

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 1, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Architecture 147

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.. The agenda was amended to move the president's remarks to follow unfinished business. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Faculty Senate Chair's Remarks – Professor Zoe Barsness. **[Exhibit A]**

Chair Barsness followed up on her written remarks. The faculty leadership is pulling together resources to help navigate the challenging terrain resulting from recent presidential election. In particular, there is a commitment to work to maintain an inclusive community reflecting a spectrum of views. The leadership will provide a website devoted to these ends. Barsness thanked President Cauce for her remarks following the election.

Barsness noted that the vice chair search has commenced and asked that nominations be forwarded to secfac@uw.edu.

Barsness introduced A.G. Rudd, the Washington State University (WSU) Faculty Senate Chair, and Judy McDonald, the Chair Elect. Rudd described some of the aspects of faculty governance at WSU. There is a new WSU President, and there is optimism about the future of faculty governance at WSU.

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions.

- a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. **[Exhibit B]**
- b. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. **[Exhibit C]**

Randy Hodgins, Vice-President for External Affairs, reported on the impact the recent national election might have on federal funding and the regulatory environment. The nominee to head the Department of Education is a relative unknown as far as higher education is concerned. A "delayed repeal" of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is expected. Things to pay attention to in the lame-duck session of Congress include the extension of the federal budget and possible stripping of new NIH funding in the 21st Century Cures Act.

There were no questions.

Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani spoke to her written remarks. Taricani reported that the state House and Senate numbers have not changed much. As noted previously, faculty priorities include compensation, student aid, diverse population access, and institutional funding including tuition backfill. The big issue for the legislature is K-12 funding.

There were no questions.

4. Requests for Information.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of November 14, 2016.

- a. Approval of the [October 3, 2016, SEC minutes](#).
- b. Approval of the [October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes](#).
- c. Report and update on the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice. **[Exhibit D]**
- d. Report of Faculty Council Activities. **[Exhibit E]**
- e. Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations opinion on Chapter 29. **[Exhibit F]**

There were no requests for information.

5. 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 Carl Erik Pearson of Applied Mathematics who died on August 8, 2016 after having served the university since 1965.

Professor Sarah Reichard of the College of Environment who died on August 29, 2016, after having served the university since 1995.

The motion was approved by a standing vote.

6. Consent Agenda.

The consent agenda was approved. **[Exhibit G]**

7. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

9. President's Remarks

President Cauce began her remarks by stating that the election brings interesting times. There are a number of ways the UW can be affected, for example through changes in the ACA. It is important to be vigilant. The administration is staying in touch with other schools through the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities and the Association of American Universities. There are also ongoing talks with other schools in the PAC 12. Further, President Cauce is in touch with both Washington State US Senators.

President Cauce talked about the recent increase in the desire for the university to become a sanctuary campus. A sanctuary campus is a designation for universities that adopt policies to protect students who are undocumented immigrants. Cauce went on to say that the UW already respects the privacy of students to the full extent of the law and Seattle is itself a sanctuary city. It is also not prudent to take symbolic actions that might provoke harmful responses with respect to grants, financial aid, etc.

President Cauce is concerned about the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). The UW is the only public school making up for the lack of availability of Pell grants for DACA students. Repeal of DACA would not change this at the UW, but it would affect employment opportunities for our students. A number of university Presidents have signed a statement confirming DACA's importance. President Cauce asked for comments on these points, and there were none.

Some concern was expressed about safety with respect to controversial speakers expected in the near future. Cauce said that controversy aside, it is not expected that speakers will go beyond what is protected by free speech. Other campuses have seen protests and counter-programming. The UW is looking at security issues.

Cauce remarked that campus safety has become a large issue. Concerns must be balanced here: with more police, some students feel safer and other students feel more uneasy. The UW will study the use of cameras. A task force will be making recommendations.

10. New Business.

- a. **Information item:** Population Health Initiative. Thaïsa Way, Faculty Senate Vice Chair, Ali Mokdad, Professor, Global Health, Hedwig Lee, Assistant Professor, Sociology.

Vice Chair Thaïsa Way introduced a presentation on the Population Health Initiative. "Population health is a broad concept encompassing not only the elimination of diseases and afflictions, but also the intersecting and overlapping factors that influence health." Way is the faculty liaison for the initiative. Way noted that this initiative deals with important questions and presents an opportunity to reimagine ourselves as a University that comes together across all three campuses to work on critical and complex issues.

Ali Mokdad began his presentation by using the disparities in female life expectancies to illustrate the importance of the underlying questions. The initiative will examine the human-health, environmental, and socio-economic factors that influence population health. There is a 30-member executive council charged with engaging faculty. Current efforts include building capacity and competence across the three campuses, creating a support structure, and focusing on an initial set of key questions to create momentum and a track record of success. Faculty are encouraged to visit the [website](#) and add themselves as a resource.

Mokdad said that faculty working in this area can provide mentorship and leadership, and the Initiative is interested in opening a dialogue toward that end. Way added that the Initiative seeks to build on the depth and breadth already existing at the UW. Financial resources would be directed first at "low-hanging fruit" such as obesity, mental health, environmental health, family medicine, primary care, and general data collection. Mokdad said that the Initiative is broader than the Schools of Public Health and Medicine.

Professor Hedwig Lee of Sociology presented a description on how social scientists have long been studying aspects of population health.

President Cauce announced a \$210,000,000 gift from the Gates Foundation to support the initiative. Talks leading to the gift started before the Population Health Initiative was announced, and the Gates Foundation has been involved in this area for years. The gift will be used mainly for the building that will house the Institute for Health Metrics, and parts of Global Health and Public Health. There will be space for collaborative efforts surrounding the Population Health Initiative. The building is a clear sign that the UW intends to be the best in the world in this area. Although the Foundation will have an advisory capacity, the Foundation does not have ownership over the Initiative in any way.

- b. Class B Legislation – Chapter 102 Scholastic Regulations. **[Exhibit H]**

Barsness described the Class B procedures. Way introduced and moved the Class B motion. Sarah Stroup, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, spoke to the motion. There was no discussion. The motion was approved.

- c. Class C Resolution regarding adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington. **[Exhibit I]**

Barsness described the Class C procedures. Way introduced and moved the Class C resolution regarding adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents. Taricani spoke to the motion and asked that the Senate pass an amended version that was the result of discussions with faculty and legislators after the SEC meeting. The amendments do not change the basic substance; the wording was changed to add some flexibility. The amendment was moved, seconded, and approved.

Questions on eligibility arose; specific criteria for eligibility would be part of the process leading to selection of the regent candidates. The resolution focused on the 2017 legislative session because things might change in a year, and it would not be prudent to tie the Senate's hands for more than one year.

A question was asked why recusal should not require some specific conflict of interest. Taricani replied that the language tracked was used with respect to the student regents, and the Governor's office and legislators expect to see the same language used.

Once the bill has been introduced, individual faculty members can reach out to their legislators and give opinions on legislation, but cannot use state resources and must be done on personal time. In reference to the number of nominees, the governor wants a slate, two being the smallest number that is acceptable. In conclusion, Taricani stressed that when the bill is introduced it will be an uphill battle for approval.

The motion was approved as amended.

d. Class C Resolution regarding a faculty seminar series. **[Exhibit J]**

Chris Laws, Chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, introduced and moved a Class C resolution regarding a faculty seminar series. The motion was seconded. Because the resolution was not provided in advance of the meeting, Laws read the motion into the minutes. There was no discussion.

The motion passed.

11. Good of the Order.

There was no good of the order

12. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Zoe Barsness
Zoe Barsness, Chair
Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma

Dear Colleagues,

The year is off to a busy, yet productive start.

The Senate and University leadership remain committed to making substantive progress on shared concerns in regards to the existing faculty salary. We have focused our initial efforts on (1) strengthening the tools we already have available and (2) identifying areas where the current policy and compensation planning practices might be improved.

As part of our efforts to strengthen our existing faculty salary tools, a working group comprised of Senate leaders, representatives from the Board of Deans and Chancellors and senior university leadership worked on revisions to Executive Order 64 over the summer. We focused on two areas: (a) increasing promotion raises to help sustain salary progression and (b) on revising the Executive Order 64 language to facilitate use of the unit adjustment tool to address a breadth of compensation and salary needs, both reactively to address existing problems such as compression or inequity (even individual instances of these) and proactively to sustain faculty salaries at competitive rates relative to peer institutions.

- The proposed revisions to Executive Orders No. 64 (Faculty Salary Policy), along with the newly proposed Executive Order No. 54 (Employee-Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest) were released to the Faculty Senate on September 28 for review and comment.
- This open comment period will close on November 28, at which time the Secretary of the Faculty will summarize the concerns and comments raised and communicate these to the President. The President stressed in her comments both to the SEC and full Senate in October that she believes this must be a collaborative process. It therefore, behooves us to review the proposed Executive Orders carefully and provide timely substantive feedback to her on each of them.
- To ensure a comprehensive review of each of the proposed Executive Orders, we have done the following:
 - Executive Orders 54 and 64 were distributed via email to all Senators with a request for review and comment.
 - Executive Orders 54 and 64 were discussed at the October 3, 2016, SEC meeting and an offer to discuss them was made at the October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate meeting. However, senators asked no questions nor offered any discussion of either executive order at the senate meeting.
 - FCSA, FCFA, FCTCP and SCPB were explicitly requested to review these orders closely.
 - Both orders were distributed to the chairs of the school, college and campus elected faculty councils and these groups were also requested to review the orders closely and provide comment.

As part of our efforts to support more robust compensation planning efforts and discussion at the unit level, Senate leadership and the SCPB are partnering with the provost to engage the deans, chancellors and elected faculty councils in the schools, colleges and campuses to review their compensation planning practices and processes. On October 19, 2016, the Senate leadership team met with the elected faculty council chairs (EFCs) from each of the schools, colleges and campuses. Provost Baldasty attended this meeting to discuss Executive Order 64 and share information with EFCs about the budget planning process for 2016-2017. He highlighted what he's asked the deans and chancellors to do in this process (i.e., consult with their EFCs). We also discussed plans to move forward in regards to facilitating and sharing of information and best practices across schools, colleges and campuses. A review of all unit bylaws was prepared that identified the advisory / consultation role on unit budgets and strategic planning for each council. We plan to meet again during winter and spring quarter.

William Covington, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, was appointed to the Board of Regents Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Advisory Committee. He will serve a 3-year term representing the faculty in

advising the Regents on matters relating to diversity, equity and inclusion for faculty, students, staff, and in procurement and contracting.

Tri-Campus Relations task force launched on September 29, 2016. The group is charged with identifying ways to work together more effectively across the breadth and diversity of three unique campuses. Work is progressing. We are currently brainstorming and identifying emergent themes. The committee next meets on December 13.

New language and proposed investigative and adjudicative models of the Student Conduct Code are currently being presented and reviewed by the Faculty Council on Student Affairs and the Faculty Council on Tri campus Policy. Plans are to bring an updated Code, reflective of these changes, to SEC for review and approval at the January 9, 2017, meeting.

Faculty nominees and membership of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy, and Practice (ACIPPP) has been pulled together and is on the agenda for today's meeting. With the help of Provost Baldasty and Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost of Research, we have secured resources to support its work. The committee plans to meet and begin its work by the end of autumn quarter, 2016.

On October 26, 2016, in response to a request of the SEC, faculty meeting a set of criteria were provided access to an interactive academic personnel demographic dashboard. The information contained in this dashboard is that which is also published annually as part of the [UW's Affirmative Action Plan](#). Access to such data will support our collective efforts to identify faculty needs and make substantive progress on meeting our diversity, inclusion, equity, and other important workplace goals on our campuses, in our schools and colleges, and within our departments. We will be reviewing the demographic dashboard at our meeting today.

The Senate leadership is continuing to partner with the Provost Office's office, deans and chancellors to support the UW Leadership Program. This two-year leadership development program is focused on enhancing skills and fostering collaboration among faculty who are passionate about advancing change at our institution. Faculty participants have been nominated by deans, chancellors and Senate leadership. This fall members of the first UW Leadership Program cohort are engaged in a number of different initiatives and projects. In November, we welcome the second cohort to the program.

Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. The Senate Vice-Chair Nominating Committee will soon be formed and will be seeking nominations for next year's vice chair. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the University and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the Faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact the Nominating Committee, c/o Jordan Smith in the Faculty Senate Office. The Nominating Committee expects to recommend candidates to the Senate Executive Committee at its February meeting.
2. Elections have been held to fill the two remaining elected seats to the Senate Executive Committee. Please welcome Theo Myhre, School of Law, and Richard Keil, Oceanography, College of the Environment.

Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Music History

Majorities for 2017–19: The current majorities of a Republican Senate and Democratic House will continue, and all legislative races have been finalized (certified later in December). The House majority will remain Democratic, with a 50-48 majority, and the Senate will remain Republican, with a 25-24 majority (one of the 25 is a Democrat who caucuses with the Republican Party, in the Majority Coalition Caucus). Although the House majority of 50-48 is an identical number of votes as in 2015-17, there are many seats that changed parties, so the actual membership and internal alliances are undergoing change.

Some state Senators will resign their seats in the next few weeks, because of election to Congress (Jayapal), election to the Lieutenant Governorship (Habib), and other one or two changes yet to be announced. But any vacated seat must be filled with a member of the same party, appointed by the county council, so these resignations also will not change the majority. If current House members decide to fill the vacant Senate seats, then those House seats will be filled in the same manner – so, no matter the reason for a vacated seat, it will be filled by a member of the same party as the departing elected official. Those of us who knew Senator Andy Hill were deeply affected by his recent and untimely death. He had led the Senate Ways & Means Committee for several years, and was a great supporter of higher education.

We are fortunate that both parties in both chambers continue to appreciate the value of excellent institutions of higher education, and that both parties understand the need to balance student cost while maintaining institutional funding. As I have noted previously, this will be a challenging balance in 2017.

Faculty priorities:

As I noted in the October Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate memberships of 2015-16 and 2016-17 were provided with a survey of budgetary and legislative issues that will be under consideration in the 2017 State Legislature. Faculty were also given the opportunity to suggest additional items. The survey was open between May and October, with monthly reminders sent to faculty members who had not responded. Three priorities emerged as the top priorities and all other issues listed here will be advocated as well during the 2017 session.

Our general theme, university-wide and state-wide, in conjunction with other universities, is that higher education needs to remain competitive. At the University of Washington, the case is that our faculty, our students, and our graduates all need to be able to compete on a national and global level. Additionally, we want to reinforce the historic and always timely theme that higher education is the primary vehicle that allows each generation new opportunities for discovery and productivity, and that the University of Washington is deeply committed to access to students of all backgrounds, abilities, and talent, by offering a faculty and an environment that allows us to challenge ourselves, our nation, and the world.

The survey of last year's and the current year's Faculty Senate consistently yielded these top three priorities; the others can be viewed at <http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia> (a Catalyst site).

Top priorities include:

1. Faculty/staff compensation: recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty requires offering and maintaining salaries competitive with peer institutions, currently lagging behind the institutions with which the UW is compared. To have excellent graduates and to remain a leading research institution requires an exceptional faculty, compensated at peer levels.
2. Student financial aid, and funding for increased access for diverse populations: There is a dramatic need for an increase in current state scholarship programs (currently, around 30,000 students eligible for the State Need Grant do not receive it; the UW contributes \$17 million per year to make up this difference for UW students). We also are emphasizing the need to increase access for first-generation students. The UW and legislators are focused on providing substantive information on

application processes and financial aid to these potential students. There is awareness on the part of legislators that this needs significant attention, and we want to be sure that the UW is a major voice in this effort.

3. Institutional funding (the general operating fund), including backfill for any tuition reductions: The UW has had significant increases in state funding over the past four years, but 2017-19 will be a very challenging budget session, with the requirement to begin funding K-12 education in a new way. The paths to the solution are varied, but our goal is to be sure that the UW continues to receive the increased level of funding that has been appropriated in the past four years, with the tuition cuts backfilled by state funding.

There are many policy issues also that will be in front of the Legislature in 2017, and they are listed under the heading "UW Faculty: Legislative Priorities" in the left menu at:

<http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia>

Faculty regent legislation: In a separate resolution, the Faculty Senate will have an opportunity to endorse proposed legislation that would create a faculty Regent on the Board of Regents. This idea has been proposed five times in the Legislature since 2007 and has not succeeded. One change in this attempt will be to proceed with only Washington State University as a partner. Although all the four-year universities agreed a year ago to undertake the local preparation and coordination needed for this legislation, only the UW and WSU have reached a point where we have arrived at common concord among faculty governance, administration, and between our institutions. The regional four-year universities (Eastern, Central, Western, and The Evergreen State College) will continue to work on this proposed legislation for introduction later in the session, or in the following year. The resolution included in this packet reflects discussions held in the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs over the past six months, the November SEC meeting, and other discussions with current and past Faculty Senate leadership.

Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice (ACIP³)

Committee charge

ACIP³ is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty intellectual property, including its management and commercialization.

Direction and priorities

- Review [Executive Order 36](#) to bring up to date and align with new practices.
- Big picture:
 - How best to compensate stakeholders for their contribution to development of IP assets? What is the appropriate allocation of ownership rights within bounds allowed by the state?
 - How to disseminate information, intellectual assets generated at UW?
 - How most effectively to educate stakeholders, appraise them of their rights? How best to provide access to resources they need to inform themselves about those rights and leverage them?
- Prioritize focus on GiX and Open Access as two lenses through which many of the emergent IP issues can best be examined and addressed, e.g.,
 - Private/public co-ownership (e.g., w/Microsoft @ GiX).
 - Group, student, faculty, institution (UW/International partners), private sector relationships.
 - Emergent copyright, digital issues, not just patents.
- Other potential topics, areas of exploration:
 - Online/hybrid courses.
 - MOOCs – massive online courses.
 - Software development.

Administrative support

- Website: The Office of Research will host the committee's web site.
- Provost has agreed to provide \$5,000 in administrative support to be used, e.g., staff support, meeting room costs, copying, etc.

Membership

SEC nominees:

- Robert Gomulkiewicz, Professor and committee chair, Law School.
- Tueng Shen, Professor, School of Medicine.
- Jim Gregory, Professor, Arts & Sciences.
- Pierre Mourad, Professor, Engineering & Mathematics at UWB.
- Foster School of Business (position pending).
- Humanities (position pending).

President's nominees:

- Ed Lazowska, Professor, Computer Sciences & Engineering.
- Gordon Aamot, Head, Scholarly Communications and Publishing, Libraries.
- Fiona Wills, Director, UW CoMotion Innovation Development.
- Clark Westmoreland, Assistant Vice Provost & Executive Director of Operations, Continuum College.
- Carol Rhodes, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Office of Research.
- Nancy Hovis, Senior Director of Business & Regulatory Affairs, Health Sciences/UW Medicine.

Ex officio positions:

- Chair, Faculty Council on Research, Mike Rosenfeld, Professor, Public Health.
- Secretary of the Faculty, Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, Law.
- Representative from ASUW, vacant.
- Representative from GPSS, Mikel Ruterbusch.
- Committee's legal counsel, UW division of the attorney general's office.

Motion to constitute a new committee structure for reviewing revising, and reporting on UW Intellectual Property policies and management, approved by SEC on April 4, 2016.

Formal motion: That the Senate Executive Committee take the following actions:

1. Terminate the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC), effective on the date that the President terminates the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC);
2. Authorize formation of and participation of faculty members in a new advisory committee, to take effect when SCIPC and IPMAC are terminated. A suggested name is Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice: ACIPPP! The new committee will have the following characteristics:
 - A. The committee will have dual reporting obligations to the SEC and to the President;
 - B. The SEC and the President may each appoint up to six voting members; the Graduate and Professional Students may appoint one voting member; the Provost may appoint an ex-officio member to advise on budget issues.
 - C. The SEC may appoint up to six faculty members. The Chair of the Senate will nominate faculty members based on their expertise or significant experience regarding intellectual property policy, management, or commercialization, including previous service on IPMAC or SCIPC, and their willingness to serve. The Chair and SEC shall make every effort to ensure that faculty appointees represent diverse disciplines with diverse interests and needs regarding IP policy, management, and commercialization. To the extent possible, faculty members should represent the following disciplines or units:
 - i. Health Sciences
 - ii. Engineering
 - iii. Social Sciences
 - iv. Humanities
 - v. Law
 - vi. Business
 - D. The President may appoint up to six members to represent administrative or academic units, such as:
 - i. The Office of Research;
 - ii. Educational Outreach;
 - iii. CoMotion;
 - iv. UW Libraries
 - v. Health Sciences/School of Medicine
 - E. The University of Washington Division of the Attorney General's Office will serve as the committee's legal counsel.
 - F. Except for the GPSS member, voting members' appointment terms will be three years and are renewable. GPSS may appoint a member for a term up to three years in length.
 - G. The President and the Chair of the Faculty Senate will consult and jointly appoint the chair of the committee. The chair's term will be one year and is renewable.
 - H. The Senate leadership will work with the Provost to secure support staff for the committee, comparable to what has been provided to IPMAC.
3. Authorize the Chair, Vice Chair, and Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to

consult with the President, and with the current members of SCIPC and IPMAC, among others, on the elements of and deadlines for the charge to the new committee. We anticipate that the charge should be developed no later than June 15, 2016, and may include elements such as the following.

- A. A recommendation, after consultation with the Open Access Task Force, regarding an “Open Access” policy for faculty research;
- B. A recommendation of policies and practices designed to lower the cost of textbooks for UW students and other course materials;
- C. A recommendation for policies and management of faculty, staff, student, and university intellectual property rights involved in on-line courses, on-line programs, and third-party on-line learning management systems;
- D. A recommendation for policies and practices for managing intellectual property interests generated during collaborations between or among UW faculty members, staff, and students;
- E. A recommendation for policies and practices for managing faculty, staff, student, and university intellectual property rights generated during or as a result of partnerships between the University and other entities, including private for-profit and non-profit entities and academic institutions;
- F. A review of, and recommendations for, policies and practices governing mandatory licensing or assignment agreements required by the UW as a condition for granting permission for outside work by faculty, staff, or students;
- G. A tri-campus assessment of ongoing or emerging needs, opportunities, or impediments to efficient and equitable management of intellectual property generated by UW faculty, staff, and students, and their external partners;
- H. A comprehensive review of and proposed revisions, as necessary, to Executive Order 36 – deadline TBD.
- I. Recommendations of a plan and method for educating faculty, staff, and students about their intellectual property rights, responsibilities, and opportunities on an ongoing basis.

Rationale:

I have consulted with the members of SCIPC, IPMAC, the faculty senate leadership, and the President's office concerning the desirability of establishing a joint faculty/administrative committee on intellectual property policy and management that has a refreshed charge and dual reporting obligations to the SEC and to the President. All have agreed that this is a good idea.

Novel intellectual property issues crop up regularly at the UW. Our basic IP policies, which were set forty to fifty years ago by EO 36, do not necessarily cover every issue, nor do our practices necessarily promote the UW's collective mission as effectively and transparently as we might hope. We are all aware of technological changes that affect both research and teaching methods and materials, many of which require faculty, staff and students to contract about and manage patents, copyrights, and trademarks in keeping with public law, university rules, and the requirements of external partners and funding sources. We are aware of increasing numbers of inter-disciplinary and collaborative research agendas. We are also aware of new funding and revenue-generating models, including partnerships with private and foreign entities, such as those involved with the Global Innovation Exchange.

Now is a good time to energize a renewed, joint, SEC and administrative focus on intellectual property rights and management. The goals of a joint effort should be to:

- Provide greater and faster public access to UW research through broader, easier open access depository and ultimately R1 depository consortia
- Join with other R1 universities in a long-term effort to reduce monopolistic publisher pricing effects on

library collections cost

- By encouraging open access policies for research and for teaching materials, and
- By gradually reducing private publisher influence over peer review and P&T criteria
- Encourage use of lower cost teaching materials, if needed quality is available
- Encourage best practices for on-line teaching materials and programs
- Be a leader in open access policies; recognize the inroads the internet has made on traditional IP practices; acknowledge open access policies of public and major private, non-profit grantors
- Identify best business/licensing practices for private/public partnerships
- Encourage intra-UW research and teaching collaborations by providing transparent templates, adaptable to multi-disciplines
- Educate faculty about what can be done; increase transparency, and efficiency
- Recognize the implications of the shift from C4C to CoMotion
- Create policies and practices that support a culture of trust, fairness, and mutual advantage for the UW, faculty and graduate students, the business, non-profit and philanthropic communities
- Update policies to comply with changed laws in certain areas.

Why is a joint SEC/administration committee with a refreshed charge desirable now?

IPMAC has worked long and hard, first to advise prior Presidents on IP policy and commercialization, and more recently to conduct a thorough review of Executive Order 36 and to engage in university-wide dialogues about emerging issues and needs. However, no formal proposals have emerged from that body recently. Meanwhile changes that involve significant IP interests and issues continue apace. Other IP-related initiatives – such as the Open Access Task Force – were prompted by a Senate Resolution. ASUW and the state legislature are interested in lowering the costs of textbooks. C4C has been reconfigured as CoMotion with a significantly different mission and funding model. A significant new partnership – GIX – has been launched.

From a faculty perspective, it was problematic that IPMAC did not report to a faculty body. SCIPC was constituted several years ago in reaction to the perception that IP issues were not necessarily handled transparently or in a manner consistent with the UW's public mission or the faculty's best interests. Even though IPMAC's recent leadership has tried valiantly to operate openly, the effect of having two bodies reviewing IP policies and practices has not been particularly efficient. IPMAC feels it must consult SCIPC; SCIPC has not developed its own agenda so much as waited for IPMAC or the administration to propose changes. To be fair, the process has been slow, not through the fault of either committee, but simply because the issues are numerous and sometimes very complex.

A joint committee could at least be more efficient. A committee with dual reporting obligations makes it more likely that the SEC will learn of important administrative initiatives that involve IP and that the administration will hear of faculty interests and concerns earlier. Now, with a (relatively new) administration, this may also be a time when a freshly charged committee can address the many and novel IP issues with a collaborative spirit and renewed energy. It is an open issue whether the committee should begin by attempting comprehensive review and revision of UW IP policies or whether it might begin by addressing specific, contemporary issues and then build toward a comprehensive review and revision of EO 36, for example. It may also be the case that the new committee should focus less on traditional IP ownership and licensing of patents in the context of tech transfer, and more on developing and disseminating best practices that serve the UW's contemporary mission and strategies across the board.

In any event, my goal in recommending a joint committee is to commit both the faculty and the administration to managing inevitable, novel IP issues by creating a shared governance body that can hold institutional memory, develop relevant expertise, review existing policies and practices, and advise on emerging issues relatively quickly and transparently.

Proposal

- Create a fresh body – an advisory committee with dual reporting obligations to Senate and President. (Model is Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics).

- Reconstitute a smaller membership (than the sum of both SCIPC and IPMAC) based on relevant knowledge, experience and expertise; attend to disciplinary diversity; ensure help from law and business, as needed, but perhaps not lead with legal considerations; consider providing graduate student researchers and staff with voice.
- Use and disseminate, as appropriate, data and analysis already done by IPMAC, SCIPC, OR, and C4C to new committee.
- Charge deans and EFCs with gathering data on discipline-specific needs and reporting to advisory committee. (Information in.)
- Consider a fresh charge to the new committee.
- Consider charging committee to tackle particular issues rather than a global reform of IP policy across UW.
- Focus first on recommending best practices to accomplish goals rather than on allocation of IP ownership.
- Revision of EO 36 would be an outcome, not initial focus.
- Foster intellectual engagement about these issues – e.g. invite prominent speakers; encourage a symposium or two. (Information out.)
- Set firm deadlines for accomplishing certain tasks.
- Provost provides staff support.

Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

- The council has discussed the offering of W-credits (Additional Writing) in language courses and decided that the W-credit was designed and intended to be granted for writing in English (to encourage training/practice in writing at the UW).
- FCAS has been asked to weigh in on a discussion relating to the departmental sign-off process for issues of course and program overlap.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

The council has had one meeting in 2016-2017, and discussed the upcoming Open Enrollment for Benefits and changes to life insurance. The council also addressed its 2016-2017 charge letter, which includes expected activities for the academic year. These activities include:

- Complete a "Benefits Comparison Chart" of UW peer institutions through a robust gathering of institutional benefits data from 11 institutions.
- Review current policy on UW Tuition Waivers.
- Review and evaluate parental leave policies with special emphasis on assessing issues of equity (e.g. paid maternity vs. leave for adoption).
- Consider mechanisms to recognize, acknowledge, and celebrate the contributions made to the university by retiring UW faculty.
- Evaluate potential mechanisms to utilize engagement of retired faculty at the UW

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs / Faculty Council on Women in Academia

- Reviewed the draft "Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices" from the Center for Teaching and Learning and voted to approve dissemination of the document in spring 2016.
- Developed a Class C Resolution on Equity, Access, and Inclusion Training for Promotion and Tenure Committees (currently within the Class C ratification process).

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

The council is continuing a robust investigation of lecturer issues at the UW with an aim to potentially consider changes to the Faculty Code, once completed.

Faculty Council on Research

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the FCR is working on improving institutional support structures for Postdoctoral Researchers at the UW. The council plans to advance a Class C resolution to disseminate information on the initiative to the wider faculty in winter quarter 2017.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students. Currently, the council is instrumental in reviewing Phase II changes to the UW Student Conduct Code, and will eventually advance Class B legislation to cement the policy changes at the UW and within the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

The FCTL is currently breaking up its membership into subcommittees to address areas of interest relating to pedagogy at the UW. The areas the council has identified include:

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

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The FCTCP has met once during academic year 2016-2017 and is currently interested in evaluating and potentially revising the university-wide curriculum approval mechanism of "Tri-Campus Review." Other areas of interest the council has identified include:

Examining the impact of Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) on cross-school/college/campus program enrollment at the graduate level

Completing review of Masters/Grad degree approval process(es) begun 2015-2016

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

FCUFS began the 2016-2017 academic year by altering its meeting schedule to meet twice a month (every two weeks). In addition to reviewing the One Capital Plan, Campus Master Plan, and other presentations from university administrators relating to capital project development, the council has expressed an interest in facilitating additional faculty review of capital developments at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

FCUL has yet to meet in academic year 2016-2017; the council has an ongoing interest in advancing the university-wide Open Access Initiative, supporting the development and review of a new policy on digital scholarship, and continuing to offer feedback and support for the Open Textbooks Initiative at the UW.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The FCWA has identified a new chair, and has yet to meet in academic year 2016-2017. As a starting point, the council is expected to address two Class C resolutions which were formulated by members during the previous academic year:

- A Class C resolution concerning Faculty and Staff Training on Assault and Relationship Violence.
- A Class C resolution concerning Faculty Power to Reform Sexual Assault Resources at UW.

Request for official code interpretation

To: SEC members:
From: Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty
Re: Interpretive issues with respect to Chapter 29 (Amendment of the Faculty Code)
Date: November 1, 2016

Last year in connection with the debate on the faculty salary policy, several questions arose about the amendment process as spelled out in Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations ("Code Cops") considered the issues and provided "opinions for consideration by the Senate Executive Committee." Their response is attached.

The SEC has ultimate interpretive authority per Section 22-60.B.9. Because of the importance of these issues, the Code Cops "recommend[] that whatever interpretations the SEC adopts be codified explicitly by amendment of the Faculty Code." The Secretary recommends that the SEC provide definitive interpretations with respect to these questions and start the formal amendment process by requesting that the Code Cops draft appropriate language pursuant to their responsibility under Section 22-61.A.3.a.

Members of the SEC should carefully read the Code Cop memo, but a brief precis, as I see it, of the key questions and the Code Cop responses is provided below:

1. The Code Cops were asked whether the SEC may, as part of its first consideration of Class A legislation submitted to it, decline to forward the legislation to the Faculty Senate. Their answer was that the SEC may not decline to forward such legislation. They went on to say: "[T]he SEC could, in theory, delay that introduction indefinitely, effectively voting it down without explicitly declining to forward. However, given the requirements for 'submission to the Senate' in 42-33A or to 'introduce' in Subsection 29-32B and the 'next meeting' timelines for proposed legislation elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the SEC could reasonably interpret the Faculty Code to require that it submit or introduce proposed legislation at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting or at a special Faculty Senate meeting."
2. The Code Cops were asked whether the SEC may at such a first consideration amend the language of submitted legislation before forwarding it to the Faculty Senate. With respect to legislation submitted by faculty petition, the Code Cops said: "Since the SEC must introduce the proposed legislation 'submitted to it in appropriate written form,' a reasonable interpretation would be that the SEC may not amend, alter or decline to forward the proposed legislation. The SEC may reasonably request that the proposed legislation be revised into appropriate written form (see, e.g., Subsection 29-32C)." With respect to legislation submitted by a Faculty Council, the Code Cops said: "A reasonable interpretation of the text of the Faculty Code would be that the SEC may recommend amendments to proposed legislation submitted by a Faculty Council to the Senate, but may not implement them, i.e., that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from a Faculty Council to the Senate substantially in the form in which it was received, perhaps with minor changes to format and grammar but without substantive changes to meaning, along with any recommended amendments, which the Senate may then adopt or alter as it chooses. This would 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." However, the Code Cops noted: "[T]his is not how the SEC has proceeded in recent times."
3. The Code Cops noted a potential inconsistency in the way legislation may be introduced through the SEC by faculty petition. In particular, Section 29-32.B describes a request in writing by 1% or more of the voting members of the faculty, but Section 22-60.B.3 describes a request in writing by at least 10% of the voting members of the faculty.

4. The Code Cops were asked what changes could be made by the SEC at the second consideration of Class A legislation. Their response was that the SEC is limited by Section 29-34.A.3, which states that the SEC:
 - “3. May make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:
 - a. To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and
 - b. To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or with other provisions of the Faculty Code, and
 - c. To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President.”
5. Finally, the Code Cops were asked what changes, if any, the Senate, may make during the second consideration of Class A legislation to the original proposal (i.e. the proposal that resulted from the Senate’s first consideration) or the alternate that results from the operation of 29-34.A.3. They responded: “[N]o change in the [alternate] proposed legislation is permitted. ... [T]he most reasonable interpretation is that consideration of the original proposal at second consideration is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty, and amendments are not permitted. ... [T]he Senate may reject the original proposal and then reintroduce either proposal for first consideration, including amendment.”

Advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

March 25, 2016

Dear Marcia,

In response to your letter of March 8, 2016, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has considered the issues you raised and offers the following opinions for consideration by the Senate Executive Committee, should it desire to make a formal interpretation of the relevant sections of the Faculty Code.

A note on vocabulary. The Faculty Code refers to ‘a proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code.’ We are then asked to consider the process for amending these proposals for amendment of the Faculty Code. In our discussion we follow your practice of referring to what the Faculty Code calls ‘proposal(s) for amendment of the Faculty Code’ as ‘proposed legislation,’ and discuss amending the proposed legislation.

In the preamble to the issues, you state:

If the Senate approves the legislation at this ‘first consideration’, the matter is sent (back) to the SEC to consider any amendments made by your committee and the President (“second consideration”), as described in Chapter 29, Section 29-33 and Section 29-34.

In fact, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations does not make amendments to proposed legislation. Per 29-33E, it

1. *Examine(s) 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*
2. *Report(s) to the Executive Committee at its next regular meeting any suggestions which may arise from its examination of the proposal.*

Also, the President does not make amendments to proposed legislation. Per 29-33D,

- A. *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.*

While the President's reasons may reasonably contain suggestions as to changes that would earn Presidential approval, these are not amendments to the proposed legislation.

You first ask

1. *Section 29-32 provides for the SEC to introduce a proposed amendment to the Senate. Frequently the proposed legislation is brought to the SEC by a Council or a member of the Senate or SEC. Is it consistent with the Faculty Code for the SEC at this "first consideration" to make changes to the proposed legislation? May the SEC decline to forward the legislation to the Senate (ie. (sic) "vote it down")? Under what conditions may an individual faculty member or group of faculty introduce a Class A proposal directly to the Senate for "first consideration"?*

Taking the questions in turn:

Q1A. *Is it consistent with the Faculty Code for the SEC at this "first consideration" to make changes to the proposed legislation? May the SEC decline to forward the legislation to the Senate (ie. (sic) "vote it down")?*

Proposed legislation reaches the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in three ways: From Faculty Councils, by petition of the faculty, or originated in the SEC itself. When originating proposed legislation under Section 29-32A the SEC may clearly alter it in any way it sees fit, including deciding not to submit it to the Senate.

Proposed legislation from Faculty Councils is governed by Section 42-33A.1 and A.3:

42-33A.1. (Faculty Councils) (s)hall 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;

42-33A.3. (A Faculty Council) (m)ay on its own initiative prepare legislative proposals or resolutions for submission through the Executive Committee to the Senate;

Since the Faculty Code calls for submission of proposed legislation to the Senate through the Executive Committee, the clear interpretation is that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from Faculty Councils to the Senate, and cannot 'vote it down.' The question is then to what extent the SEC may alter the proposed legislation prior to such submission. Section 22-60A says that the SEC '(is) to assist the Senate in the discharge of its legislative duties.' Section 22-60B.4 states:

22-60B.4. (The SEC) (s)hall make recommendations to the Senate concerning proposed legislative actions;

The question then is whether making recommendations extends to amending the language of proposed legislation.

As a matter of text and structure, we consider the SEC to be a "non-plenary" committee, *i.e.*, with no more powers than those specifically granted. Major alterations made by the SEC to legislation proposed to the Senate by a Faculty Council, prior to submission to the Senate, would appear to be closer to 'supplanting' the legislative duties of the Senate than to 'assisting' them. A reasonable interpretation of the text of the Faculty Code would be that the SEC may recommend amendments to proposed legislation submitted by a Faculty Council to the Senate, but may not implement them, *i.e.*, that the SEC must submit proposed legislation from a Faculty Council to the Senate substantially in the form in which

it was received, perhaps with minor changes to format and grammar but without substantive changes to meaning, along with any recommended amendments, which the Senate may then adopt or alter as it chooses. This would 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.

However, this is not how the SEC has proceeded in recent times. The legislative flowchart at www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/05/class_a_flowchart.pdf clearly envisions the SEC amending proposed legislation. An interpretation based on historical practice could interpret 'recommendations' as including making substantive changes to proposed legislation from Faculty Councils. However, this flowchart does not envision 'voting down' legislation proposed by a Faculty Council.

Proposed legislation from faculty petition is governed by Section 29-32B:

29-32B: 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.

Proposed legislation forwarded to the SEC under the provision of Subsection 29-32B, *i.e.*, accompanied by a written request signed by 1% or more of the voting members of the faculty, must be 'introduced' by the SEC. Although 29-32B does not explicitly say so, the proposed legislation clearly must be introduced to the Senate. Since the SEC must introduce the proposed legislation 'submitted to it in appropriate written form,' a reasonable interpretation would be that the SEC may not amend, alter or decline to forward the proposed legislation. The SEC may reasonably request that the proposed legislation be revised into appropriate written form (see, *e.g.*, Subsection 29-32C).

As an aside, Section 22-60B.3 states:

22-60B.3. (The SEC) (s)hall include on the agenda any item requested in writing by at least 10% of the voting members of the faculty;

Yet Section 29-32B requires only 1% of the faculty to introduce proposed legislation. We view proposed legislation as a special case of 'any item.' However, we consider that one or the other of these numbers may be in error.

There is no explicit time limit on introduction of proposed legislation from Faculty Councils or from petition of the faculty by the SEC to the Senate, so the SEC could, in theory, delay that introduction indefinitely, effectively voting it down without explicitly declining to forward. However, given the requirements for 'submission to the Senate' in 42-33A or to 'introduce' in Subsection 29-32B and the 'next meeting' timelines for proposed legislation elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the SEC could reasonably interpret the Faculty Code to require that it submit or introduce proposed legislation at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting or at a special Faculty Senate meeting.

Q1B. Under what conditions may an individual faculty member or group of faculty introduce a Class A proposal directly to the Senate for "first consideration"?

Subsection 29-32A provides that any Senator may introduce a 'proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code,' *i.e.*, Class A proposed legislation, at any meeting of the Faculty Senate, presumably under the New Business agenda item, provided that the proposed legislation is in written form and that it conforms to the form required in Subsection 29-33C, *i.e.*, it is a resolution to submit the proposal to the faculty. There is no requirement or provision for Senate Executive Committee review or amendment of such proposed legislation prior to its introduction to the Faculty Senate.

A single individual member of the faculty who is not a Senator may not introduce proposed legislation directly to the Senate. Section 29-32B, as discussed above, provides for a request to the SEC to

introduce proposed legislation accompanied by the signatures of 1% or more of the voting faculty.

Your second issue was

1. *Section 29-34, subsections A, B, and C describe what we call the “second consideration” of the proposed legislation by the SEC. May any changes be made to the proposed legislation by the SEC other than those recommended by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations or the President?*

Section 29-34 requires that the SEC consider the statement of the President and the suggestions of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations concerning proposed legislation. However, the SEC is neither bound by nor limited to these inputs. The SEC does not, however, have a totally free hand to make changes to proposed legislation at this point in the process. The SEC may decline to make any specific suggested change, and may make such other changes as it chooses, provided that the changes can be justified as meeting one or more of the requirements of Subsection 29-34A.3, which states:

2. *(The SEC) (m)ay make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:*
 - a. *To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and*
 - b. *To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or with other provisions of the Faculty Code, and*
 - c. *To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President.*

Your third issue was:

3. *Section 29-34, subsection D describes actions to be taken at the Senate’s “second consideration.” May any changes be made by the Senate to either the “original proposal” or the “alternate proposal” at this meeting or must they be voted on as submitted by the SEC without further amendment?*

Subsection 29-34D states that if the SEC has altered the proposed legislation resulting from first consideration in the Faculty Senate, the ‘first question’ for the Faculty Senate is to approve or disapprove submitting the revised proposed legislation (the ‘alternate proposal’) to the Faculty. Thus no change in the revised proposed legislation is permitted before this determination is made. If the revised proposed legislation is rejected, *i.e.*, the Faculty Senate votes to not submit it to the Faculty, then the Faculty Senate ‘shall then consider’ the proposed legislation approved by the Senate at the first consideration (‘the original proposal’). The question is whether the term ‘consider’ includes amendment of the proposed legislation.

The structure of the double-consideration framework of proposed legislation by the Faculty Senate seems to be aimed in large part at avoiding sending to the full faculty a proposal that is “flawed” because of conflicts with other parts of the code, executive orders, relevant state law, or administrative support. If the Senate were able to reject the alternate proposal and then freely amend the original proposal and send it to the faculty without further review by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, and without further Presidential review, flawed proposals are far more likely.

Moreover, if this were intended there would be no need for the double-consideration framework as it exists. It would have been simpler to allow the Senate to freely amend the SEC’s alternate proposal.

Thus the presence of the double-consideration framework strongly implies that consideration of the original proposal is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty. As a matter of historical practice

amendments of the original proposal have not been allowed. Indeed, the flow chart does not have an "amendments" input on the second consideration. Therefore, the most reasonable interpretation is that consideration of the original proposal at second consideration is limited to whether to submit it to the faculty, and amendments are not permitted. As we have seen, the Senate may reject the original proposal and then reintroduce either proposal for first consideration, including amendment.

Because of the importance of these issues the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommends that whatever interpretations the SEC adopts be codified explicitly by amendment of the Faculty Code.

Richard D. Christie
Chair, Advisory Committee on the Faculty Code and Regulation

2016-2017 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)**

- Tom Halverson, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

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

- Jan Whittington, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)

- Angelisa Paladin, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Angelisa Paladin, School of Medicine, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice

- Robert Gomulkiewicz, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Jim Gregory, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Pierrre Mourad, Engineering & Mathematics, UW Bothell, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Tueng Shen, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Adjudication Panel

- Margaret Adam, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Chris Hague, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Gail Stygall, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Kristiina Vogt, College of the Environment, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Class B Legislation: Chapter 102 Scholastic Regulations.

Rationale: The University of Washington has implemented the practice of allowing students to identify themselves by the name they would like to be called in classroom settings or interacting with other campus personnel. This change in the scholastic regulations reflects this practice. More information can be found on the registrar's website at <https://registrar.washington.edu/students/preferred-names/>.

Legislation:**Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102 Registration**

[Additional regulations regarding Enrollment and Registration Procedures are located in Chapter 478-160 WAC. Among the topics included are admission categories, applications, residence classification, enrollment periods, enrollment procedures, enrollment in courses on other UW campuses, enrollment service fees, credit categories, withdrawals, and information on special programs.]

1. Registration for Courses

A. Registration Required

Students are required to register for any course in which they participate. No person, other than guests approved by the instructor, may take part in a University course in which she or he has not been registered.

B. Preferred Name

The University of Washington provides students with the opportunity to have a preferred name displayed on non-legal documents and applications such as class lists and advising tools.

~~B.~~ C. Credits Allowed Per Quarter

1. Except with the consent of his or her dean, no student shall be registered for more than 20 credits of work or the number called for in the prescribed curricula.
2. For students in the Graduate School, a minimum workload of 10 credits per quarter is required for full-time status.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 14, 2016

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
December 1, 2016

Class C Resolution regarding adding a faculty member to the Board of Regents of the University of Washington.

WHEREAS, the faculty of the University of Washington have charge of the immediate government of the institution under such rules as may be prescribed by the board of regents [[RCW 28B.20.200](#)]; and

WHEREAS, state law provides that Regents will obtain the assistance and recommendation of the faculty in prescribing the courses of study in the various colleges, schools, and departments of the institution, and in the awarding of degrees [[RCW 28B.20.130](#)]; and

WHEREAS, the faculty of the University of Washington are specifically authorized to formulate regulations and to share responsibility with the University President, Chancellors, and Deans on matters such as educational policy and general welfare, policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities, scholastic policy, approval of candidates for degrees, criteria for faculty appointments, tenure, and promotions, and recommendations concerning university budgets [[Executive Order 4](#)]; and

WHEREAS, the governance of the University of Washington will be strengthened by providing the perspective of its faculty to the Board of Regents by adding a faculty member as a voting member to the Board; therefore,

THE FACULTY SENATE RESOLVES, that the Faculty supports legislation adding an eleventh member of the Board of Regents who is a full-time or emeritus member of the faculty of the University for a term recommended to be of three years.

The Faculty Senate recommends a process by which the Governor selects the faculty regent from a list of candidates, of at least two and not more than five, selected via a process determined by the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington.

The Faculty Senate intends that this faculty regent will be able to participate in processes and discussions relating to policy regarding major hiring decisions affecting the University, while expecting that the faculty regent would recuse himself or herself from voting on any decisions affecting matters relating to the hiring, discipline, or tenure of specific faculty members and personnel.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate authorizes its Faculty Legislative Representative to pursue the enactment of this proposed legislation in keeping with these principles in coordination with Washington State University's Faculty Senate in the 2017 legislative session.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 14, 2016

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
December 1, 2016

Resolution Concerning Faculty Seminar Series.**Rationale:**

As faculty members at the University of Washington, we have a responsibility to foster a community of diverse opinions, in which all members feel welcomed and respected. At the same time, we see a need for faculty to be informed in order to serve as models and leaders as we move forward as a community. In this framework, the Faculty Senate leadership has begun to compile a list of links and resources aimed at helping faculty learn how to use the classroom and our campuses to nurture a climate of inclusiveness. We would like to ask the leadership to continue this effort by facilitating a series of informational meetings that would inform faculty on the potential changes in federal policies, regulations, and funding. These meetings should respect all points of view, facilitate constructive dialogue across the full spectrum of community membership, and serve to enhance learning and understanding. With that in mind we are submitting this Class C Resolution.

WHEREAS, selected members of the University of Washington community have considerable expertise in matters of policy and practice on a wide range of issues facing our campus, city, state, and nation; and

WHEREAS, there is now the prospect of significant changes in long-standing federal policies and practices that have the potential to impact our campus, city, state, and nation, in the short and long term; and

WHEREAS, members of the University of Washington community have a responsibility to serve as leaders and models in anticipating, influencing, and responding to these potential changes; and

WHEREAS, open discussions of the potential consequences of changes in federal policies and practices is one way to increase our shared understanding of and ability to provide leadership on these issues; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that we ask the Faculty Senate leadership to facilitate the organization of a series of informational meetings and make available related resources during the remainder of the 2016-2017 academic year on topics including the following:

- Immigration law and the status of DACA students;
- The Affordable Care Act;
- Climate and environmental science;
- Government support of basic research;
- Civility and inclusivity training;
- Higher education funding and practices.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this series leverage the expertise of our faculty to help all faculty members serve as informed leaders on campus, regardless of present and future government policies, as a reaffirmation of our roles in teaching, research, and service, and a statement of our dedication to our public mission.

Submitted by:

Chris Laws, Chair, Faculty Council on Student Affairs
Gordon Watts, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
December 1, 2016

Approved by:

Faculty Senate
December 1, 2016