

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2008
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. The agenda was approved as amended by changing the order to receive the report from the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics (who will be introduced by the President) after the Chair's introductory comments.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell began by recognizing and thanking Joseph Janes for agreeing to serve again this year as the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian. He then cautioned that although much of this meeting will be devoted to discussions of the budget, at this point very little is known with any certainty about the nature or extent of any cuts to the University's budget. There is no predicting what will happen during the legislative sessions, but our legislative representatives and the administration will be actively involved in advocating for the importance of the University as the primary economic engine for the state. Lovell suggested that this could be an opportunity for the faculty to shine as a community. In any case he hopes that faculty can come together and engage in defining the principles they'd like to see governing decisions being made on shared sacrifices – and that those decisions can be made based on the greater good, rather than on how they will affect us individually.

In addition to discussions at the Senate and Senate Executive Committee meetings, he encouraged faculty to engage in discussions within their colleges, schools and campuses – particularly within the context of the elected faculty councils. If there are cuts, many of the related decisions will be made at the college level. Finally he encouraged Senators to consider engaging in affecting public policy for the good of the entire community by working with legislative representatives in Olympia during the coming session.

He then introduced President Emmert, who in turn would introduce the new Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, Scott Woodward.

3. Report from the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics – Director Scott Woodward.

Background Information on Athletic Program. **{Exhibit A}**
Husky Stadium Renovation Funding Model 7-08. **{Separate Attachment}**
Stadium Brochure. **{Separate Attachment}**

President Emmert began his introduction of Scott Woodward with some statistics related to Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). Most of ICA's budget is self-generated. The United States is the only country that integrates athletics with higher education. The decision to do this was made about a century ago and it is now an integral part of university life that sometimes skews the focus of interest in an institution devoted to higher education. For example, the University is integrally engaged in discussions about global economic issues, two wars, and terrorist attacks. But President Emmert's e-mail that day included two hundred messages concerning the hiring of a football coach, and nothing related to these issues. He estimates that roughly 80% of the attention the UW receives from the general public and press is generated by Intercollegiate Athletic issues.

This is a reflection on American society. The reality of the situation is that more people in the country know the UW through football than through any other activity. That being the case, the President is committed to maintaining an ICA operation at the same standard of excellence that he holds for the academic mission of the University. If football is the face of the University to the rest of the country then the President would like to see exemplary scholar athletes and good coaches that represent the UW in a way that reflects well on the institution. This is an expensive operation, but it easily pays for itself and it holds together alumni, supporters and friends. It allows many students (who might not otherwise have been able) to attend the University on full scholarships. It's also a complex operation, and he was very pleased that Scott Woodward was willing to step into the position.

Scott Woodward, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics began his remarks by reviewing his career over the past several years, including work for then-Chancellor Emmert at Louisiana State University as a legislative liaison. He later joined Emmert at the UW as Vice President for External Affairs until stepping into the role of Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. He is convinced that athletics does good things for a University. "It's a university's front porch." He sees himself as a steward of this operation – one that includes hundreds of student athletes and employees and one that is almost completely self-sustaining. Despite the disappointing football season, there have been notable successes this year for ICA, including women's cross-country and volleyball. ICA continues to compare well with NCAA academic standards. Graduation rates for UW student athletes are second only to Stanford in the NCAA. Sixteen UW students competed in the summer Olympics.

He touched on the renovation of Husky stadium – another complicated issue that will engage him over the next few years. The structure (80-90 years old) is essentially washing away. It's crumbling, but is not yet to the point where it can be considered "unsafe." The current plan for its renovation will cost about \$300 million. Half of that may come from County tourism taxes established for the building and maintaining of stadia in Seattle as a means of attracting tourism. The other half will come from seat holders, donors and from the department of Intercollegiate Athletics.

In response to a question about the possibility of using Qwest Field as the permanent home of the football team, Woodard said that the possibility had been considered and rejected. If the UW continues to engage in competitive football, it would be a great disadvantage to give up its home field. He cited the experiences at Tulane and the University of Minnesota – both of which declined for a time to renovate or replace stadia in favor of moving to other facilities – and both of which then lost fans and significant amounts of revenue as a result.

In response to a question concerning the likelihood of succeeding in his bid for tourism tax dollars, Woodard put the odds at six in ten. He has been working with County Supervisors and Legislators about the benefits of this renovation, but there are many others lining up to contend for those same dollars.

One senator asked Woodard if he has a Plan B if he doesn't succeed in his bid for tourism tax money. Woodard said that there was no Plan B at this point. President Emmert has named an advisory committee for the stadium renovation, and if needed he would go back to that committee for advice moving forward.

In response to a question about budget priorities, President Emmert stepped in to comment that although there is logic to the argument about using the tax revenue, which in turn would create jobs locally, it could very well seem antithetical to the general public alongside the fact that the UW will be taking large-scale cuts at the same time. He doesn't want the football debate to bleed over into the discussion about budget cuts and the UW.

Woodard was then asked how many more years before the stadium would be considered unsafe. He cautioned the Senate that if the renovation were to wait for 10 years, the UW would need to spend about \$100 million on piece-meal fixes that would have been wasted when it comes time for the final renovation.

In response to a question about the status of the track while the stadium is under renovation, Woodard responded that the track will be established just north of the soccer field, and it will be open for public use.

4. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – President Mark A. Emmert.

President Emmert began by saying that although he would be talking about the budget, he would welcome questions on any subject. He commended Lovell on his opening remarks and reiterated that the reality is that we don't have sufficient details to talk about the budget with any certainty. The current biennial deficit is projected at \$5.25 billion. Forty-one states are in similar deficit situations and California is in a state of financial exigency. The Governor is committed to bringing out a balanced budget in a couple of weeks. To be balanced, that budget will of necessity need to include

enormous cuts – eliminating some state agencies altogether and significantly reducing the budgets of those remaining. This will make the UW's lobbying efforts in DC even more important – working to position higher education as an integral participant in the new economic stimulus package. Some of these funds are earmarked for deferred maintenance in schools and higher education. The current list of deferred maintenance projects at the UW amounts to \$ two billion.

Given the anticipated extent of this budget crisis, the President cannot imagine that the possibility of increased taxes is completely off the table. The March revenue forecast may well be worse than the most recent one, and the Governor may need to reconsider her commitment not to increase taxes.

There is a good argument that this is a bad time to cut funding for higher education. If the state wants its population to return to school to train for the jobs that will ultimately fuel the state's economy, then it must fund higher education to account for increasing enrollments. Although the argument makes sense, there is no chance that the UW will escape cuts. The University will need to get support from the business community and media in addition to the support of the Governor and legislative leaders, and the President is committed to working collaboratively with all involved for as many years as it takes, while keeping five-, ten- and twenty-year goals and initiatives alive and in sight. The commitment to these goals must remain aggressive and strong -- and cannot be dimmed by easy or simplistic fixes.

Finally, he reminded the Senate of the enormous resource we have in the faculty at the UW – a brain-trust that will be needed more than ever as the University community works together to face this challenge.

5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Dan Luchtel, Committee Chair.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) Dan Luchtel referred to a December 2, 2008, letter from the Provost to Deans, Vice Provosts, and Vice Presidents and to an accompanying table showing a Budget Cut Analysis for this fiscal year **{Separate Attachment}**. These documents were distributed at the door, and are on the website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Planning & Budgets, a website he strongly recommend that all Senators go to early and often for latest updates on UW budgets. The URL is: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home>. The "Spotlight" section is particularly helpful.

What these two documents deal with is how the \$17 million cut in the current '08-'09 fiscal year budget will be done. At the next Senate meeting, discussions will undoubtedly include budget cuts for the '09-'11 biennium with budget cuts projected to be in the vicinity of \$80 million.

He stressed that his remarks were not meant as a criticism of Provost Wise or Vice Provost Jenny as they actively participated at weekly meetings of the SCPB. But a review of these two documents of shows that somehow the SCPB is not on the same page as the administration. A possible reason for this problem is that SCPB members were overwhelmed by the rapidity of the deteriorating financial condition of the State with the result that calm rational discussion was overtaken by impending deadlines. It is hard to plan and to know what questions to ask when the magnitude of budget cuts seemed to grow with each passing week of the Fall Quarter. SCPB also tended to be more concerned with the budgetary problems of the next biennium rather than the budget cuts that need to be made this year.

In any case, the discussion and data in these two documents were not the result of discussions and debates at SCPB since the beginning of fall quarter.

The core issue for us, the faculty members on the SCPB, is to understand the decision-making process and the criteria used in that process. So far we're not there yet.

The December 2 letter outlines the various decisions that have been made. He assured Senators that these decisions were not necessarily bad decisions, only that these decisions were made explicitly without SCPB input. Those decisions include:

1) Across-the-board cuts where cuts of administrative units are at the 1.5% level and academic units are at 0.75% level. How these percentages were decided on was not discussed in the SCPB. There, SCPB members talked about prioritizing, where everything was on the table and the preference was for making vertical cuts, not across-the-board cuts.

2) Fifty percent of the 2009 cut will be temporarily absorbed centrally with central fund balances. Questions here include--how was the 50% figure arrived at? How will the various schools and colleges return these temporary funds with the additional burden of further increased budget cuts in '09-'11? And what are the "central fund balances"?

The SCPB and central administration considered many ideas related to the projected larger cuts in the next biennium, about decreasing expenditures, and avoiding personnel cuts as much as possible. Some of these ideas included: I) setting up a web site to collect ideas from across the campus; II) differential tuition; III) faculty and staff furloughs; IV) more efficient use of classrooms; v) elimination of courses with enrollment of five or fewer. But none of these was presented at SCPB with background information, analysis of workability, or estimates of how much financial impact they could have. SCPB members also talked about thinking ahead as to where the University should be in five years, in ten years; of establishing priorities and making vertical cuts rather than across the board cuts. None of these discussions translated into action items in the December 2 documents. The SCPB will have to work hard in the coming months, when far more difficult decisions must be made, to ensure that faculty on the SCPB and the College Councils will be fully engaged in working with the administration and the deans about how to proceed.

6. Legislative Report – Professor JW Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington referred to **{Exhibit B}** attached to the agenda and emphasized that in the coming months the core message of his work in Olympia will be protecting opportunities for students. Another part of that work will be governance issues, and he will be joining with other representatives of higher education in the state, as well as other faculty and administrators to construct a common message. So far, the budget has been discussed within the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, the Senate Chair's Cabinet, and the Special Committee on Legislative Matters, in addition to a blog -- <http://legrep.blogspot.com> – which now includes the current legislative agenda. The blog will be updated and used extensively over the next year. Harrington encouraged Senators to use the blog and to contact him directly at jwharringtonjr@gmail.com with any comments or questions.

Referring to the attachment, he reiterated that the key focus of the agenda is protecting core educational activities. Secondarily, conversations on compensation for faculty, staff and librarians need to be continued. The 5% per year per biennium increase that had been assumed for the next couple of years may no longer be a feasible option, but Harrington will urge that salary increases for faculty, staff and librarians should be comparable to what's being planned for state employees who are on contract with unions. He noted, however, that it's unclear at this point whether Governor will be able to fund union proposals for wage increases for classified staff.

The third emphasis will be on improvements to health and safety issues, as well as increasing child care options for faculty, staff and students. Although these are crucial needs, they will be secondary to the focus on core activities.

With regard to the state capital budget request, Harrington made a special point of clarifying that the Husky Stadium renovation is not a part of the University's state capital budget request.

Other issues not related to the budget include adding a faculty representative to boards of regents and trustees at the state's institutions of higher education; supporting the Regent's authority to set tuition (an authority that has expired and must now be renewed by the legislature); and supporting access to a quality baccalaureate education.

Finally, Harrington proposed that he and his colleagues begin to consider supporting, as faculty, the possibility that there may be a need for tax increases of some sort. He would welcome any input on that proposal.

Harrington then opened the floor to questions and the first question was fielded by the President. This was a question of how state universities will be able to serve increasing numbers of students with decreasing funding. The Regents have in the past issued statements to the legislature that the UW would not take more students than it is budgeted for. The President feels there are sufficient arguments to support that stand now. However, if compelled to do so by the State, the University would need to come together to decide what to do. He noted that community colleges are compelled to take any students who meet minimum standards, and they are currently working under the burden of this challenge.

Regarding a question about faculty pay, the President reiterated that administration has a very strong commitment to make sure faculty pay is competitive and not to lose ground with regard to the UW's status among comparable institutions. It's interesting to note that negotiated union contracts have yet to be acted upon by the legislature, and it's not clear what will happen. If the legislature funds the union contracts, the University assumes it will fund a comparable increase for faculty, staff and librarians who are not covered by union contracts. Discussions about the 2% rule will be forthcoming if it looks like that baseline amount of increase is not possible this year or next.

SCPB Chair Dan Luchtel reported that SCPB has been working on the history of faculty salaries over the past ten year, including how the UW relates to its peers. That report will be posted to the Faculty Senate website once it is completed.

Faculty Council on Research Chair Mark Haselkorn suggested that in addition to "preparing for disaster" the UW could be looking for opportunities unique to this period of time – and the need to be positive as well as protective. President Emmert responded that there are at least a handful of "upsides" to the recent economic news. One very significant opportunity is the possibility of accelerating some capital construction projects through various proposals for a federal economic stimulus package. The situation also forces the UW to look at other opportunities that it wouldn't have otherwise considered.

In the interest of time and the remaining items on the agenda, Chair David Lovell suggested this discussion be continued at the next (January 29, 2009) Faculty Senate meeting.

7. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of November 17, 2008.

a. The minutes of the October 6 SEC meeting and October 23 Faculty Senate meeting were approved; b. Faculty Council Issues as of November 17, 2008 were distributed **{Exhibit C}**; c. Support for Faculty who use On-line Instructional Tools, presentation by Leslie Breitner, Chair, Faculty Council on Educational Outreach **{Exhibit D}**.

8. Announcements.

There were none.

9. Requests for Information.

Chair Lovell introduced Mark Haselkorn, Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, to address the Senate regarding concerns about the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER). Haselkorn began by recounting the AAUP request for information that had been submitted to the President and the Chair of the Faculty Senate about this Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI)-funded institute – INSER – that was established on campus about two years ago. Haselkorn reported that both Christoph Giebel, the AAUP spokesperson for this concern, and Jeffrey Kim, director of INSER, had attended the last meeting of the Faculty Council on Research (FCR). A number of additional guests attended from the Senate leadership, and both Giebel and Kim answered a series of good questions that resulted in a fair, tough and serious conversation.

This issue came up because the box on the GC-1 form attached to the INSER application, indicating that the project included classified or proprietary information, had not been checked at the time of its submission. Kim eagerly accepted the offer of FCR to conduct a post-grant review. FCR will be

working on that review in the coming weeks. It will also review the GC-1 form, to make sure that portion of the form is clear about what is, and is not, considered classified or proprietary information, and it will review that the six questions that the FCR subcommittee uses in reviewing GC-1s to make sure they are serving their purpose.

Finally, Haselkorn noted that the Faculty Council on Research is equipped and is the appropriate body to examine how these issues relate to faculty research – but it's clear from related discussions that there are moral and ethical issues yet to be clarified. These moral and ethical issues need to be addressed separately within a different council or committee.

10. Nominations and Appointments.

- a. **Action:** Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit E}**
- b. **Action:** Confirm Jim Fridley as 2008-2009 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning immediately and ending July 31, 2009. **{Exhibit F}**.

Nominations for Faculty Councils and Committees were approved. JW Harrington spoke in favor of the nomination of Jim Fridley to serve as Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative. He said he was not aware of anyone better prepared for this role who has not already done it. Fridley has worked actively with the legislature in many roles. He has been on the faculty for twenty years and has been involved in faculty governance for most of that time. Fridley's appointment was then approved.

11. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick presented the motion: **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 Lyle Jensen of Biological Structure who died October 16, 2008 after having served the University since 1947.
- Clinical Associate Professor Howard Kirz of Health Services who died August 22, 2008 after having served the University since 1967.
- Affiliate Professor Oded Schramm of Mathematics who died September 1, 2008 after having served the University since 1999.
- Professor Emeritus Nicholas Ward of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences who died October 28, 2008 after having served the University since 1975.
- Professor Emeritus Warren Wooster of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences who died October 29, 2008 after having served the University since 1976.
- Associate Professor Emeritus William Wortley of Romance Languages and Literature who died November 2, 2008 after having served the University since 1965.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the senate chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

Chair David Lovell invited the Senate to approve the resolution by a standing vote, and the resolution was approved unanimously.

12. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

13. New Business.

There was no new business.

14. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate

TO: Group Representatives

FROM: David Loyell 

DATE: November 21, 2008

RE: Background Information on Athletic Program

The new athletic director, Scott Woodward, is scheduled to speak to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting, December 4th. We expect an active discussion; to that end, please convey to your Senators a few points of information about the athletic program.

- With the exception of some scholarships for women athletes, in compliance with Title IX requirements, no state funds are used for the Intercollegiate Athletic Program. The program is supported by gate receipts and private donations, and some revenues generated by football are applied to other sports. Although the new football coach will be very highly paid, we have been assured that it will not be \$6 million per year, and that the report to this effect is speculative and fantastic.
- The Faculty Athletic Representative, Pat Dobel, has substantial oversight and authority to maintain the integrity of the athletic program. Pat Dobel is planning to present one of his quarterly reports to the Senate Executive Committee on January 12th. He will also give his required annual report to the Senate during spring quarter. There is an Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, chaired by Bob Stacey, and the Faculty Senate leadership has nominated members who take seriously their responsibility for academic oversight.
- Since the scandals of eight years ago, there have been substantial changes in policies, procedures, and resources affecting admissions, student conduct, academic support, and the mission of the athletic program. Metrics have been established on the academic progress of student athletes, which indicate that in the PAC-10, the UW is second to Stanford in the academic performance of student athletes. Among others, Ty Willingham and the previous athletic director, Todd Turner, deserve praise and credit for these gains.
- The role of the athletic program at the UW and the principles that must govern it have been discussed in meetings of the faculty leadership, the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate, and the search committee for the new athletic director. We have stated that faculty are concerned not only about academic standards, but about preventing the exploitation of student athletes. This objective requires that students specially admitted to participate in marquee sports must be committed to our educational mission and that the UW provide the resources needed to help them fulfill this commitment. Reconstruction of the new football stadium will not be funded by state revenues. The UW has requested that the state allow for funding half the cost by means of King County's hospitality tax, previously directed to professional sports facilities. These funds, \$150 million, would support those improvements (seismic, replacing lower bowl seating, ADA requirements) needed to keep the stadium safely inhabitable. Other improvements to the stadium and the football facility would be paid for by donations.

None of this means that high-profile athletic programs are happily married to a university's educational mission, that we should pay exorbitant salaries to coaches, or that we can relax and take it for granted that we're doing justice to the people we recruit and the communities from which they come. Recognizing that some measures have been taken to address faculty concerns, the Faculty Senate must and will encourage an exchange of views and continuing vigilance on these issues.

UW Faculty Legislative Agenda

Revised 25 November 2008, for discussion and review

OPERATING BUDGET

Protect core education activities of the university sector.

Maintain competitive compensation for faculty, professional staff, and librarians,

- written into the biennial budget, and
- at least comparable to the wage/salary adjustments negotiated for unionized state employees.

Improve health, safety, and child care for faculty, students, and staff.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Support the University's capital budget requests.

- The Husky Stadium ask is *not* part of the University's capital budget request.

POLICY LEGISLATION

Mandate gubernatorial appointment of **faculty regents** and trustees.

Renew **regential authority to set tuition except for resident undergraduates.**

Support **tuition and financial aid policies** that maintain broad student access to very high quality undergraduate education.

Support judicious proposals to **increase higher-education funding capacity.**

Support increased **access** to quality baccalaureate education.

- Be mindful of the large capital investments required for additional campuses.
- Draw attention to the requisites for high quality in BA/BS expansions at lower-division institutions.
- Support e-learning initiatives that call for adequate faculty, staff, and technical support to serve students' needs.

Faculty Council Issues
For Distribution: November 17, 2008
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

1. Academic Standards
 - a. Academic Rigor Committee (Joint with FCIQ). The committee is currently crafting proposed guidance for independent study and special topics courses.
 - b. Provost's Working Group on English Proficiency. The working group is developing proposed policies relative to English language proficiency and proposing additional resources for students needing support in improving their English skills.
 - c. Proposal to establish a curriculum committee for the University Honors Program.
 - d. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
 - e. Review of Handbook language relative to graduation and application for degree process.
2. Benefits and Retirement
 - a. Conversion of opt-in system for UWRP contributions to an automatic-enrollment (opt-out) system (i) upon initial employment and (ii) for the increase in contributions from 7.5% to 10% at age 50. The University has decided to convert to automatic enrollment at 10% for those turning 50 (requires SCPB follow-up.). The council feels that one can still opt-out, but would be a bad idea financially as one would give up the University match on the incremental 2.5% contribution. The group was also told that the auto-enrollment at initial employment was meritorious but too expensive to implement at this point.
 - b. Continue to advocate the council's proposal that dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians receive a discount in the base undergraduate UW tuition.
 - c. Review a communication plan for the supplemental benefit.
 - d. Review retirement fund options, possibly meet with fund reps, and review the committee charged with evaluating such funds.
 - e. Explore ways to better understand communicate the "total compensation" faculty receive, that is, the value of their salary plus benefits.
 - f. Look into an easier way for faculty to distribute their salary and benefits contributions over 12 months.
3. Educational Outreach
 - a. FCEO Charge: A challenge the Council faces this year is deciding where to focus its attention. The challenge results in part from the fact that there may be overlapping issues among Councils. Council chairs will meet this fall to discuss potentially common issues. It may be that the Faculty Senate leadership will wish to consider whether the Council's charge is still appropriate.
 - b. Identification of University-wide "outreach programs" through development of a database of all fee-based, state-funded, degree/non-degree, and certificate programs with a goal of developing the means to support distance learning.
 - c. Departmental level support for faculty using instructional technology. This would be different from the proposed support for faculty who teach distance learning courses through UWEO.
 - d. Concern about what happens to the work of each year. For example, there is no indication of what happened to the request from last year's work, summarized in the Annual Report, and submitted to the Chairs (current and incoming) of the Faculty Senate as well as the Provost.
4. Educational Technology
 - a. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology requests a stable source of financial support for contemporary teaching technology to be made available for the 'Technology Consortium'* to innovate teaching capabilities to meet and satisfy student's and faculty's expectations and learning experience as well as sustain the University of Washington's position as a center of teaching excellence. * The Teaching Consortium consists of: Classroom Support Services; Health Sciences Classroom Services; University Libraries; Catalyst.
 - b. Continues to address issues of plagiarism. This issue will hopefully be broadened to include FCUL, FCIQ, and FCAS.

- c. Investigating current practices in research data archiving. FCET will continue to follow this issue in the coming year and to set the direction for providing more contemporary forms of data storage. FCET is seeking collaboration with FCUL.
 - d. FCET looked into the possible benefits of using cameras connected to the internet for educational purposes, as these cameras are inexpensive and easily installed. A list of recommendations was devised that should be considered by those using such cameras. This class C resolution was presented to the Senate Executive Meeting and is currently under revision. The issue seems to cross path with item b from FCIQ as it affects campus photos used on the internet in general.
5. Faculty Affairs
- a. Revisions to Section 26-41 of the *Faculty Code*, Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP).
 - b. Revisions to Section 27-41 of the *Faculty Code* concerning the conciliation procedures, with a view to revitalizing the mechanism for resolving differences. Although the section was extensively revised during the 2007-2008 academic year, the council is currently working on additional modifications to the text.
 - c. Restructure Proposal – the Council will continue consideration of the most recent version of this proposal, which was distributed at the SEC orientation.
6. Instructional Quality
- a. Ad hoc Committee on Academic Rigor: Committee was created to address the issue of academic rigor of UW courses. Committee members were drawn from FCAS and FCIQ. The committee began the process of establishing criteria to assess 'academic rigor' and applying those criteria to a systematic review of data from UW courses. The committee will continue this process in 2008-09.
 - b. Student photos attached to class lists: The council began looking at the possible benefits of the University providing student photos with class lists. FCIQ will continue to work with the Registrar and ASUW to help make student class photos a reality for faculty at the UW.
 - c. 10-year Review Process: FCIQ began an in-depth investigation of the purpose, aims and outcomes of the current 10-year review process as it is conducted by the Graduate School. The Graduate School welcomed input into the process and plans were made to begin work over the summer.
 - d. Summer school tuition rates and faculty pay: Members reviewed information concerning the comparison of tuition rates that students pay for summer school versus the academic year. In 2008-09, tuition is \$2,219 for 10-18 credits during the academic year and \$2,088 for 10-18 credits for residents during summer quarter. It was noted that the tuition cost are very comparable yet faculty who teach in the summer are only paid 2 months of salary whereas they are paid 3 months of salary for the same course during the academic year. As many lecturers teach during the summer months this could be a form of rank discrimination. Further information is sought as to why faculty are paid different rates for classes taught during the school year and during summer. This discrepancy will continue to be pursued during the next academic year.
 - e. Summer school: Exam period and A and B terms. Members are concerned that the current policy of having exams on the last day of class rather than on a final's week does not allow students enough time to gain a deep understanding of the material but rather encourages superficial understanding. We are pursuing the idea of an abbreviated exam week (M-T-W) following the last week of class.
Members are also concerned that the shortened terms (A &B) may encourage students to view courses as something to check off as quickly as possible rather than invest in building deep understanding.
 - f. Review of the general education requirements: How well do they prepare students for their majors? What are the proposed learning outcomes for these courses? What is the academic rigor of these courses?
 - g. Review of course approval form: Are learning outcomes clearly stated, how are learning outcomes assessed, create a 5 year review of courses to confirm that the course still meets the requirements established in the original course approval, this would also be an opportunity to modify course approval entry to better reflect the evolution of the course.

- h. Teaching challenges for future faculty hires: Given the ever-increasing size of the student body and the need for large classes to meet this increasing student demand, are we recruiting faculty who are prepared to teach these classes and what support is the University offering faculty to help them attain teaching and learning excellence in the large class format?
 - i. Inventory and publish best teaching and learning practices: Conduct a study of faculty to ascertain their best teaching and learning practice. Highlight and display the results of this study on a Learning at the UW site where written and videotape reports of teaching innovations will be stored.
 - j. Identify teaching challenges and solutions of 21st Century: Some topics could include; teaching students with disabilities, interdisciplinary teaching, technology in the classroom, helping students prioritize their time, etc.
7. Multicultural Affairs
 - a. FCMA began looking at first steps toward creating an exchange program with schools from the Black College and University Consortium. This project will continue during the next academic year.
8. Research
 - a. Classified, Proprietary and Restricted Research: review, and if appropriate, approve applications for grants and contracts. Consider the mechanisms by which classified, proprietary and restricted research is accepted into the University.
 - b. Faculty Effort Reporting: including consideration of related issues such as the inability of research faculty to write new grants under funding from current grants.
 - c. Senate Interdisciplinary Research Committee (SIRC): This group proposed a class C resolution concerning fostering multi-unit interdisciplinary research adopted by the Faculty Senate spring of 2008, and is a first in a series of proposals that will be forthcoming.
 - d. Royalty Research Fund (RRF): participate in a comprehensive review of the RRF via an *ad hoc* committee including FCR members and others across campus. The ad hoc committee will report to FCR, which will make final recommendations and forward them to the Research Advisory Board and, if appropriate, to the Board of Deans and Faculty Senate.
 - e. Scholarly Communication Committee (joint with University Libraries): address issues of open access with the goal of encouraging and facilitating faculty publishing rights at the University of Washington.
9. Student Affairs
 - a. North of 45th Street and Campus Safety issues require continuing attention and oversight, including tracking the Administration's implementation of recommendations of the North of 45th Street Working Group.
 - b. Review of efforts to streamline and coordinate the activities of the Mental Health Clinic at Hall Health Center and the Counseling Center in Schmitz Hall.
 - c. FCSA notes that the current policy regarding the admission of "special" and "priority" student athletes has expired and strongly suggests that the ACIA present a revised policy to the Faculty Senate.
10. Tri-campus Policy
 - a. Continue discussion regarding northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Report and tri-campus issues: delineation of campus vs. university level functions and responsibilities (i.e. curriculum).
 - b. Continue discussion regarding schools and colleges at UWB/UWT: Determine strategy for this year's discussion.
 - c. Follow-up regarding meeting with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach regarding issues that affect all three campuses.
 - d. Updates on Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) revisions and Senate and Senate Executive Committee reorganization.
 - e. Assure that representation from UWB/UWT faculty on UW Faculty Councils is occurring as recommended.

11. University Facilities and Services

- a. Stewardship and Sustainability: FCUFS devoted much of its time this year to the implementation of sustainable operations practices and the implementation of best practices on the Seattle campus. FCUFS developed a class-C resolution praising the Environmental Stewardship Advisory Council (ESAC) and the Administration for their efforts and pressing for more support for future activities under consideration by ESAC. It is clear that the low-hanging fruit has been harvested in the greening of the campus, and that future progress will take more effort and collaboration, especially in areas of controlling atmospheric carbon (i.e., commuting, air flights, and campus heating). FCUFS went on record as wanting to remain an active collaborator with ESAC through frequent liaison as new programs reach the implementation stage.
- b. Sound Transit.
- c. Husky Stadium.
- d. Expansion of UW medical facility; proposed new Molecular Engineering Building.

12. University Libraries

- a. Formation of Scholarly Communications Committee: One response of the academic community to the problem of escalating serials costs for libraries has been the rise in open access publishing in which articles are made freely available on line. The FCUL and the Faculty Council on Research have joined to form an ad hoc committee to address issues of open access and maintenance of faculty authors' rights. The subcommittee consists of members from the FCUL, the FCR, and the Libraries.
- b. Effects of open access on small journals in the humanities and social sciences: The FCUL invited three faculty members who are journal editors or former editors to participate in a discussion of the compatibility of open access to journal publishing in the humanities and to present to the counsel the economic pressures faced by their journals.
- c. Status of librarians in relation to faculty: Librarians are currently classified as academic staff in a separate category from faculty. Librarians at all other public universities in the state have full faculty status. The FCUL has considered arguments for and against a change in status of University of Washington Librarians. Possible alternate forms of categorization such as affiliate faculty were discussed, as was increased participation of librarians in faculty governance. The FCUL unanimously passed a motion in favor of pursuing the representation of librarians on the Faculty Senate as full voting members.

13. University Relations

- a. Ongoing issues: SR 520 and Sound Transit Issues.
- b. UW North Campus.
- c. The issue of the Honorary Degree nomination from UW Bothell was discussed at length. The submission of this nomination is unique and raises governance issues and concerns relating to a tri-campus university. It was suggested that faculty representation from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma might be added to the Faculty Council on University Relations.
- d. The Council is currently actively soliciting nominations for honorary degrees.

14. Women in Academia

- a. Continuing exploration of the quantitative and qualitative understanding of "The Lifesycle of a Female Faculty Member."

University of Washington School of Law
William H. Gates Hall
353020, Seattle, WA 98195-3020
Phone 206.543.4550, Fax 206.543.5671
www.iaw.washington.edu

June 30 2008

Professor Dan Luchtel
Professor David Lovett
Professor Bruce Balick
University of Washington
Faculty Senate Office
36 Gerberding Hall
Box 351271
Seattle, WA 98 195-1271

Dear Dan, David and Bruce:

On behalf of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, I attach a letter advocating departmental-level support for faculty who use instructional technology. The Council believes this is an issue of great importance to faculty but one which is "under the radar" right now. The Council specifically hopes that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting will attend to our recommendations in formulating the budget for the next and future biennia and that the Administration will develop a strategy for dealing with the looming demand for on-line instruction.

Thanks for your consideration and for all your work on behalf of the faculty. I wish you all a fine summer.

Sincerely,

Kate O'Neill
Associate Professor
206-543-0928 office
206-660-6894 cell
kateon@u.washington.edu

cc: Provost Phyllis Wise (Box 351237)
Susan Folk (Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty)

Attachment

TO: Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate 2007-08
Professor David Lovell, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate 2007-08
Professor Bruce Balick

CC: Provost Phyllis Wise

FROM: Associate Professor Kate O'Neill, Chair,
Faculty Council on Educational Outreach 2007-08

DATE: June 30, 2008

RE: Support for Faculty who use On-Line Instructional Tools

Summary

The members of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach believe that the University now lacks an adequate system, or a strategic plan, to provide appropriate support for faculty and staff who develop courses and course materials that use on-line instructional tools. The problem afflicts instructors and courses in every department: distance-learning courses, hybrid courses that involve some on-site and some distance-learning, and traditional on-campus classroom courses, most of which now have significant on-line content.

Inadequate support for faculty who adopt on-line instructional tools is a de facto tax on faculty compensation and an increase in workload. Inadequate support diverts faculty time to tasks staff can do, and that undermines faculty productivity and the University's reputation and competitiveness. These problems aggravate faculty retention issues, and they undermine traditional and non-traditional student access. Additionally, quality online courses and resources would give the UW a distinct competitive advantage in the academic marketplace because of high demand from students for online courses and course materials.

We advocate three things for next year:

- 1. The University administration should vigorously press for more state dollars to support efficient use of instructional tools;**
- 2. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting should make support for use of instructional tools a line-item in the budget; and**
- 3. The Senate Executive Committee should work with its councils and the Administration to ensure that, whatever the funding for instructional tools may be, more of it is directed to the department level.**

Discussion

We think the Faculty Senate and Administration should focus on ensuring staff support at the department level for instructional design and management of on-line course materials. Instructional design is the practice of arranging media and content to transfer knowledge and develop skills most effectively. We think support at the department level is the best way to make more efficient use of faculty time and to build institutional memory and expertise in development and management of on-line course materials.

We are not concerned with development of on-line instructional technologies, per se. Excellent tools exist; the critical issue is whether the University is enabling its faculty to select and use them efficiently.

Despite substantial demand from students for on-line and distance-learning opportunities, and considerable stated enthusiasm for such courses and materials by the Administration, the HEC Board, and the Board of Regents, the University has not yet recognized the real costs to faculty of adopting

instructional tools and the lost opportunity costs to the University of failing to fund them adequately. Failure to provide adequate staff support diverts faculty time from generating appropriate content for courses, interacting with students, and engaging in research.

The University must invest in effective new strategies to provide the tools faculty need to maintain the University's competitiveness and relevance to students, whether they study on campus or at a distance. There is a common misconception that use of on-line instructional tools and on-line courses saves instructors' time. In fact, many instructional tools increase the amount of time faculty spend interacting with students and, in any case, materials must be constantly updated.

The University's present system does not support faculty who want to adopt effective new tools, and so many faculty will rationally choose to avoid them. Faculty should be content-providers, but in the present system, faculty must use a significant amount of their time on the simple mechanics of preparing and maintaining online course materials, whether for distance learning courses or traditional classroom courses. Substantial time must be spent learning to use tools available at the UW (such as Catalyst products), or faculty must develop their own tools in those situations where a suitable product is not available commercially or from campus resources.

There are significant costs to the University in using faculty this way — costs that faculty bear but that are hidden from budget. Time devoted to designing and maintaining tools must be subtracted from research or teaching. Even if faculty are able and willing to devote time to design and maintenance of instructional tools, such efforts are unlikely to count toward promotion and tenure. Faculty are not now compensated for the design or maintenance of new instructional tools, unless such efforts are grant-supported.

Moreover, when the grants run out, the University has no general commitment to maintaining the tools by supporting departmental budgets for that purpose. An effective tool may be lost because a department or a faculty member is unable or unwilling to keep supporting it. The University has no integrated system for gathering and sharing data on what tools work for what purposes, despite a recommendation from ATAC that one was needed. Too often, individual faculty start from scratch when adopting instructional tools; too often, a worthwhile on-line course initiative simply lapses when the grant ends or the instructor's energy dries up; too often, the knowledge and experience gained from developing and managing the course also lapses.

At present, the only centrally-funded technology is Catalyst. Its budget does not allow design or maintenance support for individual instructors. Faculty must teach themselves —and their students — how to use the tools, and they must keep abreast of a steady flow of new and updated tools. This year, FCEO has emphasized to Catalyst managers the importance of simplicity and backward-compatibility, and Catalyst managers are attentive to faculty needs and input. But even if Catalyst can make all its tools stable, transparent, and easy-to-use, no centrally-designed instructional technology will be sufficient or flexible enough for all teaching needs. Many faculty in many different departments will need to purchase or develop their own tools, and it would be a mistake to discourage exploration of the myriad tools developed by software companies and other universities.

The University could improve efficiency and morale by providing instructional design and maintenance support at the department level. It would be far more cost-effective for the University to devote whatever funds it does have to hire appropriate staff personnel or to fund additional TA positions, as appropriate, than to use faculty time for these purposes. A study of faculty technology-related priorities, commissioned by ATAC less than two years ago, proposed this cost-effective and much-needed solution in a pilot project. Unfortunately, the proposal was not adopted and, as far as we know, only Educational Outreach systematically provides faculty teaching in its programs with instructional design support. UWEO's practice provides an example of efficient, instructor- and course-centered support for the design, selection and maintenance of instructional tools. The University should fund similar practices in each department.

The bottom line is that we are paying a heavy price for the current inefficient use of faculty time — a price in faculty hours not devoted to the content of instruction or to research, a price in terms of faculty

retention, and a price in lost information about effective tools. In addition, enhanced delivery of classes or class materials on-line might hold down capital costs.

In conclusion, the Council members think increased support for faculty using instructional tools is a critical issue for the University's future. Additional support must be delivered locally, in the departments, where support staff involved can make sure individual faculty are aware of appropriate tools, and can provide direct assistance in learning to use them. Top-down support does not work in practice, because its effect is to increase rather than decrease the demands on faculty time. Although we recognize that there are many demands on the budget, and that any new demands are often pitted against salary raises, we think that this is an unrecognized compensation issue, and we urge the Senate and Administration to focus on it.

2008-2011 Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

Steven Demorest, Group 2, Music, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2009.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

- Jim Burke, Group 3, Mathematics, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.
- Randy LeVeque, Group 3, Applied Mathematics, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.
- Radha Poovendran, Group 6, Electrical Engineering, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

Barbara Endicott-Popovsky, Group 1, Information School, for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2011.

2008-2009 Representative Faculty Council Nominations:

Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative *ex-officio* members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2009, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty councils:

Graduate and Professional Student Senate

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Academic Standards-----	Gus Jespersen
University Libraries-----	Katherine Thornton
Women in Academia-----	Coleen Carrigan

Associated Students of the University of Washington

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Academic Standards-----	Phuong Nguyen
Educational Outreach -----	Kyle Albert
Faculty Affairs -----	Phuong Nguyen
Instructional Quality -----	Phuong Nguyen
Research -----	Richard Lum
Student Affairs-----	Phuong Nguyen
Tri-Campus Policy-----	Chris Paredes
University Relations-----	Nathan Snyder

University of Washington Retirement Association

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Benefits and Retirement -----	J. Ray Bowen (Mechanical Engineering)
Research -----	David Foster (Bioengineering)
Tri-Campus Policy-----	William Weitkamp (Physics)
University Facilities & Services-----	Robert Albrecht (Electrical Engineering)
Women in Academia-----	Bertha Barriga (Dentistry)

James L Fridley Ph.D., P.E.**Education**

Ph.D. 1984 Mechanical Engineering University of Washington
M.S. 1981 Agricultural Engineering Michigan State University
B.S. 1979 Forest Engineering University of California Davis

Recent Positions

Professor, Forest Res. and Mechanical Engineering, Univ of Washington, 1988-present.
Senior Science and Engineering Advisor, Forest Concepts LLC, 2002-present.
Assistant Professor, Agricultural Engineering, Auburn University, 1985-1989

Research Interests

My current interests fall in three main areas: ecological restoration, woody biomass feedstock (materials collection, handling, processing; technology and logistics), and ecological engineering design. Across the three I am interested how people have and are designing systems or system components and how design can be done to better meet the needs or opportunities of the motivating situation and/or stay within the intended limits or boundaries on the design.

Professional Activities

At current time I teach courses related to ecological restoration design but over the past several years I've taught a wide variety of courses in engineering, forest/ecological engineering, mechanical engineering, industrial engineering, quantitative sciences, and environmental sciences and resource management collaborating with a large number of colleagues in the colleges of forest resources and engineering. My research interests are described above. Professors Kern Ewing and Jon Baker and I are writing a book "Restoration Design and Management" for publication in 2010. I have recently served on the University's Senate Committee on Legislative Matters, the Faculty Council on University Relations and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. I also serve as the Science and Technology Advisor to Forest Concepts, LLC in Auburn Washington and serve on the board of the League of Education Voters and as an officer of Schools First. I am a licensed professional engineer in the State of Washington (#0030813 – mechanical engineering).

Sample Publications

1. Dooley J.H., D.N. Lanning, C. Lanning, and J.L. Fridley. 2008. Biomass Baling into Large Square Bales for Efficient Transport, Storage, and Handling. Council on Forest Engineering 2008: 31st Annual Meeting, June 22-25, 2008 Charleston, SC.
2. Lanning, D.N., C. Lanning, J.L. Fridley, J.H. Dooley, and M.S. DeTray, 2008. Mode of Failure Model for Cutting Solid Section Biomass. ASAE Paper No. 085111.
3. Linnell, N+, R. Anderson, J. Fridley, T. Hinckley and V. Razmov+, 2007. Supporting Classroom Discussion with Technology: A Case Study in Environmental Science, ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education 2007.
4. Bolton, S.M., S.D. Bergen and J.L. Fridley. 2001. Design Principles for Ecological Engineering. Ecological Engineering 18(2)201-210
5. Safoutin, Michael+, Cynthia J. Atman, Robin Adams, Teodora Rutar Shuman+, John Kramlich, and Jim Fridley. 2000. "A Design Attribute Framework for Course Planning and Learning Assessment," IEEE Transactions on Education Special Issue on Assessment, 43(2), 188-199 (2000).