Minutes  
Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 14, 2011, 2:30 p.m.  
142 Gerberding

Present: Evans, Nolen, Giebel, Johnson, Carline, Christie, Astley, Gregory, Stygall, Fridley, Killien, Young, Holland, McLean, Wadden

Guests: Erdly

Absent: Stern, Baker, Vogt, Taricani, Barsness, Phillipsen, Naumann

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Faculty Senate Chair Susan Astley called the meeting to order at 2:35.

The agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Senate Chair. [Exhibit A]

3. Opportunity for Questions

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. No written report.
d. Report of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL). [Exhibit D]
e. Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning. [Exhibit E]

Evans asked the Secretary of the Faculty for further information about the activity in her report related to gathering unit information about promotion & tenure. Killien responded that she was compiling for information sharing purposes the unit-based guidelines and procedures for promotion & tenure.

SEC members discussed at length the online learning report. FCTL Chair Jan Carline was asked about the effect of online learning on diverse learners and the ‘digital divide.’ Carlile responded that FCTL’s report did not include discussion of diversity because they found no literature on the topic. The use of contingent faculty in online teaching was questioned. Interim Provost Wadden suggested that relatively few courses at UW were offered totally online and that 2y2d discussion focused on maintaining focus at the UW on residential education. Carlile reported on discussions in FCTL on characteristics of and concerns about quality of instruction at the Western Governors University (WGU). Astley asked Wadden if the UW Regents were pushing for more online access; he said no, they were currently happy with UW’s activity in this regard. Carlile reported that the FCTL report highlighted issues for faculty about quality and adequacy of support for online teaching. Erdly mentioned that in the past students wanted to know what the format of courses was before they registered. Giebel asked if there was an upcoming plan for more activity on distance learning (DL) in the Senate; at this time only disseminating the report is planned for the December 1 meeting. Gregory asked if there were any policy discussions about ownership of online materials; Carlile suggested that it would be good to invite Vice Provost David Szatmary to attend a SEC meeting to discuss these policy issues. The need for a survey of faculty to describe the current extent of online learning was discussed. It was suggested that Activity Based Budgeting might be stimulating interest in DL as a way to increase enrollment but faculty may not be aware of the workload associated with developing DL courses. Carlile referred those present to the Council’s report on data about whether DL can increase enrollment without decreasing quality. Young commented that he blocked WGU from Utah when he was there but “arrived too late” to do so at the UW.

The report of the President was delayed until his arrival at 3:15pm.

President Young shared that he has been meeting with various faculty in small lunch groups and commented on the “extraordinary faculty” he has met.
He mentioned that the UW’s legislative strategy is to work with a coalition of business and education leaders in the state who believe that an all cuts budget would be devastating; the coalition does not want to pit higher education against other important state needs. The coalition is encouraging revenue enhancements; currently there is no plan for where revenues would be targeted. The UW is pushing for enhanced flexibility. Proposed cuts for charitable care and Medicare would affect UW’s role in providing a safety net for uncompensated care and health care education. Federal level efforts also are ongoing to support for Medicaid retention for medical education.

President Young mentioned that the Provost search is “coming well.” The search committee worked hard and has presented to him a narrowed list of top candidates. He announced that his final decision will be coming shortly. When asked about whether final candidates would be presented to the university community in an open process, the President indicated he had decided not to do this, because the candidates were all internal and four of five final candidates indicated they would drop out if their names were made public. The search committee sought much input on candidates. This information about the search process was followed by a respectful but tense discussion between SEC members and President Young. Vice Chair Gregory challenged Young’s position on this matter and asked how Young would learn the responses and feedback from students and faculty on these candidates. Senator Giebel questioned Young’s decision since Paul Jenny, representing the Provost Search committee, had reported to SEC that Young was interested in having a public process for finalists. Young confirmed he was interested in having a public process for finalists until he learned 4 of the 5 candidates would drop out if their names were made public. He expressed surprise that this change in plans had not been mentioned toSEC. Young was asked what will be the respective roles of the President and Provost. Young envisions a partnership, less of a split in internal/external roles. Stygall commented on the importance of the role of Provost with SCPB, and asked if Young was confident he had access to this information. Astley indicated the search committee had received much information on strengths and weaknesses of candidates. Giebel suggested that feedback on abstract qualities was different than feedback on specific candidates. Young and Astley voiced consensus that much input on specific candidates had been received. Young said he was surprised when the Presidential search had no public phase. But he believes these circumstances are different, since it was an internal search. Killien asked how Young would perceive the values held by a candidate about transparency who was uncomfortable being public before his/her peers. Young indicated he also was surprised that candidates were not comfortable with a public process for finalists. Gregory suggested a compromise that candidate names would be presented to SEC (as a duly constituted body of the faculty). Young suggested he’d want to run it by the search committee. Some SEC members suggested that meeting with the candidates would be more valuable. Young was asked if this non-public approach symbolized a lack of democratic process where faculty candidates are subjected to open hiring processes but administrative candidates are not. Gregory asked if Young has thought about the potential consequences of selecting someone faculty may not support; Young responded “yes.” Gregory announced his shock that the process would go forward without following the precedent of a public process. Astley noted the President’s decision was influenced by the fact that the pool of candidates would be narrowed down to one candidate.

Stygall asked what new initiatives and plans were being contemplated by the President; he responded that it was “still early,” but mentioned considering 1) a more comprehensive student admission and enrollment plan, balancing freshman admits with transfers, early entry into a major, 2) how we are supporting graduate admissions to attract best candidates, 3) ABB—how do we support central areas of excellence that may not be as student driven as others, 4) supporting interdisciplinary teaching and research, 5) how can technology be harnessed to improve teaching, because students are coming with different capacities than in the past, 6) seek the appropriate balance among the three campuses and their relationships, and 7) better integration with research entities outside UW—other universities, centers, industry, independent labs.
The president was asked to elaborate on his meetings with faculty. He mentioned he had been attending departmental meetings, having lunches with 10-12 selected faculty, and meeting with research and lab groups as a way to learn what faculty are thinking and doing.

5. Consent Agenda
Christoph Giebel asked that item 2a, the minutes of the October 27, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting, and 2c, the approval of the December 1, 2011, Faculty Senate agenda be moved to unfinished business. The remainder of the consent agenda was approved:

a. Approval of the October 10, 2011, SEC minutes.

b. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

Conciliation Board
Gordon Bradley, Forest Resources, College of the Environment, as a renewing member beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2014.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Bill Erdly, UW Bothell, as a new member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2012.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Carol Landis, Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Systems, School of Nursing, as a new member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2014.

6. Announcements
Secretary of the Faculty Killien invited members to encourage and submit nominations for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for the 2012-13 year. All voting faculty are eligible. Names of nominees should be received by Alex Bolton (bolt@uw.edu) by December 2, 2011.

Legislative Representative Jim Fridley announced that the state revenue forecast will be released later this week; the Governor’s budget will be announced shortly thereafter.

7. Unfinished Business.
Two corrections to the minutes of the October 27, 2011, Senate meeting were proposed by Christoph Giebel. These corrections were accepted by the members and the minutes approved as corrected.

Giebel suggested a modification to the agenda for the December 1, 2011, Senate meeting; he moved that a discussion of the provost search process, including lack of public presentations by finalists be added under New Business. The motion was seconded and was passed. The Senate agenda, as amended, was approved. [Exhibit F]

Senate Revision Cleanup Faculty Code Changes. [Exhibit G]
Rich Christie, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Changes to the Faculty Code proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs were discussed and accepted as housekeeping changes and will be forwarded by the Secretary of the Faculty to the Rules Coordinator.

There were no invited guests.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killen, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Susan Astley, Professor, Epidemiology and Pediatrics

Update on October 27, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

- A substitute Class C Resolution on "Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy" was introduced by Senator Giebel. Discussion ensued with members voicing both support and concern for the Resolution. After approximately 30 minutes of discussion, Senator Míčeál Vaughan moved to refer the motion to a committee. Committee members would be named by the Senate Chair and would include Professor Giebel. The committee’s charge would be to bring a revised motion for action at the December 1, 2011 Senate meeting.
  - A committee of 7 Faculty Senators has been established. Members include: Zoe Barsness, Chair, UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly; Christoph Giebel, Arts and Sciences; Míčeál Vaughan, Arts and Sciences; Kurt Johnson, Medicine; Helen Anderson, Law; and Lynne Manzo, Built Environments. Zoe Barsness has agreed to serve as committee chair.

- President and Mrs. Young hosted a Faculty Senate reception at the residence immediately following the Senate Meeting. The event was well attended and enjoyed by all.

Update on proposed agenda for December 1, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

- The focus of the December 1st Senate meeting will be:
  - A continuation of discussion on the Class C Resolution on "Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy."
  - Discussion of the strengths/limitations of online learning.
    - Faculty, students, and the Regents have expressed both interest and concern (e.g., quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, etc.) regarding the substantial growth of online learning in higher education.
    - A “Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning” was presented to the regents in February 2010, summarizing the current status and future of online learning at the UW (attached).
    - The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (chaired by Jan Carline) sent a brief report to Interim Provost Lidstrom in May, 2011, summarizing their year-long evidence-based review of the strengths and limitations of online learning. Their review was based on 34 peer-reviewed publications.(attached). Professor Carline is here today to share the FCTL report with the SEC. Professor Carline will also present the FCTL report to the Senate on December 1, 2011.
1. Several Faculty Councils and committees are seeking additional members. These include the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, the Faculty Council on Facilities and Services, the Conciliation Board, and the Adjudication Panel. If you are interested in serving on a Council or in recommending a colleague for service, please contact the Secretary of the Faculty. The list of current council members, along with meeting minutes and schedules can be found on our website at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html.

2. At the request of the elected chairs of Schools/Colleges/ Campuses the Secretary of the Faculty is compiling unit-level procedures related to promotion and tenure; when received a summary of practices will be compiled and shared.

3. Nominations are currently being received for candidates for Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2012. To make a nomination, contact Alex Bolton at bolt@uw.edu.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Gail Stygall, Professor, English

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting has completed its review of the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) Final Report. The Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting provided the committee with both the Final Report sent to President Young and the supporting spreadsheets. SCPB developed a list of questions for the Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting during its faculty-only (and students) meeting on October 24. The Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting responded to those questions at the following meeting on October 31. Concerns from committee members included the reconstitution of the University Budget Committee (UBC) and the undifferentiated nature of the ABB tax and the supplement. SCPB was pleased with the transparency of the tuition distributions. The Interim Provost and the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting indicated that when UBC was reconstituted that the administrative handbook would include specifications for the Senate Chair (already a member), the SCPB Chair, and another member of SCPB. We were told to expect other specifications for other groups. On the issue of the undifferentiated nature of the supplement, we agreed that ABB was a work in progress and more discussion of this would be deferred to the future. SCPB will conduct another review of the IT recharge fees during this academic year.

On November 7, SCPB discussed last year’s SCPB proposals and principles for budgeting to the Provost and described and discussed possible changes. SCPB Chair Gail Stygall will bring a new draft to the next meeting for discussion. At the next meeting, we will also begin discussing tuition alternatives for the future.
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Report of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Jan Carline, Council Chair, Professor, Medical Education

Interim President Phyllis Wise
University of Washington

Dear Dr. Wise,

Members of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning recognize that the movement towards provision of more courses on-line is an important step to bringing the university’s programs in line with student preferences and needs. Students like on-line content and the ability to review lectures and notes, and are increasingly sophisticated in their use of electronic tools and expectations for their use in teaching and learning. The demands of family, work and other aspects of modern society limit the ability of many students to spend extended amounts of time on campus. Developing additional methods to meet students’ learning needs in alternative locations and times is appropriate tasks for the modern university and faculty. Movement towards on-line education may also be seen as a means to increase class enrollment without expansion of current resources. Members of the Council are concerned about the implications of these changes in course delivery for educational quality, faculty time and costs.

During this past year, the Council has held several discussions about this issue, and attempted to seek evidence about the use of on-line education around issues of quality of instruction, faculty time, class size and cost. This letter summarizes our discussions and concerns.

First, the Council recognizes that on-line learning can mean many different things, from fully on-line asynchronous learning where students can complete all course requirements on their own schedules to fully interactive synchronous learning that replicates the classroom in many locations. The choice of specific on-line methods for a course will depend both on the content and objectives of the course.

Educational quality
- There is no conclusive evidence that on-line education per se is better or worse than traditional methods of college learning. Some studies show increases in learning, particularly in declarative content. Other studies indicate that on-line activities used to augment more traditional learning can be effective and increase retention.
- As on-line tools have gotten more advanced, instructors now can provide interactions and experiences that previously were not available in the on-line format. The quality of the tool, the ability of the instructor to use the tool, and the appropriateness of the tools in meeting the needs of the students will determine its success.
- Maintaining actual and perceived quality in education requires interaction between faculty and students. Student satisfaction with on-line courses is related to the degree of perceived interaction with instructors.
- Methods that blend on-line learning with interactive learning result in better outcomes than totally asynchronous, independent methods.
- Other aspects of education, building community and collaboration within the class, are made more difficult as more is put online. It’s important to consider not just learning outcomes but also the educational experience, interaction, and campus community.

References: 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 31

Faculty effort
- Time needed for development of on-line courses can be significant.
- Continuing maintenance of course content after initial implementation may also require significant faculty time.
Some studies have found that on-line courses require more time spent by faculty per student than in more traditional class formats, particularly activities requiring writing and on-line discussions.

Reductions in time commitment for faculty may be found in totally free-standing courses that do not include online interactions.

Moving towards a model of a community of learners, where the members of the class provide comment and direction to peers may reduce the level of faculty direction, and consequently time per student, in a course. This may be more appropriate for graduate study than undergraduate courses.

References 2, 12, 22, 23, 32, 33

Class size

The additional demands for interaction between students and instructors in teacher moderated on-line courses reduces the ideal class size compared with more traditional formats of teaching.

Larger class sizes may be possible if adjunct faculty and staff are used to moderate and provide most individual interaction with students in place of regular faculty.

Students may be sensitive to the substitution of less qualified instructors for regular faculty, and may become even more sensitive as planned tuition increases are imposed.

References 16, 17, 21, 28, 29, 33, 34

Costs of on-line education

Moving to on-line education takes time and effort. Development time must be taken into account, including time spent with the initial development of on-line course materials, ongoing maintenance or those materials, and adoption of new technologies.

All faculty members are not native users of on-line technology in teaching, and must be trained and supported in the use of these tools in order for quality of instruction to be maintained.

On-line education methods have increased the numbers of students enrolled in a class at other institutions with significant cost savings. These savings are realized primarily from the use of adjunct personnel to handle most day-to-day interactions with students. In this mode, costs are shifted to less expensive personnel without any claimed reduction in quality of instruction.

References 2, 16, 28, 29, 33, 34

Movement of appropriate instruction to on-line delivery is an important task for consideration by the university if it is to keep pace with student interests and competition within the environment of higher education. At the same time, we need to be aware that any good class, whether in person or online, will be more than simply a delivery system. We must continue to emphasize the worth of interactivity and engagement between students, faculty, and course content. There are many options for on-line learning, but our focus needs to be on the appropriate technology and setting in which students will best reach the learning goals of our programs.

We believe the move to increased on-line education is not an option, based on the interests and needs of our students, the rapid and continued maturation of educational technologies, and the growing body of literature that supports the strategic use of these technologies to enhance traditional educational practices. The University should attempt to become leader in quality education using these modalities while realizing that on-line education alone will probably not result in increased enrollment in our programs for less cost. Faculty will need support in mastery of on-line technology, the development of curriculum, and the maintenance of these programs. While adjunct staff may support or extend the work of faculty in on-line instruction, the teaching faculty of the university remain a major asset to its programs.

Consequently, members of the council request that the following actions be considered;

- The information we have reported in this letter be made available for future discussions of these issues with the Board of Regents, Board of Deans, and other administrative groups considering these issues. We also request that members of the Council be included in these discussions.
- Adequate technologic infrastructure to support on-line learning needs to be developed and implemented to insure the success of any educational offering.
- Support for the development of skills in use of technology and adaption of pedagogic methods to on-line learning should be provided to faculty.
- Any shift in educational responsibility from teaching faculty to temporary, adjunct, or lower paid instructors in implementation of on-line teaching should be monitored carefully for effects.
educational quality, learning outcomes for those courses, as well as indirect effects on more traditional programs.

- Faculty compensation for new teaching responsibilities in on-line educational efforts, including development of materials and courses and the supervision of adjunct staff must be developed and implemented.
- Methods to recognize the scholarly contribution of faculty in these efforts must be developed and included in decisions about merit and promotion.
- Courses chosen for on-line education need to be chosen judiciously, with decisions based on the appropriateness of goals and objectives of the course for use of on-line technology.

Yours,

Jan D Carline, Professor
Chair, Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

CC: JW Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate
    Susan Astley, Vice Chair of the Senate
    Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
    Kelly Trosvig, Interim Vice President and Vice Provost, UW Information Technology
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Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning

February 2010

Karen Dowdall-Sandford
James W. Harrington, Jr.
Kevin Mihata
Robert Stacey
David Szatmary
Deborah Wiegand
INTRODUCTION

Online learning has become a ubiquitous part of any discussion about the future of higher education. Provost Wise convened this working group to summarize the key issues surrounding online learning at the University of Washington. To do so, we have reviewed the extensive national literature on online learning; talked with leaders in the private sector and peer universities; and met with faculty and student leadership, through key Faculty Senate Councils (representing all three UW campuses) and ASUW.

What is online learning?

Online learning is a way of delivering most of the course content and instruction of a class using the Web. Though onsite, face-to-face classes at the UW and other institutions use educational technologies to enhance their classroom instruction, online learning courses are taught almost entirely online, and students seldom meet face-to-face with their instructors or their fellow students. Online learning includes a wide range of pedagogical techniques: websites and discussion boards; assigned readings accessible to students through the UW libraries’ electronic reserve system; audio or video recordings of class sessions that students can view and/or download; course management systems that accept and immediately grade student assignments submitted electronically; and, at times, virtual worlds in which students take on identities as avatars and interact with their classmates digitally.

Online learning in its various forms has been steadily increasing. Over twenty-five percent of all U.S. higher education students were taking at least one online course in the fall of 2008. Despite the recession, demand for online classes has grown, not decreased; according to the forthcoming Sloan Consortium report, online learning growth continues to outpace overall growth in higher education.

This growth, however, has not been evenly distributed across the higher education landscape. Community colleges have consistently produced a disproportionate share of online enrollments; over half of all online students are currently enrolled by institutions offering associate degrees. Moreover, while public institutions have increased their online offerings in recent years, there has been an even more significant
increase in attendance at for-profit online higher educational institutions. According to new research from the consulting firm Eduventures, for-profits' share of the online sector rose from 39 percent in 2008 to 42 percent in 2009, as the recession drove students back to college and severe budget cuts strained public universities.

Much attention has been paid to "open courseware" efforts from institutions such as MIT (through its OpenCourseWare project) and Carnegie Mellon (through its Open Learning Initiative). The Obama administration, numerous foundations (including the Hewlett, McDonnell, Mellon and Gates Foundations) and the National Science Foundation have all committed significant funding to open courseware initiatives. Indeed, the University of Washington was an early contributor to the open courseware movement; UWEO open courseware includes 13 free courses ranging from *Fluency with Information Technology* to *The American Civil War*.

Notably, however, neither MIT nor Carnegie Mellon offers an online degree program. MIT provides access to its syllabi and course materials, and CMU has developed eleven online courses, which are aimed at students who do not have access to high-quality instruction in these subjects at their home institutions. On the whole, open courseware expands the pool of resources available to instructors, but benefits primarily those institutions that could not otherwise develop such materials.

Fully online degree programs, which may integrate open courseware into its classes to enhance them, tend to succeed with very self-motivated, mature learners, and national growth has generally followed this pattern. Many public and for-profit institutions have successfully launched online degrees, especially master-level degrees, to working adults.

Such online programs and courses may expand access to students not otherwise able to enroll in residential programs, providing time flexibility for students with work and family responsibilities. They lessen the constraints on physical space and somewhat ameliorate the classroom shortage. Totally online courses provide a "green" alternative to driving to class, and may help institutions reach a more diverse population of students.
Online education may also appeal to a new generation of students who have familiarity with technology and offers a learning environment that can be accessed repeatedly rather than once in a live context.

ONLINE LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Given these benefits, the University of Washington, through UW Educational Outreach (UWEO), has been a national leader in online learning, with 11 degree programs, 31 certificate programs, and more than 12,000 students in 2008. UWEO has been an early adopter of several technological innovations over the past twenty years, with design and technology platforms paralleling many of the most significant trends seen during this period. Today’s UW online learning uses Web conferencing, voice-over PowerPoint presentations, Virtual Worlds, UWEO’s current learning platform, the fully integrated open-source learning management system known as “Moodle” that integrates blogs and wikis, and various types of social media applications such as Twitter and Facebook.

UW has also taken a leadership role in a number of institutional and corporate partnerships (see Table 1) dealing with online learning. Partnerships encourage sharing of online resources and benchmarks (streamed videos, syllabi, course readers, course resources, best practices, etc.) in a consortial effort, help expand the market for online learning among the collaborators and mitigate risk by spreading the sometimes very expensive costs of program development among a number of institutions. With its partners, the UW has created the first joint online certificate programs in the country.
Table 1. University of Washington online partnerships and initiatives.

- **R1edu.** In 1999, the UW started and continues to manage R1edu, a collaboration between 34 major AAU Research Institutions who offer online learning programs. (See attached for list of members.) Initiatives include:
  - Short Courses on the Environment (UW/Wisconsin/Rutgers)
  - R1edu Award
  - Course Search

- **Actions, Solutions and Growth (ASG).** In 2005, the UW helped start ASG, a consortium of large prestigious public and for-profit institutions pursuing a variety of partnerships, especially with online learning. (See attached for list of members.) Initiatives include:
  - Biotechnology Project Management (UW/UCSD)
  - Decision making for Climate Change (UW/UBC/UCI/Northwestern)
  - Certificate Program in Web Intelligence (UBC and UC-Irvine)
  - Sustainability Institute (UW/UBC)

- **Prentice-Hall.** The UW has partnered with Pearson/Prentice Hall, the largest publisher in the world, on several online initiatives, including:
  - LAAP Grant ($1.5M) dealing with Web-based curricula
  - IPhone Applications Certificate

- **Other Project Partners:**
  - Department of Labor ($1.5M grant)
  - Boeing
  - Chulalongkorn University
  - Apex
  - Heritage University
  - Sloan Foundation
  - WUN

However, the University of Washington has not developed online versions of most of its courses for its matriculated undergraduate students. As a highly-ranked public research university with particularly heavy investments in high-cost instructional areas such as laboratory sciences, engineering, and medicine, as well as a commitment to growing the residential infrastructure with new dormitories and student union, UW attracts a more residential student population than that of most online degree programs. UW undergraduates are traditionally-aged (18-24), unlike the older, career-oriented, often fully employed students who drive online learning growth. In contrast, Capella University, a large online-only institution, refuses to admit students under 24 years of age to its courses, because in its view, students must be mature to be successful. Many of the community colleges who offer online learning also cater to a more mature population of working students.

For the future, the University of Washington will likely expand its number of online learning classes to supplement, but not replace, the existing onsite classes. These online courses will enable students to have more
flexible scheduling options and address the growing classroom shortage on campus. It will also cater to the UW students who can learn more effectively online and will attract at least a few UW students who could not otherwise attend the University of Washington because they find it hard to juggle family and work responsibilities. In an experiment with seven undergraduate online courses in Autumn, both the students and faculty involved expressed interest in expanded online UW offerings to add to their largely onsite degree programs (though students also express a desire to limit the number of such courses they take over the course of their career at UW).

These online classes and others will add capacity to the UW, which will continue to maximize its physical classroom facilities with onsite courses and offer hands-on courses that cannot be easily transformed into online classes. Given the projected student population at the University of Washington, now in discussion for the 2Y2D (Two Years, Two Decades) UW strategic plan, the majority of onsite courses, some of them already enhanced by different technologies, will be supplemented by these new online offerings.

**The costs of online learning**

Surprisingly, no one has done an analysis about the relative costs of online learning versus onsite education in a nonprofit institution. Advocates have naively expected faculty to teach thousands of students as a cost-savings measure, and detractors have cited the million-dollar-a-course development costs of a few high-end online learning projects. Such broad arguments, however, do not help evaluate online learning at UW.

Rather than quote either detractors or supporters of online learning, the UW recently developed a comparative budget about the relative costs of an online versus onsite class, which represents the first comparative cost analysis between onsite and online courses at a nonprofit institution, comparing costs and revenues for a typical state-funded class at the University of Washington with identical enrollment, tuition, and faculty teaching costs for each format. In the end, the costs of the online learning course were slightly higher. Though it had no classroom costs, the online class had higher course development, technology and staff
expenses than the onsite class. The UW has somewhat equalized the cost of online and onsite courses through the partnership model, mentioned above. A detailed budget follows at the end of this report.

THE FUTURE OF ONLINE LEARNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

We expect that UWEO will continue to lead in the development of innovative programs for its target audiences. We need to find the best combination of online and face-to-face learning for traditional, matriculated undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Washington.

Our goal will be to attain maximum pedagogical effectiveness at the lowest possible cost. We have to find the optimum balancing point between cost and instructional effectiveness for the University of Washington at this moment in its history. Striking this balance is not a new challenge. It is an ongoing one, requiring constant readjustment as budgets expand or shrink, our student body changes, and educational technology evolves. The current moment, however, is a particularly dramatic one.

How we strike this balance will depend very much on the strategic decisions we make, beginning with the “Two Years to Two Decades” (2Y2D) conversations now underway. The larger questions raised in connection with these discussions will define the kind of university we want to be and the kind of students we want to teach and graduate. In fact, the topic of online learning emerged independently in multiple focus group sessions of the 2Y2D group on teaching and learning. The cost analysis clarifies the financial impact of online learning. Though we may want to expand our online offerings, lower cost should not be the central reason. We should teach online because it represents the best learning platform for our students.

It is clear that online learning has a role in the future of the University. We see a multi-tiered strategy for online learning at the University of Washington. We expect some increase in the number of fully online courses for matriculated students. The College of Arts and Sciences, for example, has already invested in the development of several such courses. We will also focus on the growth of hybrid courses, which combine face-to-face instruction with Web-based tools and resources. Finally, we expect an evolution of online learning from the text-based descendents of correspondence courses to new customized forms of learning appropriate to our
core mission at UW – in the words of one faculty member, to shape “what teaching and learning will look like 20 years from now” and to be the leader for the “integration of technology in teaching.”
# APPENDIX: COST COMPARISON, ONLINE VS. ONSITE COURSE MODELS

Analysis and notes by David Szatmary, Vice Provost for Educational Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th><strong>ONLINE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ONSITE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Certificate program</td>
<td>300-level class</td>
<td>300-level class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Student Headcount</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budgeted course enrollments</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Credits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses budgeted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>45,948&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45,948&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Fee</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL REVENUE & CONTRA REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th><strong>ONLINE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ONSITE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty - Instruction</td>
<td>21,702&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty - Course Development</td>
<td>3,883&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>965&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Faculty - Course Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant - Course Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer for Course Development</td>
<td>8,000&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologist for Troubleshooting Technical Issues</td>
<td>779&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>1,112&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,112&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Trainer</td>
<td>779&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TOTAL SALARY EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th><strong>ONLINE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ONSITE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facilities Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,444&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Instructional Office Costs per Class</td>
<td>1,103&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,103&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Office Space Per Class</td>
<td>592&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Instructional Costs for Office</td>
<td>186&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>186&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs for Office</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office software for faculty</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office software for staff</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Travel - Annual Allocation</td>
<td>250&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>250&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>200&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Management System</td>
<td>176&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server time for LMS</td>
<td>58&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology for delivery  
Advising  
UW Technology Charge for faculty  
UW Technology Recharge Rate for staff  
Special Library Needs  
General Library Resources  
Exam Proctors  
Student Financial Aid  
UW Overhead  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>2,725</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology for delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Technology Charge for faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Technology Recharge Rate for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Library Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Library Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Proctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NON-SALARY EXPENSE  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>12,546</th>
<th>15,160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Salary Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL GAIN/LOSS  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2,850</th>
<th>7,010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Gain/Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1 Assume that the class will be state-funded.
2 Assume that the class will be state-funded.
3 Represents the average class size for undergraduate courses at the UW - 35.5 students per class.
4 Assume that all students will take approximately a full load of classes, and tuition will be distributed equally among all classes. I also assume that 80% of the students will be residents and 20% will be nonresidents. Special mandatory fees have not been included in this calculation (e.g. student & activities fee, IMA fee and the building fee). I have used only operating fee revenue (2010-11) for these calculations.
5 Assume that all students will take approximately a full load of classes, and tuition will be distributed equally among all classes. I also assume that 80% of the students will be residents and 20% will be nonresidents. Special mandatory fees have not been included in this calculation (e.g. student & activities fee, IMA fee and the building fee). I have used only operating fee revenue (2010-11) for these calculations.
6 Some online classes generate license fees but most do not, so I have not included any revenues here.
7 Assume that a faculty member making $70K plus benefits will teach this course as part of a total teaching load of 4 classes per year. Obviously, this workload and salary will vary with the individual faculty member.
8 Generally, for the development of an online class, we have paid faculty one month’s salary in additional pay. Also we assume that a faculty member will have to revise the class minimally during the next two years at $1,000/year. We have finally assumed that this class will be taught once a year in the three-year period. We pay faculty for the development of these courses (unlike onsite courses in some cases) because the final class results in a product that has more identifiable intellectual property implications and could be licensed.
9 For an online class, some faculty may receive release time to develop classes. In many cases, faculty do not receive additional time or money to develop a new class for an onsite offering. In this case, we assume that a faculty member receives the equivalent of one month salary to develop a course. Faculty almost never receive additional release time to offer minor refinements to a course. As a result, I have conservatively estimated that the faculty development costs would be amortized over ten years with the class being offered once a year during this time period.
10 Assume that an instructional designer will help with the user-centered design and provide suggestions for course formats, exit requirements, interactivity tools, etc. The initial development will cost $14K and minor revisions will be made for $5K in each of the next two years. The total cost has been amortized over 3 years. In some cases, the course will need major revision sooner, especially in technical areas, and in other cases the course may last up to 5 years without a major revision. These salary figures include the cost of benefits. Assume that the class will be taught once a year.
11 Assume that a base level technologist at $60K/yr. will troubleshoot problems with the courses. Also, assume that each technologist can handle roughly 100 classes per year.
12 I have assumed that the program administration costs for these classes would include a mix of professional and classified staff. One FTE would cost approximately $60,000/year and could handle 70 classes.
I have assumed that the program administration costs for these classes would include a mix of professional and classified staff. One FTE would cost approximately $60,000/year and could handle 70 classes.

Online classes need a learning management system to be operated effectively and efficiently. Some of these systems cost a significant amount of money (e.g. Blackboard) while others operate as open source (e.g. Moodle) but require integration into the other administrative systems such as a student database. I have assumed that the UW would use an open source solution such as Moodle. This cost represents the trainer who will work with faculty to train them on the LMS systems. I have assumed that this trainer could work with 100 faculty per year and would make $60K plus benefits per year.

Based upon the rental costs for instructional space in downtown Seattle. This represents the cost for one room per quarter at full usage (8 a.m. to 10 p.m.), obviously a conservative number. With lower room utilization, the cost would increase. This number includes utilities.

On an annual basis, the cost of a cubicle for professional staff in UW Tower would be approximately $4,411. I have divided this number by the number of classes taught by a faculty member.

On an annual basis, the cost of a cubicle for professional staff in UW Tower would be approximately $4,411. I have divided this number by the number of classes taught by a faculty member.

This line includes office space for the program administrator, the instructional designer, the trainer and the technologist, assuming that the technologist deals with 100 classes, the program administrator deals with 70 classes, the trainer with 100 classes and the instructional designer deals with 10 courses annually.

This line includes office space for the program administrator.

It generally costs $3,726 to outfit a faculty office, not including research start-up. We assume that the furniture, computer, file cabinets and other materials will last a total of 5 years and have amortized these costs across the number of courses taught during this time period.

It generally costs $3,726 to outfit a faculty office, not including research start-up. We assume that the furniture, computer, file cabinets and other materials will last a total of 5 years and have amortized these costs across the number of courses taught during this time period.

It costs approximately the same ($3,726) to outfit a staff office as it does for a faculty office. I have amortized these costs over 5 years and over the number of activities that the instructional designer, the trainer, the technologist and the program administrator perform during this time period.

It costs approximately the same ($3,726) to outfit a staff office as it does for a faculty office. I have amortized these costs over 5 years and over the number of activities that the instructional designer, the trainer, the technologist and the program administrator perform during this time period.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of faculty and then divided by the number of courses offered annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of faculty and then divided by the number of courses offered annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of staff (program administrator, trainer instructional designer and technologist) and then divided by the number of activities performed annually.

According to our estimates, it will cost $50 per person for software and licenses each year. This amount has been multiplied by the number of activities performed annually.

Assume that the average faculty member receives $1,000 in travel annually divided by the number of courses taught (4).

Assume that the average faculty member receives $1,000 in travel annually divided by the number of courses taught (4).

Though the online class can more efficiently distribute printed material (i.e. no xeroxes) and show videos online, it still needs to secure copyright clearance for at least some of its material. Other materials may be free due to their open source nature.

I have assumed that a faculty member will spend about $200 per course on such materials as xeroxes, films and other instructional aids. This includes copyright clearance.

Online classes need a learning management system to be operated effectively and efficiently. Some of these systems cost a significant amount of money (e.g. Blackboard) while others operate as open source (e.g. Moodle) but require integration into the other administrative systems such as a student database. I have assumed that the UW would use an open source solution such as Moodle. The costs represent an amortized expense of integration and then the ongoing technology costs of support.
This costs represents the per course cost of hosting a class on the server of a cost-effective vendor such as Moodle Rooms. It costs approximately $1.67 per student for this hosting, though the number decreases with an economy of scale. This cost will vary widely by the type of technology that a faculty member chooses. For example, the faculty member may choose a print format with some minimal animations, which would incur little additional cost. Likewise, the use of open-source resources also would cost little more. However, if the faculty member chooses to videotape and then stream his/her own class or use Virtual Worlds (e.g., Second Life), the costs could be considerable. For example, the costs of an island and the build-out of that island in Second Life would have to be amortized over a specific number of courses, and the more courses in this format, the lower the cost until another island would be needed. For the purposes of this budget, I have been very conservative and estimated $1,000 per course for the cost of additional technology.

Assume than one advisor can deal with 1000 student visits per year in an online or onsite capacity.

Assume than one advisor can deal with 1000 student visits per year in an online or onsite capacity.

I have taken the total number of faculty headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of courses that faculty teach each year (4). Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.

I have taken the total number of faculty headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of courses that faculty teach each year (4). Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.

I have taken the total number of staff (4) headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of activities that each staff performs annually. Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.

I have taken the total number of staff (4) headcount and multiplied it by the recharge rate and then divided by the number of activities that each staff performs annually. Though the recharge rate has not yet been established, I used $175/person/year as an estimate.

Online classes many times have special library needs because students cannot come physically to the library. At the UW we have a dedicated position in the library for all online classes that helps instructors and students identify and establish electronic material resources.

I have taken the total library costs for materials and staff and divided by the total number of headcount students and assumed that a student takes 6.93 classes per year (if we have 47,361 students and approximately 36,438 student FTE).

I have taken the total library costs for materials and staff and divided by the total number of headcount students and assumed that a student takes 6.93 classes per year (if we have 47,361 students and approximately 36,438 student FTE).

At this point, we do not have an inexpensive solution for exam verification. We only have such items as retinal verification, etc. As a result, we ask students to go to a pre-assigned physical site for identity verification for exams. Though the sites generally participate for free, we need an exam proctor coordinator who establishes and verifies sites and sometimes sends exams. This half-time employee can deal with approximately 700 classes per year.

Generally, the UW attributes 7.5% of total tuition revenues to student financial aid.

Generally, the UW attributes 7.5% of total tuition revenues to student financial aid.

This overhead represents general costs that cannot be easily applied to specific activities in an activities-based budgeting model. Such costs may include the President's and Provost's office, the human resources office, general administrative systems, emergency management, disability services, the office of planning and budgeting, the attorney general's office, etc. These costs would apply to both online and onsite classes.

This overhead represents general costs that cannot be easily applied to specific activities in an activities-based budgeting model. Such costs may include the President's and Provost's office, the human resources office, general administrative systems, emergency management, disability services, the office of planning and budgeting, the attorney general's office, etc. These costs would apply to both online and onsite classes.
UW Online Learning: Degrees, Certificates, Courses

Distance learning degrees: 11
- Master in Construction Engineering
- Master in Aeronautics & Astronautics Engineering
- Master in Aerospace Engineering
- Master in Mechanical Engineering
- Master of Nursing, Master of Science (from the UW School of Nursing)
- Extended Master in Public Health
- Extended Master of Clinical Health Services (from the MEDEX Northwest Physician Assistant Program)
- Master in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructures
- Master of Library and Information Science (dMLIS)
- Master in Applied Mathematics
- Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (BSEE) – UW Bothell

Distance learning certificate programs: 31
- Addiction and the Brain – on a contract basis only
- Advanced Research in Addiction and the Brain – on a contract basis only
- Biotechnology Project Management
- Brain Research in Education
- C++ Programming
- Construction Management
- Critical Infrastructures Protection
- Database Management
- Decision Making for Climate Change
- Editing
- E-Learning Design and Development
- Embedded and Real-Time Systems Programming
- Emergency Management
- Facility Management
- Geographic Information Systems
- Gerontology
- Guardianship (online + classroom combined)
- Heavy Construction Project Management
- Information Assurance & Cybersecurity
- Infrastructure Construction
- Marketing, Advanced Interactive (online + classroom combined)
- Medical Engineering: Biosensors and Biomaterials
- Oracle Applications Development (online + classroom combined)
- Paralegal Studies
- Project Management
- Psychological Trauma: Effective Treatment and Practice (online + classroom combined)
- School Library Professional
- SQL Server Specialist (Autumn-start; online + classroom combined)
- Sustainable Transportation (online)
- Urban Green Infrastructure
- Web Technology Solutions

- Distance learning undergraduate credit classes: 58 (some of these classes are listed in the Time Schedule)

- Online free courses (including mini courses): 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UW DL Enrollments</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009 (1st qtr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total UW DL</td>
<td>10865</td>
<td>9919</td>
<td>11892</td>
<td>11242</td>
<td>12369</td>
<td>2438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 1, 2011, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor Susan Astley.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the October 10, 2011, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the October 27, 2011, Faculty Senate minutes.
   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.
   e. Report of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.
   f. Report to the UW Regents on Online Learning.
   g. Request for Information on Faculty Retention Offers.

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

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.
   Class C Resolution.
   Title: Resolution Concerning Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy.
   Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

   Discussion: Provost Search Process.

   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. Invited Guests.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, 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 8 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.
Senate Revision Cleanup Faculty Code Changes


Rationale:

Two election cycles have passed since the Faculty Code was revised to restructure the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee. This experience has indicated a need for two minor revisions to the code.

The current Code provides for special election to the Senate when a senator vacates office. This is perhaps too restrictive, as the case where the office goes unfilled due to, for example, failure of a college elected faculty council to hold elections is not clearly covered. Section 22-48 is therefore revised to permit special elections any time an elected senate position is vacant.

The current code provides for nomination of Faculty Council chairs to sit on the Senate Executive Committee but not for their election by the Senate! This oversight is corrected in Section 22-63.C.

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs also considered whether Senators should have alternates, and decided that on balance this was not needed. FCFA reviewed the current experience with nomination and election of senators, and nomination and election of SEC members, and found no need for additional changes.

Revised Code:

Section 22-63.C

C. At a regular Senate meeting prior to the end of the academic year, the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee, shall publish in the agenda for that meeting the name of at least one eligible nominee for each at-large elected Executive Committee position. Additional nominations may be made from the floor. An electronic vote will follow within one week of that meeting. The nominee receiving the highest number of votes for a position is elected. In the event of a tie, any untied nominees are eliminated and electronic ballots shall be cast again.

Section 22-48

Section 22-48 Vacancies in the Senate

If an elected senator vacates a Senate position prior to the last regular Senate meeting of the term to which the senator was elected becomes vacant, the elected faculty council of the position's school, college, or campus may conduct a special election to fill the remainder of the term for that position. The election shall conform to the principles in Section 22-47, Subsection C.