Faculty Senate Chair Bruce Balick called the meeting to order at 2:35.

1. Approval of Agenda.
   
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes.
   
   Minutes from the October 12, 2009, Senate Executive Committee meeting and the October 29, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.
   
   Bruce Balick, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

   Chair Balick began his remarks by noting that the current salary policy at the UW has its roots in a long, hard row a decade ago. In brief, prior to 1999 the faculty were upset that disproportionate funding was being used for recruitment and retention. This ad hoc, opportunistic salary policy left most faculty without fair annual raises and created unbalanced salary scales within departments and colleges. Faculty Senate leadership, working closely with Provost Huntsman, reached agreement on the present salary policy which is built on a principle of steady salary progression for all meritorious faculty.

   Executive Order #64 implements the spirit of the principle of steady salary progression by mandating that 2% raises are to be issued annually:

   "Consistent with the stated objectives, the first priority shall be to support regular merit and promotion awards to current faculty. Further, each biennium the minimum salaries by rank will be reviewed and, if adjusted, support will be provided to ensure those minimum levels are achieved. Other funds, as available, may be allotted among the following faculty salary + adjustments:

   • Additional merit to all faculty;
   • Differential distributions by unit to correct salary gaps created by changing disciplinary markets or assessments of unit quality;
   • Recruitment and retention;
   • System wide adjustments to raise the salaries of all meritorious faculty."

   There is an important caveat:

   "Without the infusion of new money from the Legislature into the salary base, career advancement can only be rewarded at the expense of the size of the University faculty. Without the influx of new money or in the event of decreased State support, a reevaluation of this Faculty Salary Policy may prove necessary."

   However, the reevaluation mechanism is not described.

   Above all, the leadership of the Faculty Senate is committed to the preservation of the extant faculty salary policy, as embodied in the Faculty Code (Chapter 24) since this represents the authoritative will of the faculty enacted by its duly elected representatives. This policy is a very principled compact with a lengthy history that
was drawn up outside the present stresses of the budget. It expresses the vital need to reward loyalty and continued accomplishment by all of UW's faculty over opportunistic salary growth.

Cuts to the UW base budget by the last Legislature were devastating to the UW's budget. Increased tuition only partially compensates. Salaries have been frozen. Nearly 1000 positions are vacant, many of them academic. This situation was not anticipated or accommodated when Executive Order #64 was written.

This view of preserving extant salary policy is aligned with that of the position expressed by the President in Executive Order #29 (temporarily suspending Executive Order #64):

"Although the suspension of merit salary increases is a temporary imperative, it remains equally evident that regular merit increases, promotions, hiring, retention, and competitive compensation of faculty are critical to the long-term success of the University. University leadership remains steadfastly committed to the fundamental elements of Executive Order #64, and its principles and priorities are reaffirmed."

Balick affirmed that the best offense in any fiscal tempest is a stalwart defense of key assets. The Senate stands behind the broader view that the present faculty salary policy is the best long-term investment in the UW's future as a world-leading university.

He closed by saying that maintaining the compact by which the faculty share in the governance of the institution is a primary objective of the efforts of the Senate leadership this year, just as it was last year. Executive Order #29 reinforces the consensus view:

"Regular merit increases will resume first priority for allocation of salary funds after this suspension expires."

This is the metric for judging events to come.

4. Report from the President.
Mark Emmert.

President Emmert concurred with the message delivered by the Chair, saying that two and a half years ago faculty and administration were working to improve a convoluted set of procedures having to do with faculty salaries, and doing so in great confidence that there would not be a time in the future when there would be no pay raises at all.

He went on to report that the University has had to eliminate 1,000 positions, with most of those positions representing current employees who were laid off. Administration has sought ways to reduce expenditures, but have done it for the most part without recourse to temporary measures. It is clear that the budget will not turn around quickly. Many universities have relied on temporary measures in hopes that the next year or years would be better. This has worked only to forestall the inevitable.

Next year another $2 billion will be cut from the Washington State budget. Although not retroactive, it will impact the next fiscal year. Revenue will not match the need, but there are limits on what can be cut from the higher education budget because of conditions that were agreed to upon the State's acceptance of federal stimulus money. Emmert is working hard to make a case the UW has taken as large a cut as it can endure. He is also making a vigorous case about the acute need for the UW to have greater flexibility in management of revenue and cost controls, internally. A year ago, these discussions were frequently dismissed. Given the current budget situation, however, legislators are increasingly willing to engage and actually welcome these conversations. He is hopeful that the UW may get some latitude with regard to flexibility of internal fiscal management, but the State base will decline even further before any such changes are enacted.

He reiterated that the decline in the State base is a trend line, not an aberration. In the past ten years, the State budget has increased 38%, and the funding for community colleges increased 28%. On the other hand, funding for four-year institutions other than the UW was down 4%, and the UW was down 12% -- a significant gap when compared to the increase enjoyed by the State. This reflects decisions that higher education is not as important as other demands on the State's agenda. Regardless of this gloomy picture, the President feels
there are many ways to solve these problems and realize the goals of the University over the next twenty years – but it will require legislative permission to explore and implement new ways of doing business internally.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   David Lovell, Faculty Senate Past Chair and Committee Chair.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) Chair David Lovell reported that the SCPB reviewed the proposed moves of the School of Oceanography and the School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences into the College of the Environments, thereby leaving only a shell of the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences. These moves raise issues about the use of RCEP provisions for college-level and program-level reorganization.

Lovell asked for questions or comments, and Gerry Philipsen, Group II representative, noted that given the President’s words and his commitment to strategic thinking, this University may be a very different place in ten years. His concern is that SCPB, representing the faculty in matters of budget and planning, needs to be in at the inception of these very important discussions. It’s the very earliest discussions of such consequential issues that shape and direct the planning and discussions that follow with the constituents and stakeholders. The focus of the SCPB agenda is too often monopolized by brush fires and tending to immediate needs, such as RCEP procedures.

Discussion ensued about the level of consideration for faculty involvement in the various committees and task forces related to activity-based budgeting (ABB) and two years; two decades (2Y2D).

The President then made a clarification to address the initial concern that this University may be a very different place in ten years. He wanted to be very clear about what's broken and what's not. His perspective is that for the most part, the UW is not broken. As a business enterprise, with teaching, research and medicine being chief among its products, demand has never been greater, and those who come here are willing to pay. What’s broken is the public subsidy. In the face of this downward trend in funding the University needs to find new ways of doing business in order to maintain its current level of operating excellence and meet its goals for the next two decades.

Philipsen concluded with expressing appreciation for the President’s vision, but reiterated his hope that SCPB, representing the interests of the faculty, be a part of all initial conversations concerning the shape of things to come at the UW. There have been times when including the SCPB in crucial discussions has been overlooked and a process has had to be re-started as a result.

   Jim Fridley, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative began his remarks by saying that most of what he had intended to convey had already been expressed by the President. He further noted, however, that this is the short half of the two year legislative session and the legislature will be working primarily to adjust the budget as a result of what’s been learned over the past year. He agreed with President Emmert’s sense that the legislature will be more receptive to proposals to change policies that would increase internal budget control. Fridley encouraged SEC members to contact him regarding this issue.

A question was raised about the possible benefits of the faculty having union representation in Olympia, since the UW seems to be in such a weak position with regard to the legislature. Fridley responded that labor unions are an effective presence in Olympia and are respected because of the power lent by their memberships. Large numbers can have an influence on those whose positions depend on constituents. However, he also indicated that he did not know if the faculty at the UW or at WSU, represented by a union, would represent a formidable enough presence to make a substantial difference. Furthermore, while employee unions are important and effective “insiders” what higher education might be most lacking is strong external advocacy.
7. Report from the Secretary of the Faculty.
Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien reported that in addition to the groups of faculty working on the faculty salary policy, there are also work groups examining the nagging issue of textbook authorship, possible revisions of how we conduct dispute resolution, and a proposal to restructure the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC).

She asked the SEC for feedback on process of recruiting and electing nominees for Vice Chair of Faculty Senate. Traditionally, candidates are asked to speak at a Faculty Senate meeting and then a vote is taken immediately thereafter. Due to attendance at Senate meeting and because faculty who hear presentations don't have time to reflect on what they've heard, she asked SEC to consider the possibility of having candidates address the Senate at a meeting – and then holding an electronic election several days or a week later. She encouraged SEC members to send comments and suggestions, positive or negative, to her concerning this proposed change in policy.

Killien concluded her remarks with an appeal that members remain at the meeting long enough to deal with packet of legislation dealing with the Faculty Council on University Relations. This involved three pieces of legislation, and given the legislative agenda in store for the Senate this year, it would be helpful to deal with these three issues at this meeting.

8. Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative. {Exhibit A}
Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative.

Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) Patrick Dobel introduced himself and his function as FAR. He then stated that there were two issues of national concern that he needed to convey to the Senate Executive Committee.

The passing of Miles Brand, President of the NCAA, was an enormous loss to that organization. There had been significant gains with regards to requiring and promoting academic support for student athletes under his leadership. This had previously taken a back seat to athletic/competitive priorities. Dobel hopes that a new president is found who shares Brand’s commitment to the academic side of student athletes’ lives.

Dobel was pleased to report that the NCAA has passed legislation addressing the troubled culture surrounding intercollegiate basketball. He also made mention of the situation in some institutions where athletic departments within institutions of higher education have been let loose – and encouraged – to find other sources of funding. This has resulted in a significant loss of accountability to the college or university that the teams represent. He and the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) are working to keep this from occurring at the UW. ACIA is also working to ensure that Title IX, which provides for equal funding for women’s sports, is being followed. In addition to this work, Dobel mentioned that President Emmert is a leader of reform university presidents working to establish a new identity for the PAC-10.

Ensuing discussion focused on the question of recruiting student athletes without enough regard to whether they are qualified or equipped to handle the academic rigors of a typical UW student. Although acknowledging the enormous and largely successful efforts made by Kim Durand (Associate Athletic Director for Student Development) to make this less of a concern, one SEC member opined that even one student who fails to thrive as a student athlete is one too many. Dobel was quick to acknowledge the point, but added that the current rate of graduation of student athletes is now roughly the same as for the student population at large.

When questioned about the value of athletics within a University, Dobel responded that he believes that athletics is a form of excellence as much as is art or music. Athletics belong in a University, although arguments could be made to the contrary with regard to football and basketball. Nevertheless the other teams exist at the UW in large part because of the success of the football program.
9. Nominations and Appointments.  \{Exhibit B\}
Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

The nominations were approved.

10. Information.

There was no information reported.

11. Announcements.

Chair Bruce Balick reported on having attended the Medal of Honor Memorial dedication on November 11 and sited it as another example of the positive impact the students and faculty of this University have had on the world.


There was no unfinished business.


a. Official Request for \textit{Code} Interpretation of Chapter 24, Sections 24-70 and 24-71.  \{Exhibit C\}

**Discussion:** Refer to the Advisory Committee on \textit{Faculty Code} and Regulations.

Chair Balick introduced David Lovell, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, to address the request for \textit{Code} interpretation of sections of chapter 24. Lovell referred SEC members to a new Exhibit C, dated November 16, 2009, distributed at the beginning of the meeting: “Request for \textit{Code} Interpretation.” He explained that this does not need to be debated today. He brought the request for the SEC to forward to the Advisory Committee on \textit{Faculty Code} and Regulations for their advice in order for the SEC to have a more informed discussion of these questions when the time comes. The SEC is the body that is authorized to interpret the \textit{Code}, with the advice of the Advisory Committee on \textit{Faculty Code} and Regulations.

After considerable discussion about the legal complexities involved and about the consequences should the faculty remain silent on this issue, Gerry Philipsen made a motion that the SEC deliver this request for interpretation to the Advisory Committee on \textit{Faculty Code} and Regulations. The motion was seconded. After further discussion, the question was called and approved. The main motion was then approved with two abstentions.

b. Faculty Council on University Relations.

i. Class C Action: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.  \{Exhibit D\}

**Title:** Proposal to Create a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees.

**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to submit the proposal to create a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees. Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien then recounted that Faculty Councils had been asked to examine council charges and efficiencies they might make in view of the budget situation. The charge of the Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR) is included in Exhibit F, attached to the agenda. In the past, FCUR has been involved in a number of issues, but in recent years, the focus of the Council has been on honorary degrees. In discussions with the Council, a conclusion was reached that their purpose could be well-supported by a special committee rather than a faculty council. This transition requires three pieces of legislation. This first Class C action would establish the Special Committee on Honorary Degrees. The next item on the agenda, Class B legislation, would change the University Handbook regarding the appointment of Honorary Degrees. The next item after that is Class A legislation that would change the \textit{Faculty Code} by deleting the FCUR.

The proposal to create the Special Committee was drafted over the summer by key members of the FCUR, then vetted and approved by its membership at its first Council meeting of the year.
After minimal discussion the motion was approved.

ii. Class B Legislation: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty. **(Exhibit E)**

**Title:** Proposed Legislation Changing Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, Section 6 Honorary Degrees.

**Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Chair Balick explained that Class B legislation changes non-Faculty Code sections of the University Handbook. After review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class B legislation once and then sends it to the university president for review. Within ten days of approval of the action by the president, the Class B legislation is duplicated in a Class B Bulletin and sent by the Secretary to each member of the faculty. The legislation becomes effective unless a significant number of written objections is received by the Secretary within 21 days of its publication.

A motion was made and seconded to send this legislation to the Senate for consideration. The question was called and approved. The main motion was then approved unanimously.

iii. Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **(Exhibit F)**

Stuart Sutton, Member, Faculty Council on University Relations.

**Title:** Proposed Legislation to Eliminate the Faculty Council on University Relations.

**Action:** Decide whether to forward resolution for Faculty Senate consideration.

Balick then explained that Class A legislation changes the Faculty Code, which is found in Volume II of the University Handbook. After first review by the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation once, sends it back to the SEC and then has a second consideration. Although Legislation may be amended at either consideration by the SEC, it is only at the first Senate meeting that it can be revised.

A motion was made and seconded to send this legislation to the Senate for consideration. Stuart Sutton, current member of FCUR, who had participated in the drafting of the Special Committee proposal, then recounted the process leading to its drafting. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

c. Intelligence Officer Training Program, Christoph Giebel, Group 4 Representative. **(Exhibit G)**

**Discussion:** Possible effect on academic integrity, safety and security of the UW’s global activities.

Chair Balick then directed SEC members’ attention to a concern raised by one of the group representatives, Christoph Giebel, from Group 4. Giebel requested that the SEC address Intelligence Officer Training Programs and their possible effects on academic integrity, safety and security of the University of Washington’s global activities.

Giebel began by distributing a reprint of an article from the June 19, 2009, issue of the Washington Post entitled “Obama Administration Looks to Colleges for Future Spies.” He described the program and told SEC members the questions this program raised for him, including issues of transparency and honesty, safety and security. For example, if it were known that the UW was taking part in this program, it may be an invitation for rival intelligence agencies to send counter-intelligence agents to enroll as well. It may also put overseas study and research programs at risk, since there is no way to identify the students who may be a part of this program.

His main concern, however, is that the UW has reacted to situations such as this one in an *ad hoc* way. Each time something like this comes up, it requires significant amounts of information gathering and organizing of faculty to ensure the issue is adequately addressed from a faculty perspective. He feels it is now time for the faculty to formulate a policy to address requests from intelligence organizations when they impact the transparency of what we do as a University and the safety of students here and in overseas programs. He would like the Senate Executive Committee to take this up for further discussion.
Chair Balick responded by saying that issues of this magnitude are generally assigned to Faculty Councils for review and any recommendation indicated. Brian Fabien, Chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, welcomed the opportunity to address this issue with his Council.

d. December 3, 2009 Faculty Senate Agenda.  **[Exhibit H]**
   
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

   The December 3, 2009, Faculty Senate agenda was approved.


   The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate
M. Basketball Academic Majors

- Undeclared - 8
- AES - 1
- Drama - 1
- Envrn. Sci - 1
- Sociology - 1
Special Admit Data Snapshot By Year

Entering Class of 2005-2006 (29 special admits)

9 Withdrew from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
2 Dismissed from UW
8 Remain at UW and in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
10 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2006-2007 (30 special admits)

10 Withdrew from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
1 Dismissed from UW
17 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
1 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
1 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2007-2008 (32 special admits)

5 Withdrew from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
1 Dismissed from UW
23 Remain at UW in good academic standing
1 Went pro (left school early)
1 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
1 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2008-2009 (27 special admits)

3 Withdrew from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
0 Dismissed from UW
24 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree
Priority Admit Data Snapshot By Year

Entering Class of 2005-2006 (46 priority admits)

10 Withdrawed from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred/ no info.
2 Dismissed from UW
15 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
18 Earned UW degree
1 Never attended UW

Entering Class of 2006-2007 (54 priority admits)

12 Withdrawed from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
2 Dismissed from UW
27 Remain at UW in good academic standing
1 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
9 Earned UW degree
3 Never attended UW

Entering Class of 2007-2008 (55 priority admits)

11 Withdrawed from UW/quit the team/ cut or transferred
2 Dismissed from UW
39 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree
3 Never attended UW

Entering Class of 2008-2009 (72 priority admits)

4 Withdrawed from UW/quit the team/cut or transferred
3 Dismissed from UW
61 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
3 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree
1 Never attended UW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number of Sports</th>
<th>Athletically-Aid $</th>
<th>Related Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>All by Team $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13,599</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$6,622,595</td>
<td>$235,443</td>
<td>$403,765</td>
<td>$41,067,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$8,084,474</td>
<td>$204,118</td>
<td>$643,329</td>
<td>$53,473,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,432</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$8,317,318</td>
<td>$286,483</td>
<td>$527,139</td>
<td>$60,538,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,836</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6,137,477</td>
<td>$296,150</td>
<td>$541,916</td>
<td>$50,489,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,631</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6,147,552</td>
<td>$262,168</td>
<td>$378,878</td>
<td>$45,409,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,516</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$10,836,337</td>
<td>$268,449</td>
<td>$699,236</td>
<td>$76,383,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$15,478,248</td>
<td>$225,615</td>
<td>$903,749</td>
<td>$65,480,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,103</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$8,171,292</td>
<td>$238,014</td>
<td>$141,734</td>
<td>$61,309,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,412</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$7,181,423</td>
<td>$326,497</td>
<td>$233,762</td>
<td>$50,813,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$5,407,143</td>
<td>$201,356</td>
<td>$302,920</td>
<td>$29,730,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$12,507,069</td>
<td>$196,073</td>
<td>$367,184</td>
<td>$68,292,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,389</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$8,242,694</td>
<td>$328,506</td>
<td>$271,784</td>
<td>$64,828,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,501</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$6,436,551</td>
<td>$276,518</td>
<td>$219,826</td>
<td>$49,169,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of NCAA Three-Year Academic Progress Rate (APR) to Pac-10 and Selected Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M Baseball</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Basketball</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Basketball</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Crew</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>T-2nd</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cross Country</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Cross Country</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Golf</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Golf</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>T-1st</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Gymnastics</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Soccer</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>T-3rd</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Soccer</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Softball</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Swimming</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Swimming</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tennis</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>T-2nd</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Tennis</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Indoor Track</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Indoor Track</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Outdoor Track</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Outdoor Track</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Volleyball</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a glossary of definitions related to the common terms used in the NCAA's academic reform efforts.

**Academic Progress Rate (APR).** The APR is the fulcrum upon which the entire academic-reform structure rests. Developed as a more real-time assessment of teams' academic performance than the six-year graduation-rate calculation provides, the APR awards two points each term to student-athletes who meet academic-eligibility standards and who remain with the institution. A team's APR is the total points earned by the team at a given time divided by the total points possible.

**925.** This is the cut score the Division I Board of Directors approved for immediate or contemporaneous penalties. APR scores have already become meaningful numbers to the membership and general public. Based on current data, an APR score of 925 (out of 1,000) translates to an approximate 60 percent Graduation Success Rate.

**900.** This is the cut score for historical penalties. This benchmark of 900 APR translates to an approximate 45 percent Graduation Success Rate.

**Squad-size adjustment.** Small sample sizes of some teams can lead to reduced confidence in the APR as an estimate of academic performance for those teams. That is particularly true with only one or two years of data. Confidence intervals, commonly used in statistics, roughly represent a range of scores within which the true APR likely resides. That means the "upper confidence boundary" of a team’s APR would have to be below 925 for that team to be subject to APR penalties. The squad-size adjustment is a short-term tool, however, and will be eliminated with the 2007-08 reports.

**Quarter school variance.** Schools that are on a quarter system instead of a semester system were found to have an unintended advantage in APR calculations simply because of the number of reporting occasions and not because of academic performance. Because the reporting of APR is done at two occasions for semester schools but at three occasions for quarter schools, a slight numerical advantage can accrue from the extra reporting occasion. To account for the disparity, a statistical formula will be applied to slightly alter quarter school APRs.
### NCAA Graduation Success Rates, 1998-2001 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA Division I</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>AZ State</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>OR State</th>
<th>USC</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>WA rank in Pac-10</th>
<th>WA State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M Baseball</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Basketball</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Basketball</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Crew</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cross Country/Track</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Cross Country/Track</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Golf</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Golf</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Gymnastics</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Soccer</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Soccer</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Softball</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Swimming</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Swimming</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tennis</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Tennis</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Volleyball</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall GSR</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) was developed in response to college and university presidents who wanted graduation data that more accurately reflect the mobility among college students today. Both rates improve on the federally mandated graduation rate by including students who were omitted from the federal calculation.

The GSR measures graduation rates at Division I institutions and includes students transferring into the institutions. The GSR also allows institutions to subtract student-athletes who leave their institutions prior to graduation as long as they would have been academically eligible to compete had they remained.
Nominations and Appointments

2009-2012 Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Gail Stygall, Group 1, English, for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2012.

2009-2010 Representative Faculty Council Nominations

Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative ex-officio members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2010, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty councils:

Professional Staff Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Alternate Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Jeanne Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate and Professional Student Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>Gus Jesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Outreach</td>
<td>Lauren Domino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Mallory Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Eligio Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Academia</td>
<td>Megan Roosen-Runge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associated Students of the University of Washington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Retirement</td>
<td>William Brenc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>Ryan Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Cheyenne Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Ryan Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Academia</td>
<td>Abigail Pearl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Official Request for Code Interpretation of Chapter 24, Sections 24-70 and 24-71.

Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2009

Request for Code Interpretation
David Lovell, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

In deliberations of the Special Committee to re-evaluate the salary policy, jointly appointed by the President and the Senate Chair, two primary considerations have emerged:

1. Emergency Class A legislation to change the Faculty Code should be avoided if possible;
2. If any changes are needed in Executive Order #64, after the temporary suspension of parts of it expires, there should be sufficient time to deliberate in a problem-solving process that includes faculty and administration.

The request for interpretation of the Code responds to the first of these issues.

The possible need for changes in the Code arises from 24.70.B.1: A salary increase shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review...

The administration and the Board of Regents have evidently been advised that this provision may require a substantial equal merit increase, notwithstanding the provisions of any Executive Order, and that this requirement would take effect in July of 2010.

A further relevant provision is 24.71.A: The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in 24.70. B...

As Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, I would like to request that the Senate Executive Committee address two questions of Faculty Code interpretation:

1. What is the range of an initial minimum equal-percentage increase that would satisfy the requirement of 24.70.B.1?
2. The principles of this code are implemented by an Executive Order that prescribes an initial minimum equal percentage merit increase under normal circumstances. If severe decreases in the UW's core educational budget lead to consideration of an initial equal merit increase lower than the percentage stipulated under normal circumstances:
   a. Do the references in 24.71.A to consultation and to “the allocation of available funds for salary increases” require that the Provost consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting on the amount of a minimum equal-percentage merit increase?
   b. If so, what elements are required as necessary to achieve consultation on the amount of a minimum equal-percentage merit increase under extraordinary circumstances?

David Lovell, Chair
Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Faculty Senate  
Class C Recommendation:  
Proposal for a  
Special Committee on Honorary Degrees

Rationale:
During the past few years, the Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR) has been operating almost exclusively as a special committee on honorary degrees, with responsibility established in 2002 by Class B legislation in the University Handbook (Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11) for recommending candidates for honorary degrees to the President. Because of financial exigencies in the Office of University Committees, and because the current Associate Vice President is willing to take on the staffing of this Committee, the following proposal was drafted:

Proposal:
To create a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees that will be staffed by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Media Relations and Communications. The Associate Vice President chairs the University’s Committee on Ceremonies and is the President’s designee to the Council or Committee managing honorary degrees. This Committee will continue to provide faculty input and oversight to the process, as described in the University Handbook, of selecting and nominating individuals for honorary degrees at the University of Washington. The Committee would be chaired by a faculty member elected from the Committee membership, and would consist of seven members of the voting faculty serving three-year, overlapping terms. The first seven members of the Committee would be drawn from the current membership of the Faculty Council on University Relations, with additional members recruited, as needed, and appointed by the Faculty Senate. The Committee would report to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and would be required to deliver a brief, yearly annual report on its activities at the penultimate SEC meeting of the academic year.

Faculty Code provision for this action:

Section 21-60. Faculty Councils and Faculty Committees Defined--Power to Appoint

A. The standing committees of the University faculty, authorized by Section 13-31.B, shall be designated Faculty Councils.

B. The power to select and appoint the chair and members of each Faculty Council is delegated by the University Faculty to the Senate.

C. The term "faculty committee" or "committee of the faculty" as used in Chapters 21, 22, 25, 41 and 42 means a special or an ad hoc committee of the University Faculty, of the Senate, or of a Faculty Council, appointed by the Senate, or by the Senate Executive Committee, or by a Faculty Council and responsible to the Senate, or to the Executive Committee, or to a Faculty Council.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964: with Presidential approval.
Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades Honors and Scholarship

Section 6. Honorary Degrees

Upon the recommendation of the Faculty, the Board of Regents may confer Honorary Degrees upon a person or persons of exceptional merit, other than graduates of this University. The Faculty Council on University Relations Special Committee on Honorary Degrees will have jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the award of Honorary Degrees. Nominations for candidates may come from a variety of sources, including faculty councils, committees, departments, programs, schools, colleges or campuses. The names of nominees approved by the Council Special Committee will be forwarded to the President of the University. After consultation with the President, the Council Special Committee will, on behalf of the Faculty, recommend candidates for Honorary Degrees to the Regents. Honorary Degrees will be presented at either a commencement ceremony or a formal academic convocation.
Faculty Senate Proposed Changes  
(Additions are underlined; deletions are struck through)

Changes to Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 42, 
Sections 42-31 and 42-35

Rationale:

The Faculty Council on University Relations (FCUR) was established as an advisory body to the Office of the Vice President for University Relations, which no longer exists in the administrative structure at the University of Washington. The current FCUR operates almost exclusively as a faculty committee on honorary degrees, with responsibility established in 2002 by Class B legislation in the University Handbook (Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11) for recommending candidates for honorary degrees to the President. Other issues which FCUR had once followed have been assigned to other Councils. Student/neighborhood issues are now overseen by the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, and various transportation issues, including the Sound Transit proposal for the campus and the impact of the proposed replacement of the SR 520 bridge, are overseen by the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services and government relations issues are overseen by the Special Committee on Legislative Matters. That being the case, this legislation would retire the Faculty Council on University Relations. A concurrent Class C recommendation to create a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees has been drafted. The Special Committee will be staffed by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Media Relations and Communications. The Associate Vice President chairs the University's Committee on Ceremonies and is the President's designee to the Council or Committee managing honorary degrees.

Since “University Relations” no longer exists as an administrative structure at the UW; and since the Office of University Committees has found it necessary to curtail activities as a result of budget cutbacks; and given that the current Associate Vice President’s Office accepts responsibility for staffing a special committee, this proposal was drafted to retire the FCUR and allow for the creation of a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees that reflects the reality of what is currently happening.

Chapter 42: Faculty Councils (the Standing Committees of the University Faculty) and their duties
Section 42-31. The Faculty Councils

Proposed changes:

A. As the principal advisory bodies to the Senate there shall be the following Faculty Councils:

1. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards;
2. The Faculty Council on University Relations;
3. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs;
4. The Faculty Council on Research;
5. The Faculty Council on Student Affairs;
6. The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services;
7. The Faculty Council on University Libraries;
8. The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality;
9. The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach;
10. The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement;
11. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology;
12. The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy;
13. The Faculty Council for Women in Academia;

B. Faculty Councils may be abolished and created only by amendment to the Faculty Code.

C. Faculty Councils are responsible to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

Section 42-35. Faculty Council on University Relations

The Faculty Council on University Relations shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to University relations, including community affairs, government relations at the local, state, and federal levels, public service, University communications, and alumni relations.
Obama Administration Looks to Colleges for Future Spies

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post Staff Writer
Saturday, June 20, 2009

To the list of collegiate types -- nerds, jocks, Greeks -- add one more: spies in training. The government is hoping they'll be hard to spot.

The Obama administration has proposed the creation of an intelligence officer training program in colleges and universities that would function much like the Reserve Officers' Training Corps run by the military services. The idea is to create a stream "of first- and second-generation Americans, who already have critical language and cultural knowledge, and prepare them for careers in the intelligence agencies," according to a description sent to Congress by Director of National Intelligence Dennis C. Blair.

In recent years, the CIA and other intelligence agencies have struggled to find qualified recruits who can work the streets of the Middle East and South Asia to penetrate terrorist groups and criminal enterprises. The proposed program is an effort to cultivate and educate a new generation of career intelligence officers from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds.

Under the proposal, part of the administration's 2010 intelligence authorization bill, colleges and universities would apply for grants that would be used to expand or introduce courses of study to "meet the emerging needs of the intelligence community." Those courses would include certain foreign languages, analysis and specific scientific and technical fields.

The students' participation in the program would probably be kept secret to prevent them from being identified by foreign intelligence services, according to an official familiar with the proposal.

Students attending participating colleges and universities who agree to take the specialized courses would apply to the national intelligence director for admittance to the program, whose administrators would select individuals "competitively" for financial assistance. Much like the support provided to those in the military programs, the financial assistance could include "a monthly stipend, tuition assistance, book allowances and travel expenses," according to the proposal. It also would involve paid summer internships at one or more intelligence agencies.

Applicants to the intelligence training program would have to pass a security background investigation, although it is unclear when they would have to do so. Students who receive a certain amount of financial assistance would be obligated to serve in an intelligence agency for the same length of time as they received their subsidy. Students in the military programs typically participate for all four years of college, but the intelligence program would seek to recruit sophomores and juniors.

Through grants to colleges and universities, intelligence agencies have been building partnerships with academia and specific professors, some of whom in past decades served as channels for recommending applicants to the CIA and other intelligence agencies. The intelligence community already has a Centers of Academic Excellence Program that funds programs in national security studies at more than 14 colleges and universities, with a goal of having 20 participating schools by 2015. The programs receive between $500,000 and $750,000 a year.

The intelligence officer training program would build on two earlier efforts. One was a pilot program, first authorized in 2004, for as many as 400 students who took cryptologic training and agreed to work for the National Security Agency or another intelligence agency for each year they received financial assistance. That program will be replaced by the new one because cryptology is not as needed as it once was.

A second program provided financial assistance to selected intelligence community employees who agreed to study in specialized academic areas in which officials believed there were analytic deficiencies.

Named the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program, after the Kansas Republican who chaired the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, over the past four years it has provided funds to some 800 students and current employees.
The director of national intelligence would make the Roberts program permanent under the new proposal and expand it beyond analysts to include personnel in acquisition, science and technology. It also could be used to help recruit employees by reimbursing them for prior education in critical areas.
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2009
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate.


4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor David Lovell, Committee Chair.

5. Legislative Report – Professor Jim Fridley, Faculty Legislative Representative.


7. Announcements.

8. Requests for Information.


   Action: Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

10. Memorial Resolution.

11. Unfinished Business.


   a. Class C Action: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
      Title: Proposal to Create a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

   b. Class B Legislation: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.
      Title: Proposed Legislation Changing Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, Section 6 Honorary Degrees.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

   c. Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
      Stuart Sutton, Member, Faculty Council on University Relations.
      Title: Proposed Legislation to Eliminate the Faculty Council on University Relations.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

Motions involving Class C actions should be available in written form by incorporation in the agenda or distribution at the meeting. It is preferable that any resolution be submitted to the Senate Chair and Secretary of the Faculty no later than the Monday preceding a Senate meeting.


PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on Thursday, December 11 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.