Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 5, 2012, 2:30 p.m.
Gerberding 142

Present: Gregory, Lee, Astley, Fridley, Stern, Evans, Treser, Morison, Taricani, Giebel, Shen, Dillon, Stygall, Olmstead, Young, Joseph, Baird, Cauce, Sherman, Wadden, Miller, Zachry
Absent: Turns, Killien, Smith
Guests: Dukes

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Meeting started at 2:31 PM and the Agenda was approved.

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

Chair Gregory gave his report and described a one-time, lump sum payment of 2% that faculty and staff will receiving at Washington State University. He summarized discussion on the Social Science online degree completion at the October Faculty Senate meeting. One question from the meeting was what the role of the Senate should be in the implementation process. Because of the uniqueness of the initiative, there is no clear path for determining the Senate’s role. He suggested that the Faculty Senate as a whole be involved in the process of establishing this degree, and continue discussions with the administration at SEC and Senate meetings. A primary issue of concern is which faculty would oversee this social science degree, since there is no social science school or department, but a collection of departments. Gregory shared that Arts & Sciences Divisional Dean Judith Howard is working on that issue.

President Young expressed support for the idea of conducting systematic reviews, and would be interested in doing something along those lines University wide.

Continued discussion followed on how the Senate should proceed in looking at the online degree completion initiative.

President Young explained that the potential start date could be delayed to ensure that details regarding the program are further developed. He wishes to ensure that the program is done correctly, and suggested that a delay is fine, if necessary to assure quality.

Gregory thanked the President and Provost for being respectful and responsive in this process.


President Young thanked Gregory for the remarks, and emphasized that he will only proceed with the online degree completion program if it meets UW quality standards, which faculty serve as the guardians of. UW is currently focusing on the undergraduate experience, and is developing a campus-wide leadership initiative on this. Student advising is also being examined in hopes of integrating the pre-major advisors along with departmental advisors. There is also a desire to have students think more holistically about integrating courses and extracurricular activities. Other items being investigated are residence halls, the freshman experience, financial aid, and enrollment.

Young shared concern about the possibility of federal sequestration which would greatly affect federal research money, which could lead to drastic consequences. The administration is working on contingency plans such as bridge funds due to this. He also worried on the potential impacts of sequestration on Pell Grants, in addition to Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement. Sequestration may also impact state revenues, directly affecting the military bases in the State. Though sequestration may already have affected the University in some ways, more direct impacts would become visible at the end of the year. A larger concern is what may happen to the overall economy if it actually happens.
On the legislative side, there are indications that the House of Representatives is investigating ways to support higher education. In absence of funding increases, it is hoped to free the University up in some of its regulations. The University also hopes to restart the Restore the Core program, to rehabilitate old buildings on campus. Efforts are being taken to gather advocates of the University to emphasize the importance of the University.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
   d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. [Exhibit E]

Pete Dukes, the Faculty Athletic Representative, began his quarterly report and referencing his report in Exhibit E. Overall, he noted that student athletes are doing well, both in the classroom and on the field of play. He noted that events and incidents at other schools often catalyze investigation on how to prevent similar events at the University of Washington. Dukes informed of the launch of the Pac-12 Networks in August. Though this has improved exposure for our student athletes, he noted concern of the amount of time student athletes spend outside of class, citing an example of the intensity within the UW men’s basketball schedule, or traveling for a game at the end of the week which causes student athletes to miss class during the middle of the week. He was unsure on how to mitigate the impacts of such schedules but wished to share his concerns, and added that student-athletes and coaches have expressed similar concerns.

Executive Vice Provost Wadden pointed out that the main change for basketball is switching a Thursday game to Wednesday, which could allow student-athletes to attend more class, depending on if they fly back, or stay on a road trip. Technology was suggested to allow student athletes to “virtually” attend class while travelling or attend similar courses on other campuses while travelling. Teams that tend to travel more actually have the highest grade point averages.

Dukes then presented information from his report on special and priority admits [Exhibit E]. Some students left the University for athletic reasons (such as playing time), but those who stay have been doing well in class. He believes the reason for this success is that the University is careful in its admissions. Once students are admitted, they receive the support they need. He then went on to explain the difference between special admits and priority admits.

Dukes explained that the NCAA is raising the academic bar for students to be eligible to participate as freshmen. He shared other changes that are taking place at the NCAA level including the Academic Progress Rate (APR, which is a method of calculating graduation rates used by the NCAA) and how if APR is too low, teams will be ineligible to participate in postseason play.

Gregory noted that Pac-12 Faculty leadership are beginning to meet regularly and how student-athlete time away from class was a large topic of conversation at their last meeting in Salt Lake City.

The Penn State situation was discussed, and President Young explained many of the things the University has reevaluated and changed after looking at the Freeh Report. The President also shared that a new compliance officer was hired who reports to him. Concerns about head injuries and concussions were discussed as well.

Senator Giebel referred to an article that he shared at the October SEC meeting looking at the NCAA’s fine imposed upon Penn State and read a quote from the article. Giebel shared worries about the precedent that it set. Dukes shared that many people have discussed this at the Pac-12 level, and some people share those concerns.

5. Consent Agenda.
   Approval of the October 8, 2012, SEC Minutes and October 25, 2012, Faculty Senate Minutes.

The consent agenda was approved.
6. Announcements.

The Senate is currently seeking nominees for the Secretary of the Faculty; an announcement was sent out last Friday. The candidates will be presented at the next SEC meeting. Gregory also announced that the Senate is seeking nominations for the Faculty Senate Vice Chair.

7. Unfinished Business.


a. Creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. [Exhibit F]

Gregory presented the legislation, which was moved and seconded. A brief discussion took place on the need to bring faculty up to pace on intellectual property, a recent court case, and committee membership. The legislation was approved unanimously.

b. Approve Nominees for the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. [Exhibit G]

Gregory presented the nominees, and Vice Chair Lee moved to substitute Exhibit I for Exhibit G, which is an updated list. The substitution was approved. The list includes six faculty members, while the chair of the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) will serve as an ex-officio member, for a total of seven voting faculty members. A point was made about the desire to add to the breadth of the committee. Jerry Miller shared that FCR is in favor of the creation of this special committee. Gregory also pointed out that it made sense to form a connection with the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL), so Gregory asked a member to serve, though the position is not a required ex-officio appointment. SCPB Chair Astley also pointed out that the FCR Chair is also an ex-officio member on Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC) which forms an important connection. Members expressed concern on lack of representation from the Tacoma and Bothell campuses.

The list of nominees was approved unanimously.

c. University of Washington Childcare Issues.

Gregory introduced Faculty Council on Women in Academia (FCWA) Chair Olmstead. FCWA and the Faculty Council University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) have discussed the need for additional childcare on the UW Campus. They were happy to hear that having childcare at Husky Stadium was being investigated, however Olmstead noted that such a facility was discussed within the Safeco Tower purchase, but was not created. Olmstead expressed concern of the impact of construction around a current childcare facility on west campus. Provost Cauce reported that an environmental review will take place for this site and considerations are being made on potential additional childcare. Discussion followed on the need for childcare on campus and Seattle in general. Provost Cauce emphasized that this is a very expensive project, mainly due to liability. Laura Evans shared her experience from Harvard, with a sliding scale for childcare tuition. Provost Cauce explained that UW’s size would make it extremely difficult for such a model to work here.


The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 PM.

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

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Tuesday, November 13 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
Jim Gregory, Professor, History

At Monday’s meeting we will have a busy agenda. Faculty Athletics Representative Pete Dukes will discuss the program’s academic performance and we will discuss NCAA policies and initiatives (see his attached report in Exhibit E). The Senate leadership will propose the creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization to provide a vehicle for consultation on IP issues (see Exhibit F). Marjorie Olmstead, chair of Faculty Council on Women in Academia, will discuss issues relating to childcare facilities on campus. And we will continue discussion of the proposed online degree completion program. Here is a brief update of that issue.

Discussion of the online program was the central focus of the October 25th Senate meeting. President Young and Provost Cauce introduced the proposal and then responded to statements and questions from perhaps 20 senators. Vice Provost Szatmary and Dean Howard also responded to queries. The comments varied. There were some statements of support; most raised concerns or probed for more information. There seemed to be a near consensus that the program should not be rushed; that more planning is needed along with continued consultation.

One key point of concern was the fact that the proposed interdisciplinary major (Social Science) does not have a corresponding faculty body to design and oversee curriculum. Provost Cauce and Dean Howard acknowledged that setting up an appropriate structure is important and will take time.

Senate leaders were asked to clarify how governance mechanisms will work. Faculty are supposed to have primary authority over the curriculum, but what does that mean in this case? What can the Senate and other faculty governance bodies do? I answered that the Senate retains oversight and that at our next meeting (November 29) we expect to hear more from the administration about the plan, including a budget and more about the proposed curriculum.

In fact this is a challenging question and I would like to discuss this with SEC. I am not sure the faculty code envisions a situation where a new degree program and undergraduate major is proposed by central administration rather than by the faculty who want to teach it. Our usual system of oversight includes reviews by a college curriculum committee and possibly elected College Council and then by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. These reviews focus on curriculum standards and presume that the faculty of the unit or units offering the program are supportive. In this case we do not yet know that to be the case. FCAS and curriculum committees are also not in a position to evaluate budget issues or institutional impacts, which in this case are serious concerns.

Because of these challenges, it is important that the Senate retain oversight and be prepared to use its authority to insure that the proposed program meets the quality standards and the standards of consultation that are expected at the University of Washington. What that means concretely is that the Senate should expect to receive the following in time to discuss them at the November 29 meeting: a budget and business plan; a report describing the curriculum and admission and graduation requirements; an assessment of how many faculty members are willing to teach in the program and of general faculty support from the 13 Social Science departments; assessments from relevant Faculty Councils. At that meeting or subsequent meetings, the Senate may choose to express itself in a Class C resolution.
1. The Faculty Leadership met on 10/23/12 with the chairs of the elected faculty councils (“college councils”) of the Schools/Colleges/ Campuses to share best practices and concern related to shared governance. The role of the elected faculty councils in providing budget advice to the Deans and Chancellors was discussed.

2. The Faculty Leadership recently met with the Dean and the College Councils of Arts and Sciences to discuss their role related to oversight of the curricular development of the social science online completion degree. The leadership also was invited to meet with the faculty of UW Tacoma on 11/2/12 to discuss shared governance.

3. Nominations are currently being received for candidates for 1) 2013-14 Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate and 2) Secretary of the Faculty for a 5 year term beginning in 2013. To make a nomination, contact Nancy Bradshaw at bradsn@uw.edu.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Susan Astley, Professor, Epidemiology and Pediatrics

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

**Faculty Salary Policy:** At our first Senate meeting in October 2011, Senator Giebel proposed a Class C Resolution “Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy” that was approved by the Senate in December and led directly to the establishment of the Salary Policy Working Group (SPWG) in March 2012. I serve as the Co-Chair of this committee. The group's charge is to examine the following questions: 1) over the next 6-12 months, how should we proceed with wage increases under the current salary policy and revenue expectations, and 2) in the longer term, are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? These topics are paramount as we slowly move out of this recession, face our 4th and hopefully final year of salary freezes, and fully implement Activity Based Budgeting. The SPWG has reached consensus on question 1 and is embarking on question 2. Our progress to date will be shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on 11/19/12. The purpose of the meeting is to solicit comments/advice from this larger body of faculty. The Advisory Group includes all faculty members of the SCPB, SEC, Faculty Senate Chair Jim Gregory’s Cabinet, Faculty Council Chairs, and Chairs of the Bothell and Tacoma Faculty. The Senate will be updated soon after the Advisory Group meeting.

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

**Intellectual Property (IP):** As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate's attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. This discussion led to the discovery that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, IPMAC has been reinstated by the President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In September 2012, Provost Ana Mari Cauce established a work group to revise the "Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation" form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. Their goal is to draft a new form by the end of Fall Quarter.

**Gender Equity in Faculty Promotion and Tenure:** In my final report to the Regents in June 2012, I addressed the topic of gender equity at the UW. The timing of my report coincided with the week Congress failed to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; an Act requiring equal pay for comparable work.
Overall, women in the U.S. make 77 cents to a man’s dollar. I shared with the Regents that I could not help but notice some compelling statistics presented in the University of Washington 2011 Facts for Academic Personnel, included in their meeting notes for the day. While 53% of students (undergraduate through professional) are female, only 38% of the faculty is female. This statistic becomes more troubling as you compare the proportion of female faculty across the ranks (Lecturer 58%, Assistant Professor 45%, Associate Professor 43%, Full Professor 27%). Among the Tenure/Tenure Track faculty, the proportion of women has increased by only 5 percentage points over the past ten years (2001 29% women, 2011 34% women). The New Hire statistics for 2011 may help explain, in part, why so little progress has been made in the past ten years. Only 44% of Professional Faculty new hires were female. The percentage of female hires drops precipitously as one advances up the ranks (47% of Assistant Professors hired were female; 36% of Associate Professors hired were female; and only 18% of Full Professors hired were female). Of the 3,899 professional faculty in 2011, 52% are tenure/tenure track, 38% WOT, and 10% Research. Of the tenure/tenure track positions across the schools in 2011, many schools had less than 25% of their tenure positions held by women (Public Health 23%, Pharmacy 25%, Medicine 21%, Environment 25%, Foster 19%, Engineering 20%). These statistics do not bode well for gender equity in faculty rank and underscore the importance of a thorough review of gender equity in salary compensation. It will be important to identify and minimize factors that may be impeding women from advancing to or being hired into full professor positions. This topic will be addressed by the SCPB in November.

**Faculty Effort Certification (FEC) and allocation of non-sponsored funds to match effort:** Over the years, considerable attention has been focused on how to handle funding and allocation of effort for university service or proposal-writing activities when faculty are funded primarily by sponsored grants or contracts. Up to 46% of the faculty (WOT and Research) receive their funding through sponsored grants or contracts. As outlined in Grants Information Memoranda GIM 35, Faculty Effort Certifications (FECs) are quarterly or semi-annual reports designed to track the effort of faculty who have been paid from and/or committed to sponsored project effort. The FEC is used to ensure compliance with the OMB Circular A-21 requirement to confirm that the distribution of effort “represents a reasonable estimate of the work performed by the employee during the period.” Faculty review and certify their FEC to ensure it reasonably reflects their effort. Use of the UW institutional base salary and average faculty work week are necessary in proposing, charging, and certifying effort. The total UW institutional base salary must be distributed across all of a faculty member’s university research, instruction, administration, service and/or clinical activities. This requirement may not be avoided by characterizing true UW activities such as proposal writing, instruction (including service on thesis committees), university-related administrative duties, service or clinical activities as “unfunded” or “volunteer” activity for which no UW salary is paid. With few exceptions, salary support for teaching, administration, service, clinical activity, institutional governance and proposal preparation effort must come from non-sponsored funds. Appropriate funding sources include, but are not limited to department funds, research cost recovery, gifts and endowments. Considerable progress has been made over the years since this topic was first addressed in the SEC on January 9, 2006 (Exhibit B). A comprehensive FEC website has been established providing departments and faculty with guidance and training that include FEC Newsletters, School and College effort policies, FAQs (e.g., Q: How is my effort preparing my next grant proposal funded? A: During the effort reporting period in which you prepare the proposal, the percentage of your effort spent on proposal preparation must be funded by University sources other than sponsored projects.), and most recently the launch of eFECs. To assess the effectiveness of the University’s effort certification process, it will be important to confirm sufficient non-sponsored funds are available to match faculty’s non-sponsored University efforts. This topic was addressed, in part, at the October 29, 2012 SCPB meeting. Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) is one potential source of funds to support faculty effort spent on proposal preparation. A brief presentation outlined how indirect cost rates are calculated and how ICR is distributed (Under ABB, 35% of ICR is returned to Schools and Colleges). Proposed and negotiated rates are always less than the actual facilities and administration (F&A) rates due to administrative caps and other negotiation adjustments. Effective F&A recovery also differs from actual F&A rates due to sponsor limitations and other waivers. Bottom line; ICR is insufficient to cover F&A costs associated with research including faculty effort on proposal preparation.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Sciences and Mechanical Engineering

Members of the SEC,

Please note that I have three items for your to-do list:

1. Tomorrow, November 6 is Election Day so, if you have not yet done so, MAIL YOUR BALLOT TONIGHT.

2. Please help me by sending me your personal non-uw (e.g., @gmail or @comcast) email address. As your Faculty Legislative Representative there are times that I would like to contact you but I would prefer not to be in a position of having to determine where my message falls in the university’s and the state ethics board’s rules about public and university resource use. Other times I know exactly where I stand per the rules – but I’d like to be able to contact you anyway.

3. Feel very free to put my personal contact information in your phone or address book (email fridley@uw.edu / jim.fridley@fridleys.net or phone 3-6993 / 206-914-8454) and do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns, now or when the legislature is in session.

When the 2013 session of the Washington State Legislature convenes in January the State of Washington will once again be facing pretty substantial budget challenges. This is due in part to our too-slowly recovering economy but also due to the recent court decision (McCleary v. State) demanding increased spending on K-12. The many areas of state government, the recipients of their services, and the employees who provide those services will have many compelling stories to bolster their arguments for new or restored investments in their particular interest. When we do that, the voices of higher education will also need to make abundantly clear that the mandate for the state to amply provide for the (high school level) education of all the children cannot continue to be an excuse for failing to make ample provision for its citizens, children or otherwise, to attain a high quality college education.

Since ballots aren’t due until tomorrow we are still in the season where the conversations are almost all about the campaigns. But after the election outcomes have been determined discussions will shift to preparing and organizing. We will soon know who will be our new Governor and who will be the members of the State House of Representatives (about 25% of the House will be new) and State Senate (only half of the senate positions are being determined but there will be a good number of new members). Real clarity around the work of the legislature won’t come until early spring, if then. Stay tuned though.
Summary Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative
Roland “Pete” Dukes, Professor, Accounting

Autumn Quarter is well underway, and UW intercollegiate athletic competitions are in full swing. My most central focus this Fall has been to understand and watch for possible ramifications of the new Pac-12 event scheduling that is affecting all of our teams. With the advent of the new Pac-12 Network, we have incredible media exposure to virtually all our teams. Fans can watch more Football than ever, but also can watch “live” on TV many matches involving our Men’s and Women’s Soccer teams, and our Volleyball team. I do not think Men’s and Women’s Cross Country teams have gotten quite the exposure, but they will be broadcast at some time.

The immediate consequence of this increased media exposure has been a re-vamping of the scheduled dates and times for competitions so that they can be shown “live” on the network. Thus the University of Washington teams are competing on more different days of the week. Mondays and Wednesdays are the new dates – we have always competed Thursday through Sunday. At a minimum these changes result in student athletes missing days of class than they would have in the past, and might result in missing more class time than in the past. Also, competitions are scheduled at different times during the day, with some competitions starting as early as 1 PM and as late as 8 PM on days when classes are held. Weekend competitions start as early as 11 AM, and again start as late as 8:30 PM. These midweek competitions will be a part of the scheduling for all our teams through the academic year.

My concern is what impact these schedule changes will have on the academic performance of our students. My fellow Pac-12 FARs and I are all monitoring this and sharing concerns and observations with each other. We are focused on “protecting” the student athlete in that we do not want his or her academic performance to suffer because of these changes. The UW Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is prepared to provide the support needed to ensure the academic performance of student athletes is not negatively impacted, but exactly how to do that is unclear.

Annually the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) and the Student Athlete Advisory Services (SAAS) group review the academic performance of our special and our priority admits. The special admit group continues to do well academically in terms of staying eligible and graduating. The priority group does well, but on a relative basis, the special admit group seems to be more successful (relative to expectations) than the priority admit group.

The NCAA, under Mark Emmert, continues to actively try to improve the setting for intercollegiate athletes and the environment in which they compete. Mark and his senior leadership team are leading this effort. That is, many proposed changes are being initiated at either the CEO level of the NCAA, or at the NCAA staff. This is a change from the status quo, where changes were primarily initiated by the institutional and conference members of the NCAA, and were more of a “grass roots” source of rule changes. The efforts by Mark with a kind of “top down” approach to rule changes is meeting considerable resistance, and is not proceeding at the pace President Emmert might have expected. Reviewing all the proposed rule changes, the recommended or proposed amendments to them, and all the comments supporting or opposing the change takes considerable time.
# Priority Admit Data Snapshot By Year

**Entering Class of 2008-2009** (70 priority admits)
- 1 Withdraw from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 0 Was cut from the team
- 1 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)/program discontinued
- 5 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 25 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 1 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
- 31 Earned UW degree

**Entering Class of 2009-2010** (52 priority admits)
- 2 Withdraw from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 3 Was cut from the team
- 2 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 1 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 34 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
- 4 Earned UW degree

**Entering Class of 2010-2011** (65 priority admits)
- 0 Withdraw from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 1 Was cut from the team
- 1 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 3 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 51 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
- 3 Earned UW degree

**Entering Class of 2011-2012** (58 priority admits)
- 1 Withdraw from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 0 Was cut from the team
- 0 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 1 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 1 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 50 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 1 Went pro (left school early)
- 4 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
- 0 Earned UW degree
## Special Admit Data Snapshot By Year

### Entering Class of 2008-2009 (27 special admits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew from UW</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit the team or were dismissed from the team</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains at UW in good academic standing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went pro (left school early)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.0 or academically ineligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned UW degree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entering Class of 2009-2010 (21 special admits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew from UW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit the team or were dismissed from the team</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain at UW in good academic standing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went pro (left school early)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.0 or academically ineligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned UW degree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entering Class of 2010-2011 (30 special admits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew from UW</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit the team or were dismissed from the team</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain at UW in good academic standing</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went pro (left school early)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.0 or academically ineligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned UW degree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entering Class of 2011-2012 (31 special admits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew from UW</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit the team or were dismissed from the team</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain at UW in good academic standing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went pro (left school early)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.0 or academically ineligible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned UW degree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

Committee Charge:

The Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty Intellectual Property, including its management and commercialization. These policies are broadly outlined in EO 36 and APS 59.4, and managed in part through C4C. Any proposed changes to such policies/practices shall be brought to this Special Committee as a part of shared governance. This special committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee.

The committee will consist of five or more faculty members (voting) and a presidential designee (nonvoting). One of the faculty members will be the Chair of the Faculty Council on Research. Members will normally serve a three year term but the initial terms will be staggered.
Faculty Member Appointments to the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

- Susan Astley, School of Public Health, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.¹

- Susan Astley, School of Public Health, as chair for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

- Jaime Olavarria, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.²

- Kate O’Neill, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

- Matthew Sparke, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.

- Duane Storti, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.³

- Tueng Shen, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.⁴

---

¹ Term has been revised.
² Additional member.
³ Term has been revised.
⁴ Term has been revised.
1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor James Gregory.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the October 8, 2012, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the October 25, 2012, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative.
      iv. Creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization.
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

5. Consent Agenda.
   Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.
   **Discussion:** UW Educational Outreach Online Undergraduate Degree Completion Initiative.

   **Discussion:** Improving Faculty Demographics.
   
   *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.*

10. Good of the Order.

11. Adjournment.

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

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, December 5 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.