

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 25, 2013, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
The meeting was called to order at 2:34 pm. The agenda was approved.
2. Report of the Chair – Professor James Gregory. **[Exhibit A]**

Since the senate was considering a measure that has a lot of history, Gregory decided to share some historical headlines from The Daily. For at least 25 years ASUW has been lobbying for a diversity course requirement. Several times proposals have wound their way through the Senate system only to be defeated at a final stage. A proposal that began with ASUW in 1988-89 was approved by the senate and was defeated when it went out to a vote of the faculty in 1991. A second proposal was rejected in 1993, and again in 1996. The proposals have changed both in content and name, but the faculty's decision has been a consistent rejection of the legislation.

Gregory shared salary news that new data indicate that much ground has been lost compared to peers over the past 5 years. The progress made in the early 2000s has been lost. Average salaries and the average of the 11 global challenge state flagship institutions have been compared; UW faculty salaries were as close as 6.5% in 2008, there is now a 11.4% gap overall; full professor salaries would need to increase 16% to reach the peer average. The UW is third from the bottom in overall salaries; dead last in full professor salaries. The salary working group is talking about a proposal that would dramatically rearrange our salary system. Planning is just beginning and nothing would happen for several years. Gregory briefly shared a profile of the working group's thinking in order to start getting some feedback; the group is proposing what they are calling a Merit-Tier system. The key idea is that faculty would no longer have yearly merit reviews. Instead everyone would be reviewed at a 3-5 year interval and that meritorious faculty would receive a 10% salary increase. There could also be market/equity adjustments. This would make the rewards system more predictable and transparent and hopefully reduce compression, reduce retention issues, and improve morale and performance. Gregory iterated that everything is fluid. If there is interest in a policy like this and if there is an ok from the regents, next year would begin the long process of writing legislation and sending it through the senate and to a vote of the faculty.

3. Report of the President – Michael K. Young.

President Young announced that the 2013-14 University Faculty Lecturer is Professor Stephen Gloyd, Global Health. The lecture will be in Fall 2013.

He has recently participated in AAU meetings in Washington, DC. Among the concerns discussed were the funding rate of NIH/NSF and a perceived attack on funding of social sciences, the future of graduate programs, particularly in humanities related to job market and length of time to degree, federal research funding and sequestration, and immigration issues for graduate students & researchers. The perception of the Washington state delegation is that the sequestration cuts are "here to stay." He has recently visited alumni in Asia. He is uncertain what will happen to the state budget under consideration in Olympia and believes it is likely they will have a special session to arrive at a budget.

In response to a question about concurrent faculty employment at other universities, Young responded that this was not a University policy, but could be a school/college/campus policy.

4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
 - a. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of April 8, 2013.
 - i. Approval of the [February 11, 2013](#), SEC minutes.
 - ii. Approval of the [February 28, 2013](#), Faculty Senate minutes.
 - iii. Faculty Council Activities. **[Exhibit B]**

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

In response to a question about the status of possible academic freedom legislation, FCFA chair Gail Stygall responded that this was the sole agenda item under consideration at FCFA.

- 5. Consent Agenda.
There were no items on the consent agenda.

- 6. Memorial Resolution.

The memorial resolution was read by Senate Vice Chair Jack Lee and approved by a standing vote of the faculty.

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 Gerald J. Brenner of English, who died on February 8, 2013, after having served the University since 1966.

Professor Emeritus John F. Ferguson of Civil and Environmental Engineering, who died on March 29, 2013, after having served the University since 1974.

Professor Emeritus David Fischbach of Materials Science and Engineering, who died on February 26, 2013, after having served the University since 1969.

Clinical Associate Professor Ausey Robnett of Surgery, who died on February 19, 2013, after having served the University since 1981.

Professor Emeritus Gerold Schubiger of Biology, who died on November 10, 2012, after having served the University since 1972.

Professor Emeritus Dale E. Smith of Dentistry, who died on February 27, 2013, after having served the University since 1960.

Professor Emeritus and University Ombudsman and Ombudsman for Sexual Harassment Emeritus Lois Price Spratlen of Nursing, who died on March 30, 2013, after having served the University since 1972.

Research Professor Emeritus George Vlases of Mechanical Engineering, who died on August 8, 2012, after having served the University since 1969.

- 7. Announcements.

The Senate Executive Committee is accepting nominations for the position of Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative to serve for the academic year, 2013-14. The same person will likely be elected to serve as Faculty Legislative Representative in 2014-15 and 2015-16. The main duties are participating with the Senate Leadership in formulating the faculty's legislative initiatives and its positions on pending legislation, and working with the current Faculty Legislative Representative in representing the faculty before the State Legislature and its committees. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact Nancy Bradshaw in the Faculty Senate Office. The deadline for receiving nominations is Monday April 30.

Killien called attention to the search for the position of University Ombud. Any faculty interested in the position can go to UW Hires and search for "University Ombud" or "Requisition # 94034" or contact Evelyn Dunagan via email at dunagan@uw.edu.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business.

a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **[Exhibit F]**

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Changes to 24-54, Promotion and Tenure Process.

Action: Conduct first review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

The process for Class A legislation was summarized by Gregory.

The motion to approve the proposed legislation was made by Vice Chair Jack Lee who then presented the background and rationale. Immediately following this introduction, a substitute motion was suggested by Provost Ana Mari Cauce. It was moved and seconded to substitute this motion for the original motion included in the agenda. Discussion of the motion focused on clarification of the proposed promotion procedures in relation to current policies and practices. It was suggested that the phrase “and Vice Chancellor” be added to all text mentioning “Deans” with a response that this suggestion was addressed in an Executive Order.

The motion to approve the legislation passed unanimously.

Gregory explained that the legislation will now be sent to the President and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations for any suggested amendments before returning for final consideration by the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate.

b. Class B Legislation. **[Exhibit G]**

Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Title: Limited Admission Students.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

The process for Class B legislation was summarized by Gregory.

The motion to approve the proposed legislation was made by Vice chair Jack Lee who then presented the background and rationale. Discussion of the motion focused on clarifying the implications of the legislation for students who would be admitted with the limited admission status including their ability to take courses outside their program either to fulfill distribution requirements or electives and the concern that these students might be disadvantaged because of a perception that their admission process was less competitive than regularly admitted students. It was clarified that the specific restrictions placed on limited admission students would be part of the approval of each program through the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) and might vary with each program. The proposed legislation includes the requirement that these students would be informed of the specific restrictions associated with their program. It was also clarified that some programs might simultaneously include both regularly admitted and limited admission students. FCAS has asked a workgroup to review, identify, and make recommendations about any university policies or regulations that might be affected if this legislation is approved.

The motion to approve the legislation was passed by a substantial majority vote.

c. Class B Legislation. **[Exhibit H]**

Faculty Council on Academic Affairs.

Title: Proposed Diversity Undergraduate Graduation Requirement.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

The motion to approve the proposed legislation was made by Vice Chair Jack Lee who then presented the background and rationale. Statements in support of the legislation were made by Evan Smith, ASUW President, Angela Ginorio, chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, and Helen Fillmore, a student that has been involved in the proposed legislation. The discussion

focused on changes in wording of the legislation that resulted in several amendments that were passed. Several questions were asked about how and when the legislation would be implemented. There were no arguments made against the legislation.

The motion to approve the legislation was passed by a substantial majority vote.

10. Good of the Order.

No topics were raised for comment and discussion.

11. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: James Gregory, Chair of the Faculty Senate

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

Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
James Gregory, Professor, History

This meeting will be the most complicated session of the year. We will be considering three items of legislation, each of them complex. I am going to preview them below. Details are in the accompanying exhibits.

Diversity course requirement (Exhibit H): ASUW has been asking for a diversity course requirement for more than 25 years and several earlier proposals have been rejected by votes of the faculty. The Senate Executive Committee has passed and sent to the Senate a proposal that has been worked on by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, ASUW and a special student task force. It was crafted to address concerns raised in response to previous proposals.

The proposed Class B legislation requires a 3 credit course. The course can simultaneously satisfy Area of Knowledge requirements, thus not adding to general education requirements. It employs a broad definition of diversity and each college will approve courses. Hundreds of existing courses will likely meet the criteria and the Provost's Task Force calculates that two-thirds of graduating seniors already fulfill the requirement. Here is the proposed definition. Please see the rest of the resolution in the agenda packet:

No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on the topics of power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.

Promotion Procedure changes (Exhibit F): Senate Executive Committee has approved and forwarded to the Senate Class A legislation that alters Section 24–54 of the Faculty Code, "Procedure for Promotions." Currently candidates for promotion receive information about their case as the department is deliberating and after the department has taken a vote. The proposed changes would allow the candidate to learn about the recommendation of the elected college council, hear from the dean, and respond in writing before the dean makes a decision. The candidate will also learn what the dean has decided as that recommendation goes to the Provost.

Please note: Provost Cauce is going to introduce two modest amendments to the legislation. Printed copies of the proposed amendments will be available at the Senate meeting.

Limited Admission Students (Exhibit G): In order to accommodate the new online completion degree in Early Childhood and Family Studies whose students will be admitted only to that program rather than to the University at large, Faculty Council on Academic Standards has proposed and SEC has approved Class B legislation that differentiates "Regularly Admitted Students" and "Limited Admission Students." To switch to a different program, Limited Admission Students must apply separately to be regularly admitted.

OTHER MATTERS

Salaries: Barring a surprise move by the legislature, we anticipate that raises will be authorized starting next September. We are hoping that the budget will support at least 4%, which will still leave us far behind our peers and well below what has been lost to inflation in the past 4 and a half years. After consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, Provost Cauce agreed that most of the first year raise will be distributed across-the-board to all meritorious faculty. Her instructions call for 2% to be distributed as "regular merit" and some further amount to be allocated as "additional merit." Three-quarters of that additional merit amount should be awarded to all meritorious faculty. Thus if a total of 4% is available for faculty raises, individual meritorious faculty will each receive 3.5% raises except in the case of a recent retention offer or other unusual circumstances. The residual will be used by departments

to fund selectively higher raises. If your chair or dean announces something different please inform them that this is official policy.

On a separate track the Joint Faculty Salary Working Group is discussing a plan that would dramatically change our salary system, replacing our ad hoc raise practice with a promotion ladder that includes steps or levels within the professorial ranks (and lecturer ranks). Faculty would be eligible for a level increase every three years at the Assistant Professor rank and every four years at other ranks following a thorough merit review. Look for more details and discussion in the very near future.

Intellectual property: We have been engaged in spirited negotiations in response to administration proposals to change intellectual property rules. The Senate leadership and the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC) are concerned about some of the terms and documents drafted by the Center for Commercialization including an Intellectual Property Agreement (IPA) that all faculty, staff, and graduate students would be expected to sign. The IPA (and proposed revisions to Executive Order 36) includes language that establishes UW ownership of any patentable products that we might invent in the future whereas current policy requires us to disclose and convey ownership at the time of invention.

The Senate leadership questions whether this aggressive approach is the only way to protect the University's legitimate interest. We have asked the administration to examine other options. And we have objected to some draft provisions that seem to change the definition of scholarship and potentially interfere with academic freedom. The Faculty Senate will hear more about these negotiations in upcoming meetings.

**Faculty Council Activities
Senate Executive Committee
April 8, 2013**

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

1. Implementation of revised satisfactory progress policy.
2. Enrollment restrictions imposed on students in fee-based programs.
3. Diversity graduation requirement.
4. Review of Distance Learning Supplement for Course Change and New Course forms.
5. Student Effort versus Credits Earned in courses.
6. UW Educational Outreach Degree Completion Initiative.
7. Proposed Humanities Major in the College of Arts and Sciences.
8. Proposed Bachelor of Science degree in Integrated Sciences from the College of Arts and Sciences.
9. Definition of students – “regularly admitted” vs. “limited admitted”
10. First on-line degree completion program in Early Childhood, etc.
11. Writing skills proficiency requirements for majors.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

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

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

1. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.
2. Consideration of proposed Class A Legislation to strengthen Academic Freedom in the *Faculty Code*.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Last year, FCMA drafted and proposed changes to the Faculty Code in order to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions. Currently, FCMA is working with the ASUW regarding their proposed Diversity Requirement for Undergraduates and assisted the Faculty Senate Leadership to address concerns on faculty demographics.

Faculty Council on Research

FCR is continuing to monitor and promote activities strengthening the research environment at the University (our goal as stated in October, 2010). One of FCR’s activities is to review proposals from UW researchers containing restrictions of various sorts (publication policies, personnel, data transfer, etc). FCR dealt with one such proposal of this sort last year.

This quarter FCR will hear presentations regarding challenges for the Research at UW, an update on Federal Budget Sequestration, Human Subjects Division Post Approval Verification and Education Program, the impacts of Sound Transit’s tunnel below campus, and Intellectual Property issues.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students, including recent topics on admissions policies and standards, campus renovations, revisions of the Student Conduct Code, the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative, and the faculty appeal board.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

FCTL continues to discuss strategies for faculty development in the use of educational technology, issues of using technology to increase class size, and increasing student engagement. Current agenda items include technology priorities across campus (Canvas, Tegrity, MyPlan and e-texts), efforts to assist faculty in “flipping the classroom,” online course evaluations, working to resolve Classroom Support Services issues and discussion on the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

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

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) continues to monitor construction, including the Stadium, the police station, the Animal Research and Care Facility, Fluke Hall, Odegaard Library, the Intellectual House, and the Burke Museum. FCUFS has also focused on the West Campus circulation plan and student housing. Transportation issues include the Burke-Gilman Trail, bicycles, parking, Rainier Vista, Sound Transit stations, and 520 expansion. Childcare for the UW community, the UW Smartgrid Project, and classroom upgrades have rounded out the agenda.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

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

6. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009-2012 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.
7. General planning for collections, services, and staff. The FCUL will advise the Libraries on changes in collections, services, and staff in support of its strategic plan and necessitated by continuing budget constraints. Initial topics include the subject librarian framework, physical and virtual space planning, etc.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

1. Efforts to inform and support the actions of the Faculty Senate regarding improving faculty demographics:
 - a. Develop input to the overhaul of human resources computer system that will improve its ability to enable longitudinal studies and demographic disaggregation of data;
 - b. efforts to inform and support development of more childcare opportunities for UW faculty, staff and students.
2. Follow-up on 2011 Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty to address report recommendations.
3. Efforts to improve mentoring on campus through development of "Faculty Matters" memos relevant to all faculty, with emphasis on women, garnered from issues raised in FCWA surveys of both ladder and non-ladder faculty.
4. Review of issues relevant to women on campus.

Reminder: Approved council minutes are always available online at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html>

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

1. It is with great pleasure that I am announcing that we have hired a new Council Support Analyst to fill the position recently vacated by Jay Freistadt. Mr. Grayson Court started in our office at the end of spring quarter. Grayson is a graduate of Western Washington University (BA, Political Science, 2006) and the UW Evans School (Master in Public Administration, 2009). He has experience supporting public programs for state and local agencies and performing legal assistance for law firms. He also has held intern positions with U.S. Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell and has been an active volunteer with community groups including King County Explorer Search and Rescue. Please join me in welcoming Grayson as he begins his work supporting the Faculty Councils.
2. I am also happy to announce that the Faculty Senate Elections are nearly complete and all of the schools, colleges, and campuses have elected senators. With nearly the entire senate elected, the SEC Nominating committee is up and running and accepting nominations for the 2013-14 SEC.
3. This quarter, the Faculty Leadership will be meeting with the University Faculty Council Chairs, School/College/Campus Elected Faculty Council Chairs and past Faculty Senate Chairs.
4. The Office of University Committees is now recruiting for membership on the Faculty Councils. If you are interested in serving on a council, or would like to nominate a colleague, please contact Alex Bolton at bolt@uw.edu. A survey was sent to all voting faculty asking for their interest in participating in faculty governance, which is available at <https://catalyst.uw.edu/webq/survey/secfac/198722>. If you have not already done so, please go to the survey to see what opportunities are available.

Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Susan Astley, Professor of Epidemiology and Pediatrics

The SCPB advises the administration and informs the Faculty Senate on long-range planning, preparation of budgets, and distribution of funds, with a particular focus on faculty concerns. The Committee consults with the Executive Committee and the Senate on matters of policy. The [Spring 2013 Agenda](#) will soon be posted on the Senate website. A number of issues came before the Senate last year that will continue to be addressed in the SCPB this year. And new issues will arise as the year progresses. Below is a summary of the key issues we are currently addressing. For each issue, I will present a brief history followed by the most recent updates.

Faculty Salary Policy: At our first Senate meeting in October, 2011, Senator Giebel proposed a Class C Resolution "[Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy](#)" that was approved by the Senate in December and led directly to the establishment of the [Salary Policy Working Group](#) (SPWG) in March 2012. I served as the Co-Chair of this committee from March-Dec 2012. As I approach the end of my 3-year Senate leadership role, Jack Lee, Senate Vice Chair was selected to serve as Co-Chair starting Dec, 2012. I will remain a member of the SPWG. The group's charge is to examine the following questions: 1) over the next 6-12 months, how should we proceed with wage increases under the current salary policy and revenue expectations, and 2) in the longer term, are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? These topics are paramount as we slowly move out of this recession, face our 4th and hopefully final year of salary freezes, and fully implement Activity Based Budgeting. Working under the presumption that salary increases will be awarded in 2013-14, the SPWG spent March-Oct 2012 drafting guidelines for the allocation of these funds. Drafts of these guidelines were shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on 11/19/12 and the SCPB on 01/07/13 and 01/14/13 to solicit comments. The SPWG Advisory Group includes all faculty members of the SCPB, SEC, Jim Gregory's Cabinet, Faculty Council Chairs, and Chairs of the Bothell and Tacoma Faculty. The Provost distributed her 2013-14 Guidelines for Salary Adjustment February 20, 2013, (attached). The SPWG's met on January 17, 2013, and began addressing question 2: "Are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? A proposal currently being discussed is a salary system that would add 'steps' to the promotion ladder at the full professor rank (and possibly at the associate professor rank). This concept was shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on February 25, 2013. The Senate will be consulted in spring quarter. This will be my last update on this topic. As I no longer serve as the chair of this salary policy committee, I will leave it up to the faculty Chair of the committee, Jack Lee, Faculty Senate Vice Chair to keep you abreast of the committee's progress. I also refer you to the Jim Gregory's reports to the Senate and SEC for brief summaries of progress to date.

Online Learning: One need only read the [headlines](#) to see the impact online learning will have (is having) on all forms of education across this country, not just higher education. Jan Carline, chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, shared the Council's year-long evidence-based [review](#) of the strengths and limitations of online learning with the Senate in December, 2011. The implications of online education on access, quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, even intellectual property are broad. The potential benefits of online learning are unlimited, if implemented strategically and guided by an evidence base. This year we will address the most recent developments in online education at the UW: the [Proposed Online Learning Undergraduate Degree Completion Program Pilot](#), [MOOCs](#) (Massive Online Open Courses), and [Coursera](#) (a platform to offer MOOCs). The Degree Completion proposal was discussed at length at the October 15, 2012, SCPB meeting and October 25, 2012, Senate meeting. Discussions will continue as the details of this proposed program coalesce. This topic is scheduled to be addressed again in the SCPB on April 22, 2013.

Intellectual Property (IP): As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate's attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the "[Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation](#)" form. This discussion led to the discovery that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through [EO 36](#), held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, [IPMAC](#) has been reinstated by the

President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In September 2012, Ana Mari established a work group to revise the "Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation" form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. The workgroup revised the Compensation Form and submitted it to the Senate Leadership on 11/14/12 for their review. The revised Compensation Form was addressed at the November 26, 2012, SCPB meeting and was reviewed by the newly established [Special Committee on IP and Commercialization](#) (SCIPC) on November 27, 2012. The establishment of the SCIPC was approved by the SEC on November 5, 2012. SCIPC is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty Intellectual Property, including its management and commercialization. These policies are broadly outlined in [EO 36](#) and [APS 59.4](#), and managed in part through the Center for Commercialization ([C4C](#)). Any proposed changes to such policies/practices shall be brought to this Special Committee as a part of shared governance. This special committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members (voting) and a presidential designee (nonvoting). One of the faculty members will be the Chair of the Faculty Council on Research. Members will normally serve a three year term, but the initial terms will be staggered. Members include: Susan Astley, School of Public Health (serving as Chair); Kate O'Neill, School of Law; Matthew Sparke, A&S; Duane Storti, College of Engineering; Tueng Shen, School of Medicine; and Gerald Miller, Physics and Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, and Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff, Office of President (serving as the Presidential designee). SCIPC meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes are posted on the [SCIPC website](#). SCIPC's proposed revisions to the revised Compensation Form are posted on the SCIPC website. We learned at our Jan 29, 2013 SCIPC meeting that our recommendation to remove the IP language from the Compensation Form has been followed. But the administration now proposes to accompany the Compensation Form with a separate IP Agreement Form (which requires revision of EO36: UW IP Policy). This proposed IP Agreement Form would be distributed to all faculty, not just those submitting the Compensation Form. The IP Agreement would require all faculty to assign to the University all their right, title, and interest in all future inventions. Language in the IP Agreement form attempts to define and distinguish inventions from scholarly work. Scholarly work belongs to the faculty; inventions 'belong' to the University. But with advancements in technology, how does one distinguish between scholarly work and inventions? Why are they distinguished and treated differently? For example, software is currently classified as an invention, thus a faculty member is required to sign it over to the UW. But to a faculty member in science, their software is as much their scholarly work as a musical composition is to a faculty member in music. Along these same lines, who owns the content of faculty websites or online courses? Who owns the copyrights and patents when multiple faculty are involved in a project? What role does the Center for Commercialization ([C4C](#)) have in helping faculty protect and commercialize their innovations? How can C4C best meet the faculty's needs? Faculty are state employees, but what aspect of our duties are 'works for hire'? Academia is not private industry, but what happens when a faculty member engages with private industry? These are important questions to address that have tremendous impact on faculty, thus faculty must be involved in these discussions. Two groups of faculty were solely established to address/discuss these issues: IPMAC and SCIPC. These issues are also being addressed in some of the Faculty Councils. But it is time to engage a broader segment of the faculty. The senate leadership is bringing these issues to the SEC, SCPB, and Senate this quarter. We will post core documents central to this discussion on [SCIPC's website](#). I encourage all faculty to avail themselves of this information. With today's technology, matters of copyright, patents, trademarks, and licensing impact the full spectrum of faculty from the sciences to the arts. We need to educate ourselves on these matters.

Gender Equity in Faculty Promotion and Tenure: In my final report to the Regents in June, 2012, I addressed the topic of gender equity at the UW. The timing of my report coincided with the week Congress failed to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; an Act requiring equal pay for comparable work. Overall, women in the U.S. make 77 cents to a man's dollar. I shared with the Regents that I could not help but notice some compelling statistics presented in the University of Washington [2011 Facts for Academic Personnel](#), included in their meeting notes for the day. While 53% of students (undergraduate through professional) are female, only 38% of the faculty is female. This statistic becomes more troubling as you compare the proportion of [female faculty across the ranks](#) (Lecturer 58%, Assistant Professor 45%, Associate Professor 43%, Full Professor 27%). There are even a handful of departments at the University of Washington that have never promoted a woman to full professor in the history of the

department. Among the [Tenure/Tenure Track faculty](#), the proportion of women has increased by only 5 percentage points over the past ten years (2001 29% women, 2011 34% women). The New Hire statistics for 2011 may help explain, in part, why so little progress has been made in the past ten years. Only 44% of Professional Faculty new hires were female. The percentage of female hires drops precipitously as one advances up the ranks (47% of Assistant Professors hired were female; 36% of Associate Professors hired were female; and only 18% of Full Professors hired were female). Of the 3,899 professional faculty in 2011, 52% are tenure/tenure track, 38% WOT, and 10% Research. Of the tenure/tenure track positions across the schools in 2011, many schools had [less than 25% of their tenure positions held by women](#) (Public Health 23%, Pharmacy 25%, Medicine 21%, Environment 25%, Foster 19%, Engineering 20%). The [proportion of assistant, associate, and full professors who are female within each department in 2012](#) is posted on the Senate website. These statistics do not bode well for gender equity in faculty rank and underscore the importance of a thorough review of gender and race equity in salary compensation. Small, but significant salary inequities across race and gender were identified in a 1997 study of UW faculty entitled "Faculty Salary Study, UW June 1997". It will be important to identify and minimize factors that may be impeding women from advancing to or being hired into full professor positions. This topic was addressed at the November 29, 2012 Senate meeting and the January 7, 2013 SCPB meeting. The Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed [A Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographics](#) that requested all units and departments "make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year". Resources to help that discussion are posted on the Senate website under [Issues Under Consideration](#). I am pleased to report that faculty from the School of Public Health are responding to the resolution by bringing the topic to the School's Faculty Council, the School's Diversity Committee, and identifying the issue as a Strategic Objective to address in the School's [Self-Study March 2013 report](#) in preparation for accreditation. I encourage all schools/colleges to actively address this important issue.

Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Sciences and Mechanical Engineering

This report is being written at the end of Day 94 of the 105 day long 2013 Regular Session of the Washington State Legislature. This is the last day for either the House or the Senate to consider bills that originated the opposite body: "After the 94th day, only initiatives, alternatives to initiatives, budgets and matters necessary to implement budgets, matters that affect state revenue, messages pertaining to amendments, differences between the houses, and matters incident to the interim and closing of the session may be considered." Thus the members of the legislature will now undertake two broad areas of work – reconciling differences in the bills that they have passed in their respective bodies and fretting, negotiating and passing the final operating, capital and transportation budgets. Right now is a time in the legislative session where very much or virtually nothing could happen in the week between when this report is prepared and the Faculty Senate meeting where it is presented.

There are several bills that have now passed both houses (although differences due to amendments have not necessarily been reconciled) in order to affect higher education. These include bills that will save money by relieving the universities of some requirements or restrictions related to business practices (good), allow students attending the Western Governor's University Washington to be eligible to receive State Need Grants (controversial), provide additional protections to students who are in the National Guard or the Reserves (faculty course management and grading policies may need to be revised), and establish a legislative group to study the needs of students with disabilities.

Several additional higher education bills have not yet been addressed on the floor of the house or senate but they fall within the broad areas of passing budgets or affecting revenue so they are not subject to bill cutoff dates. These include SB 5893 that would impose a 20% surcharge on tuition paid by all international students and deposit the money into the state's general fund (severe consequences at the UW), and SB 5883 that would reduce tuition for resident undergraduate students by 3%, limit future tuition increases to levels of economic inflation and establish future state "base-line" appropriations to the university based on a three-year running average of enrollment (potential for severe financial consequences at the UW). In addition HB 1817, known as the "Dream Act" bill, has been tied to the budget negotiations through a small appropriation to the Student Achievement Council. This keeps the bill "alive" – at least as long as it remains in the negotiations.

The state operating budget continues to be the biggest concern to higher education and the University of Washington. Both the Senate and the House have passed operating budget bills but, as has been widely written about in the local media, they are substantially different in both their substance and their underlying philosophy. The chair of the House Appropriations has indicated that while he and the Senate Ways and Means chair could easily arrive at a compromise budget that *they* would be able to agree to, the formidable challenge they are facing is to develop a budget compromise that will pass with a majority in the senate *and* a majority in the house.

While higher education funding is a much greater legislative concern this session than it has been over the past five to ten years it continues to lack the urgency that is needed to compete with other areas of state services in the budgeting process. In summary the two operating budget proposals that have been passed can both be characterized as not particularly good but certainly not devastating to the UW. The best analyses of these budgets are the ones prepared by the UW's Office of Planning and Budgeting (OPB) and can be found through the "[OPB Briefs](#)" link that is found at the bottom of the "Quicklinks" list on the OPB website.

FLR FAQ:

Q: Will they be done by April 28, the last day of the session?

A: It's hard to imagine, but you never know.

Class A Legislation
Faculty Code Section 24-54. Changes in the Promotion & Tenure Process
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Background and Rationale

Introduction

The Senate Executive Committee has approved and is forwarding to the Senate Class A legislation that modifies Section 24–54 of the Faculty Code, “Procedure for Promotions” in two major areas:

1. Requires additional disclosure to the candidate of the recommendations of the Elected Faculty Council and the Dean.
2. Provides one additional opportunity (if the dean’s initial recommendation is unfavorable) for candidates to respond to recommendations.

Reasons for proposed changes

- The goal is to encourage best practices in communication throughout the promotion process.
- Inconsistent practices exist among the departments, schools, colleges, and campuses in what candidates are told about the recommendations being made at each level of the promotion process.
- Candidates who aren’t informed of recommendations and rationale may have unrealistic expectations about the level of support for their advancement or may be unduly anxious. Annual reviews vary in the level of honest and clear feedback provided to candidates, and may be limited to department level perspectives that could differ at the school/college/campus/university level.

Background:

The proposed legislation was initially prepared by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs after lengthy debate and consideration that began in Fall 2011, including communication with chairs of the elected faculty councils, chairs of small departments, the Board of Deans, and the Provost. The legislation was approved, in amended form, by the Senate Executive Committee.

Currently, in the *Faculty Code*, candidates for promotion are only required to receive information about their case after the faculty of their academic unit has taken a vote. The proposed changes would allow the candidate to learn about the recommendation of the elected college council, hear from the dean, respond in writing before the Dean makes a final decision, and be informed of the final decision and reasons therefor.

Section 24–54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

- A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion. Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34 Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24–32, 24–33, 24–34, and 24–35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24–32.
- B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self–assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The voting faculty of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. ~~and to~~ A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, all names specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If ~~this~~ the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidates.

- C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its

recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

- D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter,

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

~~and, if the decision~~ If the decision recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost President. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

- E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 8, 2013

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 25, 2013

**Class B Legislation: Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 101, Admissions
Proposal to add limited admission student
Justification Statement and Proposed Language**

Background and Rationale

A recent proposal for an on-line degree completion program in Early Childhood Education envisions a status for their students that does not correspond exactly to either of the two types of students recognized in the UW Policy Directory, Student Governance and Policies, Chapter 101, Admissions and elsewhere in the Washington Administrative Code. The Student Governance and Policies recognizes two statuses: matriculated (paragraph E) and non-matriculated (paragraph F).

- E. A matriculated student is one who has been admitted into one of the University's schools or colleges to pursue a program of study that normally leads to a degree.
- F. A non-matriculated student is one whose educational objective does not include a University of Washington degree. Permission to enroll as a non-matriculated student implies no commitment on the part of the University for subsequent admission as a matriculated student.

Since this program is one leading to a degree, students admitted to it would qualify as matriculated students. However, these students do not compete with all other applicants for admission to the University; they apply only to this one program and will be restricted to enrollment in only this one program; they may not change programs, change major, double major, and may have other limitations. It is anticipated that there may be other new programs (online or on campus) in the future that also limit admission to a single program. This legislation provides for this new student admission status and requires such students to be informed of any limitations related to their status.

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) proposed that the definition of student in the Student Governance and Policies and in other places where the term "student" is used needs to be modified to recognize the status of limited admission for these students. The legislation was approved by the Senate Executive Committee.

Student Governance and Policies, Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101, Admission

1. Preliminary Statements and Definitions

E. A matriculated student is one who has been admitted into one of the University's schools or colleges to pursue a program of study that normally leads to a degree.

1. Regularly admitted student. A regularly admitted undergraduate student is one who is competitively admitted to one of the University of Washington campuses. The student may seek admission to any program, major or degree at that campus.

2. Limited admission student. A limited admission undergraduate student is one who has been competitively admitted to a specific degree program and must choose from a limited number of courses specifically identified in their program. Admission is restricted to this program and does not qualify the student for admission to other degree programs of the University of Washington. To be admitted to other degree programs, the student must separately apply to be a regularly admitted student, or apply to another limited admission program. The student shall be informed by the program of any additional restrictions related to their enrollment.

F. A non-matriculated student is one whose educational objective does not include a University of Washington degree. Permission to enroll as a non-matriculated student implies no commitment on the part of the University for subsequent admission as a matriculated student.

Scholastic Regulations Chapter 114, Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement

2. Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree

I. Degrees with Double Major

Regularly admitted sStudents may choose to earn bachelor's degrees with double majors. Majors may be earned within the same college or from different colleges. A single degree with a double major is appropriate when both majors lead to the same degree objective (e.g., BA or BS). If students desire to pursue double majors, they shall complete all degree requirements in accordance with the satisfactory progress policy (*Scholastic Regulations*, Chapter 116, Satisfactory Progress). The student must submit an application for each major that is to be approved by the department, school, or college granting the major. Both majors will appear on the student's permanent record.

3. Two Bachelor's Degrees at the Same Time

Two differently named bachelor's degrees may be granted at the same time to a regularly admitted student, but the total number of academic credits shall reach a minimum of 45 credits in excess of the number normally awarded for the first bachelor's degree. Two bachelor's degrees will not be awarded when both majors lead to the same degree objective (e.g., BS or BA); in these cases a single degree with a double major will be awarded. Exceptions to this rule are at the discretion of the dean of the college or school awarding the degree and only on a case-by-case basis; if the two majors are in two different colleges or schools, both deans must approve.

4. A Second Bachelor's Degree

- A. A second bachelor's degree may be granted to a regularly admitted student, but there shall be required for this degree a minimum of 45 additional credits in residence.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 8, 2013

Approved by
Faculty Senate
April 25, 2013

**Class B Legislation: Student Governance and Policies
Chapter 114, Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement
Addition of a Diversity Requirement
Justification Statement and Proposed Language**

Background and Rationale

Since 1988, efforts have been made by faculty, students, and University administration to incorporate diversity studies as part of the general education graduation requirements for undergraduates of the UW.

Diversity is one of the University of Washington's six stated values. Creating a diversity requirement will further align the University's values and curriculum. The requirement is meant to help students develop an understanding of the complexities of living in an increasingly diverse and interconnected world. The University of Washington must prepare students for the new demands and expectations that they will encounter as successful graduates.

Previous proposals encountered resistance to a diversity requirement for a variety of reasons, including debate on the definition of diversity, the number of credits required, and a concern that there might not be enough places available in existing courses that would satisfy such a requirement. The proposed Class B legislation addresses the concerns raised by prior proposals. It requires 3 credits of coursework that can simultaneously satisfy other Area of Knowledge requirements, thus not adding to general education requirements. It employs a broad definition of diversity. The faculty of each school, college, and campus will recommend and approve courses to meet the requirement. Existing courses in most all departments, schools, and campuses will fulfill the requirement, and a Provost's diversity task force estimates that two-thirds of graduating seniors already meet the requirement.

The proposed legislation was originated by and has the support of a coalition of interested students and has been endorsed by the ASUW. It results from collaborative efforts by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA), the Faculty Council on Women in Academic (FCWA) and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). The legislation was approved by the Senate Executive Committee for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 114, Degrees, Graduation, and Commencement

2. Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree

A. Required Grade Point

To be eligible for the bachelor's degree, an undergraduate student must achieve a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.00. Only resident credits and credits from DL courses will be used to compute the graduation grade-point average.

B. Required Credits

To be eligible for graduation from the University with the Bachelor's degree, a student shall satisfy all other specific requirements and shall offer a minimum of 180 academic credits.

1. The requirements for graduation shall include:

- a. No fewer than 40 credits of general education courses approved by the appropriate school or college, including no fewer than 10 credits in each of three areas of study: The Natural World, Individuals and Societies, and The Visual, Literary, and Performing Arts;
 - b. No fewer than 12 credits of writing consisting of 5 credits of English Composition and two additional writing-intensive courses (the latter may be satisfied through several options: "W" courses, senior seminars, senior thesis, or courses for which students and faculty contract for a substantial amount of writing);
 - c. No fewer than 5 credits of courses devoted to reasoning skills (courses to fulfill this requirement include quantitative, symbolic, or formal reasoning which may be satisfied within the discipline).
 - d. No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.
2. Courses taken to fulfill the writing, reasoning, diversity, and major requirements may apply as appropriate to the general education requirements.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 8, 2013

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 25, 2013