Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, January 12, 2015, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: President Young, Provost Cauce, O’Neill, Beauchamp, Lee, Hopkins, Stroup, Fong, Storti, Wood, Gharib, Shen, Astley, Resnick, McKinley, Janes, Rosenfeld, Wilkes, Killien, Taricani, Xiao, Popejoy
Absent: None
Guests: Rachel Chapman, Eve Riskin, Norma Rodriguez, Cheryl Cameron, Chuck Treser, Aaron Vetter

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair O’Neill called the meeting to order at 2:34pm. At the request of the Faculty Councils on Multicultural Affairs and Women in Academia, Chair O’Neill moved to remove agenda item 9.C., A Resolution Concerning Childcare. The motion was approved. Marcia Killien moved to add nominees for Faculty Councils to the consent agenda. The motion was approved. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Kate O’Neill. [Exhibit A]

Chair O’Neill directed members to her written report. O’Neill remarked that the Washington State Legislature had convened for the 2015 legislative session. She encouraged faculty to be engaged with their representatives in Olympia on matters being considered by the Legislature, especially those impacting higher education.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
   d. Report of Faculty Council Activities – For reports on faculty council activities please refer to the Faculty Senate website (http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/) to find each councils’ 2013-14 annual report located alongside meeting minutes. [Exhibit E]

JoAnn Taricani elaborated on her written report. Taricani remarked that given the difficulty of the coming session it was likely that the legislature would go into special sessions. She emphasized the impact of the Governor’s most recent budget on the University of Washington and other public institutions. Lastly, Taricani was looking forward to working with the new UW Director of State Relations, Genesee Adkins.

Jack Lee asked if UW’s $68 million request from the Legislature was attainable and if it would allow the UW to make priority salary increases while maintaining tuition levels. JoAnn Taricani, President Young, and Provost Cauce all expressed optimism for that being the case.

Rosenfeld asked about a recent economic impact report highlighting the UW. Taricani said it could be useful to communicate the significance of the UW in Olympia, but President Young noted a noticeable silence from lawmakers.

Chair O’Neill introduced the Faculty Council chairs in attendance and complimented the councils for their productive work.

4. President’s Remarks – Michael K. Young.

President Young expressed gratitude for the service of the late President William Gerberding. A celebration of his life would occur on Wednesday, January 14, 2015.

President Young announced the hiring of Mark Pagano as the new Chancellor of the UW Tacoma campus and noted that Interim Chancellor Kenyon Chan would stay on to assist during the transition.
Additionally, interviews were scheduled in the search for a new Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, and Young was optimistic about the candidates.

President Young spoke briefly about the economic impact report, saying that even with a base level of state funding the UW creates a major impact on the regional economy.

Regarding the legislative session, Young mentioned that the link between funding and tuition is critical, and that he was concerned with the decoupling of them in the Governor’s budget. He highlighted the UW’s request for additional funding to expand the WWAMI program in Spokane.

Young was pleased to announce that the student applicant pool had increased considerably, due in part to the growing reputation for excellence on all three campuses. He noted that both Bothell and Tacoma were getting to a point where they would need physical expansion to meet growing demand. He added that UW Tacoma was focused on student retention given that 70% of the student body were first generation college students.

President Young mentioned a new focus on the undergraduate experience, which would include tools to help students in planning their path through their education. The effort would be led by Senior Vice Provost Gerald Baldasty. Young asked for more focus on graduation timing, specifically ensuring classes are offered consistently and in reasonable order. He emphasized the need for a range of opportunities beyond curriculum, including research.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the November 17, 2014, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the December 4, 2014, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]

The consent agenda was approved without objection.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Invited Guest: UW Learning Spaces update – Gerald Baldasty, Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs [Exhibit G]

Baldasty reported on the progress of his committee’s analysis of the adequacy and usage of learning spaces on the Seattle campus. He was asked to look into these issues following discussions about building another large lecture venue similar to Kane Hall. The result of the analysis was that we could use our current space resources much more efficiently. Baldasty mentioned that some units had been found to game the system by inflating enrollment numbers to get larger rooms. Additionally, the committee heard complaints about the current 10 minute passing time. Baldasty noted that changing the way we schedule classes could reduce the number of rooms needed from 330 to about 280, which could also expedite technology upgrades in dated rooms. He cited three likely proposals: block scheduling, incentives for teaching classes outside of the 9:30am-3:30pm window, and an increase in passing time from 10 to 15 minutes.

Any changes would go into effect fall of 2016. Baldasty asked for any advice or particular concerns.

Chuck Treser asked if classrooms in health sciences buildings were included in the number. Baldasty said they were not, but that the committee was looking into efficiencies and changes for those spaces concurrently.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.
   a. Official Request for Faculty Code Interpretation. [Exhibit H]
      Appointment and promotion of part time lecturers and part time senior lecturers.
      Action: Decide whether or not to approve findings of the code advisory committee.

      Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien requested a code interpretation from the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations in response to an inquiry from the administration of the School of Medicine. The question was whether a part-time senior lecturer could advance to part-time principal lecturer.

      Vaughan indicated that there was nothing in the Faculty Code that disallowed this advancement, and noted that the title of principal lecturer has been used largely as a promotional title for full-time senior lecturers.

      Discussion focused on whether the fact that the Faculty Code does not explicitly affirm the opportunity for new appointments as principal lecturer, or renewal of appointments of part-time senior lecturers at the title of part-time principal lecturer meant that they were prohibited from this advancement by the Faculty Code.

      Provost Cauce indicated that in the absence of explicit affirmative recommendations from faculty to allow such advancement she would not approve either without significant discussions with academic chairs and deans, or a change of the Faculty Code explicitly permitting such an appointment.

      SEC members questioned the rationale for why full-time senior lecturers could be reappointed as principal lecturers but part-time appointees could not.

      Following discussion, the SEC voted to accept the opinion of the Advisory Committee as the official interpretation of the Faculty Code on this matter, with the understanding that the Provost would not approve any such appointments at this time.

   b. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit I]
      Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs / Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
      Title: Resolution concerning equity, access and inclusion in hiring.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

      Rachel Chapman, chair of FCMA, introduced the legislation. Chapman indicated that the resolution had been a work in progress for multiple years. The committee determined that the best place to introduce equity and bias training was in hiring and recruitment.

      A member asked if this training existed already. Norma Rodriguez of the Office of Faculty Advancement indicated that some resources exist but that it would be difficult to expand with current funding. Her office was piloting this work in the College of the Environment. Rachel Chapman noted that since 2007 her department provided this training to their hiring committees and was poised to make their fifth hire of an underrepresented minority candidate in as many years.

      Astley made the point that after hiring we are not good at retaining and promoting female faculty members. Chapman said the legislation was originally intended to address hiring and retention but the focus of this resolution was to promote this practice in hiring, and her intent was to bring a separate resolution forward in the future.

      Some members expressed concern about language seeming to require department heads to make improvement. Provost Cauce indicated that any requirements would be approved by her in consultation with the Office of Faculty Advancement. She hoped this would be implemented at the college level and tailored to the needs of each unit.

      A motion was made to amend the last line to add the word ‘reporting’ after the words ‘as well as.’ The motion passed.
The resolution was approved as amended.

c. **Approval of the January 29, 2015, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit J]**
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

There was a motion to remove item 11.B., A Resolution Concerning Childcare. The motion was approved. The agenda was approved as amended.

10. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.

Prepared by: [Signature] Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: [Signature] Kate O'Neill, Chair
Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
Kate O’Neill, Professor, Law

I hope everyone enjoyed a restorative winter break. Please take the time to review the agenda and supporting materials. In particular, we will be considering two important proposed Class C resolutions today, one concerning diversity training to promote more hiring and better retention of diverse faculty, and the other concerning greater support for childcare on or near campus. Both deserve careful review.

**Update on Proposed Faculty Salary Policy**

I’ll take a moment to update this committee on the deliberations over the proposed new faculty salary policy. I am pleased to report that at the last Senate meeting in December, senators engaged in a vibrant, constructive discussion of the proposed salary policy. Senators took their representative jobs seriously. As a result, we heard from many different schools and departments and a great variety of issues and questions were raised. A summary of the discussion can be found in the December 4 Faculty Senate minutes being approved at this meeting. Although we did not take a straw poll, I thought the tenor of the discussions was generally supportive, although there were a significant number of specific concerns.

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is taking note of the Senate discussion as the FCFA members continue their hard work on translating the proposal into code language. FCFA Chair Joe Janes anticipates that he will be able to bring proposed code changes to the SEC at our second meeting this quarter. If this body approves, then the Senate will consider the proposed code changes in spring quarter.

In the meantime, we will host a town hall meeting to which all faculty are invited on February 4, 2015, at 2:45 - 5:15 p.m. in 147 Architecture. The meeting will be recorded and available after the meeting on the Senate website. We plan to begin with a panel discussion among a group of faculty members and administrators representing diverse units and perspectives. Audience members will have an opportunity to raise issues and questions afterwards.

**New Payroll System**

We continue to work with the administration on implementation of a new payroll system, scheduled to launch at the end of December 2015. This is an enormously complex and expensive project – but it is plain that the UW cannot continue with the 40 year-old legacy system. We will continue to work with the administration to ensure that faculty, student employees, and staff are informed about procedural changes and about the costs to units. Cheryl Scott, the project director, will be making a presentation to the Senate, among other venues, early next fall. In the meantime, you can find more information, including FAQs, here: [http://f2.washington.edu/teams/hrp/](http://f2.washington.edu/teams/hrp/).

**Continuing projects**

We are following up with the Provost to improve access to accurate faculty demographics and to analyze the implications of that data.

Another project follows up on last year’s committee and task force work on lecturers. We are considering whether we need to change faculty code or Academic HR policies, or both, for instructional faculty appointments.

We continue our efforts to monitor and participate in efforts to update and improve UW policies governing intellectual property management. We are coordinating the work of the Senate Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization, the Faculty Council on Research, and the Faculty Council on Libraries, with the President’s Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee, Educational Outreach, Information Technologies, and the Center for Commercialization. We hope to gather information about diverse faculty and students’ teaching and research needs and goals, recommend appropriate changes to UW’s intellectual property policies, and to educate faculty and students about best practices. Among the many issues under consideration is an initiative to encourage open source publication of research and teaching materials.
In closing, I note that we have begun the biennial budget-setting process in Olympia. I will defer to JoAnn Taricani’s great expertise on what that may entail. Much of the remainder of our work this year will require us to think carefully about preserving core priorities in a period of challenging and uncertain finances, but I worry that our prolonged financial challenges make many faculty entirely focused on coping with internal budgets. In the public square, however, these are interesting times. I cannot recall a time when there was as much public attention on issues concerning the funding of education, including higher education, and the state’s tax structure. I think we do our future students and colleagues a disfavor if faculty cannot figure out better ongoing ways to persuade the public that an excellent, affordable education and first-class, disinterested research are public goods that merit more public funding. We should not leave this entirely to administrators and public relations officers. Since the SEC and the Senate’s traditional agendas do not easily accommodate such discussions, I hope that you will let me know by email if you are interested in joining an informal group to brainstorm how to advocate more effectively within ethics rules.
1. Joseph (“Joey”) Burgess has joined the office of faculty governance in the role of supporting faculty councils. He replaces Grayson Court who has moved to a new position. Joey is a graduate of the University of Oregon where he previously worked in their Faculty Senate office.

2. The vice chair nominating committee is accepting nominations for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2015. Please consider nominating colleagues you believe could serve in this important faculty leadership position. Final candidates will be presented to the Senate Executive Committee at its February 9, 2015, meeting.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting, 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.

Here are the topics that SCPB has discussed since my last report to the Senate. We plan to start posting documents and data related to all of these discussions on the SCPB website soon.

Faculty salary survey

On December 1, we received a report from the Office of Planning and Budgeting on how UW Faculty salaries have changed from 2007 to 2014. Overall, faculty salaries at the Associate Professor and Professor levels were nearly flat from 2008 to 2012 (and actually declined several percentage points when adjusted for inflation), and then increased about 5% to 6% per year from 2012 to 2014. At the Assistant Professor level, salaries continued their historical pattern of rising considerably faster than inflation, even during the depths of the recession. As a consequence, salary compression, always a significant problem, has increased dramatically.

Executive salaries

We also had a discussion about executive salaries, prompted by a widely circulated report that described the University of Washington as the "fifth most unequal" public university. It turned out that this dubious distinction had been based on erroneous or outdated information, and a corrected version of the report placed Delaware in that position instead of UW; but even so, we thought it would be useful to find out how UW stacks up on the various measures that the report authors (Andrew Erwin and Marjorie Wood of the Institute for Policy Studies) had been looking at: excessive executive pay, high student debt, and large increases in low-wage and/or contingent faculty labor. We asked the Office of Planning and Budgeting to report to us on these measures.

Here’s a summary of what we found out: (1) President Young’s 2012-2013 salary was 19th highest among public university presidents. (2) Average student debt load is moderate compared to national averages, with half of all UW undergraduates graduating with zero debt, and with those that did borrow having an average debt load of $21,263, compared to the national average of $25,000. (3) Although there was a large and well-documented increase in lecturer hiring at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses from 2006 to 2013, that trend seems to have abated, and the percentage of lecturers at UW-Seattle has not changed significantly in recent years; while recent directives by the provost (see below) should have the effect of increasing lecturers’ job security and opportunities for salary advancement. There was some concern about the president receiving a 6.2% raise while other faculty and staff were receiving only 4% on average. But on the whole, the consensus of SCPB seemed to be that while there is still work to be done in improving the UW’s allocation of resources, the alarming “fifth most unequal” headline was not justified,

State Audit Report

On January 5, we heard a report about the audit of UW commissioned by the State of Washington. In general, the audit report was favorable, and the recommendations it did make were primarily concerned with improving communication between the university and the state, and improving the consistency of accounting procedures, goals that the UW administration supports.

RCEP for Graduate Certificate in Global Trade, Transportation, and Logistics

The Graduate School requested the elimination of the interdisciplinary Graduate Certificate in Global Trade, Transportation, and Logistics. Because the content of the certificate program has been incorporated into a new Master’s program in transportation logistics offered by the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, members of SCPB decided to recommend to the Provost that this be treated as a “Limited RCEP” (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedure).
Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) program

Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, informed us that the university is considering offering another round of the Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) program, with enrollment to be open from July 1 to December 31, 2015, for those planning to retire between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016. The number of eligible faculty members and the expected cost are closely comparable to the corresponding figures for the last offering (10/1/13-3/31/14). Members of SCPB reacted positively to the proposal.

Overview of the Governor’s budget

Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani and Assistant Vice Provost Sarah Hall reported on Governor Inslee’s 2015-2017 budget proposal. A brief on the proposal from the Office of Planning and Budgeting is available here. The most important area of concern is that while the governor proposes $40 million in additional funds for the university, after various obligations are covered it is not nearly enough to pay for the governor’s proposed extension of the resident undergraduate tuition freeze. The budget will go through many revisions before it becomes final, so we need to watch carefully as it develops.

Guidelines for lecturer hiring

Provost Cauce reported on the directions that she gave to deans and chancellors this past fall about hiring and recruiting lecturers. The main new expectation is that expectation that units will use open and competitive recruitments for all part-time lecturers hired on an annual basis at 50% FTE or more (not just full-time ones).

Here are some topics we plan to discuss in future meetings. For agendas, see http://uw.edu/faculty/senate/scpb/agendas.

- Provost reinvestment fund requests
- Reports from the Colleges of Engineering and the Environment
- Administrative review of services and overhead rates
- Financial aid
- Undergraduate and graduate tuition setting process
- Faculty retention, recruitment, & separations
- Global Innovation Exchange
- Transportation services and UPass
- Unit adjustments
- Intercollegiate athletics: effects of new NCAA rules
- Capital campaign update
- Sponsorships and branding
- North Campus Housing Plan
- Childcare planning
- EO & online degrees
- Libraries
- Research funding, RRF
- Activity Based Budgeting
- Infrastructure costs in the operating budget
- Sustainable Academic Business Plan
- Tri-campus planning
- C4C
- Intellectual Property Policy
- Learning Spaces Project
Faculty legislative report (01-12-2015)

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative

Legislative session 2015:

Policy bills are already submitted and increasing in number each day; hearing in the first four weeks of the legislative session will determine which bills will proceed past their filing. So far, bills that might affect higher education relate to financial aid, medical treatments, and operational issues (agency planning and oversight). We will have a better sense of which bills are moving forward by the end of February. I will provide updates as needed, when bills that affect our academic mission have hearings and move out of the committee of origin.

Several key members of the higher education committees have already indicated their support of fully funding higher education in order to maintain the quality of higher education, while also holding tuition levels steady. See, for example, this joint statement from Senator David Frockt, member of the Senate Higher Education Committee and Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles, the ranking member of the Senate Higher Education Committee (also linked at the legislative website below):
http://sdc.wastateleg.org/frocket/2014/12/11/frockt-kohl-welles-call-for-full-funding-for-higher-education/

The Governor’s proposed budget (issued 12-19-14) – overview:

The Governor’s budget is a starting point for discussion in Olympia; it is always the first proposal of the legislative session. The next budget proposals, from the House and Senate, cannot appear until after the publication of the next official economic forecast on March 18, 2015. Almost always, the final approved state budget looks very different from the first proposal, and Governor Inslee’s budget provides higher education with many issues to pursue with legislators.

A significant point of context for this first budget proposal of the 2015 session is that it does not take into account a joint request from the six presidents of the four-year universities of the state: a request that the state invest $198 million (total to all six institutions) to offset a continuation of the freeze of undergraduate resident tuition at the level of 2012-13 and to continue to provide a high quality of learning, along with the current levels of access and productivity. The proposed budget does not provide this investment, and also would create a cut to the base budget because of the proposed method of funding all pay increases. (For related documents and analysis, see: www.tinyurl.com/uwolympia)

Details of the Governor’s budget proposal (Book 2):

Much of the budget is focused on K-12 education, as expected, given its large proportion of the state budget and the need to address the requirements of the McCleary decision to fully fund K-12 education.

Tuition: In higher education, the Governor proposes to freeze resident undergraduate tuition for two more years; if the Legislature agrees, resident undergraduate tuition will have been at the same level for five years by the end of academic year 2016-17. His position on other categories of tuition will be clarified in the full budget.

Investment in higher education: But, as noted above, this budget provides no offset of funding to universities for the tuition freeze he proposes. Last week, the Council of Presidents (COP, presidents of the four-year universities) stated that the amount of funding that would be necessary to offset two more years of a tuition freeze for resident undergraduates ($198 million for all four-year universities for the biennium). The COP took the same position for the 2013-15 budget, asking for a $225 million offset for the current biennium, which eventually was included in the final budget.
**Pay increases:** The Governor’s budget proposed to provide all state employees with a 3% pay increase in July 2015 and a 1.8% increase in July 2016. There is also permissive language that would allow other pay increases in higher education, provided that additional increases would not create a new carryforward obligation for the state.

**Funding pay increases:** The Governor’s proposed method of funding all UW raises (including collective bargaining agreements) represents a marked change in state policy, which would essentially cut the base budget. As noted by the UW Office of Planning and Budgeting (OPB; analysis linked above):

> “Although the Governor’s budget provides the UW with $40 million more in general funds for 2015-17 than the UW received in 2013-15, the call on these funds is significant. In particular, the Governor’s budget assumes that the UW will cover one-third of total compensation increases using state funds and two-thirds using tuition revenue.”

**Bottom line:** Ultimately, although there is an appearance of a $40 million increase to the budget of the UW, there is no net gain, and to again quote the UW OPB: “once salary increases are covered, recognized additional operational needs are met and dedicated funds are removed from the equation, there are no new state funds. In fact, the loss of resident undergraduate authority and the increased compensation expenses we would bear could result in potential unit-level shortfalls.”

**Financial aid:** The Governor proposes to invest $125.5 million in all of higher education, particularly the Opportunity Scholarships for STEM fields ($100 million, which would be matched by private contributions), College Bound Scholarships, and the State Need Grant ($25.5 million combined for these two, primarily supporting the College Bound program).

**Increased access:** At the UW, 150 new student slots are budgeted to expand access to programs in computer science and engineering will be added; at WSU, the budget provides 75 new slots in computer science, and at WWU, CWU, EWU, and TESC, 400 new student slots (total) for majors in mathematics and science would be added.

**Capital projects:** The Governor’s proposed capital budget includes the full requested amount for CSE Expansion ($40 million) as well as appropriations for the design of the Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies ($6.6 million), and Clean Energy Research Test Beds ($12 million). The budget also supports Health Sciences Education: MHSC T-wing Renovation predesign ($623,000), Nursing Simulation Lab ($4 million), Interprofessional Education (IPE) Classroom ($3 million). The proposed budget also supports the completion of the phased renovation of Lewis Hall, and includes funding for the Burke Museum ($16 million), which is less than the Burke’s request of $46 million.
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:

1. Creation of an ad hoc subcommittee on questions associated with courses, joint with FCTL
2. Participating in 2 taskforces: Taskforce on Enrollment and Taskforce on Online Education

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

1. Advocate changing increased faculty contributions at age 50 from "opt-in" to "opt-out."
2. Provide through the faculty senate process information to faculty regarding benefits and retirement.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

FCFA is continuing to work on language to revise the Faculty Code regarding the proposed faculty salary policy, with a goal to send to the Senate and the faculty in Spring Quarter.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

FCMA is holding joint meetings with the Faculty Council on Women in Academia to address specific issues that impact faculty demographics, including:

- Tenure demographics
- Lecturers
- Mentoring
- Data
- Faculty salary policy

Faculty Council on Research

The FCR is working with IPM, SCIPC, and C4C on a new Policy on Intellectual Property (Revisions to EO 36). We are discussing a possible resolution to be brought to the SEC and the Faculty Senate for creation of a UW “open access” repository for UW scholarly and research publications. The FCR is also focusing on barriers for collaborative, interdisciplinary research and teaching imposed by ABB and determining what services are currently available (or needed) for faculty to meet all of the regulatory requirements needed for conducting research at the UW. We will also be consulting with the Office of Financial Management on the negotiations with HSS on new F and A rates.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs (FCSA) is "responsible for all matters of policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare." (Faculty Code, Sec 42-38.)

The FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students. The major issues that have come before the Council so far this year are:

- Childcare Facilities;
- Diversity;
- Enrollment Management;
- Quality of Student Life;
- Student Athletes;
- Student Conduct Code; and,
- Student Financing & Debt.
7 October: The first meeting of the 2014-2015 academic year featured Elizabeth Lewis who discussed the Faculty Appeal Board.

4 November: Faculty Senate Chair, Kate O'Neill briefly met with the Council, to welcome members, and inform them of the important role that they play in share governance. Elizabeth Lewis returned to provide an update on the revision of the Student Conduct Code. This is an ongoing activity which will result in a complete reorganization of the code, clarification of the responsibilities of students, and a restructuring of the appeal processes.

2 December: Kay Lewis (Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment, Executive and Director of Student Financial Aid) was present to discuss student loan debt. Lewis provided an overview of different forms of undergraduate aid by type (scholarships/grants/loans/work study) and source (federal/state/university/private) and residential status. Lewis also provided results of cost of attendance by family income and statistics covering grants awarded to students with need. Patricia Kramer (Chair of the Council on Academic Standards) and Hailey Badger (ASUW representative) joined in the discussion stressing the need to factor in financial need and family contribution to available forms of financial aid for students.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

1. Update on FCTL Report on Hybrid Online Learning: On April 4, 2013, former FCTL chair Jan Carline transmitted to President Young the council’s report on hybrid online learning. At its January 9, 2014, the council hosted Jim Gregory, co-chair of the UW Task Force on Online Learning, to learn the scope of its work and its relevance to FCTL’s mission. On February 25, 2014, President Young responded to the 2013 FCTL letter (a copy of the letter was forwarded to the Senate leadership and Faculty Secretary). The president thanked FCTL for its efforts, then went on to cite several UW teaching-with-technology success stories. At the same time, the president indicated that he shares FCTL’s concerns about maintaining quality and monitoring faculty effort with regard to online teaching and recognized there “is considerably more work to do.” In response to FCTL’s recommendation for supplemental faculty funding for support of hybrid courses, he indicated that he and the provost are giving it “serious consideration,” indicating that such support is central to their vision in the 2Y/2D initiative and in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

2. FCTL continues to address faculty concerns over access to student course evaluations outside UW. In 2012, Nana Lowell (UW-OEA) learned that students from the Information School had provided public access to results of student evaluations of courses they obtained from a web site accessible only to those with a UW NetID. The practice of giving access to these evaluations only to individuals with NetIDs had been put in place based on discussions in the former Faculty Council on Instructional Quality, after consulting the Attorney General’s office. This was done because of two concerns, the first being potentially inappropriate use of faculty evaluations by individuals not affiliated with the university, and the second being restrictions on the publication of evaluations of teaching assistants included in the bargaining agreements with their union. An inquiry about this matter was referred to the Attorney General’s office for advice, but the AG’s office has ignored the request. At its February 2014 members of the FCTL supported adding a disclaimer to the web site for faculty teaching evaluations warning that the information is intended solely for the use of individuals within the University of Washington community and that redistribution to anyone who does not have a current UW NetID is prohibited.

3. FCTL provided advice on a number of teaching and technology issues this year, including the move to paperless, online course evaluations (and its possible effect on response rates), use of anti-plagiarism software, transition to the Canvas learning system, possible transition from Tegrity to Panopto and the possible integration of E-Texts and Catalyst.

4. Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs Gerald Baldasty requested that he be added as a “regularly invited guest” for all FCTL meetings. The council members agreed. He has also requested FCTL support and assistance in implementing the UW Two Years to Two Decades Initiative.
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

1. Conducting a review of tri-campus information dissemination and faculty member representation between the three faculty governance structures.
2. Reviewing issues related to student conduct code violations and how they are disseminated and treated if/when student seeks cross-campus enrollment.
3. Examination of processes related to cross-campus degrees/minors and role of UW Curriculum Committee.
4. Coordinated Faculty Senate communication of tri-campus awareness regarding governance, policies, new issues, budget, etc.
5. Budget and legislative representation related to tri-campus strategic planning.
6. Discussion of potential issues related to “UWS/B/T self-sustaining and distance learning degree programs and cross-campus implications.
7. Examination of variations/changes to faculty handbook that affect UWT/UWB faculty.
8. Cross-campus faculty research activities/opportunities — and an examination of selection processes related to limited submission research applications from the University of Washington.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

The Council toured the new Mercer dormitories, in anticipation of another round of dormitory construction replacing the northeast campus dormitories. In general construction is cheaper than renovation and seismic upgrading. The UW student dorm lifestyle is a considerable improvement on the ones in the memories of the Council members.

The Council heard a report on the campus Wayfinding Study from the campus Landscape Architect. At its roots this is about consistent signage on campus.

The Council discussed the issue of faculty governance review of capital projects. This was also discussed at a recent SCPB meeting. The takeaway was that the SCPB and Senate leadership expect FCUFS to do these reviews. The Capital Projects Office (CPO) has agreed to present revisions to the Capital Plan to FCUFS (and will do so in April). CPO has also agreed to add a box to the project flowchart for FCUFS review, and let the FCUFS chair know about projects going to the Regents for approval. The goal is for the FCUFS chair to advise the Senate Chair of whether the project has been reviewed by FCUFS, and any unresolved issues, prior to the project going to the Regents.

Future issues: Spring: Sound Transit. Transportation review. Capital Plan review. New CSE building. Fall: NE campus dorms. We’ll also hear a report from the transportation committee liaison on UPASS for faculty and staff.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

The FCUL met in October and December 2014. At the October meeting, the role of the Council was reviewed. At the December meeting Vice Provost/Dean Wilson summarized the UW Libraries’ strategic plan for the next three years around the themes of Collections and Access; Research and Scholarship; Teaching and Learning; and Organizational Effectiveness.

The FCUL will be involved in Collections and Access as it participates in ongoing dialog with other Faculty Senate groups regarding open access and information sharing by UW faculty and students. The UW Libraries will be piloting a Data Repository as a method for faculty to deposit data; this process will be followed by FCUL. Open access publishing by faculty is an active topic for discussion by FCUL. Finally FCUL is hearing and commenting on student discussions regarding ‘open access textbooks’. Although no specific actions were taken on these topics in the fall, they will be major discussion items in the remaining academic year and may lead to the development of specific recommendations by FCUL. The FCUL continues to observe and advise, as requested, on infrastructural work by UW Libraries. It is planning to tour the newly-opened Data Science Studio in the former Physics/Astronomy library space in conjunction with its January 2015 meeting, and may re-visit the recently refurbished Odegaard Library and meet its new Director, John Dannicker in the Winter or Spring 2015 quarter.
Faculty Council on Women in Academia

FCWA is meeting jointly with FCMA; please see updates under FCMA.

Approved council minutes are available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/.
2014 – 2015 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30)

- Aaron Vetter, GPSS, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 1:30)

- Jewel Evenson, GPSS, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

- Thaïsa Way, College of Built Environments, Landscape Architecture, as a member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2017.
Learning Spaces Initiative
Winter Quarter 2015 update

This is the second year of our work on making more efficient use of classrooms at our Seattle campus.

Our goals:
1. Make more efficient use of current classrooms, so that we can avoid construction of additional classrooms. A second Kane Hall-like facility would cost between $75m and $100m.
2. To respond to faculty and student concerns about how we schedule classes now, availability of well-equipped classrooms, and the current 10-minute pass time between classes.

We began our work on this topic last year, with:
1. A broad-based faculty and staff committee
2. Support from several consultants
3. An overview of how we use classrooms now
4. Extensive interviews with a wide range of stakeholders at the Seattle campus (Note: this is a Seattle initiative only)
5. Some peer benchmarking (to find out what other major universities do in terms of scheduling).

Note: Changes would go into effect in autumn 2016.

What we found in our work last year:
1. We have a huge variety of class schedules. Some classes start on the half hour, others on the hour, some run for 50 minutes, some 75 or 90 minutes. Some classes might meet daily, others MWF, or others still, MThursFriday. The result of this great array of class times means that some classrooms sit vacant for 30-45 minutes or more, even during the “prime time” hours of late morning and early afternoon.
2. Our use of classrooms is heavy during the “prime time” hours of 9:30 am to 3:30pm; we make little use of earlier or later times, and on Thursdays and Fridays, we see a drop off in classes after 1:30 pm.
   a. We are trying to crowd most of our classes into about half of the time available. So many do not get classrooms they want, and we end up having to scramble to find rooms for classes.
   i. In autumn 2014, our class scheduling systems were simply unable to accommodate the flood of prime-time requests, so more than 700 classes had to be scheduled manually. For winter 2015, more than 950 classes had to be scheduled manually.
3. Some units inflate class size estimates in order to obtain specific rooms during “prime time”, which has led to significant under-utilization of rooms (e.g., a class with 35-50 students in a room that accommodates 200 or more), thus blocking other faculty and students from using that classroom efficiently.
4. Both faculty and staff have told us that the current 10-minute pass time is insufficient.
5. In essence: Our scheduling system is no longer working
6. Our consultants advised us that, by more efficient scheduling, we could reduce the number of classrooms we need, from the current main campus inventory of ~310 down to 280 or below. That would free up some rooms –especially rooms in the 20-40 person capacity size – for other uses. Fewer classrooms would also mean a faster improvement/remodeling and repair schedule.

Consequently we are exploring a variety of options:
1. Block Schedules. We are exploring the use of clearly defined time blocks with an associated number of days.
2. Schedule Distribution. What requirements or incentives should we have to move more classes into off peak times? This might also include expansion of the daily schedule, with classes starting at 8 am.
3. Pass Time: We are studying implications of increasing the pass time from 10 to 15 minutes. This would take some time to get used to, but other universities use such pass times without problems.

Benefits of changing our current approach to class scheduling:
1. For students:
   a. Consistent scheduling blocks will minimize course overlap, making academic planning easier.
b. Increased predictability of course times, making it easier to schedule co-curricular activities (internships, work, etc.).
2. For students and faculty: Increased pass time will allow students to get to class on time, and give faculty time to set up technology or distribute material needed for class.
3. For faculty: Reducing prime-time pressures for rooms will make it possible to provide faculty with the same class rooms in successive quarters or years.
4. For UW: More efficient use of current rooms will save millions of dollars --$70 to $100 million-- that would be needed for construction of new classroom buildings.

What we have learned from Autumn Quarter campus consultations
1. Distribution of classes. We will think about “carrots” to help units—e.g., if a faculty member is willing to teach class at 3:30 pm, and needs the technology afforded by a particular room, we will work to provide multi-year guarantees for access to that classroom.
2. We will ask units/departments to figure out how best to use more hours of the day in scheduling. Department schedulers know what times need special attention (e.g., faculty meetings and colloquia times), so departments will have a good deal of autonomy in addressing how best to spread classes throughout the day.
3. We will also monitor issues of enrollment estimate inflation; Units will not be able to repeatedly “game” the system by overstating enrollment estimates in order to get certain classrooms.

We will be back in spring quarter with the options we identify.

FOR NOW
1. We need any advice you have for us. If you give us advice NOW, we can consider it. In spring, we will be seeking input on options already formulated, so there will be less ability to consider a lot of new ideas.
2. Please share this information with colleagues—faculty, staff, and students.

Let us know your thoughts:
Baldasty@uw.edu
pjreid@uw.edu
edtrends@uw.edu
Findings of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

Official request for Faculty Code Interpretation: Appointment and promotion of part time lecturers and part time senior lecturers.

Question:

1. Are part-time lecturers eligible for consideration for promotion to senior lecturer, part time?
2. Is a Senior Lecturer, Part-time, eligible for consideration for promotion to Principal Lecturer, Part-time?
3. May a faculty member be appointed as Principal Lecturer, Part time?

Response from the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

General Comment:

Behind these questions (and our responses) lie some clear difficulties with the use of the term 'promotion' in connection with what are renewable, term appointments in the Lecturer titles.

There are two distinct occasions where something like a 'promotion' can occur: 1) during the term of one appointment, a Lecturer could be proposed for 'promotion' to a higher title (24-41.C); and 2) at the end of a term of appointment a colleague could be offered a renewed appointment at a higher title, and some would use the term 'promotion' (we think incorrectly) in such cases.

The former would appear to us to be a 'promotion' that would lie in the power of a dean to effect (under 24-54.D), while the latter is instead a 'new' appointment (i.e., after the end of a previous term appointment) and would require approval by the President (under 24-52.C.1). The term 'renewal of appointment' (24-53; and cf. 24-41), in our judgment, applies ONLY to reappointment at the same rank (i.e., Ass't Prof) or the same title (i.e., Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer).

To address your specific questions:

1. Are part-time lecturers eligible for consideration for promotion to senior lecturer, part time?

Our response: Nothing in the Faculty Code (or current practice) prevents the 'promotion', or the appointment, of a Lecturer (part-time) to the position of Senior Lecturer (part-time).

2. Is a Senior Lecturer, Part-time, eligible for consideration for promotion to Principal Lecturer, Part-time?

Our response: Likewise, nothing in the Faculty Code prevents the 'promotion', or the appointment, of a Senior Lecturer (part-time) to the position of Principal Lecturer (part-time).

3. May a faculty member be appointed as Principal Lecturer, Part time?

Our response: Interpreting this question to mean, more precisely, 'May someone who does not presently hold a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer position be appointed as Principal Lecturer, Part time?', we find nothing in the Faculty Code that prevents this: i.e., that a candidate for a new appointment could be initially appointed to the UW faculty with the title of Principal Lecturer (part-time).

On the other hand, however, since final authority for new appointments resides with the President/Regents, there is nothing in the Faculty Code that would prevent the President/Provost from restricting appointments to this title only to those who have previously served as Lecturers/Senior Lecturers at UW. In other words, while the Faculty Code does not conceive of Principal Lecturer as only a 'promotional' title (and we are not aware of this being the legislative intent when the matter was debated and voted upon by the faculty), it is clearly within the authority of the President to restrict new appointments in this fashion, and since each renewal of all those with term appointments, such as those
with Lecturer titles (whether full- or part-time), is in fact a new appointment, it follows that the President’s requirement is not explicitly in violation of the letter of the Faculty Code.

For the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations,
Mícheál Vaughan
Chair
Resolution Concerning Equity, Access and Inclusion in Hiring

WHEREAS, the leadership of the University of Washington is committed to a broad vision of excellence that requires equity, access and inclusion, which is upheld by our institutional Diversity Mission statement: “diversity is integral to excellence. We value and honor diverse experiences and perspectives, strive to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promote access, opportunity and justice for all” (UW Diversity Mission Statement 2014); and

WHEREAS, consistent with this vision and mission of excellence, the UW has implemented, with University-wide faculty endorsement, important changes to the Faculty Code related to diversity work in promotion and tenure assessment, an Undergraduate Diversity Requirement, and passed Class C Bulletin No. 525 Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographic Concerns, (November 29, 2012); and

WHEREAS, in order to empower current and future UW faculty to contribute to its dynamic vision and mission of excellence, they must be equipped with resources and skills to achieve our commitment to diversity through the above changes to tenure and promotion assessment and undergraduate teaching, and to respond to UW’s faculty demographic concerns; and

WHEREAS, the UW commitment to diversity work in faculty promotion, tenure assessment and teaching should begin at the point of recruitment and hiring; and

WHEREAS, current research on faculty excellence and diversity suggests that gaps in equity, access and inclusion in hiring are linked to patterns of institutional bias, and that these often unconscious practices can be productively addressed through interactive training that helps committees successfully hire more diverse and excellent faculties; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that all University of Washington faculty search committees be given a mandate and adequate resources to participate in some form of "Equity, Access and Inclusion in Hiring" training developed in collaboration with the Office for Faculty Advancement that informs participants on best practices regarding faculty candidate outreach, assessment, recruitment and retention; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all UW unit heads are accountable to University leadership for making improvements in the area of faculty diversity by reporting unit participation in “Equity, Access and Inclusion Hiring” training efforts as well as reporting diversity hiring activities and outcomes.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Faculty Council on Women in Academia

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
January 12, 2015
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, January 29, 2015, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Kate O’Neill.

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

4. President’s Remarks– Michael K. Young.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of October 6, 2014.
   a. Approval of the November 17, 2014, SEC minutes.
   b. Approval of the December 4, 2014, Faculty Senate minutes.
   d. Official Request for Faculty Code Interpretation.

6. Memorial Resolution

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.

9. Invited Guest: UW Learning Spaces Update – Gerald Baldasty, Senior Vice Provost for Academic
   and Student Affairs.

10. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class C Resolution
      Title: Resolution concerning equity, access and inclusion in hiring.
      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.*

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien
Approved by: Kate O’Neill, Chair
Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty
Kate O’Neill, Chair
Faculty Senate

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