B Legislation: Chapter 102 Scholastic Regulations.

Rationale: The University of Washington has implemented the practice of allowing students to identify themselves by the name they would like to be called in classroom settings or interacting with other campus personnel. This change in the scholastic regulations reflects this practice. More information can be found on the registrar’s website at https://registrar.washington.edu/students/preferred-names/.

Legislation:

Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102 Registration

[Additional regulations regarding Enrollment and Registration Procedures are located in Chapter 478-160 WAC. Among the topics included are admission categories, applications, residence classification, enrollment periods, enrollment procedures, enrollment in courses on other UW campuses, enrollment service fees, credit categories, withdrawals, and information on special programs.]

1. Registration for Courses
   A. Registration Required
      Students are required to register for any course in which they participate. No person, other than guests approved by the instructor, may take part in a University course in which she or he has not been registered.
   B. Preferred Name
      The University of Washington provides students with the opportunity to have a preferred name displayed on non-legal documents and applications such as class lists and advising tools.
   B. C. Credits Allowed Per Quarter
      1. Except with the consent of his or her dean, no student shall be registered for more than 20 credits of work or the number called for in the prescribed curricula.
      2. For students in the Graduate School, a minimum workload of 10 credits per quarter is required for full-time status.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 14, 2016
Class C Resolution regarding adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington.

WHEREAS, the faculty of the University of Washington have charge of the immediate government of the institution under such rules as may be prescribed by the board of regents [RCW 28B.20.200]; and

WHEREAS, state law provides that Regents will obtain the assistance and recommendation of the faculty in prescribing the courses of study in the various colleges, schools, and departments of the institution, and in the awarding of degrees [RCW 28B.20.130]; and

WHEREAS, the faculty of the University of Washington are specifically authorized to formulate regulations and to share responsibility with the University President, Chancellors, and Deans on matters such as educational policy and general welfare, policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities, scholastic policy, approval of candidates for degrees, criteria for faculty appointments, tenure, and promotions, and recommendations concerning university budgets [Executive Order 4]; and

WHEREAS, the governance of the University of Washington will be strengthened by providing the perspective of its faculty to the Board of Regents by adding a faculty member as a voting member to the Board; therefore,

THE FACULTY SENATE RESOLVES, that the governance of the University of Washington shall be vested in a Board of Regents to consist of eleven members, one of whom shall be a full-time or emeritus member of the faculty of the University. The Governor shall select the faculty member from a list of candidates, of at least two and not more than five, selected via a process determined by the leadership of the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington. This faculty member will recuse himself or herself from any decisions affecting matters relating to the hiring, discipline, or tenure of specific faculty members and personnel. The faculty member shall hold this office for a term of three years, from the first day of July until the first day of July three years later, or until his or her successor is appointed and qualified, whichever is later.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate authorizes its Faculty Legislative Representative to pursue the enactment of this proposed legislation in coordination with an identical proposal from Washington State University in the 2017 legislative session.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 14, 2016
GLOBAL INNOVATION EXCHANGE (GIX)

Update for Senate Executive Committee
11/14/2016

Mary Udresma and Vikram Jandhyala
UW Co-Executive Directors
Global Innovation Exchange

VISION OF GIX

A global partnership between major research universities, innovative corporations and organizations
Goal of developing the future thought leaders in innovation
Experiential programs fostering team-based innovation and entrepreneurial thinking

GLOBAL CHALLENGES

- HEALTH
- SUSTAINABILITY
- SOCIAL INNOVATION

GLOBAL INNOVATION EXCHANGE (GIX)
Partnership of UW, Tsinghua and Microsoft announced June, 2015
Physical presence in Bellevue, WA in 2017
Focus on innovation, education and training
November 14, 2016, SEC Agenda

STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP

President Xi presented President Cauce, President Qiu, and President Smith with the gift of a dawn redwood tree for GIX.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

> GIX Board: Presidents of UW and Tsinghua University, one other representative from each university, representative from Microsoft
  > Provides guidance, no curricular or budgetary authority
> GIX Deans Advisory Board: dean or representative from each school or college involved in GIX; meets quarterly for updates and input
> GIX Internal Steering Committee: all principals meet weekly
> Interdisciplinary Faculty Group: oversees the M.S. degree program

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

UW’s efforts in GIX led by
- Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy
- Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research
- Shwetak Patel, WRF Entrepreneurship Endowed Professor in Computer Science and Electrical Engineering
- Linda Wagner, Senior Lecturer HCDE, Director of Academic Programs

Tsinghua’s efforts in GIX led by
- Yuanchun Shi, Tsinghua University Professor of Computer Science
- Qing-Shan Jia, faculty in Department of Automation

GIX-UW STAFF

COO: Dave Maddox (80% time)
Advancement/CoMotion: Lara Littlefield (50% time)
Staff assistants: Elizabeth Cito, Silvia De Cassan
Fiscal assistant: Adrienne Parsons
To Be Hired in the coming year: fiscal administrator, additional academic program staff, leads for Maker Space and mentor program
**M.S. IN TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION**

Connected Devices | creating NEW innovative end-to-end user experiences focused on societal benefit; approved by Regents March 2016

- Physical computing
- Sensing
- Physical waste
- Networking with sensors
- Processing signals and data
- User interface and applications

Experiential Learning

- Practice
- Launch

Main areas of emphasis:
- Health
- Social Innovation
- Sustainability

**GIX LOCATION**

GIX will be located in Bellevue’s Spring District
16 city blocks with housing, shops, restaurants and parks

**PROGRAMMATIC DETAILS**

- 96,000 SF building open Sept 2017
  - Option on adjacent site for expansion
- M.S. program growth: 70 students in Sept 2017, scale to 140 in Sept 2018
- Initial degree options—UW MISTI alone, or as part of dual degree with Tsinghua
- Students recruited locally, nationally, globally
  - Initial cohort 1/3 from UW, 1/3 from THU, 1/3 from the world
- Instructional staff from UW departments, partner universities, local industry
GIX BUILDING DESIGN

UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

> Network model
  - Subset of premier universities around the world invited to participate with students and faculty
  - One or more may eventually rise to full partner status
  - In discussions with Imperial College London, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, ETH, EPFL (Switzerland), U of Toronto
  - Targeting this group for advertising of the MSTi degree program

> UW academic benefits
  - Six new tenure-track faculty positions funded by GIX revenues
  - Visiting faculty from top universities interact with researchers at the UW as well as local industry
  - Projects are likely to spin out funded research projects
  - Some of these top M.S. students will choose to do a Ph.D. at UW, following up on their GIX project

GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY SEPT 23

> Presidents Cauce and Qiu
> Governor Inslee
> King County Executive Constantine
> Chinese Consul General Luo

A lot of press, presentation of a plaque and a directional sign in English and Chinese

FUND-RAISING

> Microsoft gift
  - $28M: GIX tenant improvements and lease subsidies for 3 years
  - $10M: endowment
  - $1M: operating funds
> Financial model is based mainly on tuition
  - $54,000 for 15-month program
> Scholarships
  - Part of financial model; fund-raising target
> Additional: current use donor funds $10M
> All costs paid for by GIX funds
**TIMELINE FIRST THREE YEARS**

**2015**
- Set up agreements
- Develop curriculum
- Hire staff
- Secure initial funding
  - $10M endowment
  - $10M operations funding
  - $20M facilities funding

**2016**
- Get M.S. program approved
- Get faculty/depts committed
- Fundraise
- Recruit first cohort of students
- Set up network

**2017**
- Launch first M.S. cohort (70 students)
- Recruit students for year 2
- Fundraise
- Bring in network partners

**QUESTIONS AND INPUT**

---
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Exhibit K

Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 1, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Zoe Barsness.

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

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of November 14, 2016.
   a. Electronic approval of the October 3, 2016, SEC minutes.
   b. Electronic approval of the October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

8. Announcements.


    b. Information item: HR Modernization Update, Aubrey Fulmer Executive Program Director, HR/P Modernization Program.
    c. Class B Legislation – Chapter 102 Scholastic Regulation.
       Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.
    d. Class C Resolution - adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington.
       Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Zoe Barsness, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, December 8 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.