

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
THURSDAY, 23 APRIL 2009  
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. There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

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

Faculty Senate Chair David Lovell began his remarks with an update on the status of the faculty salary policy executive order. He reminded Senators that a preliminary draft executive order had been provided to Senate leadership (as is the case with all new and revised executive orders). After extended discussions with faculty, which included this body, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien and he had submitted a letter to the President with suggestions for changes to address, if possible, the concerns that had been raised in those discussions. Many of those suggestions were incorporated into the final executive order, which was recently approved and endorsed by the Board of Regents. The final order suspends the 2% faculty salary policy for two years, with the intention to reinstate the policy at the end of those two years. Not everyone may have been satisfied with the outcome, but respect for the social compact represented by the *Faculty Code* was maintained by all sides.

RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs) procedures have been initiated that would transfer all the programs of the College of Forest Resources into the new College of the Environment. Comments have been taken, and the Review Committee is open to receiving further comments. If you would like to be heard on this transition your ideas will be taken in confidence by the Committee. We are also now in a twenty-day comment period concerning the move of related programs from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences to the College of the Environment. Concerns about those proposals should be directed to the Secretary of the Faculty. Once the twenty-day period has expired, the transition of those programs will move forward without further formal involvement by the faculty.

Lovell then directed his comments to the budget. He reviewed Senate leadership's attempts to ensure faculty involvement in decisions made concerning how the budget cuts will be made at the local level by alerting the chairs of the elected faculty councils in the colleges, schools and campuses that Deans are required to consult broadly with their faculty in matters concerning the budget. Some chairs were unaware that this was the case. A follow-up survey to these chairs revealed a wide range of faculty involvement in drafting the scenarios required that outlined how various levels of cuts would be taken in the units. Lovell feels confident that faculty have been more involved in this process than would have been the case without Senate leadership's initiative in involving the chairs of elected faculty councils – and that on-going involvement of faculty in budget decisions at the unit level may now become closer to a standard operating procedure. Clearly it's in the best interest of this institution that all involved should be in a position to understand as fully as possible what is going on and can thus exercise appropriate responsibility in the University's governance.

Finally, Lovell noted that a seldom-used portion of the Faculty Code would soon be invoked to call a general meeting of the faculty to meet with the President and Faculty Senate leadership to discuss the state budget and its impact on the University of Washington. No action will be taken at this meeting, though faculty may recommend action to be taken by the Faculty Senate – and there will be ample time for faculty to express their concerns. The President and Senate leadership are currently working on an agenda, and a tentative date of May 11 has been set. More information will be forthcoming.

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

The President reported that the Legislature had reached an agreement on the budget the night before. It is a remarkable budget in that it removes 22% of the state's base funding to higher education. In states that are much more deeply hit by the recession, California and Michigan, base funding to higher education has been reduced by 10% and 3%, respectively. He cautioned that those numbers will be reported in ways that reflect a 14% increase in tuition to in-state students, but the nature of the cut in comparison to cuts to higher education in other states is drastic. Federal stimulus money is yet to be seen, but after two years, that funding will be gone as well. There will be more to report at the all-faculty meeting on May 11.

In that the state has chosen to reduce funding by nearly a quarter – with slack to be taken up by students, faculty and staff – the University is now in a position to reconsider its social contract with state. He assured Senators that he is not proposing a revolution, but with the steady erosion of state support, it may be time to consider, as other state institutions of higher education have done in the past, greater independence from the state in terms of funding and operations.

There have been dips in state funding in the past, but this year is different. The extent of this cut moves the UW back twelve years, and that loss will not be recuperated in the same number of years going forward.

The University has much work to do. The current model cannot continue. The UW can continue to be successful, but it will come at a cost to the state of Washington, whose children will increasingly be unable to afford tuition here. The state will soon be populated by Washington state citizens employed to wash the cars of those who move here from California and Michigan for their higher education.

In response to a question about how and where that work will begin, the President said the University must look at the mix of students (in-state and out-of-state) we currently have, re-evaluate its relationship with state community colleges, and re-evaluate the role of research and outreach activities. Primarily, the University needs to think very carefully about its future use of resources. State funding is now fourth in the UW's list of resources, behind tuition, research and donations.

Concerns were expressed about faculty involvement in future discussions, once the final state budget is published and the University can then begin work on a final budget for the units to implement. The President remarked that a wide variety of processes have been going on in preparation for these next few weeks. The University must be prepared to submit a budget to the Board of Regents at its meeting of May 14; but given the extent of the budget meetings that have been underway on an almost daily basis since last fall, there should be no surprises. He suggested that although levels of cuts will differ among units, faculty should look at their units' model of what a 10% cut would mean for their colleges, schools or campuses. Those models would probably be closest to the reality of what will ultimately transpire.

In response to questions about support for higher education by the Governor, President Emmert reported that the Governor had been a consistently strong supporter throughout the entire legislative process. Senate leadership was supportive as well. Support in the House (which initially had proposed cutting funding by 31%) was much less so. He told Senators that he would bring to the May 11 meeting a map of the country illustrating individual states' support of higher education and how Washington compares.

The President ended his remarks by assuring Senators that the University will be able to work through these difficult times if the focus includes keeping goals for five, ten and twenty years in sight, as well as dealing with the day-to-day exigencies.

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

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) Chair Dan Luchtel noted that since the last time he had addressed the Faculty Senate, the SCPB has met weekly to try to come to grips with the magnitude of the budget cuts facing the University. Members had access to a large amount of data concerning the budgets of the schools, colleges and campuses, much of it provided by Paul Jenny, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting. Nevertheless, SCPB members found it very difficult to develop a framework in which to analyze these data. The budget narratives submitted by deans, directors and chancellors did provide a sense of the immediate impact of budget reductions in each of the units. But since committee members lacked an understanding of the relative efficiencies with which the units use their current allocations to advance institutional goals, they did not find the narratives to be particularly helpful in considering how to distribute differential budget reductions.

Thus, as of last week, SCPB formulated its advice to the Provost in terms of three broad principles.

The first principle was to protect the instructional units. Particularly given the expected sharp increases in tuition rates, protecting the programs and classes that serve students who pay such tuition in each school, college and campus should be of the highest priority.

Overall, SCPB assigned individual units to one of three categories: Low-, medium-, and high-percentage-cut categories. They recommended to the Provost that the low-percentage-cut category consist of the instructional academic units, particularly those with a high number of undergraduate credit hours. They recommended that the medium-percentage-cut category consist of the professional school academic units. And, finally, they recommended that the high-percentage-cut category consist of administrative units and non-instructional academic units.

The second principle was that vertical cuts should be considered in the high-percentage-cut category. For the instructional academic units, in order to maintain instructional quality, horizontal-only cuts seem feasible only if such cuts do not exceed 10%. For cuts in administrative units and non-instructional academic units that exceed 10%, vertical cuts in addition to horizontal cuts should be considered.

The third principle is to recommend delay of new investment in non-instructional activities. SCPB endorses President Emmert's assertion that as a leading research university in the region, the UW must focus well into the

future. But given the severity of the present fiscal crisis, SCPB advised that for the short term, its focus must be on meeting the immediate needs of today's students. Discretionary investments that do not translate into immediate instructional contributions should be deferred.

Luchtel reported that the SCPB would be meeting with the Provost next Monday and the following Monday to discuss recommendations for the budget cuts in the various units and the finalized budget would then be forwarded to the Board of Regents.

During the course of questions that followed, Luchtel, as well as the President and Provost, had opportunities to review again the process that had been followed in preparing to meet the exigencies of the budget for the next biennium – emphasizing that they are required to present the Board of Regents with a balanced budget. The President noted that in preparation for the Board of Regents agenda item on the budget, staff members are working on a three-page summary that will encapsulate this extremely complex budget. That summary will be posted on the website as soon as it is available.

5. Legislative Report.

There was no legislative report. Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington was out of town at a professional meeting, and Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative Jim Fridley was in Olympia. Chair Luchtel noted that Fridley had asked for input from Senators on how proposed cuts would impact the number of TAs in individual units.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of April 6, 2009.

a. Minutes of the February 23, 2009, SEC meeting and the March 12, 2009, Senate meeting were approved; b. Faculty Council Issues as of April 6, 2009 **{Exhibit A}** were noted; c. A Class C Resolution concerning citation practices was returned to the Faculty Council on Educational Technology for further consideration; d. A Class C Resolution concerning the hosting of Tent City was returned to its authors for more information to be considered at the next SEC meeting.

7. Announcements.

Senate Vice Chair Bruce Balick announced that the following faculty members had been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on April 20, 2009:

- William Gerberding, President Emeritus
- David Baker, Biochemistry
- Andrew N. Meltzoff, Co-Director, University of Washington Institute for Learning and Brain Sciences
- Edward L. Miles, Marine Studies and Public Affairs
- James William Truman, Zoology
- Gunther Uhlmann,, Mathematics

Senators responded with a hearty round of applause at hearing some good news!

8. Requests for Information.

Proposed Fee Increases in Commuter Services: Joshua Kavanagh, Director Transportation Services

Joshua Kavanagh, director of Transportation Services, presented the University's proposed fee increase in commuter services.

Kavanagh thanked Lovell for the opportunity to address the Senate and introduced staff member who had joined him in support of the proposal. He began by reluctantly admitting that his news was no brighter than the news regarding the budget, and in fact, the two were closely related. After reviewing the successful history of U-Pass over the past 17 years, he explained why the original model for U-Pass was no longer sustainable. He noted that the current market situation is extraordinary. Having come to expect 25 cent fare increases from Metro every three years, we have now had three straight years of 50 cent increases. Metro charges the University for the number of trips made on U-Pass. At the same time, ridership on Metro has increased significantly, including UW faculty, student and staff use of Metro. Although the U-Pass has been a very successful program in many ways, it has relied on subsidies that remain flat. Kavanagh's office took a cut in staff hours as well as in the office budget for operations, but increasing fees will also be required to save the program.

Issues raised and discussed included concerns about how the U-Pass program is responding to global warming, the extent of the increase (especially for students), and the net decrease in the number of parking stalls over time.

The Chair thanked Kavanagh and his staff for taking time to address the Senate.

## 9. Nominations and Appointments.

**Action:** Confirm Jim Fridley as 2009-2010 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2009 and ending July 31, 2010.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick then nominated Jim Fridley as 2009-2010 Faculty Legislative Representative. There were no additional nominations from the floor and the Senate approved the nomination.

## 10. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick presented the following 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:

- Clinical Professor Richard Anderson of Surgery who died January 18, 2009 after having served the University since 1976.
- Research Professor Ruth Bobbitt of Family Medicine who died January 18, 2009 after having served the University since 1962.
- Clinical Associate Professor Tyler Folsom of Oral Surgery who died April 1, 2009 after having served the University since 1949.
- Professor Emeritus W.A. Douglas Jackson of International Studies and Geography who died March 9, 2009 after having served the University since 1955.
- Senior Lecturer Carol Salomon of Asian Languages and Literature who died March 13, 2009 after having served the University since 1983.

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.

The Faculty Senate approved the resolution by a standing vote.

## 11. Unfinished Business.

a. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. **{Exhibit B}**

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) – Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.

**Action:** Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection.

After Vice Chair Balick presented the motion, Chair Lovell noted that the only changes that the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations made to the legislation since it had last been considered by the Senate were technical and not substantive in nature. The President had recommended no changes. There was no discussion, and the motion to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection was approved.

b. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. **{Exhibit C}**

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings, Volume 2, Part II Chapter 27, Section 27-41.

**Action:** Conduct final review of proposal to submit this legislation to the Faculty for approval or rejection.

After Vice Chair Balick presented the motion, Chair Lovell noted that neither the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations nor the President had suggested any changes to this legislation since the Senate had last considered it. In a response to a question about the provision stating that there be no fewer than six member on the Conciliation Board – with no upper limit – Jan Sjøvik, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, explained that there is currently more conciliation work to be done than can be readily accommodated by a Board of six members. An upper limit was not imposed in the legislation in order to give the Board the flexibility to adjust its membership as the workload demands.

With no further discussion, the motion to submit this legislation to the faculty for approval or rejection was approved.

c. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Faculty Salaries and Budget Cuts. **{Exhibit D}**

**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.

The third item of unfinished business was the Class C Resolution concerning faculty salaries and budget cuts introduced at the March 12 Senate meeting and postponed to this meeting.

After reminding Senators of related actions taken over the weeks since the last Senate meeting, the Chair recognized Jan Sjøvik, the author of the original Class C resolution. In view of the fact that this resolution now concerned a moot issue, Sjøvik asked for permission to withdraw the motion, which would withdraw both the original and amended motion. There were no objections to withdrawing the motion and the matter was withdrawn from further consideration.

12. New Business.

- a. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Scholarly Publishing Alternatives and Authors' Rights.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty. **{Exhibit E}**

After the Vice Chair presented the motion, the Chair introduced Charles Wilkinson, Chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries. Wilkinson then introduced Betsy Wilson, Dean of UW Libraries, and Tim Jewell, Director of Information Resources and Scholarly Communication, who were present to support the resolution.

Wilkinson explained that the genesis of this resolution was in discussions in the Faculty Council on University Libraries (FCUL) about the rapidly escalating costs to libraries of both online and print journal subscriptions. This has come about largely because journal publishing has been increasingly dominated by a very few commercial publishers which have imposed monopolistic pricing policies on what is essentially a captive market. The current rate of price increases is unsustainable, and academic libraries are increasingly unable to maintain their collections. In the current economic climate of severe budget cuts, massive serials cancellations are inevitable. One response of the academic community to the problem has been a movement toward open access publishing in which publishing costs are shifted from subscribers to authors, funding agencies, or institutional funding sources. As a matter of fact, a growing number of universities and individual schools and departments have passed resolutions mandating publication in open access journals. Another, related issue involving publishers' control of scholarly communication is the frequent restrictions placed by publishers on the authors' subsequent use of their own work.

Because of these issues, members of the FCUL approached Mark Haselkorn and the Faculty Council on Research with the suggestion to form a joint *ad hoc* committee to address issues of open access and authors rights. That committee, the Scholarly Communication Committee, was formally established by the Senate Executive Committee with the charge to prepare a resolution about these issues.

The Scholarly Communication Committee came up with a document that recognizes that publishing cultures and journal pricing practices vary widely across disciplines, and rather than putting an emphasis entirely on open access, it chose to emphasize faculty awareness of the pricing and authors' rights practices of the journals in which they publish or for which they review. The resolution encourages faculty members to publish in moderately priced or open access journals, to use a publication agreement addendum to preserve their rights to their work, and to deposit their publications in ResearchWorks, the UW institutional repository that is freely accessible and searchable by any search engine. In addition to increasing the availability and broad dissemination of UW faculty works, this practice will inevitably increase the frequency of citation and impact of those works. The resolution also encourages the University Libraries to assist the faculty in obtaining specific information about publishers practices, and encourages the administration to provide resources to foster these efforts and work to assure that these new publishing realities are taken into consideration in the review process for promotion and tenure.

Questions and discussion included the impact of such a transition on criteria for faculty promotions and tenure, how to find out about publishers and their pricing policies (see [www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/](http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/)), how to invoke collective bargaining with publishers, the value of the Library Selector, the need to support mid-level journals, and the value of ResearchWorks (noted above). A similar repository has been established very successfully at the University of California.

With no further discussion, the motion to distribute this resolution to the faculty was approved.

- b. Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Student Photos on Class Lists.  
**Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty. **{Exhibit F}**

After Vice Chair Balick presented the motion, Chair Lovell introduced Mary Pat Wenderoth, Chair of the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality (FCIQ) to address the Senate about the resolution. Wenderoth explained that student photos are now included on class lists provided to all UW instructors. This has been an objective of FCIQ over the past year, and has now been instituted. The resolution simply endorses what is now in effect. It has also been endorsed by the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate. In response to concern expressed by one Senator, Wenderoth explained that faculty are expected to treat the photos included in class lists the same way they

treat class lists. These are confidential documents and should be shredded at the end of the quarter when they are no longer in use. These photos are only available to instructors of record.

A number of Senators noted how useful it has been to have the photos available. With no further discussion, the motion to distribute this resolution to faculty was approved.

13. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: David Lovell, Chair, Faculty Senate

Faculty Council Issues  
For Distribution: April 6, 2009  
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 submitted a progress report to the President and Provost recommending revised policies relative to English language proficiency and proposing additional resources for students needing support in improving their English skills.
  - c. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
  - d. 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 45<sup>th</sup> Street and Campus Safety issues require continuing attention and oversight, including tracking the Administration's implementation of recommendations of the North of 45<sup>th</sup> 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. Tri-Campus Relations: The Tri-Campus Relations Work Group continues to discuss relationships among the three campuses of the UW. The Work Group is following up on the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Report and the 2005 University of Washington Presidential Tri-Campus Steering Committee and Task Force Retreat that addressed future challenges and opportunities facing our three-campus university. Specifically, we hope to delineate campus vs. university level functions and responsibilities (i.e. curriculum, naming).
    - b. Updates about schools and colleges at UWB/UWT.
    - c. Work with Faculty Council on Educational Outreach about educational outreach issues that affect all three campuses.
    - d. Track revisions on the 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.
- e. Parking
- f. Longhouse

#### 12. University Libraries

- a. Scholarly communication: The Scholarly Communication Committee (joint with Faculty Council on Research) adopted a resolution addressing issues of escalating online and print journal costs for UW Libraries, publishing options open to faculty members and the importance of informed choices, preservation of faculty members' rights to the products of their work, and use of ResearchWorks, the UW institutional repository for published papers. The FCUL unanimously passed a motion approving the SCC's resolution.
- b. Libraries' budget: Review with Libraries' leadership of impending serials cancellations, potential reductions in Libraries' hours, and possible closures of branch libraries in light of budget constraints.
- c. Development of ResearchWorks: discussions with Libraries' leadership regarding plans and priorities for future development of the institutional repository.
- d. Faculty access to information about journal costs and publishing policies: discussion of collection and organization of resources by Libraries' staff to aid faculty in identifying policies of individual publishers and journals.
- e. Survey of UW faculty in editorial positions: FCUL is co-sponsoring, with the UW Libraries, the Graduate School, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of Research a survey designed to identify faculty members with editorial responsibilities to facilitate communication about common concerns.
- f. Status of librarians in relation to faculty: Librarians are currently classified as academic staff in a separate category from faculty. Possible alternate forms of categorization for UW Librarians have been discussed, as well as 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

Completing the report on the "Career Cycle of Female Faculty Members."

## Faculty Senate Proposed Changes to Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41

### Rationale:

In 2006-2007, the Faculty Senate leadership charged the FCFA with reviewing Chapter 26-41 of the Faculty Code (Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs). The immediate impetus behind this request was some actual experience with the RCEP rules that had demonstrated that they were not working as well as was desirable. Specifically, the relatively tight timeline for completing an RCEP had made it necessary to stop and then re-start one such process, leading to a significant waste of the time of those involved. Also, the principle that the early part of an RCEP process should be conducted with a high degree of confidentiality had proven problematic.

The FCFA as part of this process sought the input of individuals who had actual RCEP experience both from the perspective of the faculty and the administration. Our preliminary observations were shared with various constituents, including the Board of Deans and Chancellors and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

While many possible changes to Chapter 26-41 were considered, the FCFA determined that it would mostly limit itself to trying to fix the more problematic aspects of Chapter 26-41, as these had been made manifest by actual experience. We have therefore proposed elimination of the requirement that the early part of the process should be conducted in confidence. We have clarified the role and function of what is now called the External Faculty Committee. Furthermore, the proposal allows the Secretary of the Faculty to extend certain deadlines, when necessary.

Faculty Senate Proposed Changes  
(Additions are underlined; deletions are struck through)

Changes to Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 26, Section 26-41

Section 26-41. ~~Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination~~ Procedures of Programs

A. (new A.) General provisions and definitions.

1. ~~(old A.)~~ For the purposes of sections B and ~~D~~ C below, a "program" is defined (comprising both 'department' and 'program' as defined in Sections 23.23.C and D) as follows:
  - a. ~~(old A.1.)~~ A department or other degree-granting unit (other than a departmentalized school, ~~or college, or campus~~); or a sub-unit within a department, an academic unit in a non-departmentalized school or college, or a group of faculty (from one or more departments) which offers a distinct degree, or 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.
  - ~~2. Either a sub-unit within a department, or a group of faculty from one or more departments, which offers a distinct degree, or 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.~~
  - b. (new b.) A disagreement as to whether the object of a proposed action constitutes a program shall be resolved by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, whose decision shall be binding. The dean or chancellor and the faculty group affected by the proposed action shall each submit a statement of their position to the chair of the Committee, which shall deliver its ruling within ten instructional days of the receipt of both statements.
2. (new 2.) {An "instructional day" is a day on which scheduled classes meet during Autumn, Winter and Spring Quarters and excludes weekends, holidays, vacation, and examination periods.}

3. For purposes of these proceedings, a timely review and consultation process is required. Each stated time period is intended as the maximum period for action, review, comment, or advice. An extension of a stated deadline may be granted by the Secretary of the Faculty only upon reasonable grounds submitted in writing.
4. Copies of all documents required under section 26-41 shall be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty.
5. Any written recommendations received by the Secretary of the Faculty under this section 26-41 must be made available to any member of the faculty on request.

B. Procedures for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of programs.

1. If a dean or chancellor after consultation with his or her elected faculty council (Section 23-45.C) determines that a budget reduction, ~~or~~ a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic priorities can only be implemented by measures that will have one or more of the following results:
  - a. the termination of an undergraduate or graduate program as defined in Section A above;
  - b. the removal of tenured faculty, or of untenured faculty before completion of their contract;
  - 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, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole; or
  - e. a significant departure from the stated mission of a college, ~~or~~ school, or campus, or of the University as a whole;

the dean or chancellor shall request authority from the Provost to initiate a formal review to identify one or more programs for elimination, reorganization, or consolidation with another unit and/or reduction in size. The Provost shall consider such requests in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

2. If the Provost grants the dean's or chancellor's request for such authority:
  - a. The dean or chancellor shall notify the Secretary of the Faculty of his or her intention to initiate a review under this section of the *Faculty Code*. The Secretary of the Faculty shall, after consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, appoint within ~~seven ten calendar~~ instructional days a Program Identification an External Faculty Committee composed of five faculty members (including one designated as the committee's Chair) from outside the college or school in which the review is to take place.
  - b. The External Faculty Committee, when convened by its Chair, shall establish a schedule of meetings for its own Committee. Such independent meetings of the External Faculty Committee will allow its members to form independent conclusions regarding the arguments and evidence supporting the proposed action of the dean or chancellor. The responsibility of the External Faculty Committee is to ensure that the recommendations of the elected faculty council and of the dean or chancellor are based on a process that was fair, thorough, impartial, and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials. (The External Faculty Committee shall retain copies of all the materials it has considered, which it will make available to the Review Committee, should one be appointed under B.4 below.)
  - c. **(old b.)** For the duration of the reorganization, consolidation, or elimination procedures, and for the business of these procedures only, the members of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee shall also be added to the ~~college~~ elected faculty council of the college, ~~or~~ school, or campus in question as *ex officio* members ~~with~~ without vote. They shall participate in all ~~discussions~~ meetings of that council, convened by its faculty chair or the dean or chancellor, leading to the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination, and shall have full access to all materials and personnel consulted by the dean or chancellor and ~~college~~ the elected faculty council in this process. This combination of the

- elected faculty council and the External Faculty Committee is hereinafter referred to as the augmented faculty council.
- d. If the ~~college~~ elected faculty council does not include student members, the dean or chancellor shall request that the student organization (or organizations) of the affected school, ~~or college or campus~~ shall appoint a graduate student and, where appropriate, an undergraduate student to ~~the augmented college council, provided that no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS and the ASUW~~ serve, with voting rights, with the augmented faculty council for the business of these procedures only. If no such student organization exists, such appointments shall be made by the GPSS or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization and the ASUW or other appropriate recognized student organization.
  - e. **(old c.)** The dean or chancellor, in consultation with the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council, associate deans, and other appropriate advisory bodies or affected groups in the college, ~~or school, or campus~~, shall examine measures to meet the required budget reduction, ~~or resource allocation goals or realigned academic priorities~~, including the ~~elimination of programs, and alternatives to elimination such as reorganization and consolidation~~ reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of programs, and alternatives to such actions.
  - f. The information used as a basis for the identification of programs for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination, and of alternatives to such actions, shall consist of:
    - 1) documents that pre-date the dean's or chancellor's request (under B.1 above), including:
      - a) the reports resulting from periodic reviews of programs or departments, any interim revisions of them, and responses to them by the dean or chancellor, the ~~college~~ elected faculty council, and the faculty of the program(s) in question.
      - b) accreditation reviews, if such exist for the program(s) in question.
      - c) any other performance data gathered and maintained by the school, college, or campus, provided they are up-to-date and have been previously submitted to the faculty of the program(s) in question for review and response.
      - d) all relevant documentation resulting from the ongoing long-range planning process in the school, college, or campus, and
    - 2) such other information requested by the dean, chancellor, or the augmented ~~college~~ faculty council as deemed necessary, or independently requested by the External Faculty Committee, provided it is up-to-date and has been submitted for review and response to the faculty of the program(s) in question for review and response for under consideration, and the faculty in the program(s) have had at least five instructional days to submit their comments on the information.
  - g. **(old e.)** In proposing program reorganizations, consolidations, or eliminations, the dean or chancellor shall protect, to the maximum extent possible:
    - 1) the overall curriculum of the school, college, or campus and the University and the educational needs of its students, consistent with the role and mission of the University;
    - 2) in the case of a reorganization or consolidation, the quality of the program in relation to ~~e.g.~~ 1) above;
    - 3) other programs in the University, including interdisciplinary programs, that may be affected by the proposed action(s);
    - 4) the University's commitment to tenure; and
    - 5) the University's commitment to ~~affirmative action.~~ diversity in faculty, staff and students.
  - f. ~~Deliberations leading to the identification of programs for elimination shall be confidential until the conclusion of the identification process, except that, at least two instructional days before any public announcement, the dean shall inform the faculty of the identified program(s) of their status, in writing, and shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents. At least one instructional day before any public announcement, the dean shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions~~

- ~~under sections B.3 and 5 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.~~
- h. When the Chair of the elected faculty council determines that the augmented faculty council is ready to conclude its review, a formal vote on the proposed action shall be taken by its eligible voting members. The result of that vote shall be communicated in writing to the dean or chancellor, who at least ten instructional days before any public announcement, shall communicate directly in writing with each faculty member of the affected program(s) to inform them of his or her intended action. The dean or chancellor shall make available to them the report described in B.3 and B.3.a below and its supporting documents, and the accompanying statement by the External Faculty Committee described in B.3.b below (when available). At least five instructional days before any public announcement, the dean or chancellor shall convene the faculty of the identified program(s) for the purpose of explaining the review procedures to them, and informing them of the provisions under sections B.5 and B.6 below for representation of their views and presentation of supporting evidence.
3. The dean's or chancellor's intention to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate the identified program(s) shall be announced within a period of thirty instructional days from the appointment of the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee (2.a above). This announcement shall be made in the form of a detailed and specific report accompanied by a separate, independent statement from the ~~Program Identification~~ External Faculty Committee. Both of these documents shall be submitted by the dean or chancellor to the ~~President~~, the Provost and the chair(s) of the affected unit(s), to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and to the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall publish them in a *Class C Bulletin* within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.
- a. The dean's or chancellor's report shall:
- 1) justify the proposed measures in relation to existing program review materials and other publicly available planning documents;
  - 2) describe the impact of the proposed measures on the faculty in the identified program(s), on other programs, and on the curriculum and students of the school, college, or campus of the college as a whole, and on the faculty affected; and
  - 3) be accompanied by all supporting documents, which need not be published in the *Class C Bulletin* referred to in B.3 above, but must be made available to any faculty member on request.
- b. The External Faculty Committee's accompanying statement shall be prepared and signed by the its chair of the ~~Program Identification Committee~~, and shall reflect the opinion of a majority of the External Faculty Committee. It shall indicate:
- 1) whether the Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean, giving reasons therefor, and whether in its view the program review process was fair, thorough, impartial, and consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and
  - 2) whether in its view the program identification process was fair, thorough, impartial, consistent in its use of appropriate criteria and materials, and free of conflict of interest, whether the External Faculty Committee supports or does not support the proposal of the dean or chancellor, giving reasons therefor.
4. ~~For each college in which these procedures are being applied, Within five instructional days of receipt of the report and statement detailed in B.3 above, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, after consultation with the Chair of the External Faculty Committee and with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, shall appoint a Review Committee consisting of five~~ four faculty members (including one designated as committee chair), one member of the External Faculty Committee, one representative of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate or other appropriate recognized graduate student organization, and one representative of the Associated Students of the University of Washington or other appropriate recognized undergraduate student organization (all with full participatory rights). The formation and membership of this committee shall be announced in the *Class C Bulletin* described in B.3 above.

5. **(new 5.)** ~~This committee shall conduct an open review of the dean's proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered, and The Review Committee's primary goal is to review the dean's or chancellor's report from the perspective of the University and the public as described below and, to this end, shall conduct an open review of the dean's or chancellor's proposal, with particular reference to the justification offered. The Review Committee may receive or request additional materials or arguments from the dean or chancellor, from the External Faculty Committee, from the faculty, students, and staff of the identified program(s), and other constituencies in the University or the public at large. Meetings to invite public comment shall be scheduled at times that permit participation by the public. Within twenty instructional days of the publication of the Bulletin, its appointment, the Review Committee shall deliver its written recommendation to the President and the Provost. The recommendation shall be transmitted at the same time to the dean or chancellor and to the chair(s) of the affected program(s).~~
  6. **(old 5.)** Following the submission of the Review Committee's written recommendations, the dean or chancellor may propose a modified course of action, and the affected program(s) may submit an additional statement. This statement may suggest alternatives to the measures proposed by the dean or chancellor, giving detailed reasons based on educational policy and/or past reviews of the program(s) in question, and may include additional relevant documentation. Any such materials must be transmitted to the President and Provost within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.
  7. **(old 6.)** After the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a final decision on the matter and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, when required, and to the dean(s) or chancellor(s), the chair(s) of the affected program(s) and the Chair of the Faculty Senate within ~~thirty fifteen calendar instructional days of the comment period provided for in 26-41.B.6 above, of receiving the Review Committee's recommendations, but in no case later than the final day of Spring Quarter.~~ The President's decision shall take careful account of the impact of the reorganization(s), consolidation(s), or elimination(s) on the University's ability to perform its educational role and mission, and on the diversity of the University community.
- C. **(old D.)** Procedures for ~~L~~limited ~~R~~reorganization and ~~C~~consolidation of ~~P~~programs.
1. In order to reallocate resources, ~~or~~ implement educational policies or realign academic priorities, a dean or chancellor may at any time propose the reorganization of one or more programs within a school, college, or campus, or their consolidation or amalgamation with other units. The reallocation of graduate degree programs (Section 23-24.B) from one qualified academic unit (Section 23-24.D) to another, or to an interdisciplinary program within the Graduate School, is a limited reorganization that should follow the procedures outlined in this section.
  2. **(new 2.)** If the proposed measures will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the dean or chancellor may proceed with the measures, provided:
    - a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected program(s), and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the school, college or campus;
    - b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the Provost and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in ~~B.2.d~~ B.2.f above; and
    - c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected program(s) may exercise the option described in ~~section D.2~~ C.3 below.
  3. **(old 2.)** If a majority of the voting faculty of ~~an~~ the affected academic program(s) determines by a vote judges that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the Provost for a review under the procedures for reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of programs (under Section B above). The Provost shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and

Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the dean or chancellor to conduct a review of the proposed program reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of program review following the procedures described in Sections A and B.2 through 7 above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners, the dean or chancellor, and to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining this decision. ~~why an elimination review is not deemed appropriate.~~

D. **(old C.)** Procedures for ~~the~~ reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of a ~~C~~college or ~~S~~school.

1. If the Provost and a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting concur that a budget reduction, ~~or a reallocation of resources,~~ or a realignment of academic priorities should be achieved by the elimination of a particular college or school in its entirety, or by its reorganization or consolidation with another college or school, the Provost shall ~~invite request that~~ the Chair of the Faculty Senate ~~to~~ appoint a Review Committee, ~~constituted as described in B.4 above.~~ of five faculty and the two student members described in B.4 above.
2. The Provost shall submit to the Review Committee a detailed justification of the proposed measure, prepared on the basis of the materials described in B.2.~~f~~ above and other appropriate planning documents made available by the central administration, provided they have been previously submitted to the dean or chancellor and faculty of the college or school in question for review and comment. The justification shall:
  - a. review alternatives and explain why elimination of the college or school is preferable; and
  - b. protect to the maximum extent possible the aspects of the University described in B.2.~~g~~ above.
3. The Secretary of the Faculty shall publish the Provost's proposal, and the accompanying justification, in a *Class C Bulletin* within ~~seven~~ five instructional days of receiving them.
4. The Review Committee shall conduct an ~~open~~ review of the Provost's proposal in the manner described in B.3~~5~~ above, and shall deliver its written recommendation to the President, Provost, deans or chancellors of the affected college or school, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, within thirty instructional calendar days of the publication of the *Bulletin*.
5. Following the delivery of the Review Committee's report, the Provost may propose a modified course of action, and the dean or chancellor of the affected college or school may submit an additional statement of the kind described in B.5~~6~~ above. Any such materials must be submitted to the President within ten instructional days of the delivery of the Review Committee's report.
6. Within fifteen instructional days of the end of the comment period provided for in D.5 above, and A after the President (or the President's delegate) confers with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, he or she shall transmit a final decision and accompanying recommendations to the Board of Regents, when required, the deans or chancellors, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. ~~as prescribed in B.6 above.~~

E. **(new E.)** Procedures for limited reorganization and consolidation of colleges and schools.

1. In order to reallocate resources or implement educational policies, or align academic priorities, the Provost may at any time propose the consolidation of colleges and schools. If the proposed measure will not have the effects described in B.1 above, the Provost may proceed with the measures, provided:
  - a. the proposal results from detailed discussion with the affected colleges or schools, and with appropriate faculty advisory committees in the colleges or schools;
  - b. a detailed justification of the proposed actions is submitted to the President and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, taking account of the documentation described in B.2.f above; and

- c. the measures are not implemented until the conclusion of a period of twenty instructional days during which the faculty of the affected college/school(s) may exercise the option described in E.2 below.
2. If a majority of the voting faculty of an affected college or school determines by a vote that a proposed reorganization or consolidation will have one or more of the effects described in B.1 above, such majority may petition the President for a review under the procedures for elimination of a college/school. The President, or the President's delegate, shall consider such petitions in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and within ten instructional days may either direct the Provost to conduct a review following the procedures described in section D above, or decline to do so, in which case a detailed statement must be transmitted to the petitioners and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, explaining why a review under section D above is not deemed appropriate.

*S-A 49, December 4, 1975; S-A 57, April 3, 1978; S-A 67, December 5, 1983; S-A 73, May 24, 1985; S-A 95, June 17, 1996: all with Presidential approval.*

*Approved by Senate Executive Committee  
February 23, 2009*

*Approved by Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
April 23, 2009*

## Changes to Conciliatory Proceedings, Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 27, Section 27-41

### Rationale:

Although the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs will be considering a more thorough review and revision of Chapter 27, Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences, that revision will not be ready for SEC review until later in the academic year. In the meantime there is some urgency in making one particular change. In part, the request to increase the number of conciliators addresses the enlargement of the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to include Tacoma and Bothell. Currently, four cases are being conciliated and the Ombudsman has been made aware of eight other possible conciliations. Growth in the conciliation caseload is a positive development that should be encouraged, for conciliation offers the possibility of reaching a mutually satisfactory resolution and avoids adjudication. Several factors limit the Board's capacity to provide conciliation services. The Ombudsman's general practice is to assign two conciliators to each case. The conciliation process routinely lasts more than one quarter. Typically, a conciliator is assigned to one, possibly two cases per year. Conciliators can only handle cases arising outside their own school or college. In this regard, Arts and Sciences cases present challenges in finding neutral conciliators, since the college and its faculty are so large. If the current year caseload in fact reaches 12 cases, the board of conciliators will be severely challenged to meet that level of demand and to provide services without delays.

The Conciliation Board agrees with the FCFA that staggered terms and a specific start date (September 16) should not be codified. This will give the Ombudsman flexibility to fill vacancies and add new Board members as necessary to carry on the current practice of staggered terms without being mandated to do so.

### Section 27-41. Conciliatory Proceedings

- A. If the process of resolution by mutual consent under Section 27-31 does not take place or fails, the faculty member or the dean may request the assistance of a conciliation officer as a neutral third party by applying to the University Ombudsman for the assignment of a conciliation officer. Conciliatory proceedings aim at resolving problems by informal means without resorting to the more formal adjudicative proceedings provided in Chapter 28.
  1. Conciliation officers shall be tenured members of the faculty, associate and full professors without tenure for reasons of funding, or emeritus faculty who are familiar with procedures and opportunities for the resolution of disputes or complaints involving faculty members.
  2. There shall be not ~~more~~ fewer than six conciliation officers who shall serve three-year ~~staggered terms commencing on September 16.~~
  3. Conciliation officers shall be selected by the President from a list of names ~~equal to twice~~ exceeding the number of ~~vacancies~~ positions to be filled, prepared and approved by the Senate Executive Committee. Vacancies for the remainder of unexpired terms shall be filled according to this same procedure. Conciliation officers may be reappointed to successive terms by mutual consent of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.
  4. Any conciliation officer may be removed during his or her term of office by concurrent decision of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.
  5. Conciliation officers shall be attached to the Office of the University Ombudsman but shall be limited in their activity to disagreements arising among faculty members or between individual faculty members and the University administration.

The Ombudsman, who may consult with the other members of the Conciliation Board (Section 27-42), shall determine which conciliation officer shall be assigned to a case, and shall inform the Secretary of the Faculty of appointments made. No conciliation officer shall be assigned to a case arising within his or her own school or college.

*Approved by Senate Executive Committee  
February 23, 2009*

*Approved by the Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate  
April 23, 2009*

**Class C Resolution Concerning Faculty Salaries and Budget Cuts**

WHEREAS, the State of Washington is facing a major budget shortfall for the 2009-2011 biennium that has resulted in major cuts in funding for higher education and the University of Washington; and

WHEREAS, other agencies providing vital public goods and services face budget cuts of equal or greater magnitude; and

WHEREAS, the faculty are committed to serving the citizens of the State of Washington by maintaining access to high-quality education in the face of severe economic hardship; and

WHEREAS, hundreds of instructional and administrative staff will be laid off in response to severe budget cuts; and

WHEREAS, the administration has declared its intention to limit discretionary use of salary funds for hiring and retention to cases strictly necessary to maintain vital teaching or research programs; and

WHEREAS, the faculty are empowered and obligated to advise the university on budget priorities within their departments, through the elected faculty councils at each school, college and campus, and through the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the temporary suspension, for the 2009-2011 biennium, of the provisions of Executive Order No. 64 that require a 2 percent salary increase for all meritorious faculty, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate encourages all faculty to fulfill their right and responsibility to advise the university on budget priorities at the level of departments, schools, colleges, campuses, and the university as a whole.

*Submitted by:*  
Jan Sjøvik, Chair  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

**Class C Resolution – Substitute Amendment – March 12, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

WHEREAS, the State of Washington is facing a major budget shortfall for the 2009-2011 biennium that has resulted in major cuts in funding for higher education and the University of Washington; and

WHEREAS, other agencies providing vital public goods and services face budget cuts of equal or greater magnitude; and

WHEREAS, the faculty are committed to serving the citizens of the State of Washington by maintaining access to high-quality education in the face of severe economic hardship; and

WHEREAS, hundreds of instructional and administrative staff will be laid off in response to severe budget cuts; and

WHEREAS, the draft Executive Order temporarily suspending Executive Order 64 was publicized just 2-days prior to this Senate meeting and with minimal opportunity for wide faculty discussion; and

WHEREAS, concrete state budget data have not yet been made public; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate urges the University of Washington Regents and administration not to take action regarding Executive Order 64 until after the first Senate meeting after publication of the state budget to allow faculty time for discussion and input and their Senators time for formulating considered motions and amendments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate urges the University of Washington administration to engage in transparent discussions with the faculty on all budgetary aspects and options and to offer reciprocal administrative concessions and guarantees with regard to any temporary suspension of Executive Order 64.

*Submitted by:  
Christoph Giebel, Senator  
Group Four  
March 12, 2009*

**Class C Resolution Concerning Scholarly Publishing Alternatives and Authors' Rights**

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the products of faculty scholarship are generated for the public benefit, are supported in part by nonprofit or public agencies, and are created, peer reviewed, and edited by faculty with little or no direct remuneration; and

WHEREAS, scholarly journal publication, especially in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and medicine, is increasingly being dominated by and aggregated in the hands of a few large commercial publishing houses; and

WHEREAS, the costs to academic libraries of journals published by these commercial publishers have risen far more rapidly than inflation, thereby limiting free and open exchange of scholarly information; and

WHEREAS, the publication agreements offered by some publishers limit authors' rights to use their own work in their teaching and research and/or to archive their work in an openly accessible repository; and

WHEREAS, proprietary formats, new forms of digital protection, and new subscription models for selling "backfile" databases to libraries threaten to further restrict access to scholarly resources; and

WHEREAS, the continued increases in journal costs have impaired the Libraries' purchasing power and have forced the Libraries to conduct a serials review that will almost certainly result in widespread cancellation of journal subscriptions; and

WHEREAS, the current system for production and distribution of scholarly works is increasingly dysfunctional and fiscally unsustainable and restricts rather than increases access to and dissemination of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington Libraries has established an online, freely accessible and searchable repository, *ResearchWorks at the University of Washington (ResearchWorks)*, for the dissemination and preservation of scholarly works published by members of the University community; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that

1. the University of Washington prepare for a future in which academic publications are increasingly available through open sources by encouraging faculty members to:
  - assess the pricing practices and authors' rights policies of journals with which they collaborate (as authors, reviewers, and editors) and advocate for improvements therein; and
  - adopt and use an Addendum to Publication Agreement such as that provided by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) in order to retain their rights to use their work in the classroom and in future publications and to archive final accepted manuscripts; and
  - publish scholarly works in moderately priced journals, in journals published by professional societies and associations, or in peer-reviewed "open access" journals; and
  - archive their work in the UW's *ResearchWorks* or other repositories supported by research institutions, professional societies, or government agencies in order to provide the widest and most affordable access to their scholarship; and

## 2. UW Libraries is encouraged to

- provide relevant, current information regarding journal publishers, pricing, and authors' rights to departments and individual faculty members; and
- maintain and further develop *ResearchWorks* and related services; and
- allocate personnel to facilitate the deposit of faculty publications in *ResearchWorks*, and to obtain publishers' permission to deposit previously published works when possible; and

## 3. the University of Washington administration is encouraged to:

- provide resources to the Libraries and to academic units to foster these efforts; and
- work with departments and colleges to assure that the review process for promotion, tenure and merit takes into consideration these new trends and realities in academic publication.

*Approved by:  
Faculty Senate  
April 23, 2009*

*Approved by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Submitted by:  
Scholarly Communication Committee  
Faculty Council on University Libraries  
& Faculty Council on Research  
April 6, 2009*

**Background and Rationale:**

The following resolution was drafted by the Scholarly Communication Committee, an *ad hoc* committee established by the Senate Executive Committee in October 2008, the membership of which consists of representatives from the Faculty Council on University Libraries, the Faculty Council on Research, and the University Libraries.

The rationale for the formation of the committee grew out of discussions in the Faculty Council on University Libraries about the escalating costs to the Libraries of both online and print subscriptions of scholarly journals, due partly to the increasing dominance of a few large commercial publishers that have restricted dissemination of knowledge by the imposition of monopolistic pricing and “bundling” policies upon institutional subscribers. One response to this challenge has been the development of “open access” journals, the publishing costs of which are borne by authors, educational institutions, and/or funding agencies rather than subscribers. A related issue of publishers’ control over scholarly communication is the limitation of authors’ rights to use material from their publications in teaching and in subsequent works. The charge of the Scholarly Communication Committee was “to draft a resolution about open access and faculty authors’ rights.”

Increasing appreciation of differing publishing cultures across academic disciplines resulted in alteration of the Committee’s initial approach. Journals with the most egregious pricing policies tend to be concentrated in the sciences, technology, and medicine – the same fields in which the importance of immediate availability of information together with potential publishing support from funding agencies make open access most practicable. Open access publishing is arguably less feasible in the arts and humanities in which generally lower journal costs place less of a financial burden on libraries and authors’ publication expenses are unlikely to be offset by funding agencies. The committee therefore broadened its advocacy to promotion of faculty members’ awareness of journal pricing and publishing alternatives and of the impacts of their choices of publishers (by writing, reviewing, and editing) on the cost, availability, and dissemination of their work to scholars and other interested individuals around the world.

The resolution also seeks to promote faculty members’ awareness of mechanisms they can use to retain rights to their work, such as adding an addendum delineating those rights to publishers’ publication agreements (example attached). Included among these may be the right to deposit publications in a freely accessible institutional or discipline-based repository, such as the Libraries’ “ResearchWorks at The University of Washington” <https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks>. In support of this activity, the resolution calls upon the Libraries and the University of Washington administration to further develop, publicize, and facilitate faculty authors’ use of ResearchWorks.

The resolution has been unanimously approved by the Scholarly Communication Committee and its two parent councils, the Faculty Council on University Libraries and the Faculty Council on Research, and unanimously endorsed by the Libraries Cabinet.

### ADDENDUM TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT

1. THIS ADDENDUM hereby modifies and supplements the attached Publication Agreement concerning the following Article:

\_\_\_\_\_ (manuscript title)

\_\_\_\_\_ (journal name)

2. The parties to the Publication Agreement as modified and supplemented by this Addendum are:

\_\_\_\_\_ (corresponding author)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (Individually or, if one than more author, collectively, Author)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Publisher)

3. This Addendum and the Publication Agreement, taken together, allocate all rights under copyright with respect to all versions of the Article. The parties agree that wherever there is any conflict between this Addendum and the Publication Agreement, the provisions of this Addendum are paramount and the Publication Agreement shall be construed accordingly.

4. **Author's Retention of Rights.** Notwithstanding any terms in the Publication Agreement to the contrary, AUTHOR and PUBLISHER agree that in addition to any rights under copyright retained by Author in the Publication Agreement, Author retains: (i) the rights to reproduce, to distribute, to publicly perform, and to publicly display the Article in any medium for non-commercial purposes; (ii) the right to prepare derivative works from the Article; and (iii) the right to authorize others to make any non-commercial use of the Article so long as Author receives credit as author and the journal in which the Article has been published is cited as the source of first publication of the Article. For example, Author may make and distribute copies in the course of teaching and research and may post the Article on personal or institutional Web sites and in other open-access digital repositories.

5. **Publisher's Additional Commitments.** Publisher agrees to provide to Author within 14 days of first publication and at no charge an electronic copy of the published Article in a format, such as the Portable Document Format (.pdf), that preserves final page layout, formatting, and content. No technical restriction, such as security settings, will be imposed to prevent copying or printing of the document.

6. **Acknowledgment of Prior License Grants.** In addition, where applicable and without limiting the retention of rights above, Publisher acknowledges that Author's assignment of copyright or Author's grant of exclusive rights in the Publication Agreement is subject to Author's prior grant of a non-exclusive copyright license to Author's employing institution and/or to a funding entity that financially supported the research reflected in the Article as part of an agreement between Author or Author's employing institution and such funding entity, such as an agency of the United States government.

7. For record keeping purposes, Author requests that Publisher sign a copy of this Addendum and return it to Author. However, if Publisher publishes the Article in the journal or in any other form without signing a copy of this Addendum, such publication manifests Publisher's assent to the terms of this Addendum.

AUTHOR

PUBLISHER

\_\_\_\_\_ (corresponding author on behalf of all authors)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Neither Creative Commons nor Science Commons are parties to this agreement or provide legal advice. Please visit [www.sciencecommons.org](http://www.sciencecommons.org) for more information and specific disclaimers.

SPARC (the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) are not parties to this Addendum or to the Publication Agreement. SPARC and ARL make no warranty whatsoever in connection with the Article. SPARC and ARL will not be liable to Author or Publisher on any legal theory for any damages whatsoever, including without limitation any general, special, incidental or consequential damages arising in connection with this Addendum or the Publication Agreement.

SPARC and ARL make no warranties regarding the information provided in this Addendum and disclaims liability for damages resulting from the use of this Addendum. This Addendum is provided on an "as-is" basis. No legal services are provided or intended to be provided in connection with this Addendum.

<http://digital.lib.washington.edu/rw-faq/faq.html>

## ***Frequently Asked Questions about ResearchWorks at Washington***

---

### **General information**

#### **What is a digital repository?**

A digital repository is a system for disseminating and preserving scholarly work to researchers and other interested people around the world. The University of Washington Libraries repository is based on DSpace, open-source software created at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (<http://www.dspace.org>) and in wide use by North American universities.

The phrases "digital repository" and "institutional repository" are often used interchangeably.

#### **How is ResearchWorks at the University of Washington organized?**

The repository is organized into Communities (colleges, schools, research centers, or other groups). Sub-communities for departments can be established in the college or school community and Collections, such as e-Prints can be set up within sub-communities.

Colleges, Schools, Departments and Research Centers can easily present their work to prospective students, faculty, granting institutions, as well as colleagues and other interested individuals around the world resulting in higher visibility for your work. In addition, each College, School, Department and Research Center primary page can be enhanced with text, logos, and links to departmental websites.

#### **Who decides what types of material go into the repositories?**

The Communities in collaboration with the Libraries define the kinds of material they want to include. The Libraries encourages contributions from all communities across the three campuses.

#### **Do other universities have digital repositories?**

Yes: examples include the University of California system (EScholarship: <http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/>) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (DSpace: <http://dspace.mit.edu>).

#### **How do I start?**

First visit the [Communities and Collections](#) page, to see if your department is represented. If it is not, please [contact us](#).

### **Depositing your work**

#### **What type of materials can be deposited?**

The system will accept any file format or content that a Community decides it wants to deposit into the repository (but see below for long term preservation implications). No special software is needed for you to submit materials.

Examples of appropriate content may include numerical datasets, working papers, technical reports, pre-prints and post prints of published articles. The copyright of articles that have been previously published is often owned by the publisher. To determine your publisher's policy on self-archiving, please use the link from this site's front page or visit <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo.php>.

**I have a large number of previously published articles that I wish to contribute. Can you help?**

Yes. Please contact the Libraries Digital Initiatives office at [diginet @ u\[dot\]washington\[dot\]edu](mailto:diginet@u.washington.edu). It is possible that we may be able to assist with researching copyright policies, scanning the offprints into PDF, metadata record creation and the batch import of large quantities of materials.

**Preservation and access****Why should I participate? I don't need to worry about managing my publications... the publishers will take care of that.**

Yes, and no. While publishers may indeed preserve your materials over time, it may be that the Libraries will not be able to afford to pay publishers the price they charge us to provide access to your work. In addition, in the past the Libraries purchased a copy of the journal your article appears in and made the commitment to preserve the paper copy. Now, however, the system has shifted and the Libraries typically licenses access to online content. That could mean that if we cease paying for access, we have no retrospective access at all.

Using the University of Washington Libraries digital repository will save departmental staff time and money. Because the Libraries has made the commitment to support server maintenance and upgrades, a staff member or graduate student in your department or lab will not need to back-up, maintain or restore these files. Instead the Libraries assumes this responsibility. If others link to your work, putting items into Washington ResearchWorks will provide them with a persistent identifier. In addition, those interested in obtaining copies of your article no longer need to contact you directly; they can simply access the article from the repository.

In the not too distant future, we will be able to send you emails with information on how often your articles and other materials are downloaded from the Repository.

The University of Washington Libraries participates in a number of consortia that distribute our digital collections through a variety of search engines and interfaces. This means that faculty materials are more widely distributed and easily found. Papers will be findable via Google, GoogleScholar, MS Live Search and other search engines.

**Can I still link to my papers from my own website?**

Yes - using the repository can relieve you of maintenance chores for your files but you can still link to your collection or individual papers from your personal or department website. In addition, if you leave the University of Washington you will also be able to continue linking to your papers.

**What about preservation? How long will the files in the digital repository last?**

The repository addresses two aspects of digital preservation. First, the University Libraries has made a financial commitment of staffing and server space to preserve the files deposited in the repository. Second, depending on the file format, we may be able to preserve the full functioning of that file (for supported formats such as ASCII) or we may be able to preserve only the bits (for known or unsupported formats - usually created with proprietary software). In addition, the repository software creates persistent addresses (handle - e.g., <http://hdl.handle.net/1808/126>) that will not change over time. They will be enduring citations.

**Can I delete a file after depositing it?**

Because the purpose of this repository is to provide long-term preservation and access, deleting files is not recommended. However, in certain instances files can be deleted by the Libraries.

**Who can read the files in the repository?**

The UW Libraries Digital Repository is a platform for freely distributed research. The default is open access to all deposited items for all users of the World Wide Web.

**Class C Resolution Concerning Student Photo Class Lists**

WHEREAS, the mission of the University is to promote the continued improvement of teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, research has shown that having student photos available to faculty allows faculty to learn student names and thereby produce a more welcoming and safe environment for student learning to occur; and

WHEREAS, Alexander Astin stated in What Matters in College (1993) that two things that made the biggest difference in getting students involved in the under-graduate experience were greater faculty-student interaction and greater student-student interaction, and although learning student names may seem a trivial matter in the entire university enterprise, it is a powerful means to foster both of these interactions; and

WHEREAS, student photos are already taken for the student ID card and stored on UW computers, this photo data could be tapped and photo class lists made available as an option for the faculty at their MyUW teaching page (which is a password protected site). Faculty would be informed to treat student photos with the same degree of confidentiality as they do all student information (student ID numbers, grades, etc.); and

WHEREAS, adding student photos to class lists would promote a greater sense of community and identity among the faculty and students which in turn would create a stronger and more vibrant community of scholars at the University of Washington; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate strongly endorses the University's effort to supply a photo class list as an option to all teaching faculty.

*Approved by:  
Faculty Senate  
April 23, 2009*

*Approved by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
April 6, 2009*

*Submitted by:  
Mary Pat Wenderoth, Chair  
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality  
April 6, 2009*

*Approved by:  
Faculty Council on Instructional Quality  
January 15, 2009*