Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 24, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Jack Lee called the meeting to order at 2:38pm. The agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor Jack Lee. [Exhibit A]

Chair Lee introduced Norman Beauchamp, who was recently elected as the Faculty Senate Vice Chair for 2014-15. Lee encouraged participation in Faculty Councils and other university committees, and stressed the importance of nominating candidates for the Senate Executive Committee. He anticipated an opportunity for discussion of the faculty salary policy at the end of today’s meeting.


President Young reminded the faculty of the upcoming commencement and invited their participation. He addressed admissions, noting that the applicant numbers increased, with a robust increase in out-of-state applicants. Applications for graduate and professional degrees also increased after a period of relative stability in recent years. He addressed some of the highlights of the recent legislative session, noting that the legislature approved a change in pay periods from bimonthly to every two weeks, which saves the University considerable money. The University did not receive any major additional funds, but some small investments were made, including the exploration of opening a law school branch in Tacoma.

In response to a request from Senate Chair Lee, President Young commented on his vision for overall funding plans for the university into the future. This is the start of a needed conversation about an immense issue. He doesn’t expect to see a significant shift back to funding patterns of the past where higher education was seen as a public good and strongly supported by public funds. About 42% of the state budget goes to health care; 45% to public education; this leaves few funds for other public needs. To change this there would need to be changes in the cost structure of health care and public education or increased revenues, none of which he expects to occur in the near future. There is no single ‘magic bullet’ but rather a need to approach needs from a variety of funding streams: tuition, research funding, and partnerships. Increased tuition could deny access to higher education for potential students unless financial aid can also be increased. UW has continued to be successful in obtaining increased and a larger share of federal research and foundation funding. He expressed concern that foundations may be shifting away from supporting basic research. Creating partnerships with the private sector for research and student funding has potential pitfalls but also presents an opportunity. Finally, additional revenue streams need to be explored. This may include monetizing the knowledge we have through online education or professional master’s degrees, for example. Fund raising is very important, however, those funds are often targeted, not discretionary, and increasingly goal oriented. Young said we must keep a clear eye on core values, which may include streamlining the institution through administrative and infrastructure reductions. Teaching expenses may decrease somewhat through technology and we should cut things that are not essential to core values and have continued historically. Lastly, we must have a clear eyed evaluation of costs associated with activities that are ‘good’ but not ‘essential.’ There is no easy answer; a transparent and collaborative approach must be used.

Questions and discussion:

Faculty expressed appreciation to the President’s remarks and also questioned how seriously the university has explored new ideas like “pay it forward”. Young reflected on concerns about increasing student debt and approaches to address it thoughtfully. A faculty member expressed concern about the shrinking middle class and its impact on needs for financial aid. Another faculty member suggested that the conversation about funding needs to be held with our students and their parents rather than corporate partners. A faculty member pointed out that the UW ranks highly among national peers on access and affordability. Most state voters are not UW grads, college graduates or parents of UW grads; the economic benefits we provide to the state need to be presented.
Duane Storti asked about the rationale for passing administrative expense from the new HR/Payroll system down to units. Young answered that the system will have a significant upfront cost, but will be mitigated by long term savings in risk management and staff resources. Cost will be distributed to units based on how they use those services. Storti expressed his concern with how it will affect his unit. Young was confident that the new system will meet expectations. Deans and department chairs are being consulted about the impact on their units.

Alex Merz expressed concern over the use of Canvas. President Young asked that he be in touch with Kelly Trosvig.

4. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair Kate O’Neill presented the memorial resolution:

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Professor Emeritus Robert Burgner of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, who died on January 9, 2014, after having served the University since 1949.

Associate Professor Stephanie Camp of History, who died on April 2, 2014, after having served the University since 1998.

Lecturer Lloyd Guy Hammel Jr. of Business, who died on March 29, 2014, after having served the University since 1990.

Associate Professor Emeritus Sidney Miller of Social Work, who died on February 16, 2014, after having served the University since 1962.

Clinical Professor Emeritus Robert William Simpson of Medicine, who died on February 13, 2014, after having served the University since 1950.

Professor Emeritus Robert Lee Van Citters of Physiology & Biophysics, who died on December 7, 2013, after having served the University since 1962.

The Senate approved the resolution by a standing vote.

5. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.

      i. Approval of the *February 10, 2014*, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the *February 27, 2014*, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Faculty Council Activities. [Exhibit B]
      iv. Report of the UWEO Search. [Exhibit C]
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit D]
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit E]
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

There were no questions.


   a. Athletics Report – Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics; Pete Dukes, Professor of Accounting and Faculty Athletic Representative.

Scott Woodward and Pete Dukes presented their regular report on student athletes to the Senate.

Professor Dukes commented on his report on student athletes’ academic performance. All but 2 of 40 specially admitted students are continuing and succeeding academically. He described the focus of ACIA. He pointed out the diversity of majors among student athletes. He expressed concern about the increasing number of competitive majors on campus and its effect on student athletes’ choice of majors. NCAA is
proposing changes in ways universities can support student athletes through allowing coverage of the full cost of attendance. Coverage of medical costs beyond college is also a concern. Dukes commented on the issues of unionization of student athletes and how it could affect the UW.

Scott Woodward emphasized the positive reputation of the UW athletics program. He pointed out several academic awards received by student athletes and also the UW’s athletic performance achievements. He supports paying the full cost of student attendance. He reported that the UW’s athletic program’s financial status is healthy. Donor contributions are critically important to operate without a deficit. He explained his position on athletics contributions to the overall university and his reluctance to do so based on his concern on needing a healthy reserve, and that a certain level of a reserve is required by the University for debt service on the loan for the new stadium. Several faculty and Woodward debated the use of athletic revenues.

Duane Storti asked why it isn’t appropriate for the Athletic Department to pay for scholarships of student athletes. Woodward said that if certain other contributions weren’t being made to the University that might be an option. Jim Gregory asked how much the surplus is. Woodward said the number is slightly over 20 million dollars. Woodward expressed that the University is lucky that he isn’t asking for additional money.

Discussion focused on how student athletes function socially and academically as compared to non-student athletes. Dukes confirmed that students can extend their scholarship beyond their playing years to complete their education.

b. A representative of the English language extension lecturers will give an update on their efforts to conclude their contract negotiations.

Peter Messenger, a representative of the English language extension lecturers, presented his comments on the status of contract negotiations to the Senate, at the request of Jack Lee, Senate Chair. Provost Cauce responded with the administrative position.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Confirm JoAnn Taricani, Professor of Music History, as 2014-2015 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2014 and ending July 31, 2015.

There were no objections and the consent agenda was approved.

8. Announcements.

There were no announcements.


There was no unfinished business.

   a. Class A legislation – First Consideration. [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed new faculty position: Professor of Practice.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

Vice Chair Kate O’Neill moved the legislation and introduced Gordon Watts, chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, who introduced the legislation. His presentation was interrupted due to another group claiming the room and an apparent scheduling conflict. There was a call for quorum and quorum was not present. The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m., to be continued at a date to be determined. At that time the remainder of the agenda will be taken up.

Chair Jack Lee called the continuation meeting to order at 2:45 p.m. He explained the format for continuation meeting and that the meeting will resume with the presentation of Class A legislation on the proposed new faculty position: Professor of Practice.

   a. Class A legislation – First Consideration, Continued [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Title: Proposed new faculty position: Professor of Practice.
      Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

Kurt Johnson, representing the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, re-introduced the legislation. Johnson spoke about the process in the council and how the name Professor of Practice was chosen. He also spoke about the concerns from FCFA, including voting rights and tenure.

A question was asked about how many of these similar appointments are occurring. Johnson said that it ranges from one to fifteen, depending on the school and their appointment processes. Another senator asked who would be superior in ranking to vote on a renewal of a contract for Professors of Practice.

The consensus was that all those listed above them in the ranking would vote.

Leah Ceccarelli expressed concern about the title and entertained changing the name to Practitioner in Residence. She argued that a practitioner title wouldn’t force them into the existing title of Artist in Residence, and would keep the professor title for those with academic backgrounds.

William Jones expressed that the Information School is concerned that removing the voting rights diminished the clout of the position.

Dafney Dabach from Education had concerns about tenure erosion as a result of creating different tracts within faculty, and asked to what extent this position would allow Professors of Practice to access funds for professional development. Provost Cauce answered that it wouldn’t preclude them from accessing department funds.

Michael Townsend moved to change ‘rarely used’ to ‘sparingly used’ in 24-35.B.5. It was seconded. After a short discussion the amendment passed.

William Jones moved to move Professors of Practice above Senior Lecturers in Section 21-31, and secondly to add Professors of Practice above Senior Lecturers in Section 21-32, thus granting them voting rights.

Without objection, Chair Lee divided the question. The first amendment was seconded. Jim Gregory spoke against moving Professor of Practice above senior lecturers in Section 21-31. Some senators expressed that Professors of Practice should be at the same level as Artists in Residence. The amendment failed.

The second amendment, adding voting rights, was seconded. Jones said that without voting rights it is a position without any sort of power, and diminishes the position.

JoAnn Taricani expressed concern with Professors of Practice voting on matters that are in the long term interest of the University, despite their short term appointments. Others spoke in favor of the position as something to recognize honor and prestige, not as a voting faculty member of the university.
Without objection, the amendment was amended to move Professor of Practice under Senior Artist in Residence.

Others spoke against the amendment, saying that voting rights will likely not be important to the Professors of Practice. The question was called and the amendment failed.

Leah Ceccarelli moved to change Professor of Practice to ‘Practitioner in Residence’ at all points in the legislation. Arguments in favor were that it would reserve the title of professor for those with academic backgrounds. Arguments against changing the name were that it did not capture the prestige of the position. The amendment failed.

Storti spoke against creating the new title and moved to refer the motion back to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. Others spoke in favor on the grounds that the scope of the title is unclear. Leroy Searle said that voting the legislation down would be a better alternative to sending it back to committee, but advocated that the legislation was adequately vetted.

Cheryl Cameron spoke in favor of continuing consideration of the legislation and pointed out that faculty in each unit will have a great deal of power in approving these appointments. Jill Purdy from UW Tacoma agreed.

The motion to refer it back to committee failed.

A senator asked if someone could fund their own Professor of Practice position. Provost Cauce said that would never be allowed, though in the past some offers to teach for free or donate salaries back to departments have been granted.

The question was called. The motion to approve the legislation as amended passed.

b. Class C Resolution [Exhibit G]

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Title: Resolution concerning transgender coverage.
Action: Approve for Distribution to Faculty.

Vice Chair Kate O’Neill moved the legislation and introduced Ashley Emery, chair of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement, who introduced the legislation. Emery spoke to the principle of fairness that underlies the motion. He said passing the resolution would not change the state medical plan, but would add our voice to the issue.

Jim Gregory spoke in favor of the legislation and thanked Emery for his introduction. The resolution moved to a vote and passed.


Chair Lee updated the Senate as to the status of the faculty salary policy proposal. He addressed comments, questions, and facilitated discussion.

12. Good of the Order.

There was no good of the order.


The meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm.

Prepared by: Márcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Jack Lee, Chair
Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
Jack Lee, Professor of Mathematics

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

**Professor of Practice:** The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has proposed Class A legislation (Exhibit F) creating a new faculty title, “Professor of Practice.” The proposed code language is attached to this agenda. I encourage you to look closely at the proposed legislation, talk with your departmental colleagues, and think carefully about the issues.

**Transgender Coverage:** The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement has proposed a Class C Resolution (Exhibit G) urging the state to provide appropriate benefits to transgender faculty, analogous to benefits that are already provided to undergraduate students, faculty in a number of other universities, and residents of a number of other states.

**Educational Outreach Search:** With the retirement of David Szatmary, the university is in the process of searching for his replacement as Vice Provost of UW Educational Outreach. Because of the increasingly important role being played in the university by online courses and degrees, this is a crucial position. If you know of a university where the educational outreach operation seems to work particularly well in supporting the academic goals of the faculty, I encourage you to express this to the search committee, and to suggest individuals who might be good candidates for the position if you know of any.

**The Legislative Session:** The short legislative session concluded on March 13, 2014. In his report to the SEC, Faculty Legislative Representative Jim Fridley highlighted the issues pertaining to higher education and the University of Washington. Since this is Jim’s last year as Faculty Legislative Representative, please join me in extending our sincere thanks to Jim for his five years of service as FLR. JoAnn Taricani has been nominated by the SEC to be next year’s FLR, and today we will vote on whether to confirm that nomination.

**Report on Athletics:** We’ll be receiving our annual report today on the athletic program from Athletic Director Scott Woodward and Faculty Athletic Representative Pete Dukes. Please have your questions ready!

**Next Year’s SEC:** This is the time of year when the Senate selects members to serve on the Senate Executive Committee next year. If you’re going to be on the Senate next year, you should already have received an email from the nominating committee (Norm Beauchamp, chair; Jim Gregory; Diane Morrison; and JoAnn Taricani), inviting you to nominate yourself or someone else for the committee. The SEC sets the agenda for Senate meetings, advises the President and the senate leadership, considers legislation, and resolves faculty code issues. I strongly encourage you to consider volunteering. Even though the deadline is April 23, the committee will be accepting nominations until April 25, the day after the senate meeting.

**Committees and Councils:** As Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien points out in her report, we’re seeking nominations of new members for university faculty committees and councils for the academic year 2014-15. These positions are central to the effective functioning of shared governance, because a lot of the fundamental work of shared governance is done in committees and councils. I encourage you to consider volunteering for one or more of these bodies, and to recommend colleagues who would be effective members.

At least two Faculty Councils will have significant new responsibilities next year: The Faculty Council on Academic Standards will be taking on new oversight of policy issues surrounding proposals for new and modified courses; and the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services will be participating much more closely with the Office of Planning and Budgeting in the early stages of planning and prioritizing new buildings and other capital projects. This is important stuff – let’s ensure that we are well represented on these councils.
Faculty Salary Policy: Because the new faculty salary proposal is not yet ready for a vote, and parliamentary rules prevent us from having the first vote on Class A legislation at the last meeting before summer, the salary policy will not be officially coming to the Senate until the fall. There will still be time then for it to be voted on twice before winter break, and then if it passes we will be able to carry out the transition process in winter & spring 2015, with the new policy going into effect in the summer of 2015.

As you probably know, a description of the proposal has been posted for faculty feedback on catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/board/senate/35848/, and other members of the salary policy working group and I have been talking to various groups of faculty around campus. Meanwhile, the drafting process for amending the faculty code is well underway, and both the working group and FCFA are looking carefully at the proposed code revisions. I will be leading a discussion of the proposal at this meeting, so please encourage members of your department to read the proposal and give their feedback, and bring any relevant questions or comments to the senate meeting.
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 addressing the following issues:

1. Code Cleanup Issues
   a. Minor changes to remove out of date terminology & clarify the code in some places are in progress
   b. Changes to bring some of the code into line with reality are in progress
   c. Adjustments to deal with the modern electronic world
2. Professor of Practice
   a. Should (and how) we add a new rank for people distinguished in their accomplishments outside the academy that wish to join us on a temporary basis to help with our teaching mission.
3. Faculty salary policy

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 general concern of the FCR is to discuss ways to improve the UW research environment with various administrative units. FCR will review proposals from UW researchers containing restrictions of various sorts (publication policies personnel, data transfer etc.). We will be discussing proposed changes in UW rules regarding the outside activities form and proposed changes in UW rules are published. We will also be concerned with emerging issues regarding OMB, NIH/HHS and NSF and with rules regarding export controls.

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, including: recent Senate action on admissions policies and standards; on-going and planned campus renovations; revisions of the
Student Conduct Code; the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative; and, staffing the faculty appeal board. Among the topics discussed during the Council meetings this quarter were the following.

7 January: Ann Browning, Director Academic Support Programs, was present to discuss student tutoring centers. Browning works with the Center for Learning and Undergraduate Enrichment (CLUE) within UW Academic Support Programs. We also heard reports from the President's designee and the PSO representative to the Council.

4. February: Melanie Mayock (External Affairs Specialist for Transportation Services) discussed recent transit developments affecting UW. As a result of the recession Seattle revenues have been dropping over the past few years. Since then Metro has been relying on reserve funds, raised fares and temporary funding in the form of the $20 annual license renewal fee. This cut in funding is similar to other regional transportation districts which are cutting back on service areas and bus routes. Last November King County announced its proposed cuts which will completely delete 20 routes that serve UW (out of 42 current Metro routes).

4 March: Chair Treser was out of town for this meeting and asked Brian Fabien to chair the meeting. Council members discussed the chair’s report that was circulated prior to the meeting. In the report Treser addressed recent developments in student profiles, student debt, recent Class A legislation creating housekeeping changes, the Universal Student U-PASS Advisory Board and Seattle’s new Bike Share program.

The FCSA and FCAS will begin holding joint discussions on items of mutual interest.

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 it 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 2y2d 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 meeting, 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.

Facility 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.

Facility 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.

Fall: NE campus dorms. We’ll also hear a report from the transportation committee liaison on UPASS for faculty and staff.

Facility Council on University Libraries

1. Implementation of the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence, as approved by the Faculty Senate. Fund website is located at: https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift?source_typ=3&source=LIBFAC
2. Facilitation of Open Access publishing at the UW. The FCUL will continue to seek to engage faculty and students in submitting documentation of their past, current, and future research (i.e., archival and grey literature) to the open access repository ResearchWorks.
3. Strengthening educational partnerships/ the development of a sustainable academic business plan. The FCUL will continue to investigate ways to bring emerging Libraries technologies and initiatives into UW courses. The strategic plan will consider a wide variety of issues, including fee-based and distance courses and programs.
4. Employment of multi-institutional approaches. The FCUL will provide input to continuing Libraries efforts to lead and leverage multi-institutional Libraries initiatives, related to e.g., the Hathi Trust, the Western Storage Trust, and Orbis Cascade activities.

5. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009 – 2012 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.

6. General planning for collections, services, and staff. The FCUL will advise the Libraries on changes in collections, services, and staff in support of its strategic plan and necessitated by continuing budget constraints. Initial topics include the subject librarian framework, physical and virtual space planning, etc.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

There are no updates at this time

Approved council minutes are available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html
Search Committee for the Vice Provost of UW Educational Outreach.

Judy Howard and I are members of the Advisory Search Committee for the next Vice Provost for UW Educational Outreach (UWEO). Other committee members are meeting with a wide variety of stakeholders, and we have solicited the thoughts of our Deans and Chancellors, as well as the UWEO Advisory Board. We also provided all UWEO staff with an opportunity to give us their thoughts via a catalyst survey.

We have hired a search firm and are working with Regan Gough, Principal at Isaacson, Miller. The position description has been posted on UW Hires and has been advertised in The Chronicle for Higher Education, among other publications.

We will take your ideas and advice back to the full committee and make sure that the advisory search committee members know your views. We have a few broad questions, and we welcome your advice and thoughts:

1. What are the characteristics you would like to see in the next Vice Provost for UW Educational Outreach?
2. In 3-5 years, what will be the definition of success in our new Vice Provost? What are the key metrics?
3. What are the key issues or trends in continuing education that the Advisory Search Committee should know about?
4. What do you believe to be the most essential work of UW Educational Outreach?
5. Are there any other issues you would like to bring to our attention?
6. What do you see as the optimal relationship of UWEO with other UW units?"

You can contact the search committee via eosearch@uw.edu.

Thank you for your valuable input.

Jerry Baldasty, Chair, Advisory Search Committee on the Vice Provost for Educational Outreach
Judy Howard, Search Committee Member
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty  
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The election of the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate has been completed; Professor Norm Beauchamp was elected for a term beginning in Fall 2014.

2. The process of electing Senators for the 2014-16 term is underway. Those schools/colleges/campuses that are due to elect new senators have been notified and most have completed electing senators. We are hoping to complete the elections entirely by late April. The following units are up for election this year: Built Environments, Education, I-School, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, ROTC, Evans School, UW Bothell.

3. Nine nominations were received for the 39th University Faculty Lecturer and the President will announce the selection soon.

4. Nominations are being accepted for appointments to university faculty committees and councils for the academic year 2014-15. If you are interested in serving on a faculty council, or would like to nominate a colleague, please contact me at secfac@uw.edu.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jim 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. Meetings since my last report have dealt with the following matters:

Future of the Royalty Research Fund and Center for Commercialization: Both RRF and C4C have been funded principally by royalties from one patent derived from the work of Professor Benjamin Hall (Biology). His patent, which has generated more than $200 million dollars for UW, expires this year. What are the plans for the Royalty Research Fund and the Center for Commercialization? Vice Provost Linden Rhoads outlined plans for C4C to increase revenues. Provost Cauce reported that the reserves will support both enterprises for two years, at which time tough decisions will be necessary. Both RRF and C4C may need support from the general operating budget.

Building Plans: Since the budget cutbacks, very little state money has been available for new construction. UW has been financing buildings with private donations and by increasing borrowing debt. Planning procedures have also changed and opportunities for faculty input on planning decisions have diminished. SCPB has negotiated a new arrangement that will allow the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services to play a role in planning. In addition, SCPB reviewed the One Capital Building Plan prepared by the Office of Planning and Budgeting. This includes a report on the condition of campus buildings and a tiered list of priority projects. Further discussion of building plans will take place later in spring quarter.

Faculty Demographics: In response to a Senate resolution passed in FY13, the Office of Planning and Budgeting is creating a longitudinal database that will allow SCPB to monitor several dimensions of faculty demographics at department, college, campus, and university levels. In a preliminary presentation, the committee noted that women remain disturbingly underrepresented in some colleges at every rank and in most colleges at the full professor rank. Also of concern, there has been no slowing in the trend toward hiring lecturers rather than tenure track or WOT faculty, notably at Bothell and Tacoma which are already overbalanced with lecturers. The committee still awaits the data on race and ethnicity. The Faculty Senate will receive a full report on trends at its May 15 meeting.

Classroom survey and class scheduling changes: Vice Provost Jerry Baldasty is leading an effort to assess classroom quality and scheduling problems. SCPB received a preliminary briefing. It is clear that many classrooms are in terrible shape, with inadequate teaching technology and poor spatial arrangements. Baldasty also noted that an archaic scheduling system causes bottlenecks in some time slots and leaves rooms empty at other times. SCPB will hear a follow-up report later this quarter that will probably recommend increased expenditures to upgrade facilities and also recommend a new scheduling template that will include (1) reserving M-W-F for 50 minute classes (2) requiring departments to schedule more late-afternoon and early-morning classes.

Other matters: The committee approved a limited RCEP for the Real Estate Program in the College of Built Environments; reviewed the legislature’s session with UW lobbyist Margaret Shepherd and Faculty Legislative Representative Jim Fridley; discussed how the University will accommodate a minimum wage hike should the City of Seattle enact legislation; discussed plans for a feasibility study for a proposed Law School program based in Tacoma.

Upcoming spring quarter meetings will look into the following:
- Provost Reinvestment fund allocations
- Fiscal year 2015 budget plan
- Classroom space recommendations
- Capital projects and planning for FY 15-17
- Activity Based Budget planning
- IT plans and costs
Class A Legislation
Faculty Code Sections 21 and 24, Professor of Practice
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Introduction

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) voted on April 1st 2014 to forward proposed code changes to add the rank of Professor of Practice to the faculty code.

Reasons for Proposed Changes

There are a large number of people outside the academy that have made significant and ground breaking contributions to their field (e.g. distinguished). Their presence as part of the faculty would contribute to the quality of the university.

There is no easy way for the university to invite these people into the academy to teach a special topics course, help start a program, or collaborate on some research with a title commensurate with their standing in the field.

Background

The request for these changes started with a group of deans getting in touch with the FCFA to propose the changes. Several members of the FCFA also discussed how a position like this would be beneficial to their units. This type of appointment is currently used at peer institutions including Harvard, Tufts, Penn State, and Arizona State University (See examples on the Senate Website, Issues Under Consideration.)

The deans and FCFA envision there would be few of these positions in a unit or department at any one time. These positions are meant to be for highly distinguished individuals, at the top of their respective fields. No explicit limit is set in the proposed legislation on the number of such positions in a unit, though it is expected that there would be no more than one or two without a careful review.

Extensive discussions occurred within the FCFA addressing potential arguments against adding this position to the faculty including tenure erosion and allocation of funds away from new hires or increases in salaries of ladder faculty. The proposed legislation reflects attempts to minimize these potential risks. Additional concerns were raised about the voting status of individuals appointed to this position and it is anticipated an amendment will be proposed to SEC to remove the voting rights that are part of the current proposed legislation.
Section 21-31 Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

- The president,
- The vice presidents,
- The professors,
- The associate professors,
- The assistant professors,
- The principal lecturers,
- The senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- The professors of practice
- The lecturers and artists in residence,
- The instructors,
- The teaching and research associates,

whether serving under visiting, acting, research, clinical, or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.


Section 21-32 Voting Membership in the Faculty

A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section the voting members of the University faculty are those faculty members holding the rank and/or title of:

- Professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Full-time principal lecturer,
- Full-time senior lecturer,
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- Full-time lecturer,
- Full-time artist in residence, or
- A retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.

B. Notwithstanding the rank or title held, the following are not voting members of the faculty:

- Persons serving under acting or visiting appointments,
- Persons on leave of absence,
- Persons serving under clinical or affiliate appointments,
- Persons serving under professor of practice appointments,
- Persons of emeritus status unless serving on a part-time basis,
- Persons serving under adjunct appointments insofar as their adjunct appointments are concerned.

[For definitions of faculty titles, see Section 24-34.]
C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:

- Senior artist in residence
- Senior lecturer,
- Principal Lecturer,
- Associate professor,
- Professor,
- Associate professor WOT,
- Professor WOT.


Section 24–34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability that evidences promise of a successful career.

2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

3. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

4. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non–
renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24–53.

Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years (see Section 24–41, Subsection G.) The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24–41.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24–53.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24–35.

5. Appointment with the title of Professor of practice is made to a person who is a distinguished practitioner or distinguished academician, and who has had a major impact on a field important to the University’s teaching, research, and/or service mission.

Professor of practice appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24–53. This title is available to address a unique appointment need and is intended to be sparingly used; and tenure is not acquired through service in this title.

6. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.

7. An affiliate appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

8. An adjunct appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.

9. A joint appointment recognizes a faculty member’s long–term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or
not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.

10. A clinical appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

11. Appointment with the title of teaching associate is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or shorter; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

12. The emeritus appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another state of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an administrator at the level of dean or vice president, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.

13. The acting title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.

14. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a visiting title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting lecturer.

15. The visiting scholar title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor's presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.

Section 24–41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

A. The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in Subsection D. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three–year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or
   b. the appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a full–time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

   The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

2. Appointment as a full–time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

   The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24–53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.
Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24–53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

A full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50% of full-time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than 50% of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure;
   b. The appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases b and c the appointment is extended by one year.
4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or

b. The appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.

5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

G. At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, or Professor of Practice, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of a Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, or Professor of Practice is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

H. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25–51), for termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25–52.)

I. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25–51), for termination of funding as defined in Subsection I, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25–52.)

J. Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.

K. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Subsection G.

L. The procedures prescribed in Section 24–53 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24–54 for Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.


Section 24–53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24–41), the procedure described below shall be followed.
A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24–34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24–41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.

D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non-renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 41, April 3, 1972; S–A 60, June 25, 1979; S–A 81, January 30, 1990; S–A 94, October 24, 1995; S–A 124, July 5, 2011; S–A 126, June 11, 2012: all with Presidential approval.

Section 24–57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit–Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit–based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University’s obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24–32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.
The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D, or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer, or principal lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean, or his or her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors "without tenure" appointed under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D. The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors, and principal lecturers, and professors of practice at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24–55.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss:

1. The department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments;

2. Shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and

3. A shared strategy for achieving those goals.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24–32. The chair, dean or his or her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member's work.

Approved by:

Senate Executive Committee
April 7, 2014

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
May 1, 2014
Class C Resolution Concerning Transgender Coverage

WHEREAS, the University Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement has heard testimony about the need for transgender individuals to receive adequate medical coverage; and

WHEREAS, we believe that providing the best benefits at the most affordable cost is a key part of the total compensation package that affects the University’s ability to hire and retain an outstanding and diverse faculty; and

WHEREAS, the Council believes that the current exclusions in all faculty health plans regarding the treatment of Gender Dysphoria, Gender Identity Disorder, Transsexualism or Transgender people’s healthcare is not in keeping with current medical science; and

WHEREAS, major medical bodies support public and private health insurance coverage for treatment of gender identity disorder; and

WHEREAS, according to the testimony the University of California system, Yale, Harvard, Portland State, the University of Michigan and others extend these benefits to faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, the states of Oregon, California, Colorado, Vermont, Connecticut, and Washington DC, require insurance companies to offer these benefits; and

WHEREAS, coverage is currently available to Group Health and City of Seattle employees and to UW undergraduate students; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of Washington Faculty Senate recommends that the State of Washington offer the needed benefits to transgender people.

Submitted by:  
Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement  
April 7, 2014

Approved by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
April 7, 2014

Approved by:  
Faculty Senate  
May 1, 2014