Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, May 8, 2017, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: President Cauce, Provost Baldasty, Zoe Barsness, JoAnn Taricani, Dan Ratner, George Sandison, Chris Laws, Paul Hopkins, Mike Townsend, Casey Mann, Mark Pendras, Kelly Edwards, Kurt Johnson, Janelle Taylor, Rick Keil, Theo Myhre
Absent: Duane Storti, Thaisa Way, Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim, Gordon Watts, Susan Astley, Daniele Menez
Guests: Rich Christie

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Barsness called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. The agenda was approved.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Zoe Barsness. [Exhibit A]

Chair Barsness spoke to her report, focusing on the search for a new Provost. Listening tours will take place on all three campuses and will concentrate on the following: defining qualities the new Provost should have, describing challenges that the new Provost will face, determining how to present ourselves in a positive light to potential applicants, and identifying names of candidates.

   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. Council Activities Report. [Exhibit E]

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke to her report. Taricani remarked that she had sent out a list of people who could be contacted about the budget, but faculty members must not use University resources for advocacy purposes.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce, President.

President Cauce added some comments on the Provost search. There will be a national search, and it is expected to produce three or four finalists who will be vetted on site. The search will look for someone with commitment to shared governance and working with students. The best person may not be one who reads job ads, so it is important to work through networks.

Cauce said that the last year has tested us as a community. The University has come through it so far, but we will continue to be tested in the future. In particular, we want to make sure that our students have access to health care insurance. Cauce ended by noting that she has attended a number of meetings on campus that demonstrate the deep commitment of our faculty and students to work for the public good.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the April 3, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the April 20, 2017, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]
   d. Approve nominations for 2017-18 Senate Executive Committee Positions. [Exhibit G]
   e. Approve 2017-18 schedule of Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meetings. [Exhibit H]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

Chair Barsness noted that the SEC has been chosen as the 2017 Student Life Partner of the Year for work done in conjunction with the student conduct code.
7. Unfinished Business.
   Official Request for Faculty Code Interpretation
   **Action:** Approve findings regarding interpretive issues with respect to Chapter 29 Amendment of the Faculty Code. [Exhibit I]

Chair Barsness opened the discussion by reminding the SEC of the background. The question here is the amending/rejecting power of the SEC on first consideration of Class A legislation proposed by Faculty Councils. Last year the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (Code Cops) said that the text of the Code supported the idea that the SEC had to forward Council proposals as presented, but could make accompanying recommendations. The Code Cops went on to note that current practice assumed that the SEC had the power to amend before submission or even refuse to submit altogether. The SEC appointed a subcommittee that ultimately endorsed the first position. Subsequently, the SEC asked the Code Cops to draft language appropriate for either position. The Code Cops complied, but indicated a strong preference for the first position.

During the discussion, members supported the dual ideas that the Faculty Councils should be respected and that the SEC should not operate as a mere pass through. It was also said that amendments from the SEC would be acceptable, but that the SEC should not be able to stop legislation from moving forward.

A motion was made and seconded to interpret the Code to reflect SEC practice as established by the previous Secretary of the Faculty: the SEC is able to amend Class A Legislation and the Faculty Senate is presented a single redlined amended version that also reflects the original Faculty Council proposal. However, the Faculty Council could request that the two versions be presented separately to the Faculty Senate or even withdraw their legislation. With respect to a redlined document or two separate proposals, the SEC version is moved in the Faculty Senate by the Vice-Chair.

The motion passed.

The SEC requested that the Code Cops draft appropriate clarifying Class A legislation for fall quarter action.

   a. Class A Legislation – Second consideration. [Exhibit J]
      Title: Clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles.
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Barsness introduced the legislation. A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

   b. Class B Legislation [Exhibit K]
      Title: Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations.
      Faculty Council on Academic Standards
      **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Barsness introduced the legislation. A motion was made and seconded to submit the Class B legislation to the Faculty Senate.

Dan Ratner, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), spoke to the motion. Ratner went over the rationale provided in the Exhibit. In response to questions, Ratner noted several things. The legislation deals only with undergraduates because FCAS only deals with undergraduate issues. The legislation does not provide for the creation of new courses, but for a new utilization of existing courses. FCAS will monitor for “double dipping” with respect to existing majors and minors. To get a course added to the interdisciplinary concentration (IC) list, one would consult the unit running the IC. Having said all that, the legislation is aimed more at creating a designation that students can place on their transcript than on the process by which the IC’s are defined, created, and maintained. Even so, some members questioned whether this would just create incentives for students to pad their resumes in addition to majors and minors in a way that detracts from getting a broad educational experience. Moreover, concerns were raised about
the underlying process by which IC’s are defined, created, and maintained. Leaving the IC list in the hands of a single unit could create incentives for self-serving behavior with respect to including courses from other units that might otherwise compete for students. It was suggested that IC’s be interdepartmental and/or that there be some general review process that considers, for example, adding in new courses at a later date. In light of these questions and concerns, the SEC consented to the withdrawal of the motion so that FCAS could consider the issues raised here.

c. Class B Legislation [Exhibit L]
Title: Proposed changes to priority registration.
Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

Chair Barsness introduced the legislation. A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate. Ratner spoke to the legislation. During discussion three points were made. First, the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) provision mandating the current provision for veterans expires in 2022, but FCAS feels that the priority should continue nonetheless. Second, the phrase “and domestic partners” is being added to conform to the RCW language; the phrase is defined per state law. Finally, the priority for contracting ROTC students (200 students) is based on recognizing the future service of those students, not any special difficulty that they are currently experiencing in signing up for classes.

The motion passed.

d. Approve the May 18, 2017, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit M]
Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.


The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m. There immediately followed a round of applause for Zoe Barsness’s service as Chair.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Approved by: Zoe Barsness, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, May 15 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma

Please take the time to review the agenda and supporting materials.

Continuing projects:
We anticipate wrapping up our discussion of the Faculty Code interpretation with respect to Chapter 29 Amendment of the Faculty Code. Just to refresh everyone’s memory, in the spring of 2016, the SEC made an official request for an interpretation of the Faculty Code relating to the SEC’s role in review of Class A legislation submitted to the SEC for transmittal to the Senate. Historically, it has been the SEC’s practice first to review and discuss any proposed Class A legislation submitted by the faculty councils. The SEC’s established practice has been to (A) sometimes recommend that such legislation be returned to the council for additional development, (B) other times to amend the proposed legislation (either by adjusting language to achieve better clarity or address issues of substance) before then passing the legislation onto the Senate for action, and (C) other times to forward the legislation without amendment directly onto the Senate for action. In reviewing Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code, the “Code Cops” indicated that the existing code language could be interpreted to support either of the following scenarios:

1) Historical SEC practice as described above. In short, the SEC has the power both to amend and to turn back proposed legislation (which can then be reworked before re-submission to the SEC for review and transmission to the Senate for consideration as redrafted by the originating body or proposed directly from the floor of the Senate for consideration in its current form).

2) The SEC’s role is purely one of transmission and the SEC has neither the power to amend the legislation nor turn it back. The SEC, if it preferred different language or wished to change the substance of a proposal, would instead submit an alternative version of the proposal—reflective of such changes—along with the proposing body’s original draft legislation to the Faculty Senate for review. (This would be consistent with the process outlined in the code and currently adhered to in practice when Class A legislation returns to the SEC for second review after the President requests changes or amendments to the proposed legislation as initially approved by the Senate).

This fall, after some substantive discussion of these two alternative interpretations of the code, the SEC delegated review of these approaches to the SEC’s role to a sub-committee and requested they work with the Code Cops to draft two possible amendments to Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code: one that would explicitly articulate the SEC role in regards to the Class A legislation to be consistent with its historical conduct (approach #1 above) and a second that would explicitly articulate the SEC role to be consistent with approach #2 as described above. As requested, the sub-committee has worked with the Code Cops to produce two sets of Class A legislation designed to clarify the existing code language and make explicit the SEC’s role such that it is consistent with either scenario 1 or scenario 2. Furthermore, the sub-committee has recommended amending Chapter 29 language to bring the SEC role in line with that described in scenario 2 because they feel such a role is more consistent with existing code language.

Today, it is our task to return to the issue of interpretation and established practice, consider the recommendation of the sub-committee in regard to the two alternative interpretations of existing code language, and determine which conceptualization of the SEC’s role in the faculty legislative process best serves our legislative process and enhances the quality faculty governance. Class A legislation supporting the code interpretation we choose to adopt, as drafted by the Code Cops, will then be brought forward for SEC and Senate action in Fall 2017.

New Business
Finally, there are three pieces of important legislation. The first is second consideration of Class A legislation that addresses clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles (Exhibit J). This legislation comes to the SEC with no changes since its first consideration on April 3. The second two are Class B legislation sponsored by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. The first piece proposes the addition of interdisciplinary concentrations (Exhibit K), and the second proposes changes to priority registration (Exhibit L). Both polices reside in the Student Governance and Policies section of the UW Policy Directory. Each of these pieces of legislation deserves careful review.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

First-Year as Secretary of the Faculty:

In addition to the usual secretarial activities, a number of things have been added this year. A Committee on Committees has been formed to help staff faculty councils, thus bringing to fruition planning done last year by Marcia and the Senate Office staff. A video component has been added to the Senate minutes, which brings us in line with the practice at other institutions. We are also compiling a list of Code sections that need some clarification.

The prospect of a new Provost raises some concerns because of the good relationship we have with Provost Baldasty. I have begun discussions with the Provost about clarifying some aspects of shared governance that I hope will lead to an understanding with some inertia as the changeover occurs. These aspects include the Code-interpretation powers of the SEC and Provost, the disciplinary authority of Deans, and the scope of the Secretary of the Faculty’s role in providing advice to members of the University community with respect to their rights and obligations under the Faculty Code. With respect to the latter, the Secretary and Senate Leadership are considering ways to provide faculty with independent legal advice.

This was my first year as Secretary of the Faculty, and it has been a challenging year with a steep learning curve. I would like to thank the staff of the Senate Office, members of the current and previous Senate leadership, members of the Provost’s and Ombud’s Offices, and especially past-Secretary of the Faculty, Marcia Killien, for their help and support.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Paul Hopkins, Professor, Chemistry

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (SCPB) 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.

In this last report of academic year 2016-17 to the Senate Executive Committee, I briefly review the year’s activities of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

SCPB exists to provide advice from the faculty to the Provost on a wide range of issues of the Provost’s or the committee’s choosing. The Provost integrates this with advice, sometimes contradictory, from many other sources, including but not limited to the Board of Deans and Chancellors and the Provost’s Advisory Committee for Students.

In the course of the year, the Provost requested our advice on a range of issues. Many of these were for our group “one and done” consultations. A few other issues were discussed at several meetings, and because of their importance and complexity will no doubt be recurring topics at SCPB for years to come.

Revision of Executive Order 64. The committee divided evenly on the question of whether faculty raises accompanying promotion in rank should be elevated from 7.5% to 10% or to 12%. Those favoring 12% emphasized the need to boost full professor salaries (which on average across the UW lag relative to off campus peers), as well as the need for a significant raise to accompany the significant accomplishment required for promotion. Those favoring 10%, which the Provost and President ultimately chose, emphasized that in a zero-sum financial environment, higher promotion raises come at a cost to rewarding continuing faculty throughout a career (particularly those already at highest rank and under-salaried). The committee additionally advised that the unit adjustment language be modified to insure that the unit adjustment provision could be used by schools and colleges to maintain salaries at a desired level (e.g. comparable to off campus peers) rather than exclusively to correct salaries that had fallen behind the desired level. I return below to the subject of faculty salaries.

Proposed Changes to Tuition and Fee Levels. The committee reviewed proposed changes to tuition and fee rates. SCPB reviewed the status of resident undergraduate tuition levels, including known student debt data, and comparisons to off campus peer tuition and fee levels. Compared to off campus peers, resident undergraduate tuition at the UW is low, as are known student debt levels at graduation (the median of which is zero). SCPB concluded that the 2.2% increase allowed under current legislation is somewhat less than is justified all things considered (assuming the state funds allocation is modest). The committee reviewed and did not advise against proposed tuition and fee increases in all other categories.

Biennial State Budget Process. The committee reviewed the proposed budget request to Olympia, which emphasized the need for state funds for compensation increases. The committee was periodically apprised of developments in Olympia, including discussion of the proposed Governor’s, House, and Senate budgets. We will presumably provide advice on the distribution of funds allotted to UW in the final budget.

Undergraduate Enrollment Management and Student Aid. The committee requested and received a detailed report on undergraduate enrollment management and student aid from Philip Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment and Undergraduate Admissions; Kay Lewis, Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment; and Associate Professor Patricia Kramer, member of Faculty Council on Academic Standards. Ballinger emphasized the rapid increase in the proportion of undergraduate student applicants who express interest to study computer science. At the same time, current UW students have shifted away from some areas of study in which we have significant investment in tenured faculty. Kramer reported on plans to better match the interests of the incoming class to the availability of study opportunities for students. In light of the shortfall of student interest in some areas in which we have capacity, the high interest of students in study at the UW, and the resources needs of the institution, SCPB believes we should reevaluate the common wisdom that we are truly near maximum capacity of
the Seattle campus to accommodate undergraduate students. The success of efforts to improve the
efficiency of utilization of classrooms will be important in this regard.

**Human Resources/Payroll Modernization.** Aubrey Fulmer, Executive Program Director, reported on the
status of the program. The report emphasized efforts to reach out to all stakeholders to insure the system
will work on opening day. SCPB has across time encouraged the program leaders to take advantage of
faculty expertise; to some extent this has happened.

**Faculty Salary Minima by Title.** As required by the faculty code, the Provost sought SCPB advice on
proposed changes to required salary minima. Several changes were recommended, and some of these
were adopted.

**Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination Procedures (RCEPs).** SCPB advises the Provost on
whether proposed RCEPs should proceed through a full process or the “limited” process associated with
changes that are relatively non-contentious. Four proposals were reviewed (creation of a Department of
Real Estate in the College of Built Environments and a Department of Emergency Medicine in the School
of Medicine, and two graduate program transfers from the Graduate School to the College of the
Environment (Quantitative Ecology and Resource Management) and to the Department of Global Health
(Pathobiology). In all cases a limited RCEP procedure was recommended, and the Provost agreed with
that advice.

**Other Reports.** SCPB requested and received informative presentations concerning the status of
defered maintenance of university facilities (Michael McCormick, Associate Vice President for Capital
Planning and Development), fee based programs (Dr. Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic
Affairs, Graduate School), and the status of the environment for research at the UW (Mary Lidstrom, Vice
Provost for Research). No recommendations to the Provost resulted from these.

**Future Reports.** Prior to the end of the current academic year, SCPB will receive a presentation from
Jeffrey Scott, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration on enterprise-wide financial
planning, focusing on the impact of the declining growth rate of the revenue streams that support the
enterprise on the availability of funds for expenditure. It will apparently be argued, not surprisingly, that we
need to reduce the rate we are spending compared to historical norms. Enterprise wide, growth in
number of faculty and staff FTE and growth of salary levels are strong drivers of overall spending, as is
the Capital One plan. In order for this kind of financial planning to inform decisions at the level of the
individually budgeted units (say a school/college, or a supporting administrative unit) it will be necessary
to disentangle the varied revenue streams and kinds of expenditures that are unique to each unit. Another
key question will be how reductions in spending are spread across various expenditure categories. We
will also receive two reports from Sarah Hall, Associate Vice Provost, Planning and Budgeting, on the
proposed Regents’ Budget for FY18 (2017-18).

**Longer Term Issues:**

**Faculty Salaries.** We face a long-standing and well known situation that our faculty salaries, particularly
at the full professor level, are in some schools and colleges, and on average across the university, well
below off-campus peer levels (at least for those faculty titles for which we have data). This situation is
potentially damaging to both recruitment and retention of highly capable faculty members.

As an institution, we have a pattern on the decadal time scale of “digging a hole” during cycles of no or
low raises, followed by efforts to “dig out” using university-wide (additional merit), unit-selective (unit
adjustment), or individual-selective (retention) mechanisms. As a step toward improving understanding of
the rate at which raises need to be awarded to achieve our goals, for example to keep pace with off
campus peers (even if one is behind, a keep-pace raise prevents falling further behind), SCPB partnered
this year with the Provost to encourage a dialog between Deans or Chancellors and their respective
faculty advisory bodies (elected faculty council at the Seattle campus) to plan to manage faculty salaries
under revised EO64 (see above). Specifically, the relaxed requirements for approval of unit adjustment
raises provide a powerful tool to Deans and Chancellors to manage faculty salaries locally.
SCPB developed and provided Excel spreadsheet based tools to help users understand the impact of entry point salary, total salary pool, and FTE count on the degree of “salary progression” that can be expected (purely mathematically) across a career. The Provost asked each school, college, or campus to develop plans to address salary issues, calling on each to submit a three or more year plan. “Preliminary thoughts” from the Deans and Chancellors are due on May 1.

There is reason for both optimism and pessimism concerning the plans, which are not available as this is written. On the one hand, some units clearly took quite seriously the call for planning. The College of Arts and Sciences College Council, led by Professor Barbara Wakimoto, deserves a special shout-out. They quantitatively modeled faculty salaries in each division of the College, and now have a clear understanding of the new investment or reduction in FTE that would be needed to adjust upward faculty salaries. Whether the College chooses or is able to act on such plans remains to be seen. On the other hand, this exercise has made painfully clear that some faculty advisory bodies are operating absent all of the information needed to develop a thoughtful financial plan. One advisory group observed that they have almost no information from their Dean on which to begin planning.

It is probable that this planning exercise will bear fruit in the long run only if SCPB continues to have interest, and if the Provost requires such planning on an on-going basis.

One lesson this exercise attempted to teach is worth mentioning here. Many faculty members express concern over salary “compression.” Salary compression has a simple definition: it is when more experienced personnel earn little more than much less experienced personnel. How does compression arise? A moment’s thought will reveal that compression is the result of continuing employees receiving (annual) raises that are not sufficiently greater than the rate the entry point salary is rising. An example should make this clear. All evidence suggests that for the last few years entry point salaries have been rising close to 2.7%/year (this is a university-wide average; some disciplines could move slower or faster). In other words, each successive year the new first year assistant professor commands a salary that is 2.7% higher than last year’s first year assistant professor (who has become this year’s second year assistant professor). It is easy to understand that if continuing employees also receive a 2.7%/year raise, then despite the added years of experience, the ratio of their salary to that of the entering first year assistant professor remains constant; it does not advance. Salaries rise with experience if and only if annual continuing faculty raises on average across time exceed 2.7%.

You can judge for yourself how well your unit is doing at combating compression by comparing the average raise in your unit for continuing faculty against the rate the entry point is rising.

**Activity Based Budgeting.** This year the Provost asked SCPB for advice on the management of course and degree creation under Activity Based Budgeting. With the formulaic component of school/college budgets at the Seattle campus directly linked to the generation of student credit hours (SCH) and degrees, and the dollar value of each SCH considerably in excess of the cost to generate SCH (at least for some large-lecture formats), it is not surprising that the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), which oversees the evolution of the curriculum, is reporting rising interest in course and degree creation. In some cases this is perceived as placing Seattle units in direct competition with one another for students, and thus competing in a zero-sum budget environment.

SCPB reviewed the available data, and discussed this situation at several meetings. SCPB concluded that FCAS does not wish, nor is it well equipped, to consider the strategic and financial considerations associated with new course and degree applications. We advised that a new faculty led body should be created for this purpose. SCPB further concluded that in instances (which we hope are rare) when this body advises approval of a new course or degree and the Provost or President disagree, on the basis of financial or strategic considerations, he or she should intervene, perhaps not approving the new program, or by allowing it, but making a compensating financial adjustment to the budgets of the schools or colleges involved. If the Provost and Senate leadership concur with this plan, the parameters under which the new body functions should be devised, and the body established.
I suggest that in the future SCPB and the faculty broadly should seriously consider whether the financial incentive to create new courses and degrees has become excessive. The commitment to distribute 70% of net tuition revenue on the basis of SCH and degrees was made at a time when tuition was a considerably smaller fraction of the core operating budget of the institution. It is not obvious to me that it is in the best interests of a research university—the institution itself, and all of the students who study with us—to have so large a fraction of the total budget distributed (and more importantly redistributed) among the academic units on the basis of shifting patterns of undergraduate student enrollment. It would be a simple matter, and could come at no current cost to any existing unit, to rewrite the formulas such that a smaller fraction of tuition funds are distributed formulaically.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Music History

Little has changed since our Faculty Senate meeting. The regular session ended on April 23, with the first special session opening on April 24 (30 days in length). As I have been noting, it is the source of new revenue that is the major focus of discussion and disagreement between the parties and the House and Senate. The Senate majority (Republican majority) forced a vote on a capital gains tax the day after our own Senate meeting on April 21, seeking to defeat the capital gains tax proposal and also to force Democrats to vote in favor of a capital gains tax, votes that would become an Autumn campaign issue. But all the Democrats also voted against this tax, leading to a unanimous defeat of a capital gains tax. Then, the Senate majority introduced a tax package that included a variety of new taxes, again with the intention of voting down the package; this proposal has had a hearing, but no vote yet. For an overview of the politics of these proposals, see http://www.thelympian.com/opinion/editorials/article146724714.html and also http://mynorthwest.com/609383/why-republican-dino-rossi-sponsored-biggest-tax-increase-in-wa-history/
Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to the normal business of reviewing curricular changes, the following are major policy issues that FCAS is undertaken or has recently completed:

- Approved proposal submitted by the College of Engineering and its individual departments to change admission requirements in anticipation of shifting 50% of enrolled students to direct-to-college admissions as entering 1st year students at the University.
- Advanced Class B legislation concerning changes to the Student Governance and Policies that allows students to identify themselves by the name they would like to be called in classroom settings or for interacting with other campus personnel (approved).
- Advanced Class B legislation concerning changes to the Scholastic Regulations that allows the University to consider "area of academic interest" for undergraduate applicants (approved).
- Established new Policy on W ("additional writing") credit that specifies that writing for these credits must be done in the English language.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

- Conducted a comprehensive comparison of a range of employee benefits between the UW and other major research universities. A final summary of findings will be developed before the end of the 2016-2017 academic year.
- Continues to investigate needs associated with parental leave (and associated policies) for faculty at the UW.
- Conducted a rough cost-analysis of a tuition waiver program for offspring of professional staff and faculty at the UW.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Reviewed the newly-developed 2017-2021 UW Diversity Blueprint and provided feedback to the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Continues to conduct a robust investigation into lecturer issues at the UW.
- Advanced Class A legislation on clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles (currently within the legislative process), which adds a new passage to Faculty Code Chapter 24.34 stating: "individuals appointed to one of the instructional titles in Section 1-3 above may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of specific ways (Section 24-32). While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required."

Faculty Council on Research

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the following are other activities undertaken by the FCR:

- Advanced a Class C resolution on Postdoctoral Researchers (approved), which states in part that the "Faculty Senate urges the Provost’s Office to charge the Task Force for Postdoctoral Affairs to develop the policies and practices that would bring UW in line with national guidelines and peer institutions."
- Continues to disseminate information widely to the UW community in anticipation of potential adoption of a draft university-wide Open Access Policy.
- Received updates on the status of federal research regulatory reform.
- Discussed issues related to shared resources for research at UW.

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

- Advanced several pieces of Class B legislation to cement major Student Conduct Code policy changes within the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) as well as locally at the UW.
- Reviewed and played a role in development of a FAQ sheet for a new Student International Travel Policy (developed by the Office of Global Affairs).
- Continues to address issues related to medical excuse notes and UW’s Hall Health Center.

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

Individual subcommittees of the FCTL are working to address areas of interest relating to pedagogy in the following areas:

- Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments
- Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges
- Diversity- and Equity-Informed Pedagogies
- Teaching and Learning effectiveness

In addition, the council has:

- Reviewed and successfully recommended changes for the revised Canvas Learning Management System Data Retention Policy.
- Provided feedback on the retirement plan for certain UW Catalyst Tools.
- Continues to analyze and provide feedback on UW-IT development of new information technology solutions, new online academic tools, and policies relating to use of student data in learning analytics.

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

- Discussed with guests from all three UW campuses (including the University Registrar and curriculum council chairs) formulation of a plan to revise the university-wide undergraduate curriculum approval mechanism of “Tri-Campus Review.”
- Discussed separating UW academic transcripts according to degree-granting campus with broad input from tri-campus faculty, staff, administration, and students.

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

- Advanced a Class C resolution concerning general class room assignment (approved), which in part urges the Provost to “identify and protect building sites in the central part of the Seattle Campus and similarly functional sites at other campuses for future buildings to satisfy long-term needs for general assignment classroom seating.”
- FCUFS has reviewed the following topics and provided feedback/oversight to administrative guests:
  - Seattle Campus Master Plan
  - One Capital Plan
  - Seismic Improvements Initiative
  - Population Health Building
  - Electric Energy Monitoring and Conservation
  - Space Utilization
  - Deferred Maintenance
  - Landscape Maintenance
  - North Campus Housing Project
  - Transportation Services and Parking
  - Annual Classrooms Update
  - 45th St Light Rail Overbuild
Faculty Council on University Libraries

- Conducted final review of the draft Open Access Policy with authors present to offer any remaining feedback and coordinate roadmap for review by the Faculty Senate.
- Reviewed and offered feedback on the ongoing Open Educational Resources initiative at the UW.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The FCWA has had administrative guests present to discuss and provide feedback on the following topics:

- Parental Leave issues for faculty
- Gender-neutral bathrooms at the UW Seattle campus
- Nursing stations at the UW Seattle campus
- University Title IX resources/policy changes
2017-2018 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

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

- Dan Ratner, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Sarah Stroup, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Sarah Stroup, College of Arts & Sciences, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2018.
- D. Shores, Foster School of Business, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

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

- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 11:00)

- Steve Buck, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Mondays at 12:30)

- Brenda Williams, School of Law, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2018.

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

- Ben Marwick, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

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

- Bruce Hevly, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)

- David Goldstein, UW Bothell, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

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

- Marcy Stein, UW Tacoma, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00)

- Giovanni Migliaccio, College of Built Environments, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Bruce Balick, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Murray Maitland, School of Medicine, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Rich Christie, College of Engineering, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

Adjudication Panel

• Jamie Shirley, UW Bothell, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Harris Baden, School of Medicine, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Tom Hazlet, School of Pharmacy, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Emily Cilli-Turner, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

• Joe Janes, Information School, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
• Rich Christie, College of Engineering, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2017, and ending September 15, 2020.
Nominations for 2017-18 Senate Executive Committee Positions

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine – 2 positions</td>
<td>Scott Barnhart, Department of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurt Johnson, Rehabilitation Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gautham Reddy, Radiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Wurfel, Department of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences – 2 positions</td>
<td>Steve Buck, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janelle Taylor, Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max Lieblich, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering – 1 position</td>
<td>Joyce Cooper, Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health science colleges¹ – 1 position</td>
<td>Tom Hazlet, Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gunnar Almgren, Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Built Environments – 1 position</td>
<td>Gundula Proksch, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools² – 1 position</td>
<td>Thomas Halverson, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent Hill, Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Kosack, Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore Myhre, Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Council Nominations
1. Faculty Council on Academic Standards
2. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
3. Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

¹ Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work
² Business, Education, Evans, Information, Law, ROTC
Nominating Committee:

Charge

Nominate at least one candidate for each of the eight Executive Committee positions and the three Faculty Council Chairs.

Section 22-63 of the Faculty Code provides guidance: “The Chair and immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate shall appoint a nominating committee that shall nominate at least one candidate for each Executive Committee position. Nominations of Faculty Council Chairs shall consider the relationship of the Council’s work to the Senate’s upcoming agenda. The nominations as a whole shall provide broad representation across academic disciplines, such as Health Sciences, Arts and Sciences, and other schools and colleges, and shall endeavor to balance continuity and turnover of representation.”

How Nominees were selected:

Executive Committee seats were allocated on the basis of academic geography. The eight elected SEC positions were allocated as follows:

- School of Medicine – 2 positions
- College of Arts and Sciences – 2 positions
- College Engineering – 1 position
- Other health science colleges (Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work) – 1 position
- College of the Environment and College of Built Environment – 1 position
- Professional schools (Law, Business, Education, Evans, Information, ROTC) – 1 position

The Nominating Committee sent a request for nominations to all current and incoming Senators, listing the eight contested positions; self-nominations were received, all were placed in their corresponding positions. The Committee then added to the list as needed.

The faculty council chairs were selected based on a list of upcoming issues that were given to us by the faculty senate vice chair.

Members of the nominating committee:
Mike Townsend, School of Law and committee chair
Cherry Banks, UW Bothell, School of Educational Studies
Tom Hazlet, School of Pharmacy
Lauren Montgomery, UW Tacoma, Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences
Paul Sutton, School of Medicine
Ken Yocom, College of Built Environments
## 2017-2018 Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

### Autumn Quarter, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winter Quarter, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>December 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>March 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring Quarter, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senate** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102.

**Executive Committee** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in 142 Gerberding Hall.

**Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
From: Advisory Committee on the Faculty Code and Regulations, Rich Christie, Chair
To: Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty
Date: February 13, 2017
Re: Legislation Draft

In response to your request of January 13, 2017, containing the subcommittee report dated January 9, 2016 (sic, 2017), the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has drafted the language below for amendment of the Faculty Code to address issues 1, 2 and 5 as numbered in the report. New or changed language is denoted with *italics*.

As requested, two drafts are presented for issue 2, recommended language and alternate language. The strong advice of the Advisory Committee is that the alternate language NOT be adopted. In fact a number of members of the Advisory Committee strongly disapproved of even submitting the language. However, since a draft of the alternate language was specifically requested I have chosen to submit it.

The issues are:

- Issue 1: Amend sections 29-32.B and 42-33.A to reflect that the SEC must forward Class A legislation to the Senate in "a timely manner."

- Issue 2: Amend sections 29-32.B and 42-33.A to allow the SEC, when forwarding Faculty Council legislation, the option of including an alternative proposal containing an amended version of the legislation, and to enable voting of the Senate on the alternative proposal. The subcommittee envisions a process analogous to 29-34.B, C, second consideration of Class A legislation. Also clarify that the SEC cannot amend the Council proposal.

Language should ensure that it does not preclude the SEC making recommendations to the submitting Faculty Council, and that Faculty Council choosing to revise the proposed legislation in view of the recommendations, prior to resubmission to the Senate through the SEC. Indeed, the Faculty Council could choose to withdraw their submission. Also allow the Faculty Council to submit proposals to the SEC for consideration alone, rather than submission to the Senate.

SecFac: 29-33A,B may also need clarification.

Issue 2 Alternative Language - Codifying current practice – Amend sections 29-32.B and 42-33.A to allow the SEC, when forwarding Faculty Council Legislation, to amend or reject Faculty Council submissions.

- Issues 3 & 4: No legislative change requested.

- Issue 5: Amend 29-34.D to clarify what can be done if both the amended proposal and the original proposal are rejected, i.e. reintroduce either proposal for amendment under first consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Language Jan 2017</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Alternate Revision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 29-32 Introduction of Amendments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> A proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code may be introduced in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate by a member of the Senate or by the Senate Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> When requested in writing to do so by 1% or more voting members of the faculty, the Executive Committee shall introduce a proposed amendment of the Faculty Code which has been submitted to it in appropriate written form.</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> When requested in writing to do so by 1% or more voting members of the faculty, the Executive Committee shall introduce to the Senate in a timely manner a proposed amendment of the Faculty Code which has been submitted to it in appropriate written form.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Issue 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **C.** The Executive Committee shall introduce to the Senate in a timely manner any proposed amendment of the Faculty Code received from a Faculty Council. In reviewing Faculty Council submissions, the Executive Committee may propose changes that may be accepted by the Faculty Council Chair or designee. The Faculty Council Chair or designee may withdraw the submission at any time prior to Senate consideration. | **C.** Upon receiving a proposed amendment of the Faculty Code from a Faculty Council, the Executive Committee may review and revise the proposed amendment as it sees fit, introduce the proposed amendment to the Senate, or reject the proposed amendment. | | **Issue 1 – “timely manner”** **Issue 2 – recommended and alternate language** For the recommended language, the subcommittee concept of up or down votes on an SEC alternative and the original Faculty Council proposal, analogous to the second consideration process, seems unduly complex. The language here has the SEC proposal framed as an amendment to the Faculty Council proposal, which better fits the normal process of initial consideration in the Senate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Language Jan 2017</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Alternate Revision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> A proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code shall be in the form of a resolution by the Senate to submit the proposal to the faculty for approval or rejection. It shall be filed in triplicate with the Secretary of the Faculty.</td>
<td><strong>D.</strong> A proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code shall be in the form of a resolution by the Senate to submit the proposal to the faculty for approval or rejection. It shall be filed in triplicate with the Secretary of the Faculty.</td>
<td><strong>D.</strong> A proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code shall be in the form of a resolution by the Senate to submit the proposal to the faculty for approval or rejection. It shall be filed in triplicate with the Secretary of the Faculty.</td>
<td>Number change only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Section 29-33 Initial Senate Action on Amendments</strong> | | | |
| <strong>A.</strong> Upon introduction of a proposal to amend the Faculty Code, the question before the Senate shall be whether the amendment shall be submitted to the faculty for approval or rejection. | | | Issue 1: No change required |
| <strong>B.</strong> When such a proposal is introduced, Senate procedure shall be as follows: | | | |
| 1. Unless the proposal is printed in the Senate agenda, it shall be read in full; | | | |
| 2. If the Executive Committee has accompanied the proposal with an alternative, the alternative shall be introduced as an amendment to the proposal for consideration by the Senate. | | | Issue 2: The proposed language seems more straightforward than voting on the SEC alternative, then voting on the original Faculty Council language, as envisioned by the subcommittee. It brings the SEC alternative into the normal |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Language Jan 2017</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Alternate Revision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The proposal shall be subject to amendment by the Senate and to any subsidiary motion;</td>
<td>3. The proposal shall be subject to amendment by the Senate and to any subsidiary motion;</td>
<td></td>
<td>proposal and amendment procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If, after consideration of amendments and disposition of subsidiary motions, the proposal is still before the Senate, final action upon the question of referral to the faculty shall not be taken. Instead, the Chair shall refer the proposal, as amended, to the Executive Committee.</td>
<td>4. If, after consideration of amendments and disposition of subsidiary motions, the proposal is still before the Senate, final action upon the question of referral to the faculty shall not be taken. Instead, the Chair shall refer the proposal, as amended, to the Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issue 1: No change required. Issue 2: Number change only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. When a proposal for amendment has been so referred to the Executive Committee, the Secretary shall immediately deliver a copy of it to the President and to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The President shall consider the proposed amendment and within 14 days shall notify the Executive Committee of his or her approval or disapproval of the proposal. If the President disapproves it, reasons for so doing shall be stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Language Jan 2017</td>
<td>Proposed Revision</td>
<td>Alternate Revision</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Examine the proposed amendment, with reference only to its form and its consistency with other provisions of the Faculty Code, relevant statutes, resolutions, and executive orders; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Report to the Executive Committee at its next regular meeting any suggestions which may arise from its examination of the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 29-34 Executive Committee and Senate Consideration of Amendments**

<p>| A. After a proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code has been referred to it by the Senate, the Executive Committee at its next meeting: | | | |
| 1. Shall consider any statement of the President concerning the proposal; | | | |
| 2. Shall consider suggestions of the Advisory Committee on | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Language Jan 2017</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
<th>Alternate Revision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Code and Regulations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. May make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Executive Committee may submit to the Senate either:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The proposal for amendment in the form in which the committee received it, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Both:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The proposal in the form in which the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Language Jan 2017</td>
<td>Proposed Revision</td>
<td>Alternate Revision</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee received it, and</td>
<td>D. If the Executive Committee submits an alternate proposal under the provisions of Subsection B.2 of this section, the first question before the Senate shall be whether it approves or disapproves submission to the faculty of the alternate proposal. If the Senate rejects the alternate proposal, it shall then consider the proposal originally referred by it to the Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Senate votes down the proposal during initial consideration that would end the matter, so recursion is not necessarily infinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. An alternate proposal embodying changes authorized by Subsection A.3 of this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Executive Committee shall place the proposal or proposals for amendment on the agenda either of a special Senate meeting or of the next regular Senate meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. If the Executive Committee submits an alternate proposal under the provisions of Subsection B.2 of this section, the first question before the Senate shall be whether it approves or disapproves submission to the faculty of the alternate proposal. If the Senate rejects the alternate proposal, it shall then consider the proposal originally referred by it to the Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the Senate also rejects the original proposal, any Senator may immediately reintroduce either the original or alternate proposal to amend the Faculty Code for initial consideration and amendment following the procedure of Section 29-33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Language Jan 2017</td>
<td>Proposed Revision</td>
<td>Alternate Revision</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 42-33  Duties, Responsibilities and Powers of Faculty Councils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Faculty councils serve as deliberative and advisory bodies for all matters of University policy, and are primary forums for faculty-administrative interaction in determining that policy. Each faculty council within the area of its jurisdiction:</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues 1 and 2: The change is in how the Senate Executive Committee deals with Council legislation to the Senate. This section does not address the actions of the Senate Executive Committee and does not need to be changed. If the SEC is explicitly permitted to reject Faculty Council proposals, as in the alternate language above, that would override the implicit meaning in 'through' in this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee all legislative proposals pertaining to matters set forth in Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection A;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee any resolution passed at a faculty meeting falling under Chapter 21, Section 21-51, Subsection D;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. May on its own initiative prepare legislative proposals or resolutions for submission through the Executive Committee to the Senate;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Language Jan 2017</td>
<td>Proposed Revision</td>
<td>Alternate Revision</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shall submit to the Senate Chair any report, including annual reports, for transmission to the Senate through the Executive Committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. May receive and make appropriate recommendations, within the limits set forth in Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection B, concerning any communication from a member of the faculty;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. May request such information and assistance as may be required in the effective pursuit of its duties;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. May appoint, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, such ad hoc committees as may be required for the effective pursuit of its work;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shall be responsible for providing information and for interpreting or obtaining interpretation of policy regarding matters falling under its jurisdiction;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Language Jan 2017</td>
<td>Proposed Revision</td>
<td>Alternate Revision</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shall receive reports or recommendations or resolutions from administrative or presidential committees in areas for which it is responsible, and, when appropriate, shall be invited to be represented on those committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Senate Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee, shall decide which faculty council shall assume jurisdiction when jurisdictional responsibility may be unclear and shall arrange for coordination among councils in the event that a matter may fall within the responsibility of more than one council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class A Legislation – Clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles.

Purpose

Chapter 24-32 of the Faculty Code states: “The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service.” Part A of that section elaborates: “Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.”

Section 24-34.A defines “Lecturer,” “Senior Lecturer,” “Principal Lecturer,” “Artist in Residence,” and “Senior Artist in Residence” as “instructional titles.”

This proposed Code change clarifies what the University means by “scholarship and research” for faculty members with instructional titles.

Explanation

Given that the primary responsibility of faculty members in the lecturer or artist in residence track is instruction, the requirement of “scholarship and research” for all faculty members should be interpreted for the lecturer or artist in residence titles in ways that relate to such instruction: i.e., in terms of method, content, pedagogy, student achievement, etc.

Moreover, given the UW needs classroom teachers to meet the needs of its students, and if annual and multi-year appointments and reappointments of lecturers are required to serve those needs, then those lecturers need to be assured that the terms of those continued/continuing (re)appointments are specifically suited to their primary duties and responsibilities. Any definition of “success” for them should be based on the quality of their achievements in teaching and service that reveal their scholarship and research (i.e., their remaining current in their field and their success in transmitting those materials to UW students).

This Code clarification also benefits the rest of the faculty because (a) it encourages a lecturer or artist in residence to do the work most needed by the unit rather than dissipating effort in areas that serve the unit less; and (b) it provides guidance to the more senior faculty (i.e., individuals holding titles above that of a given lecturer or artist in residence plus all of the tenure-track faculty) who serve on hiring and promotion committees for lecturer and artist in residence positions.
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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, 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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, 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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, Section 24-53.

4. Individuals appointed to one of the instructional titles in Faculty Code, Chapter 24, Section 24-34, subsection B. 1-3 above may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of specific ways (Section 24-32). While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.

4-5. 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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, 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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, Section 24-41, Subsection H.) 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 Faculty Code, Chapter 24, 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
5.6. 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. Tenure is not acquired through service in this title.

6.7. 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.

7-8. 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.

8.9. 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.

9.10. 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.

10.11. 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.
117. 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 undepartamentalized 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.

12. 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.
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Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations

Rationale

Many undergraduate students take a set of courses outside their major(s) to expand their opportunities for post-baccalaureate experiences or further training. Examples include “pre-med” coursework, independent research projects, and international studies. Currently, there is no formal mechanism to acknowledge these experiences on the student’s transcript. This proposal would create a new transcriptable credential, the interdisciplinary concentration (IC), to facilitate the formalization of these structured series of courses.

The IC is explicitly not topically focused, which differentiates it from majors, minors, and options, all of which are topical. The IC also must include courses from multiple programs.

The motivation for this change is to provide students with the benefit of having a transcript that clearly indicates these additional interdisciplinary experiences. As with minors, the intent is that students would not take additional time to complete the IC, but rather receive a credential for a defined set of courses, most of which they would have taken regardless. The IC also formalizes which courses are appropriate and simplifies planning for students.

ICs would be created, modified, and administered using the same procedures as majors, minors, and options, i.e., via the 1503 process. Tri-campus and online ICs would be permitted, as long as the pertinent procedures for approval are followed. ICs would be awarded to any student who completes the requirements; in other words, ICs are “open.”

If this Class B legislation is enacted, two ICs would move forward quickly (tentatively named “pre-Health Studies” and “Leadership”) and we anticipate that several others would be developed in the near future.

H. Degrees with Minor and/or Interdisciplinary Concentration

Departments, schools, and colleges are authorized to provide a course of study leading to a undergraduate academic minor and/or interdisciplinary concentration. Requirements are within the purview of the department, school, or college.

1. The minor shall consist of not less than 25 credits and have a disciplinary or topical focus. Interdisciplinary minors are encouraged. Courses taken to fulfill the minor may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the minor will appear on the permanent record.

2. An interdisciplinary concentration shall consist of not less than 30 credits that are organized around a set of skills, prerequisites for post-baccalaureate education, or other defined experiences. Courses taken to fulfill the interdisciplinary concentration may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the interdisciplinary concentration will appear on the permanent record.

2) Distance-learning minors or interdisciplinary concentrations (whether entirely new or a distance-learning version of an existing minor or interdisciplinary concentration) must be approved by the same process as non-distance-learning minors versions. Modes of content delivery must be described and approved at all levels, including unit, college, and Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations, Registration
Chapter 102, Section 2.B
Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations

Rationale:

The phrase, “veterans and National Guard members and their spouses” is in accordance with RCW 28B.15.624. While not required by state law, FCAS believes that bestowing the same privilege on ROTC students who have contracted for military service following graduation would be in the spirit of that law. In making this request, FCAS considered the following:

- The revision removes reference to RCW 28B.15.624, which expires August 1, 2022, as members did not wish to see this UW policy expire at that time.
- The addition of “domestic partners” was made in the spirit of the law, as defined in RCW 28B.15.621, referred to in RCW 28B.15.624.
- Most of the ROTC students at the UW (roughly 80-90 percent most years) are active duty service members, National Guard or civilians on scholarships awarded through a competitive national selection process. All of these students are contractually obligated for military service following graduation for a minimum of four years and, depending upon military career choices, as many as eight years.
- Once contracted, if a student fails to meet the requirements of the ROTC program academically, physically or morally, then that student must either perform four years of enlisted service or repay the government for the cost of the scholarship.
- The categories of students listed in SGP, Chapter 102, Section 2.B are placed in order of the likelihood of constraints on their time, except for the veterans, National Guard members and their spouses, as specified by state law. These students are afforded priority registration by virtue of, and in appreciation for, their past or ongoing service to the nation. We believe that a similar level of appreciation for contracted future service to be reasonable and equitable.
- If approved, this change in the SGP would apply to 175-200 students per year, across all three ROTC units and all UW campuses.
- The UW would not be unique in affording ROTC students this privilege; a partial list of schools that already offer Priority 1 Registration to ROTC students includes: USC, UC Irvine, Radford, William & Mary, UVA, Purdue, Indiana, Ohio State, Drexel, Toledo, Kent State, Cal State Fresno, Cal State Fullerton, Arkansas, Kentucky.
- Also considered, but not a key factor in recommending this change to the SGP, was the 12-16 hours of extracurricular activities required of an average ROTC student per week. While there have been no cases of ROTC students failing to graduate due to academic schedule conflicts, required extracurricular work does pose a complication in the execution of degree plans.
- The ROTC units and the Office of the Registrar have developed procedures for implementing this change, should the Faculty Senate approve.

B. Registration Period 1

Registration period 1 is designed primarily to accommodate currently registered matriculated students. It occurs during the latter half of the quarter preceding that for which the student is registering excluding Summer Quarter. Registration priority dates are assigned according to the following sequence: disabled students, athletes, eligible veterans and national guard members and their spouses and domestic partners as defined in RCW 28B.15.624, ROTC students contracted to service following graduation, students with graduating senior priority status, graduate students, seniors, juniors, sophomores, and freshmen.
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1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Zoe Barsness.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.
   e. Classroom scheduling system information.
   f. Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs report.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce,

5. Requests for Information.
   a. Approval of the April 3, 2017, SEC minutes.
   b. Approval of the April 20, 2017, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approval of the 2017-18 schedule of Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee meetings.
   d. Approval of official code interpretation.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Approve nominations for 2017-18 Senate Executive Committee Positions.

8. Announcements.


10. Invited Guests:
    a. CoMotion update: Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy, CoMotion and Lara Littlefield, Associate Vice President for Innovation Strategy, CoMotion.
    b. Intercollegiate Athletics Report – Frank Hodge, Faculty Athletic Representative, Kim Durand, Associate Athletic Director for Student Development and Kate Cullen, Senior Associate Athletic Director - CFO, Intercollegiate Athletics.
    c. HR Modernization update – Jeffrey Scott, Executive Vice President, Finance & Administration.

       Title: Clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles.
       Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
       Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

    b. Class B Legislation.
       Title: Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations.
       Faculty Council on Academic Standards
       Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

    c. Class B Legislation.
       Title: Proposed changes to priority registration.
       Faculty Council on Academic Standards
       Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.
12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Zoe Barsness, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, May 25 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.