Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 18, 2013, 2:30 p.m.
HUB 340

Absent: Young, Cauce, Killien, Lizotte, Kutz, Stern, Fridley, Allen, Purdy, Shen
Guests: Gail Stygall, Mary Lidstrom, Jerry Baldasty, Roland (Pete) Dukes

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Jack Lee called the meeting to order at 2:34pm. The agenda was approved without amendment.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – Jack Lee. {Exhibit A}

Chair Lee asked members to look at his written report and asked if there were any questions. Duane Storti asked if the sponsorship policy would be addressed at the next Senate meeting. Jack Lee said it will be and that it is posted online as EO 15.


President Young was not able to attend but Jerry Baldasty, Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs, and Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, attended on his behalf in order to discuss the Innovation Institute. Mary Lidstrom began with the history; she said that the discussion began with 2y2d planning for the future of the University of Washington. Many of our peers have similar funds so the administration is interested as a competitive issue. The Innovation Institute will be a specific fund that donors can direct their donations to. The plan is to set it up as a pilot this year to fund high risk projects with potentially great returns in education and research. Jerry Baldasty mentioned that the idea for this originally came from faculty. Jim Gregory asked how much it would cost and what the difference will be between research and education. Mary Lidstrom said that one level of grant funding would be $100 thousand for two years, and the other would be $250 thousand for two years. University of Washington Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) is discussing committing $1 million for the coming year. Susan Astley asked why these aren’t NIH or NSF funds. Mary Lidstrom said that the reason is because they are so high risk and those agencies often won’t fund high risk projects. Susan Astley asked for an example. Mary Lidstrom mentioned that David Baker, who does protein innovation studies, wanted to come up with an entirely different therapy system. One proposal was largely educational; how to teach synthetic biology to undergrads with self-directed technology-based learning. Lidstrom was excited to get a few really good projects to start in the hopes to motivate future donors. She added that with stocks at an all-time high, she is hoping people might spend more money on philanthropic efforts.

Rob Wood asked what percentage would go to education. Mary said that she would hope it would be 50/50 but that it would be difficult given the tendency for high-risk innovation to be more research-based. He also asked to what extent the donor could direct the money. Lidstrom mentioned that other schools like Princeton allow donors to direct to an issue area but not to pick specific projects. She also mentioned that the money from ICA will not have strings attached.

Susan Astley asked about the metrics that will be used to evaluate the Institute. Lidstrom said that first and foremost it must be used as a faculty retention tool, and that it must lead to a lasting collaboration that impacts resources for campus. Leroy Searle suggested that we look at projects of this kind with more of a skeptical eye, given the range and kinds of innovation that are already happening. Lidstrom indicated a commitment that his would be a pilot and that we would heavily evaluate it before making it permanent. Jim Gregory had concerns about the similarity to the Royalty Research Fund and the Hall patent’s effect on its funding. Lidstrom said they have maintained some funds to continue Royalty Research and other programs for five years and at that point they will be self-sustaining.

A discussion on criminal background checks began. Jack Lee asked the status of admissions questions regarding criminal history. Jerry Baldasty said that the direction would change from asking an admissions
question and using it in admission decisions to support those with criminal backgrounds who were admitted to the University of Washington. The plan for admissions is to report back about numbers of admitted students with criminal backgrounds and the type and offenses involved. Kari Lerum voiced her support for the new direction of that program.

   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 report.
   d. Report of Faculty Athletic Representative. {Exhibit D}

The Faculty Athletic Representative, Roland (Pete) Dukes attended. He said a few words about his priorities, including student athletes and accountability. He is very impressed about ICA’s commitment to student athlete academic success. He also mentioned that in one specific case, ICA stepped up to help a student athlete with severe personal problems. While Dukes is impressed by the overall culture, he still has some concerns, for example, travel and game times can affect student athletes academically and personally. Additionally, the vast exposure of their performance on the field can affect athletes. Lastly, he mentioned an exit survey of student athletes, in which they are by and large happy with their experience at the University of Washington, though sometimes they feel disconnected from campus.

Kate O’Neill asked about head injuries for football players. Dukes said that there is no question that the attention and response to head injuries has been great but he is not an expert despite it being an ongoing issue. O’Neill also asked about bad press the NCAA has been receiving. Dukes said he sits on an NCAA committee relating to that image but is a small voice and is still figuring out his role. Jim Gregory said he appreciated the report. He expressed some concern over mid-week games despite his personal enjoyment of Wednesday night volleyball games. Dukes said class absences are a shared concern but that it has always been a reality with athletics. Astley asked about students’ opinions on their absences. Dukes said he will bring that concern forward. Lerum, a former student athlete, asked about support with talking to media and use of online technologies during travel. Dukes was not sure about the extent but was confident that some communications support exists, and that athletes are plugged in while traveling. He said they are also exploring ways to provide instructional exposure while student athletes are on the road.

Rob Wood asked Jim Gregory about the plan to replace the HR / Payroll system. Gregory said it is an extensive overhaul both to build the system and to train all departments and units on campus. Leah Ceccarelli asked when unit adjustments were beginning. Jim Gregory said they will start in January and that the Provost wanted to set guidelines so that departments that are more than 9% behind peer groups could be eligible for an extra 3% pay increase over other departments. If a department is over 20% behind peers they will be eligible for up to a 5% pay increase.

Duane Storti brought up the new Biology building and concerns about the process and availability of information. Chair Lee said more information will be forthcoming.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the October 7, 2013, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the October 24, 2013, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. {Exhibit E}

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

Jack Lee had one announcement that nominations are now being sought for the David B. Thorud Leadership Award and that nominations are being accepted on the award website and will be closed Friday, December 6th, 2013. There were no other announcements.
7. Unfinished Business.
   Class A Legislation – Second Consideration {Exhibit F}
   Title: Changes to 24-33 A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility.
   Action: Conduct final review of proposal for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Lee mentioned that on the second and final review of the Class A Legislation, the SEC can accept
amendments from the President or the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations but cannot
otherwise amend the legislation. Jack Lee asked for a motion to accept those amendments. Chair Lee spoke
about the history of the legislation, including amendments added at the most recent meeting of the Faculty
Senate. A motion was made to accept amendments and to forward the legislation to the Faculty Senate for
second consideration. The legislation passed with no objections.

   Approval of the December 5, 2013, Faculty Senate Agenda. {Exhibit G}
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

Kate O’Neill asked about the Class C Resolution regarding English lecturers. Jack Lee said it is being
amended and that the new version should go out to senators with the agenda for the upcoming meeting. Lee
said that if anyone has suggestions they should get in touch with Diane Morrison. He also mentioned that at
least one representative from the English lecturer group and one or two representatives from UW Human
Resources will be available for questions at the Faculty Senate meeting. There was a motion to approve the
agenda. The motion passed.

9. Good of the Order

Storti thanked everyone who was involved in the academic freedom language and said it was a big step
forward.

Jack Lee mentioned that the salary policy is in the process of being drafted and that he has talked to some
stakeholders including deans and a couple colleges. He answered two questions about cost and initial
placement. Astley asked how the rollout of the policy will take place. Lee said he will send it to the entire
Senate with the plans of multiple discussions around campus and the possibility for in-person forums and
anonymous online comments.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:01pm.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

Here’s an update on some of the main things we’re working on.

**Academic Freedom**: The Class A legislation amending the code’s Statement of Academic Freedom and Responsibility was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate at its October 24 meeting, and was approved by the President. Today it comes back to us for a second vote, with some minor changes recommended by the Code Cops.

**International and English Language Program Instructors**: At the October 24 Senate meeting, a Class C resolution was introduced by Senator Diane Morrison expressing support for the instructors of the International and English Language Program in their contract negotiations. Senators had many questions about the resolution and its background, so the vote on the resolution was postponed until the next Senate meeting so that more information could be presented. The Senate will be considering a revised resolution on December 5.

**Faculty Salary Policy**: The development of the details of the proposed faculty salary policy is continuing, and code drafting has begun. We still need to work with the professional schools to find out what tweaks the policy will need in order to work well for them. You can expect to see a detailed written version of the proposal sometime in the next few weeks.

**Lecturers**: The Seattle campus lecturer task force has started meeting, and the Tacoma and Bothell ones are getting geared up. I expect that Provost Cauce will be appointing a tri-campus task force to study issues surrounding Lecturer appointments and make recommendations for new policies.

**Intellectual Property**: The Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC) will be reporting to SEC in January.

**University Sponsorship Policy**: The President has just issued a new executive order (EO 15) describing the university’s policy regarding sponsorship agreements with external organizations. The executive order will soon be posted on the UW Policy Directory website (if it is not already there), and will be attached as an information item to the next FacultySenate agenda. Also, Steven Bell, the Director of Sponsorships & Partnerships, will be a guest at the next Senate meeting to describe the policy and answer questions about it.

**Online Degrees**: The College of Arts and Sciences is moving forward with plans for a new online degree completion program in Social Sciences. The Senate will be receiving a report on that degree program at its January 30 meeting. Meanwhile, Provost Cauce has appointed a joint faculty/administration task force to study and make recommendations about the role of online education at UW. The members are:

- James Gregory, Professor of History and Chair of SCPB, Co-chair
- Betsy Wilson, Dean of University Libraries and Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives, Co-chair
- Jan Carlile, Professor of Medical Education
- Colleen Carmean, Assistant Chancellor for Instructional Technologies, UW-Tacoma
- Jeffrey Cohen, Assistant Professor, Social Work Program, UW-Tacoma
- Kelly Edwards, Associate Dean, The Graduate School
- Dan Grossman, Associate Professor, Computer Science and Engineering
- David Pengra, Senior Lecturer of Physics
- Matt Sparke, Professor of International Studies and Director of Integrated Social Sciences
- David Szatmary, Vice Provost for Educational Outreach
- Jane Van Galen, Professor, Education Program, UW-Bothell
- Bill Zumeta, Professor, Evans School of Public Affairs
- Representative from ASUW
- Representative from GPSS
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. Nominations are currently being received for candidates for the 2014-15 Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate. To make a nomination, contact Nancy Bradshaw at bradsn@uw.edu.

2. The Senate leadership met on 10/4/13 with chairs of the Faculty Councils/University Committees for coordination and information sharing. A similar meeting is scheduled for 12/10/13 at 11:30 a.m. to meet with the chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils (“college councils”) of the Schools, Colleges, and Campuses.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
James Gregory, Professor, History

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budget, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions. Fall quarter meetings have dealt with the following matters:

**Online Education Initiatives Task Force:** This committee will recommend policies regarding (1) new fully online undergraduate and graduate degree proposals; and (2) MOOCs. Co-chaired by Betsy Wilson (Dean of Libraries) and James Gregory, it will report to Provost Cauce and SCPB. Members include Jan Carline, Colleen Carmean, Jeffrey Cohen, Kelly Edwards, Dan Grossman, David Pengra, Matt Sparke, David Szatmary Jane Van Galen, Bill Zumeta and representatives from ASUW and GPSS. It will meet for the first time on November 22.

**Faculty Salaries:** SCPB reviewed data on the distribution of raises in September and has approved the Provost’s plan for unit adjustment allocations that will allow some units where average salaries are dangerously below peers to receive increases in January. The plan allows for unit adjustments up to a cap of 5% at the unit level for units that are more than 20% behind peer averages, and up to 3% for units that are more than 9% behind peers. All unit adjustments will need to be funded at the college level and College Councils are required to participate in the planning. Currently only the College of Arts & Sciences is preparing a proposal. SCPB reviewed peer salary comparison data in conjunction with the plan. 35 units are at least 9% behind peers, most of them (23) in the College of Arts & Sciences. Several SCPB members argued that more needs to be done to close the peer gap. Provost Cauce indicated that a second round of unit adjustments will be recommended next year.

**Budget planning:** Deans have prepared and submitted budget requests for the coming year and SCPB will soon begin to review them.

**RCEP:** The College of the Environment is reconfiguring the MS degree in Biology for Teachers. SCPB approved a “limited” RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, or Elimination of Programs) procedure which has now been implemented.

**Research grants:** The committee heard a somewhat encouraging report from Vice Provost for Research Mary Lidstrom. Research grant revenues which had appeared to drop precipitously earlier in the year have recovered and are expected to remain steady. But some grants have been lost and the Provost has set aside limited bridge funding for affected faculty.

**Activity based budgeting:** SCPB heard from the ABB Steering Committee co-chair Paul Jenny that no major changes are contemplated in the near term. Discussion continues about whether to implement phase two which would bring administrative units under ABB and perhaps introduce charges for space and utilities. Some adjustments in the tuition allocation formulas may be recommended. In the meantime, the Steering Committee and SCPB are continuing to monitor the effects of ABB.

**Other matters:** SCPB heard an update on the plan to replace the Human Resources and Payroll system software; was briefed on the UW Profile web tool for monitoring enrollment and student demographics and on the Whole U initiative to provide enhanced opportunities for health and social connections on campus.

**Upcoming Fall quarter meetings** will look into the following:

- Proposal for new salary policy
- Reports on student admissions, financial aid, class size
- Proposal to change Intellectual property rules
- Retention and retirement data
- Governor’s proposed supplemental budget (Dec 10)
Faculty Athletic Representative Summary Report – 2012-13 Academic Year
Professor Roland (Pete) Dukes
November 12, 2013

Student athletes at Washington continue to do well academically and feel they are being well treated by the University and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). As the Faculty Athletics Representative I encountered no major issues during the 2012-13 academic year. In general I believe the University of Washington intercollegiate athletics program is doing the right things and is in good shape. However, I continue to focus on some areas where I have modest concerns.

Missed Class Time

I continue to have concerns with the increasing impact of media, specifically the Pac-12 Networks, on the scheduling of competitions. During the 2012-13 academic year the UW Men’s Basketball schedule included three away games on Wednesdays, all during the ten week Winter Quarter. For two of the three Wednesday games the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) made extensive efforts to minimize the amount of class time missed by chartering flights to return the team to campus immediately after the conclusion of the game. The student athletes returned to campus sometime after midnight and were in their classes the next morning. However, we know they were tired and not fully engaged in those classes. As best we can determine there was no substantive decline in the academic performance as measured by team GPA during this intense traveling Quarter. I will continue to investigate ways to mitigate the impact of these scheduling challenges.

At Conference meetings my fellow FARs and I continually raise the issue of reducing the amount of missed class time for student athletes. I feel we are being heard, at least minimally. For example, this year the UW Men’s Basketball team has only two Wednesday away games, and both are relatively close geographically (Oregon and the Bay Area) making it easier to return to campus after the game. I will continue to monitor and raise my voice on this issue, but Conference institutions are constrained by the contract the Conference has with the Pac-12 Networks and other media organizations (e.g., ESPN).

Pac-12 Rule Change Benefiting Student Athletes

In June my fellow FARs and I were able to enact a rule change with the Pac-12 Conference that benefits student athletes. I led the effort to change the Pac-12 legislation that restricted student athletes transferring within the Conference from competing for their new school the following year. The NCAA rules allow, in all sports but football, men’s and women’s basketball, and hockey, student athletes to compete immediately in the academic year following the transfer. Because the Conference seems to want to restrict and de-incentivize intra-conference transfers, the rules were very restrictive. That has been changed.

Academic Performance

Academic performance for Washington relative to other member schools in the Pac-12 Conference continues to be a distinguishing feature of our ICA program. Our football graduation rate continues to be second only to Stanford in the Conference, although UCLA is greatly improving their performance and surpassed UW in the latest (October 2013) statistics. Our overall program graduation rates were second behind Stanford in the 2012-13 NCAA report, but again UCLA looks like they will overtake Washington in the next round of reporting. Washington has not slipped in graduation rates, and indeed has made small increases in graduation rates in some sports. To their credit, UCLA is making huge strides in improving their rates. Still, Washington is viewed by most of the public institutions in the Conference as a model program for providing the support, guidance and assistance needed to ensure academic success for student athletes.
I believe behavioral norms or standards and the culture of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics continues to focus on making sure the student athletes are successful academically. Coaches are very proud of the academic success of the student athletes on their teams, and the Department continues to encourage Coaches to make this a priority.

**NCAA Activities**

I serve on the NCAA Amateurism Cabinet, which evaluates and considers legislation affecting the definition of what does and does not constitute an amateur athlete. The NCAA is undergoing extensive reform in several areas (for example, what constitutes major or minor rules infractions, and what are appropriate penalties for each), and thus more routine and/or specific legislative issues are being delayed until the more major structural issues of the NCAA are addressed.

**Special Admits**

Washington admits a few student athletes, restricted to be thirty or fewer annually, whose academic preparation is such that they are less than 50% likely to succeed academically if they do not receive careful guidance, support and tutoring. The Student Athlete Advising Services (SAAS) group at ICA provides the support needed by these student athletes, and very carefully monitors their academic performance. The Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics asks for and receives detailed information on the academic performance of these athletes. To provide a quick summary, 98 special admits have been made over the four year period 2009-10 through 2012-13. Of these, five have since graduated, and 68 are still enrolled and are eligible to compete, meaning they are making satisfactory progress toward their degree. Fifteen students transferred to other academic institutions and had academically satisfactory performance when they transferred. Four of these students quit school to pursue professional careers in their sport, and another six students withdrew from the University for personal or other reasons. None of these students was dismissed from the University because they were failing academically.

Again, we monitor this group very carefully. It is important that these at-risk students have a good opportunity to succeed academically, and the data suggests that they are.

**Concerns for the Future**

I continue to be concerned about the impact of the ever increasing media exposure that our Conference seems to be seeking, and the consequences that might entail for our student athletes. I am less concerned with what that means for fans (such as changing the start time for events like football, basketball, and indeed virtually all our sports) but am continually focused on what it means for the educational and developmental experience of our student athletes. One example is that by scheduling competitions on different days in different weeks, the student athlete's routine or regular schedule gets interrupted. For example, the student athlete on the Men's basketball team whose regular routine is to attend a weekly review session or tutoring session for a course on a Wednesday evening cannot do so because of games on that night four times during the Quarter. This is not just a missed class time issue; it is an issue about disrupting the regular studying and class preparation routine of students. This, of course, can be overcome, but it can be a challenge for our at-risk students.

Finally, I have some concerns about the indirect tensions and pressures that increased media puts on the student athlete. I believe performing in front of a few fans is less stressful than realizing that the cameras are recording and broadcasting to a wide audience. I am not sure of the impact of this subtle pressure, but want to be aware of it.

Overall, I am generally pleased with the way our student athletes are being served by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Exit surveys of graduating students continue to show that our student athletes feel very positive about their educational experience and the support they received from ICA and the University.
2013 – 2014 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)

- Robert Breidenthal, Aeronautics and Astronautics, College of Arts and Sciences, for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15th, 2016.
- Tyler Yorita, Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW), as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 9:30)

- Julian Rees, Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS), as a non-voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014. (GPSS without vote)

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)

- Mary Ruffin, ASUW, as a non-voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Research (Meets Wednesdays at 9:00)

- Dikshya Dhungana, ASUW, as a non-voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00)

- George Mobus, Computing and Software Systems, UW-Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15th, 2016.
- Marnie Brown, ASUW, as a non-voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30)

- Katherine Schroeder, ASUW, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.

Adjudication Panel

- Gail Stygall, English, College of Arts and Sciences, as Chair Pro-Tempore for a term beginning September 16th, 2013, and ending September 15, 2014.

Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

- Jeff McNerney, ASUW, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2013 and ending September 15, 2014.
Background and Rationale

Changes to A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility
Class A Legislation Proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Section 24-33 (formerly Section 13-31) is one of the older sections of the University of Washington Faculty Code, first approved by the Faculty Senate and President on April 16, 1956. Much of the language of the document has remained unchanged since that time, although there is a footnote added in 1992 on Faculty/Student Relationships and Conflicts of Interest. The initial date of 1956 indicates that this addition to the Code was adopted after the Red Scare investigations of the Canwell Committee (a state-level legislative committee similar to HUAC). Several professors lost their jobs in this investigation. A statement on academic freedom seemed quite necessary at the time to preclude future investigations that abridged that academic freedom.

More recently, at least one recent Supreme Court decision, Garcetti v. Ceballos 547 U.S. 410 (2006), complicated the relationship between the First Amendment and speaking when a public employee. Although academic freedom has not been addressed directly, it became clear that what was not addressed in our academic freedom statement was our role in shared governance. Garcetti involved criticism of an elected prosecutor; his firing was upheld. Many faculty have and voice opinions about administrative decisions and much of this is part of shared faculty-administration governance of the university.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs also added language taken from the University of Utah’s statement on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and from the national AAUP. We needed to define what academic freedom is and give examples of some of the situations in which faculty should not be subject to reprisals, punishment, for what they said or for what other people think of what they said.

These are fairly straightforward changes, mostly additions giving a more complete definition of academic freedom.

The final sentence of the section was deleted by the Council’s recommendation. It seemed to the Council to contradict most of what went before it.

We don’t anticipate that we will need to invoke Academic Freedom in the immediate future, but we have been very concerned about both attorneys and those outside the academy not understanding what effect shared governance would have on faculty speech and writing.

President Young requested some changes to the version that FCFA sent to the Senate Executive Committee. A subcommittee of SEC has finalized this version in consultation with the President.

After its first consideration by the SEC and Faculty Senate, the legislation was sent to the president and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations for final review. The president approved the legislation with no changes. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has proposed minor revisions shown in red.
Section 24-33. A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in teaching, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to shared governance and the general welfare of the University.

Faculty members have the right to academic freedom and the right to examine and communicate ideas by any lawful means even should such activities generate hostility or pressure against the faculty member or the University. Their exercise of constitutionally protected freedom of association, assembly, and expression, including participation in political activities, does not constitute a violation of duties to the University, to their profession, or to students and may not result in disciplinary action or adverse merit evaluation.

A faculty member’s academic responsibility requires the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.

Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and Regents an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways which injure individuals and damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one’s instructors or colleagues. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but also be given an opportunity to be heard. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that clearly and significantly impede the functions of the University.

Students and faculty are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to evenhanded treatment in all aspects of the instructor-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach a student on the ground of the student’s beliefs or the possible uses to which the student may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. Students should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional relationship to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own roles in society. Evaluation of students and the award of credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance. (Examples of such matters include but are not limited to personality, personal beliefs, race, sex, gender, religion, political activity, sexual orientation, or sexual, romantic, familial, or other personal relationships.)

It is the responsibility of the instructors, faculty members to present the subject matter of their courses as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. Within the approved curriculum, it is the instructors: faculty members are free to express ideas and teach as they see fit, based on their mastery of their subjects and their own scholarship, which entitle them to their classrooms and to freedom in the presentation of their subjects. It is the responsibility of the instructors to present the subject matter of their courses as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. Because academic freedom has traditionally included the instructor’s full freedom as a citizen, most faculty members face no insoluble conflicts between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience, on the one hand, and the claims and expectations of their students, colleagues and institutions, on the other. If such conflicts become acute, and the instructor’s attention to his or her obligations as a citizen and a moral agent precludes the fulfillment of substantial academic obligations, he or she cannot escape the responsibility of that choice, but should either request a leave of absence or resign his or her academic position.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 7, 2013

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
October 24, 2013
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 5, 2013, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.


4. Memorial Resolution.

5. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the October 7, 2013, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
      ii. Approval of the October 24, 2013, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative.
   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.

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

   UW Sponsorship Activities – Steven Bell, Director of Corporate Sponsorships.

8. Announcements.

   a. Class A Legislation – Second Consideration.
      Title: Changes to 24-33 A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility.
      Action: Conduct final review of proposal to submit legislation to the faculty for approval or rejection.
   b. Class C Resolution.
      Diane Morrison, Faculty Senator, Social Work
      Title: Resolution concerning the University of Washington English Language Lecturers.
      Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.

    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.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien
   Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Jack Lee, Chair
   Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, December 12 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.