

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 21, 2011, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:36 by Chair JW Harrington.
The Agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor James “JW” Harrington. **{Exhibit A}**

Harrington supplemented his written report by discussing activities related to data gathering about online courses. Proposals for an online version of a course (or a new online course) are reviewed by faculty-led curriculum committees at the school/college/campus and university levels. Decisions about the staffing of any course, including online courses, are made by program or department heads, with whatever broader faculty consultation that their faculty mandate. Therefore, these decisions are all in the hands of faculty. However, the institution needs to know the sum of these local-level decisions. One inquiry to be made is what are the titles of the instructors of our courses, aggregated by lower-division, upper-division, online-only, versus all media. Harrington is working with the faculty leadership to clarify what summary information would be most useful, on an annual basis, and then will confer with the administration to determine what sorts of summary information reporting is feasible.

He also emphasized that the May meeting of the Faculty Senate will feature an extended opportunity for discussion with Interim President Wise and chair of the Board of Regents, Herb Simon.

Harrington responded to a Senator who asked for clarification about the UW's policy for recognizing transfer credits from the Western Governor's University. Harrington deferred to John Schaufelberger, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, who responded that the university's Registrar evaluates each course and determines if transfer credit will be given.

3. Report of the President – Interim Provost Mary Lidstrom.

Interim Provost Lidstrom asked Vice Provost Paul Jenny to provide a budget update. Jenny responded that a special session of the state legislature is likely. It is expected that there will be a freeze on salaries for all state employees that would mean no merit increases for UW faculty. Salary increases for retention and promotions will be allowed. Jenny reviewed the highlights of the House and Senate versions of the state budget that will need to be reconciled in the final state budget.

Provost Lidstrom described the internal process she has used to make budget allocations to the various units on the Seattle campus. She has reviewed the evaluations and reports of all (over 100) academic units and discussed these reports with the respective Deans. From these discussions she has identified those programs that are 'premier,' 'strong,' and 'struggling.' The final category of 'struggling' programs are likely candidates for program reorganization, consolidation, or elimination. She has discussed action plans with all units. In making decisions she has kept in mind the principles recommended to her by the Board of Deans, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and student groups. Decisions will be guided by indicators of quality, impact, affordability and leverage. Priorities include providing access for undergraduates to high demand classes for timely degree completion and preserving student and faculty support services. She is expecting the net cut to units to be 10-12%, but these cuts will not be the same across all units; the distribution will be based on tuition allocations based on student credit hour generation.

Provost Lidstrom provided an update on discussions with the Evans School and Information School. Each has proposed a plan to remain as independent schools by increasing the cost of degrees to students. Discussions have occurred with students and the plans and associated risks have been

submitted to the elected faculty council (EFC). If the EFC is willing to accept the risk of the plans, the Provost will not move forward with proposals for consolidation.

In response to questions from Senators, the Provost clarified that the budgets on the Tacoma and Bothell campuses differ from the Seattle campus and that cuts to those campuses are expected to be small. Concerns about increased faculty workload need to be addressed internally within each campus. The Provost clarified that risks for the Evans and Information Schools are that faculty salaries will need to be covered through tuition generated through adequate enrollment in master's programs but that admission standards should not be lowered to keep enrollment high. The Provost responded to questions about cuts to administrative units by indicating that more extensive program evaluation of those units will occur next year. In the last two years cuts to administrative units averaged 16% compared to 12% in academic units. This year the cuts are expected to be similar. Some administrative areas, especially those related to compliance and safety, are being stretched too thin. Budget cuts are also being made by not filling some vacancies in administration.

4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
 - a. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of April 4, 2011.
 - i. Approval of February 14, 2011, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
 - ii. Approval of March 10, 2011, Faculty Senate Minutes.
 - iii. Faculty Involvement in International Activities. Discussion with Steve Hanson, Vice Provost for Global Affairs.
 - b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. **{Exhibit B}**
 - c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. **{Exhibit C}**
 - d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. No written report.

A supplement to the report from the Secretary of the Faculty was distributed at the meeting; a document of RCEP frequently asked questions. The FAQ has also been posted on the Faculty Senate website. If there are further questions or comments about the document, please contact the Secretary of the Faculty.

SCPB chair Bruce Ballick reported that SCPB reviewed and approved a proposal from the School of Dentistry to consolidate the Departments of Oral Biology and Dental Public Health Sciences under limited RCEP procedures. The Secretary of the Faculty has notified faculty of the affected units of the 20 instructional day deadline to petition the Provost to request full RCEP procedures.

Since Faculty Legislative Representative Jim Fridley was in Olympia, Chair Harrington presented brief comments in his absence. The house budget's tuition increases were miscalculated so something closer to the Senate's (16% annually) would be needed. The real key will be in the final tuition and accountability bill (HB1795). It is not clear today whether this bill will be final before the session ends, but things in Olympia are very fluid and many amendments are rumored. However, it is likely passage will wait until the special session.

In regards to the special session, the regular session will probably end tomorrow; it is unclear when the special session will begin. There are still many outstanding bills related to the budget, so there is much to be done before a budget is finalized. More information, including budget updates, can be found on the Faculty Senate blog.

5. Invited Guests.

There were no invited guests.

6. Consent Agenda.

Confirm Jim Fridley, Professor of Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as 2011-2012 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2011 and ending July 31, 2012.

The consent agenda was approved. Senate Chair Harrington thanked Professor Fridley for his ongoing service; his comments were greeted with applause from Senators.

7. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair Susan Astley presented the memorial resolution

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

Professor Emeritus Clyde Benjamin Graham of Radiology who died on March 18, 2011, after having served the University since 1959.

Clinical Professor A. Bernard Gray of Surgery, who died on March 25, 2011, after having served the University since 1960.

Professor G. Alan Marlatt of Psychology, who died on March 14, 2011, after having served the University since 1972.

Clinical Professor Beverly Aleta LaVeck McCall of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, who died on February 22, 2011, after having served the University since 1978.

Professor Emeritus Morris D. Morris of Economics, who died on March 12, 2011, after having served the University since 1949.

Professor Emeritus Ronald John Nunke of Mathematics, who died on April 3, 2011, after having served the University since 1958.

Clinical Professor David Allan Taft of Surgery, who died on March 10, 2011, after having served the University since 1982.

Professor Emeritus Ronald Lee Terrel of Civil and Environmental Engineering, who died on March 24, 2011, after having served the University since 1967.

The resolution was approved by a standing vote

8. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

9. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **{Exhibit D}**

Rich Christie, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Code Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.

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

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, the motion was presented by Vice Chair Astley.

Rich Christie, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, reviewed the motion and highlighted the justification distributed with the agenda. One Senator asked if the qualifications for appointment as assistant professor should be revised to include the MD. Christie replied that this change was not considered by the Council but could be reviewed in the future.

The motion passed by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

11. Good of the Order.

Senate Chair Harrington mentioned an upcoming meeting of the chairs of all elected faculty councils from the schools, colleges, and campuses of the university. At this meeting "best practices" in shared governance and in conducting Faculty Senator nominations and elections will be shared.

One Senator remarked that future considerations of the university's organizational structure should consider the importance of structures that allow for interdisciplinary collaborations.

In view of no faculty salary increases again this year, a Senator asked if data could be provided at a future meeting about how UW pay scales compare with those in peer institutions.

A Senator requested a status report about concerns related to adjudications. Rich Christie, chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, reported that the council is in the middle of deliberations on this topic.

Bruce Kochis, faculty member at UW Bothell announced they were exploring a software initiative to digitize vitas so information about faculty can be aggregated for reports. If anyone has information about such software, please contact him.

12. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: James "JW" Harrington, Chair of the Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
JW Harrington, Professor, Geography

Oversight and Instruction of Online Courses

At the April meeting of the Senate Executive Committee, I reported the following:

At the 10 March meeting of the Faculty Senate, Senator Janelle Taylor asked about faculty oversight of online courses, in reaction to the recent news articles that UW plans to double online course offerings. I suggested that I would look into this and determine whether I should ask a Faculty Council chair or two (Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning came immediately to mind) to lead a discussion of this at the 4 April meeting of the Senate Executive Committee.

I later asked Prof. Taylor for more detail on her questions, and she replied:

"My questions concern faculty oversight over curriculum standards & content, but also who is teaching these classes (t-t faculty? adjuncts? grad students?), their pay and workload and benefits and protections, and also the possibility that if the university is expanding its online offerings while contracting departments and programs and t-t faculty position, this may represent a real erosion of the tenure system and all it entails."

In response to e-mail inquiries, Jan Carline, Chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, reported:

"This year, there has been some discussion of issues of CAI [computer-aided instruction] use, particularly with the strategy of using CAI to increase capacity without increasing faculty. I have a couple of individuals currently doing literature reviews in this area, and I am sure that there will be further discussions in FCTL on these issues. We have developed our own questions in this area, but now would be an excellent time for modification or addition to these topics."

John Schaufelberger, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), reported:

"In order for a department to offer a course online, it must be approved by the University Curriculum Committee, even if it is a course that is currently offered in a classroom. The department submitting the course approval request must include a distance learning supplement with each course request.

'While UWEO [University of Washington Educational Outreach] has an online learning staff, an academic department is not required to go through UWEO to offer a course online. Many online instructors are regular teaching faculty who teach online as a part of their normal teaching load. Part-time faculty who teach online should be reviewed by department faculty in the same manner as part-time faculty who are appointed to teach on campus.

'The policies for review of individual courses were established by FCAS, but FCAS reviews programs and not individual courses. Any course change must be reviewed by department faculty, a college curriculum committee, and the dean before being submitted to the University Curriculum Committee for approval. As far as I know, there is no centralized support for online courses, other than those offered in partnership with UWEO."

David Szatmary, Vice Provost for Educational Outreach, reported:

1. "UWEO provides the infrastructure support and administration for fee-based online credit and noncredit programs. Because the UW has very little state-supported infrastructure for online classes, the vast majority of online classes are fee-based and administered through UWEO. I would also add that the UW does have some central (e.g. Catalyst) and departmentally based educational technology support, though this differs from the infrastructure to develop and offer completely online courses.
2. 'The pilot to offer online classes to UW matriculated undergraduates through the time schedule has been vetted extensively with the Regents (twice), the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) (three times), students, academic units and the administration. Since the autumn of 2009,

we have offered 36 online course sections to 3,013 enrollees. As John indicates, ALL of the academic aspects of the classes (faculty, curriculum, scheduling, etc.) are determined by the appropriate academic unit. We have surveyed the faculty and students about their experiences, and the majority in both groups found the courses to be satisfying and worthwhile. I have attached two of the surveys above.”

Karen Dowdall-Sandford, Director of Online Programs for UWEO, provided a spreadsheet of each of the courses offered through the pilot through which online versions of existing undergraduate courses are offered at an additional fee, in Autumn 2009, Winter 2010, Spring 2010, Autumn 2010, and Winter 2011. I compiled those data to generate a distribution of the faculty title for the instructors of those courses. Some of the courses were taught under multiple headings (e.g., COM 389, AES 389, and WOMEN 389); my compilation counts such as one faculty hiring. Some of the hiring was done using the incorrect title “hourly extension lecturer”; I inferred a correct title from the student/non-student status of the instructor. 35 distinct hires, 7 of which were for classes that were listed under multiple headings.

15 (43%) Lecturer Part-Time, or should have had that title
9 (26%) Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor
7 (20%) Predoctoral Instructor, or should have had that title
2 (6%) Lecturer Full Time
2 (6%) Affiliate Assistant Professor

Faculty Oversight of International Activities

At the April meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), Vice Provost Stephen Hanson (Global Affairs), presented the range of activities and agreements that his office oversees. Professor Míceál Vaughan led a discussion of the need for official faculty oversight of some of the related policy issues. I suggested a follow-up meeting to pursue this further.

President's and Provost's Reports

At the April meeting of the Faculty Senate, Interim Provost Lidstrom will present the President's report, and then will provide some summary of her interactions with deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts regarding budget planning. See the written statements from deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts – impacts of prior cuts, plans for further cuts, and lots of standardized data – linked to the [Planning & Budgeting home page](#) under “[Budget Narratives for FY2012](#).”

May Senate Meeting

The May meeting of the Senate will feature an extended report from and opportunity for questions of the President, and remarks from and opportunity for questions of the chair of the Board of Regents.

Summer Meetings of the SEC

The Faculty Code (Ch. 22-60, Sec. B, Item 12) notes that the SEC “Shall act for the Senate during the period from the last Senate meeting in the Spring Quarter until the first meeting in the Autumn Quarter, and shall report such actions at the first Senate meeting in the Autumn Quarter.”

Given the number of issues we face and the need to ensure the possibility of official faculty input into continuing issues, the Chair of the SCPB has set dates for possible SCPB meetings, and I have set [dates](#) for possible SEC meetings during the summer. They are contingent dates -- if there are not pressing matters, we will cancel the meetings.

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

1. University Faculty Lecture

Nominations for the 2011-12 University Faculty Lecturer close on Friday, April 22, 2011. Thus far we have received six nominations.

This award, established in 1974, is intended to honor current or emeriti faculty whose research, scholarship, or art is widely recognized by their peers and whose achievements have had a substantial impact on their profession, on the research or performance of others, and perhaps on society as a whole.

In addition to honoring the recipient, the award is designed to increase awareness, both within and outside the University, of the nature and significance of original work being done by outstanding faculty members. Accordingly, the recipient is asked to present a lecture open to the University community and the general public.

Members of the nominating committee are:

Marcia Killien, Nursing, Secretary of the Faculty, ex officio without vote
Susan Astley, Epidemiology, Vice chair, Faculty Senate, ex officio without vote
Ron Stenkamp, Medicine, Chair, Faculty Council on Research, ex officio without vote
Mayumi Willgerodt, Nursing
Eve Riskin, Engineering
Jaime Olavarria, Arts and Sciences
Jan Carline, Medicine
Borje Saxberg, Business
Steve Paige, Public Affairs
Joe Janes, Information School

2. RCEP

At the March meeting of the Faculty Senate there were many questions about the procedures for reorganization, consolidation, and elimination of programs and schools/colleges. As a resource for faculty and administrators, a document: "RCEP: Frequently Asked Questions" has been developed by the Secretary of the Faculty with consultation from members of the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations. This document is in progress and will be discussed at the April 21, Faculty Senate meeting. It will also be posted on the Faculty Senate and Governance website, and updated periodically.

3. Senate and SEC Elections

The following Schools and Colleges will elect Senators for the 2011-13 term; all but one College has completed their elections: Arts & Sciences, Business, Dentistry, Engineering, Environment, Nursing, Public Health, Social Work, UW Tacoma.

The nominating committee for positions on the Senate Executive Committee has been appointed, consisting of: Norm Beauchamp, Medicine; Vandra Huber, Business; Dan Luchtel, Public Health; Linda Martin-Morris, Arts and Sciences. Nominees will be brought to the Senate at its May 19 meeting and elections will be conducted electronically the week of May 23.

4. Council membership for 2011-12

Nominations for membership in the various faculty councils for 2011-12 are being accepted. If you are interested in serving on a council, please contact Alex Bolton at bolt@uw.edu.

RCEP: FAQs**Updated 4/20/11****By Secretary of the Faculty**

The RCEP process provides for collegial dialogue and consultation when budget reductions, resource reallocations, or shifting academic priorities lead to consideration of organizational restructuring. The process provides administrative leaders with counsel from faculty, students, and staff, both internal and external to the unit under review for restructuring, and provides directly and indirectly affected or interested parties a forum for gathering or contributing information and perspectives. This consultative and collegial process is intended to lead to fully informed decisions regarding academic unit reorganizations, consolidations, and eliminations.

The RCEP process is fully described in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, and the *Code* is the authoritative source on the process. This “FAQ” document is intended as an introductory, evolving, informational resource on some of the questions frequently asked by faculty, staff, students, and administrators about the RCEP process. However, because the information presented here is a brief summary of the *Code*, it does not substitute for the *Faculty Code* on any matters of dispute.

1. Question: What does “RCEP” Stand for?

A: “Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures,” a set of procedures outlined in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41. These procedures apply to those organizational restructuring actions affecting either “programs” or entire schools or colleges.

There are two basic types of RCEPs, one for programs and departments *within* a school/college/campus (proposed by the dean or chancellor) and the other for entire colleges, schools, and campuses (proposed by the Provost). Each type has two variations: one is a full/extended set of procedures and the other is a limited or expedited set of procedures. Detailed descriptions of the procedures are described in sections 26-41 B, C, D, and E of the *Faculty Code*.

2. Question: RCEP procedures (*Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsections B and C) refer to “programs.” What is a “program?”

A: For the purposes of RCEP, a “program” is defined in Section 23-23, subsections C and D, and Section 26-41 of the *Faculty Code* as follows:

- a. A department or other degree-granting unit (other than a departmentalized school, college, or campus); or
- b. A sub-unit within a department, an academic unit in a non-departmentalized school or college, or
- c. A group of faculty (from one or more departments) which offers a distinct degree, or
- d. A track within a degree that is described as a distinct option in the University Catalog, or in the course catalog of the college or school in question, or is customarily noted as such on student transcripts

A disagreement as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a “program” is resolved by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB); their decision is binding. The Dean or Chancellor and faculty group affected by the proposed action each submit a statement of their position to the SCPB chair. SCPB has 10 instructional days after receipt of both statements to make a decision. **[(*Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsections B and C)]**

3. Question: RCEP procedures (*Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsections D and .E) refer to “college or school.” Which University units are a “college or school?”

A: The procedures that refer to reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of a college or school apply to one of the 15 Schools and Colleges of the University of Washington Seattle campus or the reorganization or consolidation of the University of Washington Bothell or University of Washington Tacoma campuses. **[Executive Order IX]**

4. Question: How do I know if a proposed action requires going through the RCEP procedure?

A: If the answers to the following 2 questions are both yes, then an RCEP should be initiated. 1) Does the proposed action involve a “program?” (see above) or one or more Schools or Colleges? 2) Does the proposed action involve a (structural) reorganization, or a consolidation, or an elimination of one or more “programs” or Schools/Colleges/Campuses? If in doubt, please contact the Secretary of the Faculty for guidance.

5. Question: Who initiates an RCEP?

A: If the proposed action is to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate one or more “programs” *within* a single school, college, or campus, the RCEP is initiated by a Dean or Chancellor. If the proposed action is to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate one or more Schools or Colleges or Campuses, the RCEP is initiated by the Provost

6. Question: How does an RCEP get started/initiated?

A: In keeping with the intended spirit of collegial dialogue and consultation, any RCEP proposal should be developed through discussions with the affected program faculty and administrator(s) and appropriate faculty advisory committees.

If the proposed action will occur *within* a School, College, or Campus (i.e. A program-level RCEP), the Dean or Chancellor is required to consult with the unit’s Elected Faculty Council, and then request authority from the Provost to initiate a formal RCEP procedure. The Provost considers that request in consultation with SCPB. The Provost contacts the chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) to place the matter on an upcoming SCPB agenda.

If the proposed action will occur at the university level (a School/College/Campus-level RCEP), the Provost first consults with the Dean or Chancellor and the Elected Faculty Council of the affected unit(s), and then presents a proposal to the President and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

It is suggested that preliminary discussions about the proposed action occur with the Secretary of the Faculty and SCPB chair, as well as staff in the Provost’s office. These individuals can provide guidance on the RCEP process and preparing the proposal to bring to SCPB.

7. Question: The RCEP description in the *Faculty Code* seems very complex. How do I know what part applies to my situation?

A: There are actually 4 distinct RCEP procedures. Each is described separately in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41:

1. Program RCEP: Full Process [***Faculty Code*, Section 26-41.B**]
2. Program RCEP: Limited Process [***Faculty Code*, Section 26-41.C**]
3. School/College/Campus RCEP: Full Process [***Faculty Code*, Section 26-41.D**]
4. School/College/Campus RCEP: Limited Process [***Faculty Code*, Section 26-41.E**]

Program-level RCEP procedures apply to proposed actions that occur *within* a school, college, or campus and are initiated by the Dean of that unit.

School/College/Campus-level RCEP procedures apply to proposed actions that occur within the University and are initiated by the Provost.

8. Question: What determines if the RCEP will follow the procedures for a full or a limited process?

A: If the proposed action WILL have one or more of the effects listed below, then the full process is required. If not, then the limited process is allowed.

- a. The termination of an undergraduate or graduate program (with 'program' defined above and in the *Faculty Code*, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection A).
- b. The removal of tenured faculty or of untenured faculty before completion of their contracts.
- c. A significant change in the terms, conditions, or course of employment of faculty.
- d. A significant change in the overall curriculum of a college, school, or campus, or of the University as a whole.
- e. A significant departure from the stated mission of a college, school, or campus, or of the University as a whole.

When a RCEP proposal is presented to SCPB, members may ask for information to clarify that a proposed action fits the criteria for a limited process. Faculty in the affected programs(s) have the opportunity to petition to have a proposal proceed through the full (not limited) process if they believe it does not meet the criteria for a limited process. Ultimately, the Provost or President determines if the limited process can be followed. [***Faculty Code, Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection B.1., Subsection C, and Subsection E***]

9. Question: How long does an RCEP take to complete?

A: It depends on whether the full or limited process is followed. The full process for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of a program or School/College/Campus generally takes 1-2 quarters to complete. The time limits for various steps are outlined in the *Faculty Code*. In considering these time limits, note that some steps are specified as maximum limits and others are minimum limits; all time limits refer to "instructional days" and thus exclude weekends, holidays, examination periods, quarter breaks, and Summer quarter.

The limited process can only be used for a reorganization or consolidation of a program or a School, College, or Campus; it cannot be used for an elimination. The limited process can be completed in a minimum of 20 instructional days following presentation of the proposal to SCPB.

10. Question: What are the opportunities for affected faculty and other stakeholders to voice their opinions about the proposed RCEP action(s)?

A: All RCEP proposals should be developed through consultation with the unit(s) affected faculty, administrator(s), and Elected Faculty Council.

In a full RCEP, affected faculty and other stakeholders are also invited to provide testimony during hearings held by a Review Committee, as part of the RCEP procedures.

In a limited RCEP, faculty in the affected programs may file a petition if they believe a full RCEP process applies; if the petition is accepted, the faculty would then be able to provide testimony as stated above.

11. Question: In what other ways are the University faculty involved in the RCEP process?

A: Involvement of University faculty in the RCEP procedures include: participation as members of the Elected Faculty Councils and individual faculty members of affected programs, as members appointed to the External Faculty Committee for program-level RCEPs, as members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), and as members of the appointed Review Committees.

12. Question: What is the role of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) in RCEP processes?

A: SCPB has the following roles:

1. Resolves any disagreements as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a "program". SCPB's decision is binding.
2. Participates in determining if a proposed action meets the criteria for a "limited" reorganization or consolidation process. SCPB's role is to consult with the Provost (for a program-level RCEP) or the President (for a School/College/Campus-level RCEP).
3. Participates with the Provost in granting the authority to a Dean or Chancellor to initiate a formal review (full RCEP) to identify one or more programs for elimination, reorganization, or consolidation. SCPB's role is to consult with the Provost.
4. Must concur with a Provost's proposal to begin a full RCEP process to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate a college or school. The majority of the members of SCPB must concur with the request before the review of the proposal can proceed.
5. Confers with the Provost (or President) after the Review Committee (Full process for program-level or college-level RCEP) submits its final report and before the Provost (or President) makes a final decision.

13. Question: What is the role of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of Faculty Senate?

A: The Faculty Senate approves the legislation that sets forth the RCEP procedures. Senators may be asked to serve as members or chairs of External Faculty Committees or Review Committees. Individual Senators may also provide testimony in hearings held by Review Committees. The Chair of the Faculty Senate appoints members of Review Committees and receives reports from Review Committees.

14. Question: What is the appeal process for a President's decision to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate a program or school/college?

A: The Code does not specifically provide for further review following the President's decision.

15. Question: Who do I go to if I have further questions concerning RCEP?

A: The Secretary of the Faculty

Report of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Bruce Balick, Committee Chair and Professor, Astronomy

The House has passed its state budget for 2011-13, and the Senate is expected to follow by the weekend. After the reconciliation of the two budgets the merged budget will reach the Governor's desk for approval. As far as we can tell the House and Senate budgets are quite close in most respects, including the Higher-Ed budgets, so the process could reach completion by the end of the month. At that point we'll know our state allocation for the next biennium. We'll also know about permitted tuition rates for resident undergraduates and we will have internal agreements on other tuition rates.

The regents have the authority and responsibility to set the rates within the restrictions. So the revenue picture will not be formally completed until June at the earliest. It's only then that our revenue picture is set.

Jim Fridley, our Faculty Legislative Representative in Olympia, and I have been sending "budget headlines" to all faculty by email as major budget events unfold. Thus I will not review the budgets of the House and Senate here. We will continue to send out news until the ink is dry on the budget that goes to the regents for approval in a month or two. Stay tuned.

SCPB has worked closely with the Provost on budget priorities and design philosophy, all of which was described in a letter from the Provost (30 March, <http://www.washington.edu/discover/leadership/provost/message-provost-3-30-11>). The Provost has completed 40 interviews with deans, vice provosts and vice presidents on their plans for budget cuts next year. Each of them was given a set of target figures and asked to describe how they would incorporate the cuts while preserving quality and building a sustainable revenue plan for the future. This isn't easy in the best of times. Add the complexities of the implementation of Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) is starting to divert the bulk of tuition revenues from the Provost's office to the sites of actual instruction.

The revenue picture is already in sufficient focus that informed budget scenario planning is in progress by the Provost and SCPB discussions can proceed. Interim Provost Mary Lidstrom will bring formative budgets to SCPB for joint discussion in the weeks ahead. First up will be scenarios for the administrative budgets (1/3 of our expenses) -- perhaps by April 25. As the budget-planning discussions with deans conclude, SCPB will preview and discuss College/School-level budgets for UW Seattle along with an analysis of their impacts on our overall academic program. Please note that SCPB considers only the College-level allocations; it does not displace the function of Elected Faculty Councils to look deeply into spending within the units in consultation with their deans.

Activity-Based Budgeting: A Status Summary

An overview ABB document was released last month (http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/pdf/abb/ABB-Overview_March-2011.pdf). On April 13 the ABB Steering Committee met to approve the final plans for the largest policy issues. This went smoothly. A variety of detailed issues remain to be resolved, and swatting the emerging devils is making progress. The final roll-out of ABB will come from the Office of Planning and Budgeting, perhaps in late May or June. The current state of ABB planning will be reviewed by SCPB on April 18.

In brief, ABB will divert 70% of undergraduate and graduate tuition revenues directly to the units of instruction. The funds will be apportioned using a simple formula based on course enrollments and degree majors registered within each college. The current balance of college funding will evolve as a result. The remaining 30% of the tuition revenues plus all of the state allocation will continue to flow to the Provost to cover the costs of infrastructure (such as libraries, IT, admissions, and police), fixed costs such as power, central investments in academic programs, the costs of administration, and other university-wide needs, as in the past. More details are found on pages 6-8 of the document above.

Reorganizations, Consolidations, or Eliminations of Programs ("RCEP"s)

"RCEP"s are the pathways to various major types of programmatic change within or among colleges and schools (Faculty Code Section 26-41)." SCPB is expecting to receive as many as five proposals from

deans for RCEPs within their units this spring. Based on scant advance information, all five of these will be proposed as "limited" RCEPS in which the dean and affected faculty are in general agreement about the need for the proposed actions. These types of RCEPs can be completed within a month.

Among other requirements for a limited RCEP is that no faculty positions are lost, the conditions of employment are not violently changed, and that terminated programs do not affect students presently in the system. More contentious types of RCEPs attract far more attention, but none are yet visible in the pipeline.

Faculty Merit Raises for 2012

As required by Executive Order 64, the Provost has informed SCPB and explained why funds for minimum 2% merit raises will not be available for the next academic year. SCPB has reviewed the budget and heard that the Legislature will soon freeze or cut salaries of all state employees for at least a year. (Indeed, our salary budget is being cut by 3% in the budgets of the House and the Senate, but UW will absorb these cuts through layoffs and retirements and not pass them on to remaining employees in 2012). SCPB acknowledged that merit raises seem infeasible for 2012 but it may review the decision in the unlikely event that the state budget and UW's allocated budget and tuition revenues unpredictably increase beyond current expectations.

Other SCPB Activities

In summary, SCPB is in the early stages of discussions on differential costs of tuition (undergraduate tuition variations by discipline or student degree status at UW) and direct admission to selected majors. It has just started a discussion about the optimum college structure for UW Seattle -- a discussion that is highly abstract and oriented towards the long term. Finally it will review the emerging recommendations of the 2y2d strategic planning effort (<http://www.washington.edu/discover/leadership/provost/initiatives/2y2d>) after the internal budget discussions conclude. Our schedule of meetings is posted at <http://www.washington.edu/facsen/issues.html>.

Class A Legislation**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs****Revisions to Chapters 21, 24 and 25: Code revisions related to lecturer and instructor issues.****Rationale:**

This code revision originated when a principal lecturer pointed out that senior and principal lecturers were required (by that person's college) to have an annual collegial evaluation of teaching, while associate and full professors were only required to have such an evaluation every three years. In addition there was some concern over whether lecturers were promotable, or were simply occupying appointed positions.

FCFA consulted with the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (FCTL) about the frequency of collegial evaluation of teaching for senior and principal lecturers. FCTL expressed the opinion that once every three years was a suitable interval for these positions. The code (24-57A) has been changed to reflect this.

Reviewing the code, it was clear that, although all lecturer positions are limited term appointments, it was still intended that lecturers could be promoted to senior lecturers, and senior lecturers could be promoted to principal lecturers. No substantive change was required.

However, the review also turned up a number of inconsistencies in the code related to lecturers and instructors. For example, principal lecturers were omitted from some places where they should have been listed, the term "instructor" was used where "lecturer" was more appropriate, etc. There were also inconsistencies in the use of the terms "rank" and "title". Minor, non-substantive changes to correct these inconsistencies and reflect existing practice were made throughout the code.

During review of the changes, it was proposed that a title of "principal artist in residence" be added to parallel the principal lecturer title, since we have senior artist in residence and artist in residence titles that parallel the senior lecturer and lecturer titles. After input from the Divisional Dean of the Arts, we decided not to add this title. Principal lecturer is a title that can only be achieved by promotion from senior lecturer. The artists in residence and senior artists in residence are appointed, only, and are not promoted.

During review of the changes, we noted that the instructor rank is described in the existing faculty code as the first step in the tenure track ladder. That is, the code envisioned that someone could be hired as an instructor, and promoted to assistant professor. However, the University has not hired instructors for this purpose for some time, using assistant professor as the first step in the tenure ladder, so this use of the rank of instructor is defunct. We did determine that the Medical School, in particular, uses the title "acting instructor" for post-doctoral researchers who have run out the time limits on the research associate title, and also uses the affiliate instructor and clinical instructor titles. We decided to eliminate the instructor rank in the tenure track ladder and add the titles that are actually in use in the appropriate places (24-34 and other places).

Finally, in the course of reviewing the change language, FCFA noted that the existing language governing the initiation of a promotion process (24-54) actually requires a full promotion process (packet, letters, department faculty vote) for every faculty member below the rank of professor every year. Clearly we do not do this, nor should we. Although changing this language went well beyond the original purpose of the revision, the Council decided that a revision reflecting current practice was necessary. Our revision permits eligible faculty to forgo the promotion process, unless the case is mandatory, but ensures that a full case will go forward if the faculty member so desires.

Chapter 21

Section 21-31. Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

the president,
 the vice presidents,
 the professors,
 the associate professors,
 the assistant professors,
~~the instructors,~~
~~the teaching and research associates,~~
 the principal lecturers,
 the senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
~~the senior artists in residence~~
 the lecturers and artists in residence,
~~the instructors,~~
~~the artists in residence, the teaching and research associates,~~

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

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 29, June 8, 1964; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 78, December 14, 1988: all with Presidential approval; RC, February 1, 2008.

Section 21-32. Voting Membership in the Faculty

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

professor, 50% appointment or greater
 research professor, 50% appointment or greater
 associate professor, 50% appointment or greater
 research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater
 assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater
 research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater
~~full-time instructor~~
 full-time principal lecturer,
 full-time senior lecturer,
 full-time senior artist in residence,
 full-time lecturer,
 full-time artist in residence, or
 a retired assistant professor, associate professor, or
 professor during the Quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or
 a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor or
 research professor during the Quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.

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

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

[For definitions of faculty titles, see Section 24-34.]

- C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the *Faculty Code* except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:

Senior Artist in Residence
 Senior Lecturer
Principal Lecturer
~~Assistant Professor~~
 Associate Professor
 Professor
 Associate Professor WOT
 Professor WOT

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 37, February 8, 1971; S-A 45, January 17, 1975; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 98, May 12, 1998; S-A 103, March 6, 2001; S-A 108, June 21, 2002: all with Presidential approval.

Chapter 24

Section 24-34. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

- ~~1.~~ Appointment to the rank of instructor normally requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and the promise of a successful career in teaching and research.
- ~~1.~~ 2. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability beyond that ordinarily required of an instructor that evidences promise of a successful career.
- ~~2.~~ 3. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.
- ~~3.~~ 4. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are *instructional titles* that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.
2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are *instructional titles* that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.
3. Principal ~~L~~ecturer is an *instructional title* that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

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

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

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

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

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

5. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.
6. ~~5. Appointment with a~~ An affiliate appointment rank requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
7. ~~6.—An adjunct~~ appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This ~~title~~ appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.
8. ~~7.—A joint~~ appointment recognizes a faculty member's long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or

not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.

9. ~~8.~~—A *clinical* appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
10. ~~9.~~—Appointment with the title of *teaching associate* is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or shorter; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.
11. ~~10.~~—The *emeritus* appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another State of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an administrator at the level of ~~D~~dean or ~~V~~vice ~~P~~resident, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.
12. ~~11.~~—The *Acting* title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons ~~at~~ in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as ~~instructor~~ or assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.
13. ~~12.~~—Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a *visiting* title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting ~~L~~ecturer.
14. ~~13.~~—The *visiting scholar* title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor's presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 23, February 22, 1959; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 33, June 13, 1967; S-A 37, February 8, 1971; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 97, January 10, 1997; S-A 103, March 6, 2001; S-A 108, June 21, 2002; S-A 109, June 5, 2003: all with Presidential approval; RC, April 18, 2006.

Section 24-41. Duration of Nontenure Appointments

~~A. The first appointment of an instructor is for one academic year. The dean of the instructor's college or school may renew this appointment annually at the same rank for a total period of not more than five years. If the instructor's appointment is to be continued beyond a fourth year his or her reappointment must be accompanied by either a notice of termination effective at the end of the fifth academic year at that rank or a recommendation to the President for an advancement in rank concurrent with the fifth year of his or her appointment.~~

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

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether: a) the appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment; b) the appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or c) the decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.
2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether: a) the appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or b) the appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.
3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

C. ~~Instructor,~~ Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a full-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. Appointment as a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less.
2. Appointment as a full-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost. Appointment as a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less.
3. Except as provided in Subsection 4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer, ~~instructor,~~ artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.
4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection 3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time ~~instructor,~~ lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.
5. Part-time appointments ~~at the rank of as~~ lecturer, ~~instructor,~~ artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter

of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24-53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

- D. A full-time lecturer, ~~or~~ artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to a senior lecturer, ~~or~~ senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer respectively.
- E. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 24-41, Subsection B, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.
- F. The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50 percent of full-time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than 50 percent of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.
- G. The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:
1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether a) the appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment; b) the appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or c) the decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.
 2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether a) the appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or b) the appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.
 3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether a) the research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure; b) the appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or c) the decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases b) and c) the appointment is extended by one year.
 4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether a) the research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or b) the appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.
 5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.
- H. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 24-41, Subsection H, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Section 25-51), for termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 25-52).

- I. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Section 25-51), for termination of funding as defined in Section 24-41, Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Section 25-52).
- J. Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50 percent of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.
- K. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Section 24-41, Subsection H.
- L. The procedures prescribed in Section 24-53 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24-54 for Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 31, December 28, 1966; S-A 41, April 3, 1972; S-A 42, June 9, 1972; S-A 49, December 4, 1975; S-A 62, December 2, 1980; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 67, December 5, 1983; S-A 68, April 19, 1984; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 98, May 12, 1998; S-A 102, July 7, 2000; S-A 108, June 21, 2002: all with Presidential approval; RC June 19, 2008.

Section 24-53. Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

- A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of ~~P~~professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a ~~R~~research ~~P~~professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration.
- B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.
- C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24-41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.
- D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non-renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 41, April 3, 1972; S-A 60, June 25, 1979; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995: all with Presidential approval.

Section 24-54. Procedure for Promotions

~~Each member of the faculty below the rank of professor shall be considered annually for possible promotion. The procedure described below shall be followed.~~

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 are directed to study 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 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 ~~is-if~~ undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record and to vote on the promotion question.

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 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 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.

- 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 therefore to the dean. 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, and if the decision is favorable shall transmit his or her recommendation to the President.

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: all with Presidential approval. [See Footnote #1 on Documentation following Section 24-57]

Section 24-55. Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this Section, to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, university, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities.

The evaluation of a faculty member's merit and salary shall be arrived at after review of the individual's performance in relation to that of their colleagues and by comparison of individuals' present salaries to those of their peers. In evaluating a faculty member's eligibility for merit-based salary increases (Section 24-70.B.1 and 4; Section 24-71.A.1 and B.1) and for "market gap" salary increases (Section 24-71.B.2), the following procedure shall be followed.

- A. In arriving at their recommendations for salary decisions the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, and deans shall each consider the following:

1. the cumulative record of the candidate, taking into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles;
2. the candidate's current salary;
3. documentation of the review conference required by Section 24-57.D ; and
4. any documents produced under Section 24-55.H

Salary recommendations shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of merit funds available over time, may be considered in making merit salary recommendations.

- B. The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited.
- C. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college, shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his/her recommendations the chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall seek the advice of the full professors according to a procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.
- D. If the recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean with any supporting data the dean may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendations he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

- E. The dean shall review the department's recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.
- F. The dean of each college/school shall review the record and salary of the chair of each department and shall recommend an appropriate salary increase to the President.
- G. The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.
- H. At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit (as a result of reviews under 24-55), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his/her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within twenty- one calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 58, May 16, 1978; S-A 75, April 6, 1987; S-A 82, November 21, 1990; S-A 99, July 9, 1999: all with Presidential approval. [See Footnote #1 on Documentation following Section 24-57]

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

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

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

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24-32.C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that

member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, F~~for~~ faculty at the rank of ~~instructor or assistant professor~~ or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

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

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean or his/her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers and assistant professors. The chair (or dean or his/her designee) shall confer individually with the ~~A~~ associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the ~~P~~ professors and principal lecturers at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24-55.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his/her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss 1) the department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments; 2) shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and 3) a shared strategy for achieving those goals.

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

D. Documentation

The chair, dean or his/her designee, shall, in a timely manner, document in writing, with a copy to the faculty member, that such conferences occurred, and shall list the subject matter discussed.

This conference document shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and responsibilities of the faculty member for the coming year(s) and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.

Should the faculty member not agree with the summary or statements in this conference document, he or she shall indicate so in writing. The failure of a faculty member to object in writing to the chair's (or dean's) conference document within ten days of receiving it (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the period is extended by the chair or dean) shall constitute his or her official acceptance of its terms and conditions.

If the faculty member disagrees with the conference document, the chair (or dean) shall either withdraw it and issue a revised one to which both parties can agree, or reaffirm the accuracy of the original conference document.

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference document, the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an un-departmentalized school or college) shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior (or in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member, or faculty members from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner. The faculty member and the chair, or dean, shall each select one member of the *ad hoc* committee and those two members shall select the third member. At its earliest convenience, the *ad hoc* committee shall review fully the records relating to the conference, meet with the faculty member, and meet with the chair, dean, or his/her designee.

The chair, dean, or his/her designee, and the faculty member shall then meet with the *ad hoc* committee to discuss the issues, with the purpose of achieving a resolution. In the event resolution is not achieved, the committee shall, in a timely manner, report in writing the results of its review to the faculty member, to his or her department chair or dean, and to the designee, if any. The committee's report and advice, if any; the faculty member's written response, if any; the response by the chair, dean, or his/her designee, if any; and any agreement between the faculty member and chair, dean, or his/her designee shall be incorporated into a written report that shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

A faculty member's record upon the stated duties and responsibilities in the conference document will be assessed in accordance with Section 24-55. Nothing in Section 24-57 is intended to alter the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.

S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 79, May 31, 1989; S-A 99, July 9, 1999; S-A 107, June 20, 2002: all with Presidential approval.

Footnote #1: *Documentation for Recommendations for Promotions, Tenure, and Merit Increases* In submitting to the President's Office a recommendation for promotion ~~in rank~~ or the granting of tenure or merit salary increase, the dean of the school or college is requested to present a detailed documentation of the recommendation. The primary data would originate from the department. Faculty and chairs are directed to give careful attention to all phases of the candidate's service to the school or college and the University. Characteristic types of contributions to the University are described in the following terms:

Teaching. An essential qualification for the granting of tenure or for promotion is the ability to teach effectively. Some elements in assessing effective teaching are: the ability to organize and conduct a course appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; the consistency with which the teacher brings to the classroom the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline; the ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments; the extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate within the course to enable students to articulate the ideas they are exploring; the availability of the teacher to the students beyond the classroom environment; the regularity with which the teacher examines or re-examines the organization and readings for a course and explores new approaches to effective educational methods. A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's ability to participate in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The faculty member's concern for the progress and well being of the students is an inseparable adjunct to the classroom.

Research. All members of the faculties must demonstrate scholarly ability and attainments. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods, and their participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals. Attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation in the realm of constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the realm of the creative arts.

Service. The scope of the University's activities makes it necessary for members of the staff to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks, clinical duties, and special training programs. The University recognizes the value of its staff in rendering these internal services as well as extramural professional services to schools, to industry, and to local, state and national organizations.

Other Considerations. In arriving at recommendations for promotion or tenure, faculty and chairs are directed to study the whole record of candidates. To warrant recommendation for the granting of tenure or for promotion in the professorial ranks, a candidate must have shown outstanding ability in teaching or research, an ability of such an order as to command obvious respect from colleagues and from professionals at other universities; and substantial contribution in other phases. The qualifications of teaching and research must remain unequivocally the central functions of the faculty, but administrative and other internal and extramural professional services must also be recognized.

The factors with reference to the granting of tenure or for promotion thus far mentioned have to do with the qualifications of the candidate as an individual and may be regarded as the intrinsic factors. Consideration must also be given to the way in which the candidate will fit into the present and foreseeable future of the department. Does there appear to be a place for a candidate with these special interests? Will a given candidate help to bring the department into balance or throw it out of balance? It does happen that individuals whose performance would otherwise warrant the granting of tenure should not, and cannot, become tenured here because the special nature of staff requirements in the department makes it impractical.

Executive Order No. 45 of the President, June 1, 1972 (formerly University Memorandum No. 70, June 15, 1964); revised March 21, 1978; April 20, 1979.

Chapter 25

Section 25-32. Criteria for Tenure

- A. Unless he or she is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:
1. he or she is a professor or associate professor; or
 2. he or she has held full-time rank as ~~instructor or~~ assistant professor in the University for a ~~combined accumulation of~~ seven or more years and has not received the prescribed notice terminating his or her appointment.
- B. Generally, recommendation for tenure (Section 25-41) is made concurrently with recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor (except in the circumstances listed in the subsequent paragraphs of this section). Only under exceptional circumstances may a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor be recommended for tenure without promotion.

- C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure:
1. under an acting appointment, or
 2. under a visiting appointment, or
 3. under any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, or
 4. under any initial appointment specified to be without tenure, or
 5. under an adjunct appointment, or
 6. under a research appointment, or
 7. under a clinical appointment, or
 8. under an affiliate appointment, or
 9. under any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment. Each appointment governed by this provision shall contain notice whether tenure may or may not be acquired.
- D. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor "without tenure," as specified under C.4 above, are limited to not more than three years. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor "without tenure by reason of funding," as specified under C.9 above, are continuing appointments governed by Section 24-41.
- E. A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of his or her appointment with the agreement of his or her department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in his or her part-time appointment.
- F. A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Section 24-45 accumulates eligibility for tenure under Subsection A of this section.
- G. Time spent on leaves of absence from the University does not count in the accumulation of time toward tenure.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 25, October 29, 1959; S-A 26, December 19, 1960; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 37, February 8, 1971; S-A 41, April 3, 1972; S-A 61, February 22, 1980; S-A 67, December 5, 1983; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 98, June 2, 1998: all with Presidential approval.