

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 4, 2014, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Kate O'Neill called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Faculty Senate Chair's Remarks – Professor Kate O'Neill. [Exhibit A]

Chair O'Neill referred members to her written agenda. O'Neill mentioned recent discussions regarding the HR/Payroll system implementation, specifically regarding the bi-weekly pay periods which will go into effect at the beginning of the overall transition. She pointed senators to the transition [website](#), which includes a [FAQ](#) addressing many of the concerns.

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions.

- a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. **[Exhibit B]**
- b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting. **[Exhibit C]**
- c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. **[Exhibit D]**

There were no questions regarding the written reports. JoAnn Taricani, the Faculty Legislative Representative, was asked to give a brief report. Taricani mentioned that the next Faculty Senate meeting will occur two weeks into the legislative session. She emphasized the difference between the Governor's Book 1 and 2 budgets, specifically that the former does not include any new revenue streams. As far as issues directly affecting the university system, the legislature seemed to be interested in avoiding tuition increases.

Taricani said WSU may be looking to amend the Washington Administrative Code to allow another medical school to operate in the state.

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

President Young took a moment to thank the Alumni Association for their efforts to affect change in Olympia. The last application cycle yielded a record number of applications to the university, most notably from out of state students. The final stages of the UWT Chancellor search were underway, and Young was impressed with the caliber of the remaining candidates.

Young said the most significant challenges in Olympia would be finding ways to increase revenue and the passage of Initiative 1351.

The legislature recently completed an audit of 4-year institutions regarding reserve funds. The audit was narrowed to UW only, and he anticipated the results at the end of December.

Regarding the proposed medical school at WSU, Young added that Senator Baumgartner already submitted a bill to the legislature to make the change in the WAC mentioned by JoAnn Taricani.

5. Requests for Information.

- Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of November 17, 2014.
- a. Approval of the [October 6, 2014](#), SEC minutes.
 - b. Approval of the [October 23, 2014](#), Faculty Senate minutes.
 - c. Report of the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. **[Exhibit E]**
 - d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. **[Exhibit F]**
 - e. Proposed changes to the student conduct code. **[Exhibit G]**

There were no questions.

6. Memorial Resolution

Vice Chair Norm Beauchamp read the memorial resolution:

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

Associate Professor Emeritus Beryl Moya Martin Duplica of Social Work who died on October 21, 2014, after having served the university since 1963.

Clinical Professor Terrence “Terry” Gleason of Medicine who died on October 22, 2014, after having served the university since 1967.

Clinical Professor Hugh James Lurie of Medicine who died on September 28, 2014, after having served the university since 1969.

Professor Emeritus Elaine Ranker Mosen of Health Services who died October 29, 2014, after having served the university since 1963.

Clinical Professor Emeritus James W. M. Owens of Pathology who died on November 1, 2014, after having served the university since 1963.

Professor Emeritus Fendall Yerxa of Communication who died on October 19, 2014, after having served the university since 1965.”

The memorial resolution was approved by standing vote.

7. Consent Agenda.

Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **[Exhibit H]**

There were no objections and the consent agenda was approved without amendment.

8. Announcements.

Chair O'Neill had two announcements. First, O'Neill asked members to contact the vice chair nominating committee to suggest nominations for the next Faculty Senate Vice Chair. Second, she indicated that there were two open positions on the University Disciplinary Committee, and asked for those interested to contact the Secretary of the Faculty.

9. Discussion: ABB Academic Policy Committee.

Dean Sandra Archibald attended to seek input for the recently formed ABB Academic Policy Committee. The committee is addressing ongoing issues with the funding mechanisms within ABB which affect the academic missions of the university.

The committee plans to look into better ways to handle emerging issues including: summer quarter funding, cross-listed courses, graduate students who are enrolled in one unit and teaching or researching in another, and other disincentives or incentives for cross-college collaboration within the ABB model.

Patricia Kramer expressed a concern regarding courses created to increase enrollment, and therefore funding. She offered the help of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards in reviewing those issues.

Young said that if colleges are underwater now it is a result of poor budget management on the dean's part because aggregate expenditures are almost equal to what they were before ABB.

Some faculty members expressed support for addressing these issues within the current faculty governance structure instead of creating a new committee.

Kate O'Neill suggested that EFCs are the best venue to provide input to the deans.

10. Discussion: [Faculty Salary Policy Proposal](#). At the last meeting, senators were asked to initiate salary policy discussions in the departments they represent and come to this meeting prepared to report faculty responses to the proposal, and also how a vote might go in their units.

Kate O'Neill first mentioned that a forum on the proposal would occur in February or March. She outlined the process for the proposal then asked for members to report on the support and concerns from their units.

O'Neill referred members to the [Faculty Senate website](#) where detailed information about the salary policy proposal could be found. She asked that discussion be focused on hearing from the Senators rather than presenting information to the body. She encouraged senators who would not get a chance to speak to post their comments to the [salary policy discussion board](#). O'Neill expressed that it would be ideal to have some feedback from each school, college, and campus. She outlined the procedure for speaking and opened the floor for input.

1. College of the Environment

Would this proposal be funded? Would it be funded internally, within departments and units? What if the unit doesn't have the funding to implement the recommended raises?

2. College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) (Chemistry)

Discussion should focus on the main advantages, not the main details. Adding more opportunities for salary advancement than the current two-per-career major promotions is a positive feature.

3. School of Medicine (Bioethics and Humanities):

Concerned that there wasn't a problem needing fixing. They didn't perceive a problem with current system and were concerned that there would be more work with little gain/change; also concerned about funding.

4. School of Social Work:

Members wanted more information, especially about disadvantages and what other models were considered.

5. A&S (Astronomy):

Concerned about where the funding would come from. Will this force cuts in other priority areas?

6. A&S (Statistics):

Focus on salary itself was disconcerting. Need deeper consideration of incentives and rewards. Concerned about funding because nobody expects consistent revenue. What other forms of reward might there be? Would appreciate more flexibility and focus on compression. Focus on professor reviews "obnoxious." Suggested more flexibility for WOT faculty to switch to a focus on teaching. Main issue not salary, rather a need for flexibility to offer an exchange of salary and duties to increase career stability.

7. College of Education:

Wanted more detail on specific timelines for implementation. Wanted to know about salary impact on whole college.

8. A&S (English/Comparative Literature):

Diversity of cultures and perspectives across campus. Little public discussion thus far. Faculty skepticism about whether this will ever work and about power of deans.

9. School of Law:

Faculty apathetic. Low turnout for discussion. Tier reviews a concern. People might not want to go through a review, opting to stay where they are in the salary. Strict review process is concerning and suggested an expanded annual review for those opting out.

10. UW Bothell:

Where will funding come from? If retirements, what about younger units or campuses where few retirements are occurring? Concerned about impact on lecturers since they do not have four year contracts. Would it then be more attractive for deans to let long term lecturers go and hire new candidates?

11. A&S (History):

Discussion has been framed that other institutions are doing better than we are so we should copy their systems. This proposal has an analog to the UC system. Colleagues at UC don't feel empowered, so does this proposal have the advantages it claims?

12. College of Built Environments:

Similar to others, but how will this affect small colleges with few retirements? Concern about faculty, staff, and administrative load of review process compared to the current system. If approval by dean is required it undermines the assumption that this would be a faculty-empowering change. Concern this could prevent RA/TA hiring, which could increase teaching load and have negative impact on retention and recruitment. We need a holistic approach.

13. A&S (Art):

What are the imbedded threats? Female and minority junior faculty feel threatened by review process now and this seems it would increase that stress and have a negative impact.

14. UW Tacoma:

Junior faculty/contingent faculty don't have a role in evaluating increases now. Will this make reviews more problematic or better? More money should go into equity distribution, but would this system decrease equity funds available? In an expanding campus with largely junior faculty, will workloads increase?

15. Social Work:

Sense is that junior faculty are enthusiastic and senior faculty are more concerned. If merit reviews don't work now, will this make them worse or improve them? Will burden be less or more?

16. College of Engineering (Mechanical Engineering):

About a third of faculty in the department reported they had reviewed the website and of those not a single person supported the proposal because they all think it would make salary issues worse.

17. School of Business:

Sent survey to faculty and received a 25% response rate. Of those 65% would reject proposal as it stands. 19% uncertain. Don't like that the proposal constrains faculty reward system in unnatural way to 8% or nothing and would require cuts in other important areas. External labor market not as favored as an internal market and creates an arms race with ourselves. Concern about effects on those at high performing, high salary levels. Retention not a problem but will be a problem to recruit high performing senior faculty due to the salary cap.

18. Graduate and Professional Student Senate:

Students have supported faculty salary increases, including asking for tuition increases to pay for them. They believe it is important to reward diversity of demographics and skills. What will be the guidelines for reviews and will faculty and administrators be trained adequately?

19. School of Public Health (Environmental Health):

Low response. Basically supportive but looking for more information.

20. School of Nursing:

Faculty have mixed responses and have reviewed materials and attempted to master the complexity of the proposal. Many are looking forward to forums. Some concerns about placement in tiers and ability to move from one tier to the next.

21. Members of the Faculty Council on Research:

Concern about salaries set by NIH grants for 5 years. Often faculty cannot accept increases because caps are imposed by the NSF and NIH. Need to pay attention to impact on research faculty.

Joe Janes, the chair of FCFA, thanked the Senate for their responses and said it would be enormously helpful to his council. Their timeline is to finish *Faculty Code* language by the end of winter quarter so that the legislation could go to the Senate in spring and faculty members could vote by June 15, 2015. He especially appreciated the importance to consider all types of faculty (instructional, research, WOT). He did not like the idea that it is a one shot deal due to the process and that amendments may be only be made at first reading of the Senate. He hoped to avoid late changes, especially minor ones. He appreciated constructive comments and said they were more helpful than general sentiment.

Chair O'Neill was asked how senators should proceed at that point in the process and she responded that posting on the discussion board is most helpful for faculty to discuss the proposal and become more informed. Some asked for lists of their constituents to solicit feedback and for Christina Fong to share the survey she sent to Business faculty.

O'Neill turned the discussion over to Jack Lee. He thanked members for their comments and repeated his willingness to present the proposal to any group. Lee had several key responses to questions and concerns posed earlier in the discussion:

1. Funding:

There is no question that our state, and therefore institutions of higher education, have a funding problem.

2. How does the proposal address problems with the current system?

The current system is very inflexible with specific promotion raises and retention as the main mechanisms. Merit and additional merit have been very limited. The goal of the proposal is to push more money into raises for continuing faculty and for the raises to be a function of merit and performance. At this point, annual merit reviews are not working and deans are making most of the decisions. The hope is that faculty will be given more authority to decide who gets raises.

3. Will this take money out of other things?

Yes, because it will prioritize merit increases.

4. Burden on faculty and administration during the review process:

This will be more work for faculty in departments that do not currently take merit reviews seriously. They will be less frequent but more important.

5. Disadvantages:

See slides on the [Faculty Senate website](#).

6. Modeling:

Jack Lee willing to do this, Office of Planning & Budgeting willing to help also. Send him an [email](#).

7. Mandatory tier review:

Required by accrediting agency, but a faculty member can write to department and say they do not want a review.

8. Dean power:

The deans have power over the budget so will be a part of any salary policy and faculty review process.

9. Lecturers:

It would not be practical for the policy to sync with lecturer contract length. Anything that gives lecturers more money over time could create issues with departments hiring less expensive faculty instead of renewing contracts. A competitive search process may help prevent this.

10. Salary cap:

There are flexible parts to the plan and retention raises will still be possible.

There were additional comments:

1. There is a lot of misinformation floating around and the town hall meeting will be helpful to spread awareness.
2. WOT and research faculty might be better off under this proposal because they can project and plan for increases.
3. Equity should be a major concern and the current retention process is a key factor in creating inequities.

There were additional questions:

1. Money comes from existing sources. Where do decisions get made about cuts?
College level, specifically the dean with advice from the elected faculty council.
2. What salary comparison group shows UW lower than other comparable universities? Are these data based on tenured faculty or others, and do they include WOT faculty?
Send Jack Lee an [email](#).

22. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

23. New Business.

There was no new business.

24. Good of the Order.

There was no good of the order.

25. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Prepared by: *Marcia Killien* Approved by: *Kate O'Neill*

Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Kate O'Neill, Chair
Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Kate O'Neill, Professor, Law

Since my last report, Vice Chair Norm Beauchamp and I have been busy meeting with the President and the Provost, several other top administrators, the Board of Regents, and with student leaders. I have also met with many chairs of the senate's faculty councils and committees, and I expect to have met with all in the near future. I think we have a good exchange of information on key issues and good coordination among our councils and committees. I want to express particular thanks to the members of those senate councils and committees and their chairs. They are the front line in gathering the data and doing the analysis of the myriad issues that concern the faculty at an institution of this size.

The issues include, to name a few: enrollment policy, managing access to majors, diversity, efficient use of classrooms and course scheduling, on-line and distant education, global education initiatives, commercialization policy, public/private partnerships for research, capital projects selection and funding, child-care facilities, parental leave, tri-campus governance, athletics & NCAA rules, an impending new payroll system, revisions to the student conduct code, and of course the proposal for a new salary policy. You will receive reports on many of these issues as the year progresses.

In the end, all these issues can be grouped around three basic questions:

1. Who will be the future students at the UW and what will be the benefit to them, and to society, of their education and experiences here?
2. Who will be the faculty at the UW, and how can the institution efficiently and ethically enhance their opportunities for innovative teaching and discovery?
3. How can the UW continue to support high-quality teaching, research and service by its faculty and staff while providing affordable access and an excellent learning experience for a truly diverse population of undergraduate and graduate students?

While these questions are obvious, I think it will be helpful for the Senate and faculty at large to keep them in mind as we work with the administration to identify key priorities and set strategy on discrete issues.

It's a cliché to say that UW faces challenges and we will have to be innovative to surmount them. I would like to see the faculty lead that innovation. To do that, we need to have clearer shared vision(s) and collective determination to pursue key goals with some specific strategies. We have made a good start with excellent faculty councils, good information flow among the councils and with the administration. Now, we hope to engage the Senate in more active debate and to encourage all senators to continue to engage with their constituencies so as to inspire a campus-wide conversation about key priorities.

Today, we will begin that engagement on the issue of the proposed new salary policy. That policy is an effort to deal with one of those big questions – who will be the faculty and what will be their incentives and opportunities here? The fundamental question before the Senate and the faculty is: Will the proposed policy help the UW attract the best faculty and then motivate and retain them by rewarding their best efforts in a fair, transparent, and affordable manner?

The issues are numerous and complex and perhaps different for different units. The proposal represents a significant policy innovation with significant implications for units' finances as well as their culture about hiring, peer evaluation, and retention policies. Funding the policy may ultimately affect tuition and class sizes as well as the relative sizes of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculties. The Provost and President have indicated support for the proposal but they have also made it clear that they want any new salary policy to represent the faculty's priorities. As advocates of shared governance, we completely concur.

To that end, we have allocated significant time to hearing from senators about what their and their constituents' views are at the December 4 meeting. The Senate will, of course, have other opportunities to review the proposed policy when proposed legislation is presented to it.

In the meantime, senators should also know about the process we plan to use to facilitate a meaningful and productive discussion across all three campuses.

The process runs along two tracks – which is a little unusual. We have adopted this process because the new salary policy proposal has been on the table for quite some time, and we think that it's important for the faculty to make an informed decision soon – ideally this year. The two tracks enable the hard work of code drafting to go on simultaneously with a campus-wide discussion of the issues. So, on track one, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) is hard at work reviewing the salary policy proposal and drafting code language. We think the FCFA should continue drafting, and we hope to see the proposed legislation by the end of winter quarter.

On track two, while the FCFA is working, we want the faculty as a whole to have multiple meaningful opportunities to study the proposal, assess its impact on each school and college, and debate its merits. It's important for us to facilitate a campus-wide discussion so that we can all get a sense of whether the faculty is generally favorably inclined or opposed to the basic principles. In addition, if there is support for the principles, but there are specific problems that we might fix now, we want to share those with FCFA before that Council presents its proposed code language to the Senate Executive Committee.

So, the Senate leaders have taken, or will soon take, the following steps to get the information out and encourage discussion and debate. First, the proposal has been posted with a discussion board at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/issues/>. Please call your colleagues' attention to that discussion board and FAQ and encourage them to post comments and more questions.

Second, as you will recall, Jack Lee presented the proposal's basics to the Senate at the October meeting and a vibrant discussion took place. Senators were then urged to discuss the proposal with their faculties and return to the Senate ready to express their colleagues' views and concerns at the December meeting. The Senate agenda before you allocates a considerable amount of time for those reports and discussion of the salary policy.

Third, Jack Lee is preparing a set of slides that senators and others can use to present the proposal to their colleagues at faculty meetings. The slides are on the same Web page as the proposal and FAQ.

Fourth, we have discussed the proposal at a meeting with the chairs of the elected faculty councils. That was well-attended, and we urged the chairs to facilitate discussions between their deans and faculties. We now ask senators to follow up and make sure those discussions happen.

Fifth, we are planning a town hall meeting early in winter quarter to which all faculty will be invited. The meeting will include a panel discussion of the issues, followed by a question and answer period. We expect to record and post the proceedings.

Finally, Jack Lee and I also plan to attend meetings of the faculty organizations at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell.

If you have additional ideas for how we can ensure that all faculty are made aware and have an opportunity to get their questions answered, please let me know

Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The Vice Chair Nominating Committee is being formed and will soon 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 Nancy Bradshaw in the Faculty Senate Office. The Nominating Committee expects to recommend candidates to the Senate Executive Committee at its January 12 meeting.

2. The Senate leadership will meet on 12/2/14 at 11:30 a.m. with chairs of the Faculty Councils/University Committees for coordination and information sharing. A similar meeting is scheduled for 11/17/14 at 11:30 a.m. to meet with the chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils ("college councils") of the Schools, Colleges, and Campuses.

Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

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

Here are the topics that SCPB has discussed since my last report to the Senate:

Self-Sustaining Program Conversion: A new state law, [SHB 1669](#), requires that the UW establish guidelines for self-sustaining program conversions. We have established an ad hoc subcommittee, consisting of Provost Cauce, Lisa Graumlich (Dean of the College of the Environment), Alice Popejoy (GPSS), Christina Xiao (ASUW), Dan Turner (Foster School), Dan Jacoby (UW Bothell), and Mark Haselkorn (Engineering). This committee will bring suggested guidelines to SCPB in winter quarter. (Note that the UW currently has placed a moratorium on conversion of existing programs to self-sustaining status; but we are required by law to establish guidelines in case the moratorium is ever lifted.)

Admissions Report: We received a report from Associate Vice Provost Phil Ballinger on incoming student demographics. We learned that both the Autumn 2014 applicant pool and the entering freshman class set size records. The number of incoming international freshmen declined a bit since last year, but remains large, and as in recent years the majority of international students are from China. The most requested majors were Business Administration, Biology, and Computer Science. For more detailed information about admissions statistics, see the [Enrollment Trends page](#) on the Office of Planning and Budgeting website.

Enrollment Management: Associate Vice Provost Ballinger also gave us a preliminary report of the activities of the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee established last year by President Young and Provost Cauce and chaired by Senior Vice Provost Jerry Baldasty. This council is charged with exploring options for managing undergraduate admissions and financial aid, including such issues as affordability, access, strategic use of financial aid, enrollment capacity, selectivity, diversity, and transfer enrollment.

Internal Lending Program: We received a report from Associate Vice President Christopher Malins of the UW Treasury Office about the [Internal Lending Program](#). This is a program run by the Treasury Office that centralizes all of the university's external borrowing, and makes loans to internal unit of the university at stabilized interest rates.

Romance Languages RCEP: The College of Arts and Sciences has proposed splitting the Department of Romance Languages into two separate departments: the Department of French and Italian Studies and Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies. Currently, these are two functionally independent divisions within the department, so the separation would have little effect other than formalizing a split that has long been in place. SCPB recommended to the provost that the request be treated as a "limited RCEP."

College of Arts and Sciences Report: This year, SCPB is beginning a new program of meeting with deans and faculty and student leaders of each college, school, and campus on a rotating basis. Because more and more planning and budgeting decisions are being made at the college level (a process accelerated by the advent of Activity-Based Budgeting), SCPB decided it needs to have some more direct interaction with the leadership of college-level units in order to effectively carry out its charge. We will be meeting with leaders of all colleges, schools, and campuses on a rotating basis, starting with Arts and Sciences. We heard about the college's challenges in managing its changing student profile, as more and more students select STEM-related majors. We also heard about the college's shared governance process, which all agreed is robust and healthy.

Legislative Update: Outgoing Director of State Relations Margaret Shepherd gave us a report on the legislative outlook in Olympia, focusing on the challenges the state will be facing in trying to find enough revenue to adequately support the state's universities while meeting the mandates of the McCleary decision and Initiative 1351.

WWAMI: The WWAMI Regional Medical Education Program has trained physicians since the 1970s to care for patients and communities throughout the states of Washington, Alaska, Montana and Idaho, with Wyoming joining in 1996. Until this year, Washington State University has been a partner with UW in the Spokane site for WWAMI, but now WSU has withdrawn from that partnership. We learned about the UW's efforts to maintain state support for the UW-WWAMI program in Spokane, as well as planned efforts to expand its size. One of the most pressing immediate questions is whether the state will approve the UW's request to transfer the jointly controlled assets of the Spokane-based program to the UW so it can continue to run UW-WWAMI.

Faculty Salary Policy Update: I gave SCPB a summary of the financial projections for the [proposed new faculty salary policy](#). Three different groups have modeled the expected costs of the proposed policy over the next few years: the president's salary policy working group; the UW Office of Planning and Budgeting; and the School of Medicine's Office of Business Planning and Analysis. In all three cases, the conclusions are the same: the centrally mandated parts of the proposed policy will not cost any more than the normal operation of the current salary policy. Of course, to make significant progress toward closing the gap in average salaries between UW and peers will entail additional costs, but that will be true whether we adopt a new salary policy or not.

Learning Spaces Overview: Senior Vice Provost Jerry Baldasty and Associate Vice Provost Phil Reid gave us an overview of their classroom scheduling initiative – they have been asked by the provost to explore options for more efficiently using our existing classroom space, so as to relieve the pressure on classrooms without a huge investment in new buildings. Some of the options being considered are “block scheduling” (reducing the variety of time combinations available for classes); increasing the pass time between classes; and introducing requirements and incentives to schedule more courses during off-peak times. To learn more or to offer suggestions, faculty members can contact Vice Provost Baldasty (baldasty@uw.edu) or Vice Provost Reid (pjreid@uw.edu).

Pay It Forward Proposal: We learned about the “Pay It Forward” proposal for funding universities, which has been proposed by the [Economic Opportunity Institute](#) as a way to reduce the debt load of students, by making college attendance free but requiring income-based payback. The general consensus among SCPB members was that federal income-based loan repayment programs combined with more robust funding of the State Need Grant would be likely to accomplish the same goals with less risk.

Meet Us in the Middle: Hailey Badger (ASUW Director of University Affairs) presented the ASUW's [Meet Us in the Middle](#) report on college affordability. The main recommendation of the report is that expected student contributions to the cost of university education should be calculated based on an assumption that students work 20 hours a week during the school year and 40 hours a week during the summer at minimum wage, and that state support for higher education and financial aid should be increased so that every student can afford to attend college based on this standard. Members of SCPB expressed strong approval of the report, and commended the ASUW representatives for their excellent work.

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

- Continuing legislative updates
- State audit
- Faculty demographics
- Faculty and administrative salaries
- Guidelines for lecture hiring
- Overview of the governor's budget
- Provost reinvestment fund requests
- Reports from the Colleges of Engineering and the Environment
- Administrative review of services and overhead rates
- Financial aid
- Tuition setting process
- HR/Payroll modernization
- Faculty retention, recruitment, & separations
- Global Innovation Project

Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor and Chair, Music History Program
olympia@uw.edu

Update as of November 24, 2014: There will be several significant updates by the second week of December regarding the state budget and possible policy implications. As of this third week in November, the news is about the certified results of the general election on November 4 and the forward motion regarding budget planning for the 2015-17 biennium.

First, the budget news: As expected, the quarterly economic forecast of the state Economic and Revenue Forecast Council on November 19 has projected an increase in state revenues for the 2015-17 biennium. However, even with the projected increase of revenue, the increased caseload of K-12 enrollment, Medicaid cases, and overall increasing carryforward budget of the state still will create a significant deficit, particularly because of the requirement to fund the mandate of the McCleary legislation and Supreme Court decision that has ordered increased spending in the K-12 sectors to fulfill the state's statutory obligation to fully fund K-12 education. The Governor also plans to offer a salary increase to state employees, and is taking that into account in his budget building. The Office of Financial Management, which advises the Governor regarding the state budget and projections, indicates that over \$2 billion will be needed in the next biennium in addition to the increased revenue indicated in the November economic forecast.

By the time the Faculty Senate meets on December 4, it is possible that the Governor's budgets will have been issued, or will be issued shortly thereafter. The Governor's budget is the first step in the legislative budget process, and he is required to submit a Book 1 budget that offers a budget that does not exceed the economic forecast, and takes into account all the required spending mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The Book 1 budget therefore will be quite spare, and will include cuts in state agencies where possible; likely also will include tuition increases to offset cuts to universities. He also will issue a Book 2 budget, in which he can offer new sources of revenue that would reduce the need for cuts, and the ideas in the Book 2 budget will become part of the discussion of the Legislature starting in January. Whether the Governor's revenue proposals are adopted is up to the Legislature, which will issue budgets after March 20 (possibly not until April or beyond); the Legislature needs to ascertain what combination of cuts and increased revenue will create a sustainable biennial budget for 2015-17, then the Governor needs to amend or agree with the budget, in consultation with the House and Senate.

The preceding paragraph is a long way of saying that the Book 1 Governor's budget will be quite stringent; and that his Book 2 budget will offer solutions that may or may not survive the legislative process. Some legislators and caucuses will want to see an emphasis on trimming spending before considering any increases in revenue; and both the House and Senate, along with the Governor, ultimately need to agree on a biennial budget. The end of the regular legislative session is April, but it is likely it will go into May or June with special sessions after the end of the regular session.

Legislators are already discussing issues such as tuition, and are interested in keeping tuition at its current level or even reducing tuition, but with the stipulation that to offset any lack of increases, universities need to receive funding to cover the loss of tuition increases – this is the scenario currently, in which tuition has remained at the same level for resident undergraduates for three years (2012-15), because the Legislature has provided the funding that would have come to the UW via tuition increases, had they occurred.

The priorities of the university are to maintain and increase the state appropriation that will allow the university to maintain its excellence in teaching and research; to keep access for all students affordable; to obtain salary increases for faculty and staff; and to pursue particular projects and initiatives such as capital (building) funding for renovated and new buildings and infrastructure at the UW.

Regarding the outcome of the November 4 election: The majority parties will remain the same in the State House of Representatives and Senate, with the Republican party holding an actual majority in the coming session, in contrast to the majority it created and titled the Majority Coalition Caucus in the past two sessions, with the migration of two Democratic Senators. The House will remain Democratic, but with

a more narrow majority of 51 or 52 votes instead of the 55 Democratic members of the House in the past two sessions. Much political commentary notes that this will require a higher level of consensus within the House Democratic caucus in order to hold the voting majority stable on floor votes (the final votes on legislative bills).

Not a surprise (except that it was expected to have a more robust majority) is the voters' approval of Initiative 1351, mandating smaller class sizes in K-12 education. In addition to the McCleary ruling that mandates additional expenditure on K-12 education, this has the potential to add another significant cost to the large shortfall the state will face in writing a budget for 2015-17. The State Supreme Court has required the Legislature and Governor to write a budget by the end of April 2015 that takes the expenditures of the McCleary decision into account. But I-1351 may or may not be funded in the next budget; some aspects of it can be addressed within the McCleary decision, but there are many elements that will require additional funding. The Office of Financial Management, which advises the Governor, projects that \$1.2 to \$2 billion will need to be added to the carryforward state budget for 2015-17 for the McCleary decision; and the estimates for Initiative 1351 range from \$2 billion to \$4.5 billion over the next four years. A link to the various carryforward and additional expenditures (except for I-1351, which had not yet passed) has been prepared by OFM and can be found at:

<https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/d9d211f70f56ec59ef742991a94f420846945a72ce249f653e1de53c5c9cc25c?inline=1>

Legislative committees have already started to meet to become oriented to budget and policy issues that will emerge as bills in January. Over the next month, the policy committees and chairmanships in the Legislature will be identified, and the Governor's two budgets will be issued in early December. These events will provide us with a more clear view of the issues the state and our university will face in the legislative session that begins in January.

Report of the Chair of the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC)
Tueng Shen, Professor, Ophthalmology/Bioengineering

- Status of Outside Work Form: At its April 29, 2014, meeting the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization approved a final draft of the Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation (Form 1460). Details of the discussions are in the committee's 2013-14 annual report at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/Annual-Report-2013-14-SCIPC_sa.pdf. The Office of Research, the Center for Commercialization, and the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee then reformatted the documents. The new format does not alter the wording of the assignment clause that SCIPC approved. OR and C4C are still working on implementing an electronic signature process and so the new format is not yet in use, but the older format does include the SCIPC-approved assignment clause.
- Pre-packaged intellectual property (IP) clauses for sponsored research: SCIPC members unanimously agreed to endorse/support the proposed pre-packaged IP clauses for sponsored research. Due to lengthy IP negotiation terms, the proposal was created as an efficient alternative to allow PI's to negotiate with small companies for their intellectual properties. Details of this proposal are on the committees Website at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/scipcmin_052714.pdf.

Summary Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative
Roland "Pete" Dukes, Professor, Accounting

As the Faculty Athletics Representative I encountered no major issues during the 2013-14 academic year. In general I believe the University of Washington intercollegiate athletics program is doing the right things and is in good shape. I continue to focus on some areas where I have modest concerns. But we are looking at a potential sea change in the way intercollegiate athletics are governed and the support provided to student athletes. The next year will see many changes.

New Governance Structure at NCAA and Pac-12 Levels

Huge changes are on the horizon for the governance of intercollegiate athletics at both the Pac-12 Conference level and at the national NCAA level. For years institutions have attempted to use resources generated within intercollegiate athletics to provide better support for student athletes. The areas in which these institutions wanted to improve the life of student athletes included underwriting the full cost of attending their institutions, provide guarantees of support for four years and even for completing their education if the student should leave the institution before completion, more complete medical support, and providing meals and food for student athletes when practice or competition times impede attending a normal meal time. These major or large institutions, including Washington, would support providing these benefits, but other institutions with fewer resources would vote them down.

This past year efforts were successful in creating the opportunity to have a new governing structure within the NCAA that will allow the five major conferences the autonomy to enact some of the support items mentioned above. In January 2015, at the NCAA national meetings in Washington, DC, the agenda includes setting up the governing body for this new subgroup and allow them to set their own rules with a prescribed set of areas. The new governing structure will for the first time include student athletes as voting members of the governing body.

The Pac-12 Conference and its institutions fully support the above summarized changes. Moreover, the Conference is changing its own governing body, the Pac-12 Council, to include student athletes as participating members. At this time the body includes Faculty Athletic Representatives, Athletic Directors, and Senior Women Administrators from each institution, with the FAR being the voting member from each institution. At a minimum I can envision the structure changing to include a student athlete from each institution.

Much remains to be done in implementing these governing changes, and then agreeing to what actions that the five conferences will undertake. But in my opinion these changes are necessary in order to right some of the grievances of student athletes at these very demanding institutions.

One issue that is in the middle these changes is the composition of the overriding governing body. Currently the plan is that it would be dominated by Athletic Directors, with additional members coming from FARs, Senior Women Administrators, Conference representatives, and of course student athletes. FARs in the Pac-12 and indeed across the country "lobbied" for greater participation in the leadership, but in the end most of us felt the changes were so important to move forward that we have acquiesced for the moment to the proposed structure. In any case this governing body reports to a Board of Directors composed of University Presidents which would have veto power, so at the highest level intercollegiate athletics is on the hands of the academe.

Pac-12 Changes

Consistent with the direction outlined above, the Pac-12 as a Conference is taking a leadership role in moving forward with this driving agenda behind these changes, that of better treatment of student athletes. Here is an excerpt from a Pac-12 news release in which it identifies actions the Conference is taking in support of student athletes.

PAC-12 STUDENT-ATHLETE REFORM PACKAGE

- i. Guaranteeing four-year scholarships that can neither be reduced nor canceled provided the student-athlete remains in good standing and meets his/her terms of the agreement. Effective in 2015-16, all financial aid agreements offered to incoming student-athletes will be multi-year agreements for no less than four academic years.
- ii. Financially supporting student-athletes who do not graduate in four years and return to school to complete their degrees. Effective 2016-17, if a student-athlete departs the institution in good standing and has completed a reasonable portion of their degree (50%), the student-athlete can return and receive the remaining terms of his/her four-year agreement at any time.
- iii. Enhancing medical support for both current and former student-athletes. Effective in 2015-16, Conference schools will be required to provide documented and direct medical expenses to former student-athletes for a period of four years after separation from the team or institution.
- iv. Liberalizing Transfer Rules within the Conference. The CEOs approved elimination of the financial aid penalty of the intra-conference transfer rule. Effective immediately, a student-athlete who transfers between Pac-12 institutions can receive an athletic scholarship from the second school without restriction, provided he or she is otherwise eligible to receive the aid.
- v. Increasing student-athlete representation in Pac-12 governance. The CEOs supported including student-athletes in Council meetings and giving them a meaningful role in its deliberations. Final recommendations will be determined June 2015.

Concerns for the Future

Implementation of proposed changes is always a concern. Exactly how worthy objectives are pursued is very important. Hence, the details of implementation will be important for the FAR and other concerned academics to monitor and guide.

On another front, the debacle that is in the news at the University of North Carolina is very disturbing. There are at least two levels of concern for that institution. There is the concern about loss of institutional control of the quality of course offerings being made available to all students, and concern about the athletic department participation in furthering or at least taking advantage of the opportunity to enroll student athletes in less than demanding courses. The events at UNC have caused us to re-examine our processes and controls to limit student athletes taking advantage of what I might term "easy course credit opportunities." We have extensive monitoring in place at Washington to limit the opportunity for student athletes to complete multiple independent study courses. SAAS and I carefully monitor situations where there are large numbers of student athletes in sections of courses. This area will continue to be examined to ensure student athletes are not "gaming" the system or getting an unfair advantage. However, neither the FAR nor the Department of Athletics can define what constitutes acceptable content in a course. This is an area where it appears the University of North Carolina, at the institutional level, might have failed.

Student Athletes at Washington

Overall, I am generally pleased with the way our student athletes are being served by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Exit surveys of graduating students continue to show that our student athletes feel very positive about their educational experience and the support they received from ICA and the University. This past year the Department has, with permission from the NCAA, increased support in terms of meals provided to all student athletes. Another small but very popular benefit granted to our student athletes was providing parking for them close to the athletic facilities.

On the academic front, our student athletes compete with the best in the Conference. Our graduation rates and academic progress ranking are always in the top half of the Conference, and frequently in the top quartile.

That said, there are always concerns about academic performance of student athletes, and this is exacerbated when there are coaching changes. Coaching changes in men's soccer, baseball, women's basketball, women's tennis and football will likely impact graduation rates if (when) players leave because of the coaching change. We will experience these as players recruited years ago depart early and impact the computation of later graduation rates. We are experiencing some of that today in our data as players recruit by a former football coach (Willingham) dropped out years ago but were to graduate now, hence impact (lower) our current graduate statistics.

Proposed Changes to the University of Washington Student Conduct Code
Elizabeth Lewis, Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct
Julie Draper Davis, Associate Director, Community Standards and Student Conduct

In November 2010, then Vice President and Vice Provost for Student Life, Eric Godfrey, charged a committee to review the Student Conduct Code, WAC 478-120. The goals of the committee were three fold: 1) find a way to make the code easier to navigate for students and staff; 2) to review the Off Campus Code WAC 478-120-025 to see if it was meeting the needs of students and the institution and 3) to consider if the implementation of a Medical Leave policy tied into the Student Conduct Code. Brian Fabien and Chuck Treser have been representatives on the committee and offered insightful comment.

The committee made up of faculty, staff and students from all three campuses met over a number of years to evaluate and review the current code. The committee arrived at the following conclusions:

- A comprehensive review had not been done of the code since the 1990's.
- The current code has groups of violations together as one line item for example, WAC 478-120-020(3) Specific instances of misconduct include, but are not limited to:
 - Conduct on university premises constituting a sexual offense, whether forcible or nonforcible, such as rape, sexual assault, or sexual harassment;
- This grouping presents challenges for reporting and for working with students.
- The code needed to be structured differently in order to make things easier to find.
- The Off Campus Code was too restrictive and was making it difficult to respond to student issues we are federally required to respond to.
- A Medical Leave policy tied to the Student Conduct Code was not appropriate. The committee stopped working on that component.

Additionally, with the Dear Colleague Letter regarding Title IX of 2011 and changes to the Clery Act in this past year it became clear that the University needed to make changes in responding to Title IX violations.

A draft has been developed and presented to the Faculty Council on Student Affairs at the Nov 4 meeting. We are taking feedback and working with the large committee to receive feedback. Changes in the code are as follows:

1. Restructuring the code to include definitions and discreet functions as separate WACs.
2. Unpacking and defining violations into discreet units to increase the awareness of students of the expectations of the University.
3. Creating a separate Title IX Conduct Process to be compliant with federal guidance regarding sexual harassment and sexual assault.
4. Creating an Agreed Settlement process for responding to non-Title IX issues.
5. Creating a more streamlined process for students regarding appeals and reconsideration of orders.

Additionally, the new draft envisions faculty appointment to disciplinary committees would be in line with the Faculty Senate and Assemblies normal process for appointing faculty to committees. It further envisions specified term limits, but expands the pool of faculty to include non-voting faculty. This is important at Bothell and Tacoma which may have limited pools of faculty to draw from.

We will be working with the Faculty Council on Student Affairs to bring this forward to the Faculty Senate for a referendum approving the code. We will also be continuing the Rules Making Process with a desired date of implementation of Fall 2015.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT CONDUCT CODE WAC 478-120
WAC 478-130-010 AUTHORITY
WAC 478-130-020 PREAMBLE

ARTICLE I: DEFINITIONS
WAC 478-130-030 DEFINITIONS

ARTICLE II: STUDENT CONDUCT CODE AUTHORITY
WAC 478-130-040 JURISDICTION OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

ARTICLE IV: PROSCRIBED CONDUCT
WAC 478-120-050 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT
WAC 478-120-060 ABUSE OF OTHERS
WAC 478-120-070 ABUSE OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESS
WAC 478-120-080 ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT
WAC 478-120-090 ACTS OF DISHONESTY
WAC 478-120-100 AIDING, SOLICITATION AND ATTEMPT*
WAC 478-120-110 ALCOHOL
WAC 478-120-120 COMPUTER ABUSES
WAC 478-120-130 DISCRIMINATORY HARASSMENT
WAC 478-120-140 DISRUPTION OR OBSTRUCTION
WAC 478-120-150 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE*
WAC 478-120-160 DRUGS
WAC 478-120-170 FAILURE TO COMPLY
WAC 478-120-180 HARASSMENT
WAC 478-120-190 HAZING
WAC 478-120-200 INDECENT EXPOSURE*
WAC 478-120-210 POSSESSION OR USE OF FIREARMS, EXPLOSIVES, DANGEROUS
CHEMICALS OR OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS
WAC 478-120-220 QUALITY OF LIFE
WAC 478-120-230 RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE*
WAC 478-120-240 RETALIATION*
WAC 478-120-250 SEXUAL EXPLOITATION*
WAC 478-120-260 SEXUAL HARASSMENT*
WAC 478-120-270 SEXUAL MISCONDUCT*
WAC 478-120-280 STALKING*
WAC 478-120-290 THEFT
WAC 478-120-300 UNAUTHORIZED KEYS, ENTRY OR USE
WAC 478-120-310 UNAUTHORIZED RECORDING
WAC 478-120-320 VANDALISM
WAC 478-120-330 VIOLATION OF DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

ARTICLE IV: STUDENT CONDUCT CODE PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-340 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS
WAC 478-120-350 EVIDENCE
WAC 478-120-360 DISCOVERY
WAC 478-120-370 DELIVERY OF NOTICE
WAC 478-120-380 STANDARD OF REVIEW
WAC 478-120-390 SANCTIONS
WAC 478-120-400 RECONSIDERATION OF FINAL ORDERS
WAC 478-120-410 EMERGENCY AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT AND CHANCELLORS OF
THE UNIVERSITY.
WAC 478-120-420 RECORDING AND MAINTANCE OF RECORDS

ARTICLE V: CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS
WAC 478-120-430 PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
WAC 478-120-440 NOTICE OF INFORMAL DISCIPLINARY CONFERNECE
WAC 478-120-450 INFORMAL DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE

WAC 478-120-460 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD
WAC 478-120-470 INITIATING CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-480 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-490 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-500 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS PROCESS
WAC 478-120-510 CONCLUSION OF THE CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARING

ARTICLE VI: TITLE IX CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS

WAC 478-120-520 PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
WAC 478-120-530 NOTICE OF INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-540 INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-550 CONCLUSION OF INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-560 REQUEST FOR TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING
WAC 478-120-570 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD
WAC 478-120-580 INITIATING TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-590 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-600 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-610 WITNESSES IN THE TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING PROCESS
WAC 478-120-620 ROLE OF ADVISORS IN TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-630 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING PROCESS
WAC 478-120-640 CONCLUSION OF THE TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING

2014 – 2015 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)**

- Brady Begin, ASUW, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2014 and ending September 15, 2015.

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

- Eli McMeen, ASUW, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning September 16, 2014 and ending September 15, 2015.