

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 12 MARCH 2009
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

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

Chair Lovell welcomed Senators to the final meeting of Winter Quarter and informed them that there were two important items of Class A legislation to be considered: one concerning procedures for reorganization, consolidation and elimination of programs, and the other concerning conciliatory procedures. Both were initiated long before anyone anticipated the current budget situation. Nevertheless, both may now be put to use more responsively and vigorously than they have been over the past few years, so it will be important to pay close attention as these changes move through the legislative process.

Lovell reminded Senators that decisions made at the local level, by Deans and Chairs, are more consequential to the University – its programs and staffing – than decisions made about merit increases. Faculty participation at the department, college and campus level is crucial. The Faculty Code mandates that academic units (e.g. departments) have policies on file on how to handle retention offers and that these policies should also be on file with the Secretary of the Faculty. That has not been the case in recent history and the discussion today will demonstrate how important having a policy in place for each academic unit will be as budget decisions are made over the next few months.

He also reminded Senators that Executive Orders are the purview of the President. In the spirit of shared governance, the President historically solicits comments from the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty before issuing final Executive Orders. His support of the proposal to solicit comments from the Senate illustrates how seriously he takes this issue and the value of shared governance, particularly regarding this issue. Although he did not anticipate unanimous agreement on how this will be played out, he noted that his role would be to ensure that the issues are debated and discussed in an informed and rational way. He hoped to ensure a process of rational deliberation.

Discussions about a partial suspension of Executive Order 64 were initiated by Faculty Senate leadership, not by administration. Given the limited options provided for by the Executive Order and correlative parts of the Faculty Code, Senate leadership was concerned that this initiative come from within the ranks of faculty. On-going conversations included members of the faculty, administration and individual members of the Board of Regents. The Senate Chair also addressed the Board of Regents in January and conjectured at that time that the Faculty Senate would not object strongly to a temporary suspension of the 2% rule. A committee was formed to re-evaluate the policy and the draft Executive Order was issued by the President. Subsequent discussions within the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and the Senate Executive Committee, as well as within the original committee, and the results of those discussions are reflected in the letter and attached suggested changes to the Executive Order that the Chair sent to Senators on March 10. Copies of this letter were also available at the door. The proposed Class C resolution distributed at the door now would give Senators a chance to refute Lovell's conjecture that the Faculty Senate would not object strongly to a temporary suspension of the 2% rule.

In response to a question concerning departmental policies regarding recruitment and retention, Chair Lovell stated that the Secretary of the Faculty would soon be taking steps to begin compiling those files in anticipation of their importance in the coming months.

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

Given the length of the agenda, the President noted that he would limit his remarks to observations on the budget process, anticipating that those remarks would be supplemented by reports from the Faculty Legislative Representative and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

The situation in Olympia remains ambiguous. A week from today the final revenue estimate will be posted – which will ultimately be used in the equation to balance the state budget. Once that happens, the work in the House and Senate will begin in earnest. The Senate will release its budget first and those who work with legislative staff anticipate that there will be cuts to almost every agency, and that those cuts will be deeper than the Governor's proposed budget. There may be federal stimulus money coming to the UW, but that money is seen as a mixed blessing. The stimulus money would be good for 24-36 months, but it won't be renewed. Agencies cannot balance their budgets with temporary funds and would be better off if stimulus money went to other agencies, leaving more state dollars for their own agencies. Tuition increases are still under consideration. One advantage of the federal package is that it increases Pell Grant pay-out by more than \$1,000, and is also now available for summer school for the first time. It also includes a tax code provision for tuition, giving families earning under \$160,000 year a \$2,500 tax credit.

It's difficult to anticipate what the House will propose as they generally act in response to the Senate action. Minority and majority leaders are indicating that they wouldn't support tuition increases, however. This inclination is based on incorrect information that UW legislative staff are working to correct. The Senate budget is due on March 26, with the House coming out shortly thereafter. If all goes according to plan, the final budget should be in place by mid-April.

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 reiterated that the budget for the next biennium is still largely unknown, although it is currently assumed that it doesn't look good. It's not known how severe the cuts will be. Cuts have been modeled at eight, ten, and 12%. An educated guess now is that 12% may not be enough. A tuition increase would help mitigate this figure although the amount of such an increase is still being debated. It's not known if an attempt will be made to increase state revenues, nor what local resources or central funds of the UW may be available.

He reported that the process that is being used to determine budget cuts depends heavily on input from each academic and administrative unit. There are forty such units. The Provost has requested of each Dean, Director and Chancellor a plan for addressing budget cuts within each unit based on a set of principles and priorities. It is important that, for the academic units, the College Councils play an active role in this process. The Senate leadership is monitoring the activities of these Councils. The next step in the process is a series of individual meetings of the Provost with each Dean, Director and Chancellor to discuss how budget cuts will be made in each unit. A few of forty such meetings have already taken place.

In order to have an objective basis for making cuts, a huge amount of information has been assembled by Paul Jenny's office—the Office of Planning and Budgeting. There are now three sets of documents with detailed data on the financial status and the proposed budget cut scenarios for both academic and administrative units.

The three sets of documents are:

- 1) Executive Summaries of Proposed Budget Reductions. These are one to two page summaries in a standard format of cuts modeled at eight, ten, and 12% that facilitate comparisons among the units.
- 2) Budget Reduction Narratives. These are documents of a half dozen or so pages for each unit that provides context to the proposed cuts and how the units will be impacted.
- 3) Unit Resource Profiles. These are detailed analyses of the resources of the individual units, including information about instructional metrics, grant and contract expenditures, endowment resources, operating resources and expenditures, faculty and staff resources, and space resources.

All these documents have been posted on the web. They are available both on the home pages of the Office of Planning and Budgeting and of the Faculty Senate. On the Faculty Senate's homepage,

click on "Issues under Consideration" to find the three documents under the heading "Budget Reduction Documents."

Luchtel then stated that he would be remiss in his responsibilities as Chair of SCPB to leave Senators with the impression that all is going smoothly with the inner workings of the SCPB and its interactions with the administration. This was pointed out to him in an e-mail he received recently from a member of the SCPB. To quote, "we have struggled to find a way to effectively process the vast amounts of data we are given and turn our discussions of that data into useful advice to the Provost." Luchtel said that he agreed that SCPB is still learning how to establish a productive advisory relationship with the Provost, replacing a previous more-or-less reactionary-response mode. The SCPB expects that the Provost will, as she proceeds through her series of meetings with the individual units, keep the SCPB up to date with summaries of these meetings, particularly as to any general themes or problems that may emerge. For its own part, the SCPB intends to be knowledgeable about the issues, while avoiding a micro-management stance, so that the Committee can provide her with candid advice when hard and painful decisions have to be made.

The one thing faculty and administration need to keep uppermost in mind during this financial crisis is that we are engaged in a struggle to preserve this institution as a world-class institution. The University community needs to work together to accomplish that.

The Provost joined the conversation reporting that SCPB meeting with her staff had been very rich and informing. These are uncharted territories. The UW has not faced this kind of challenge in thirty years, if ever. During the course of her meetings with deans, chairs and chancellors, she will be developing plans and reporting on the progress of each at the SCPB. If, as she learns more about how best to make this process work, she determines that she needs to return for follow-up meetings with the first few that were scheduled, she will. Then, in consultation with SCPB her office will create draft summaries of the larger reports, including reasons why different cuts are made in different types of units. She stated again that she felt that conversations within SCPB are rich and two-way.

The President added that having worked on University budgets for twenty-five years, Paul Jenny has been doing more than anyone else he has known in a comparable role, to make this complex and difficult information as transparent and easy to decipher as is possible.

5. Legislative Report – Professor James "JW" Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington encouraged Senators to refer to his blog (<http://legrep.blogspot.com>), and to refer their constituents to the blog as well.

With regard to the budget, he suggested there are three moving parts:

- General fund
- Tuition
- Stimulus Package

The first is in much worse shape than when the Governor proposed 13% cuts in the state portion of the university budget. The second is complicated by the political unattractiveness of tuition increases, the limits of the Guaranteed Educational Tuition program as it is currently designed, and the state's practice of increasing budget allocations to the State Need Grant program to keep pace with resident undergraduate tuition increases.

With regard to legislation:

1. House Bill 1841 passed the House with the support of Rep. Scott White (prime sponsor) and Speaker Frank Chopp. This bill would establish a faculty member on governing boards of institutions of higher education. It now goes to the Senate.
2. Senate Bill 5460 is law; freezing hiring and travel for the rest of the current fiscal year, and freezing salaries until March 2010. The University is suggesting legislation (or budget language) to allow more flexibility.
3. Senate Bill 5734 passed the Senate. This bill would enable institutions of higher education to set all but resident undergraduate tuition.

He noted that although today is the deadline for a bill to pass through its house of origin, there are still many hurdles for legislation to overcome before becoming law.

In response to a question about the State's salary freeze and how that relates to Executive Order 64 and the 2% provision, Harrington suggested that State law would supersede an Executive Order or the Faculty Code – but noted that he's a legislative advocate, not a lawyer. As the University's attempts to get some more budget flexibility than SB 5460 allows, the University is concerned that current internal rules would mandate that flexibility be used first for a general faculty salary increase.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of February 23, 2009. The SEC reviewed Council Issues **{Exhibit A}**; confirmed the President's appointment of Susan Neff as Ombudsman; and confirmed the Faculty Senate Chair's appointment of a Review Committee to serve on the College of Forest Resources RCEP: John Schaufelberger, Committee Chair, Kurt Johnson, Lillian McDermott, Robert Plotnick, William Talbott, Theresa Barker, GPSS.

Chair Lovell directed Senators' attention to actions taken at the last Executive Committee meeting and encouraged them to take note.

7. Announcements.

There were no announcements

8. Requests for Information.

In response to a question about the status of the INSER (Institute for National Security Education and Research) request for information of some months ago, Chair Lovell responded with thanks to the Senator for keeping this issue alive in the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Council on Research had responded to those portions of the request that were within its purview at the December 2008 Faculty Senate meeting, but other portions are still being considered by other administrative units. Chair Lovell stated that he hoped to be able to report soon about the outcome of those deliberations.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

Action: Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit B}**

There were no additional nominations, and the slate of nominees was approved as attached as Exhibit B.

10. Resolution of Appreciation for Retired Faculty Members.

The next agenda item was a resolution of appreciation for retired faculty members. Last December, Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien and Pat Dougherty, Director of the UW Retirement Center, began discussing the ways the University recognizes and honors faculty who have retired. That initial discussion has led to the institution of a Faculty Senate resolution that lists faculty who have recently retired. The resolution will be presented three times a year – at the final Senate meetings of fall, winter and spring quarters. Today initiates what will become a long-standing Senate tradition that honors the work and commitment to this University of our colleagues who have retired.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick presented the following motion:

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the gratitude and appreciation of the entire faculty for the following esteemed colleagues who retired during the Fall Quarter of 2008:

Nancy Amidei, Social Work
 Hilda Blanco, Urban Design & Planning
 James Callis, Chemistry
 Elinor Graham, Pediatrics
 Mark L. Holmes, Oceanography
 William N. Howald, Medicinal Chemistry
 Anthony H. Ishisaka, Social Work
 George James Kenagy, Biology
 Carole A. Kubota, UW Bothell Education

Keith B. Leffler, Economics
Joel E. Lichtenstein, Health Sciences Radiology
Betty L Lucas, Family and Child Nursing
Marshall Palmer, UW Educational Outreach
John C. Saari, Ophthalmology
James C. Steiner, Dentistry
Gary L Sundem, Accounting
Deborah Ward, Psychosocial and Community Health
Judith Zeh, Statistics

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the senate chair and the secretary of the faculty be directed to communicate the University of Washington's appreciation and gratitude to these colleagues for their significant contributions to their fields, to the University, to the state of Washington, and well beyond the Pacific Northwest.

The resolution was approved unanimously.

11. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick presented the following motion:

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

Clinical Associate Professor Emeritus David Anderson of Orthopedics and Sports Medicine who died February 12, 2009 after having served the University since 1958.

Clinical Professor Rick Carlson of Health Services and Pharmacy who died February 9, 2009 after having served the University since 2004.

Professor John Coombs of Medicine who died January 19, 2009 after having served the University since 1972.

Teaching Associate Violet Hilbert of American Indian Studies who died December 4, 2008 after having served the University since 1972.

Professor Emeritus Benjamin Moffett of Orthodontics who died October 1, 2008 after having served the University since 1964.

Lecturer Frances Nostrand of Romance Languages and Literature who died January 17, 2009 after having served the University since 1962.

Professor Emeritus Charles Paulsen of Medicine who died December 18, 2008 after having served the University since 1958.

Clinical Instructor Alfred Sheridan of Surgery who died September 28, 2008 after having served the University since 1948.

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 motion was approved by a standing vote of the Faculty Senate.

12. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

13. New Business.

- a. Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **{Exhibit C}**
Jan Sjävik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) – Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41.

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

Chair Lovell noted that there were three items of New Business. The first was Class A Legislation proposing changes to the policy on Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) attached as Exhibit C.

Class A legislation changes the *Faculty Code*, which is found in Volume Two of the *University Handbook*.

Lovell reminded Senators that the Faculty Senate considers Class A legislation twice. Legislation may be amended only during this first consideration. At the second consideration the Senate is limited to an "up or down" vote on legislation -- which may have been amended by the Senate Executive Committee between Senate considerations in response to requests made by either the President and/or the Advisory Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations. Before making amendments, he cautioned Senators to remember that all legislation comes before the Senate after considerable thought and review by your colleagues on Faculty Councils and Committees.

Vice Chair Bruce Balick then moved, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, that the Faculty Senate submit to the faculty for vote Class A legislation amending the *University Handbook*, Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 26, Section 26-41 attached as Exhibit C to the agenda.

Jan Sjøvik, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA), then recited a brief history of the legislation. He noted that FCFA had been working diligently on the legislation for about a year, having been asked to re-consider the procedures because of problems that had come up during its use on actual cases. The Council shared its preliminary draft with various stake-holders which led them to limit their proposal to correcting specific problems that had come up rather than anticipating possible future problems. He referred Senators to the rationale – and noted that as a result of an amendment made by the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting of February 23, the proposed procedures take roughly the same time as the procedures found in the original document. He concluded his comments by reiterating

In response to a question about specific problems and how this proposal addressed them, Sjøvik stated that the proposal addresses a requirement of confidentiality in current procedures that is no longer possible to offer, given public information access. In so doing, the proposal also provides for a more transparent process. It also allow the Secretary of the Faculty to extend deadlines upon receipt of a written request. This will allow needed flexibility rather than having to re-start a procedure that had missed an internal deadline. Finally, the Council attempted to organize the document in order to make it cleaner and more user-friendly.

The legislation was approved as attached to the agenda.

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

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

Title: Proposed changes to the Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings

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

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Vice Chair Bruce Balick moved that the Faculty Senate submit to the faculty for vote Class A legislation amending the *University Handbook*, Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 27, Section 27-41 attached as Exhibit D to the agenda.

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, explained that given the alternatives, conciliation is a cost effective way to deal with differences between faculty and administration. It is much less costly in terms of time and expense than adjudication. These procedures have been included in the Code for several years, but a former Ombudsman chose not to fully utilize the procedures. Since the

retirement of the previous Ombudsman, the procedures have been used more and more frequently, and the current Board (which includes a mandated maximum of six members) is becoming over-taxed. The proposal would change the procedures to provide for “not fewer than six” – instead of a maximum of six - Conciliation Officers.

Ensuing discussion included support for the lifting of a restriction on the number of Conciliation Officers, support for the increasing use of these procedures in general, and the provision for Presidential appointment of the Conciliation Officers.

Following a discussion of appointment procedures, a Senator offered a friendly amendment to the motion that would change Section 27-41.A.3: “Conciliation officers shall be selected by the President from a list of names ~~equal to twice~~ exceeding the number of positions to be filled...”

The motion was seconded, and there was no further discussion on the amendment. The Senate then approved the amendment to the main motion.

The question was then called on the main motion, and the Senate approved the main motion as well.

c. Discussion Item: Draft of a New Executive Order on Salary Policy. {Exhibit E}

After explaining executive orders and how they relate to the Faculty Code, Chair Lovell asked Senators to turn their attention to the Class C resolution distributed at the door. The Class C resolution has nothing to do with the President’s process of issuing an Executive Order. Rather it is an opportunity for the Faculty Senate to endorse or reject the conjecture he made to Regents that faculty would willingly suspend their 2% raises this year.

The President concurred with the context Lovell had provided for the issue under discussion. He emphasized his commitment to navigating his way through short-term economic problems while keeping his eyes on long-term goals for the future of the University. Salaries are of paramount interest to him; they are of singular importance. In his first five years at the UW, faculty salaries has been among his highest priorities, and until this year, significant progress had been made. We still don’t know the extent of reductions the UW will have to accommodate. Today’s discussion centers on a policy embedded within an Executive Order and the Faculty Code. Everyone has agreed that we need to find a mutually agreeable solution to this problem to get us through the next couple of years and to stay committed to the value of faculty compensation. The other goal is to find a way to have this be a thoughtful, vigorous discussion that is respectful of shared governance and the moral integrity of the individuals involved in the discussion.

Complicating issues include possible legal ramifications of whatever we do or don’t do at this juncture. The President does not want to spend dwindling resources on attorney fees, especially at a time when funds are so badly needed for the operation of the University. Although ultimately the President has the authority to issue an Executive Order without the approval of any of his constituencies, he stressed that he needed to hear the thoughts of the Senators, as representatives of the faculty at large, in order to help guide him toward the end he needs to reach.

Issues raised by Senators included the question of whether state law “trumps” an Executive Order. If so, and if all state salaries have been denied, does the University need to take any action at all to suspend an internal salary policy. The President responded that that may be so, but failing to adhere to the Executive Order (without enacting a suspension) could still be challenged in a lengthy and costly court proceeding.

The question of whether the salary policy could be postponed rather than suspended was raised, and the President acknowledged that option had been considered and rejected as prohibitively expensive.

When asked why this proposal is for two years, instead of one, the President explained why the change back to the standard 2% rule could more readily be made after a year than re-instating the suspension after one year, if it is still needed.

Paul Hopkins, chair of the Department of Chemistry, thanked the President for his willingness to engage in this discussion and for seeking faculty advice. He concurred that there are good reasons for faculty to forgo salaries this year and next. But it is crucial to have funds for retention available, and there's some confusion surrounding how this work. The Code specifically implies that if there are no 2% raises given, then there will be no funding for retention. The current proposed Executive Order suspending the 2% raise does not address this. The President replied that this is the really significant issue on the table. His understanding is that this policy, embedded within an Executive Order and the Faculty Code, has legal standing, and that to change the provision concerning funding for retention, in the event that no 2% raises are given, the Code must be changed as well.

Senator Gerry Philipsen added that there is no ambiguity in the Code, which clearly states that funding must be provided for all meritorious faculty (2% rule) before money can be spent on recruitment and retention.

Hopkins further surmised that since this is a global economic situation, peers will not be moving nearly as frequently and easily from institution to institution, and perhaps there won't be too much need for retention funding, although it will still be important to have some resources on hand for counter-offers.

In response to another question, the President responded that if the 2% rule is suspended, and if a given unit decides to meet its mandated cut in such a way that funding is still available to give the 2% raise to its own faculty, the negative ramifications across the campus would be significant.

When asked why faculty are being asked to provide advice now related to a budget that will become certain in just a few more weeks, the President responded that the question is complicated by the recent interpretation by the court that these documents currently under consideration can be seen as contractual and legally binding. The process to amend these documents in anticipation of a greatly reduced budget will need to proceed quickly in order to be able to defend the University from the law suits that will undoubtedly arise.

Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, then moved adoption of the Class C resolution that had been distributed at the door **{Exhibit F}**. He explained that although his name is shown on the resolution, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs had not had a chance to fully vet this resolution. They have seen the resolution, but have not met since it had been distributed. Nevertheless he felt confident that the draft would give structure and focus to the conversation and hoped that the Senate would, by approving this resolution, indicate their support of Senate leadership in working with the administration. The motion was seconded.

Senator Christoph Giebel then moved to amend the resolution that would keep the first four "whereas's" and exchange the language of the remainder of the resolution as shown in **{Exhibit G}**. The motion to amend was seconded.

Senator Gerry Philipsen remarked that these are difficult choices and he questioned why there was a need for a Class C resolution at all. The President's willingness to seek the advice of the Senate is unprecedented. He is required to consult only with the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty. He sees no disadvantage if the Senate declines to act on either of these resolutions. The Senate has expressed their concerns, and the President will promulgate an Executive Order that best reflects his sense of what is right for the University.

After further consideration, a motion was made to postpone consideration of the amended resolution until the next Faculty Senate meeting (April 23, 2009). Another Senator called the question. A vote on whether to call the question was passed. A vote on postponement was also passed.

14. Adjournment. Motion seconded and adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

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

Faculty Council Issues
For Distribution: February 23, 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 proposed revised foreign language graduation requirements for College of Arts and Sciences.
 - d. Review of proposed curriculum for a Bachelor of Paramedicine degree to be offered by the School of Medicine.
 - e. Review of departmental grade-based graduation requirements.
 - f. Review of Handbook language relative to graduation and application for degree process.
2. Benefits and Retirement
 - a. Conversion of opt-in system for UWRP contributions to an automatic-enrollment (opt-out) system (i) upon initial employment and (ii) for the increase in contributions from 7.5% to 10% at age 50. The University has decided to convert to automatic enrollment at 10% for those turning 50 (requires SCPB follow-up.). The council feels that one can still opt-out, but would be a bad idea financially as one would give up the University match on the incremental 2.5% contribution. The group was also told that the auto-enrollment at initial employment was meritorious but too expensive to implement at this point.
 - b. Continue to advocate the council's proposal that dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians receive a discount in the base undergraduate UW tuition.
 - c. Review a communication plan for the supplemental benefit.
 - d. Review retirement fund options, possibly meet with fund reps, and review the committee charged with evaluating such funds.
 - e. Explore ways to better understand communicate the "total compensation" faculty receive, that is, the value of their salary plus benefits.
 - f. Look into an easier way for faculty to distribute their salary and benefits contributions over 12 months.
3. Educational Outreach
 - a. FCEO Charge: A challenge the Council faces this year is deciding where to focus its attention. The challenge results in part from the fact that there may be overlapping issues among Councils. Council chairs will meet this fall to discuss potentially common issues. It may be that the Faculty Senate leadership will wish to consider whether the Council's charge is still appropriate.
 - b. Identification of University-wide "outreach programs" through development of a database of all fee-based, state-funded, degree/non-degree, and certificate programs with a goal of developing the means to support distance learning.
 - c. Departmental level support for faculty using instructional technology. This would be different from the proposed support for faculty who teach distance learning courses through UWEO.
 - d. Concern about what happens to the work of each year. For example, there is no indication of what happened to the request from last year's work, summarized in the Annual Report, and submitted to the Chairs (current and incoming) of the Faculty Senate as well as the Provost.
4. Educational Technology
 - a. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology requests a stable source of financial support for contemporary teaching technology to be made available for the 'Technology Consortium'* to innovate teaching capabilities to meet and satisfy student's and faculty's expectations and learning experience as well as sustain the University of Washington's position as a center of teaching excellence. * The Teaching Consortium consists of: Classroom Support Services; Health Sciences Classroom Services; University Libraries; Catalyst.

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

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

12. University Libraries

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

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

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

2008-2009 Representative Faculty Council Nominations

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

Graduate and Professional School Senate

<u>Council</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Benefits and Retirement -----	Caroline Pew
Educational Technology -----	Shannan Marsh
Faculty Affairs -----	Theresa Barker
Research -----	Michael Vannatta
Student Affairs-----	Brad Osborn
Tri-Campus Policy-----	Julia Petersen
University Relations-----	Arendt Speser

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, and have also lengthened the maximum duration of the process by approximately 50 percent. Furthermore, the proposal allows the Secretary of the Faculty to extend certain deadlines, when necessary.

As it presently stands, Chapter 26-41 is a very complex document. While much of this complexity is no doubt required by the nature of the type of process described therein, the FCFA has also attempted to make the proposed version of Chapter 26-41 more accessible by including a preamble and by simplifying some of its language.

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

PREAMBLE:

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

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:

- the termination of an undergraduate or graduate program as defined in Section A above;
- the removal of tenured faculty, or of untenured faculty before completion of their contract;
- a significant change in the terms, conditions or course of employment of faculty;
- a significant change in the overall curriculum of a college, or school, or campus, or of the University as a whole; or
- 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:

- 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.
- 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 Limited Reorganization and Consolidation of 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 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 ~~College or 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.~~d~~ 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.~~e~~ 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~~ instructional 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 the Faculty Senate
March 12, 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 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.

Version of Chapter 27 adopted by the FCFA to increase Board size to 24.

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.
 6. 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 the Senate Executive Committee
February 23, 2009*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate
March 12, 2009*

March 10, 2009

Dear Senators:

In a previous message, I described the work of a committee to re-evaluate Executive Order #64, which requires that all meritorious faculty receive an annual 2% pay increase. Attached to this message are two drafts of a new Executive Order. The first was issued by the President on February 18th for review and comment. The second is a revised draft, suggested by the joint committee to re-evaluate EO #64, after the first draft was reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee in its February 23rd meeting.

Review of the new Executive Order is scheduled for the Senate meeting this Thursday. We expect the Senate will also be asked to vote on a Class C Resolution stating some principles and expressing support for a temporary suspension of policies requiring a general merit pay increase. Discussion so far has revealed principled differences among members of the faculty on the wisdom of suspending EO #64 as well as on what stance the Senate should take. It is more important than ever that you discuss these issues with your colleagues so you can effectively represent the values and interests of faculty. Let me express three hopes.

First, please think through the issues, taking advantage of available sources of information. These are the rough dimensions of the problem we face:

- The Governor's proposed budget calls for a cut of \$60 million annually in our core educational budget;
- Recent budget projections have led to proposals to cut our budget by half again as much;
- Because approximately 75% of our core educational budget consists of personnel, we may lose between 400 and 800 instructional and administrative staff;
- Schools and colleges are being asked to model cuts ranging from 8 % to 12%, with the higher range sounding more realistic based on recent estimates. Administrative units are being asked to model higher percentage cuts.
- The cost of a 2% general merit increase is roughly \$6 million.

Putting these numbers together may help faculty judge the merits of the proposals before us. More detailed sources of information include the website maintained by the Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, presenting summaries of the proposed cuts and their rationale at each school and college, at <http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/uw-bgt-process.htm>; the blogs of the Senate chair and especially the faculty's legislative representative, on the Senate website <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/>; and the website of the Office of State Relations, providing updates on discussions in Olympia, at <http://depts.washington.edu/staterel/wordpress/>.

Second, please bear in mind that we have a right and responsibility to participate in discussions of budget priorities in our departments and schools as well as at the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. As you may infer from the above estimates, decisions about priorities at the level of schools and colleges are far more consequential in financial and program terms than the general pay increase; it is the status of shared governance that makes the pay increase discussion especially significant.

Finally, please think about these matters in broader terms than the relationship between the faculty and the administration. I have views that differ from those of administrators on some questions, and many of us have differences among ourselves; but other key participants in this conversation include the legislature, the Board of Regents, the citizenry, and our own colleagues and staff who are vulnerable to losing their jobs. For these reasons, we have a duty to proceed wisely and fairly within the constraints of the faculty code and state law.

Thank you.

David Lovell, PhD
Chair, Faculty Senate
Research Associate Professor, Psychosocial & Community Health



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 18, 2009

Professor David Lovell
Chair, Faculty Senate

Professor Marcia G. Killen
Secretary of the Faculty

Dear David and Marcia:

Enclosed is a draft of a new Executive Order which will partially suspend Executive Order No. 64, "Faculty Salary Policy," contained in the *University Handbook*, Volume 2, Part 2, Chapter 24, Section 24-57. This draft Executive Order is the result of the work done by an Administration/Faculty committee charged jointly by the President and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Please forward any suggestions and comments you may have by March 13, 2009, before this executive order is issued. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carol S. Nicolls".

Carol S. Nicolls
Special Counsel to the President

Enclosure

cc: Board of Deans and Chancellors
Dr. Bruce Batick
Dr. Cheryl A. Cameron
Ms. Rebecca Goodwin Dardorff
Dr. Mark A. Emmert
Mr. Paul E. Jenny
Mr. Jack G. Johnson
Dr. Gerry F. Philipsen
Ms. Lea B. Vaughn
Mr. Douglas J. Wadden
Dr. Phyllis M. Wise

DRAFT EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. ____
(Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64)

Purpose. The purpose of this Executive Order is to address the immediate financial circumstances facing the University by temporarily controlling faculty salary levels while reaffirming the University's commitment to ensuring the quality of the University through a competitively compensated faculty dedicated to academic excellence.

Need for Temporary Reevaluation of Faculty Salary Policy. Executive Order No. 64 recognized that in the event of decreased State support, the Faculty Salary Policy would need to be reevaluated. Unfortunately, we face that contingency to a degree that could not have been predicted even a year ago. The nation and the State of Washington are experiencing the effects of a global financial crisis of historic proportions. One consequence of this financial crisis is a drastic reduction in the State budget, which is virtually certain to result in significant reductions in State support for the University. The expected reductions in State support, combined with other economic forces, will result in cuts to programs, increased tuition and reduced access for students, lay-offs and non-renewal of personnel, as well as limitations on the University's ability to increase salaries for broad classes of its employees. The cost of maintaining regular merit increases for the 2009-11 biennium would be even more damaging in the midst of broad and dramatic budget cuts across the institution.

Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64. In light of the economic circumstances facing the University, the portions of Executive Order No. 64 which provide for a regular 2% merit salary increase for all faculty members deemed meritorious must be and are immediately suspended.

This suspension shall expire at the conclusion of the 2009-11 biennium.

Reaffirmation of Principles and Commitment. Although the suspension of merit salary increases is a temporary imperative, it remains equally evident that the hiring, retention, and competitive compensation of talented faculty is of critical importance to the long-term success of the University. The principles and priorities set out in Executive Order No. 64 are reaffirmed because they are as sound today as they were when that order was issued nine years ago. While the Administration and Faculty should continue to collaborate to refine the details of the Faculty Salary Policy to best achieve both, predictability for individual faculty members and flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, University leadership remains steadfastly committed to its fundamental elements.

Executive Order No. ____ of the President, March ____, 2009

February 18, 2009

DRAFT EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. _____

(Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64)

Purpose. The purpose of this Executive Order is to address the immediate financial circumstances facing the University by temporarily controlling faculty salary levels while reaffirming the University's commitment to ensuring the quality of the University through a competitively compensated faculty dedicated to academic excellence.

Need for Temporary Reevaluation of Faculty Salary Policy. Executive Order No. 64 recognized that in the event of decreased State support, the Faculty Salary Policy would need to be reevaluated. Unfortunately, we face that contingency to a degree that could not have been predicted even a year ago. The nation and the State of Washington are experiencing the effects of a global financial crisis of historic proportions. One consequence of this financial crisis is a drastic reduction in the State budget, which is virtually certain to result in significant reductions in State support for the University. The expected reductions in State support, combined with other economic forces, will result in cuts to programs, increased tuition and reduced access for students, lay-offs and non-renewal of personnel, as well as limitations on the University's ability to increase salaries for broad classes of its employees. The cost of maintaining regular merit increases for the 2009-11 biennium would be even more damaging in the midst of broad and dramatic budget cuts across the institution.

Partial Suspension of Executive Order No. 64. In light of the economic circumstances facing the University, the portions of Executive Order No. 64 which provide for a regular 2% merit salary increase for all faculty members deemed meritorious must be and are immediately suspended.

This suspension shall expire at the conclusion of the 2009-11 biennium.

Reaffirmation of Principles and Commitment. Although the suspension of merit salary increases is a temporary imperative, it remains equally evident that ~~the regular merit increases, promotions,~~ hiring, retention, and competitive compensation of ~~talented~~ faculty ~~is of are~~ critical ~~importance~~ to the long-term success of the University. During the 2009-11 biennium, the Provost will provide the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting quarterly reports to review the status of faculty recruitment and retention across the institution. University leadership remains steadfastly committed to the fundamental elements of Executive Order 64, and its principles and priorities are reaffirmed. ~~The principles and priorities set out in Executive Order No. 64 are reaffirmed because they are as sound today as they were when that order was issued nine years ago. While the Administration and Faculty should continue to collaborate to refine the details of the Faculty Salary Policy to best achieve both, predictability for individual faculty members and flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, University leadership remains steadfastly committed to its fundamental elements.~~

Executive Order No. ____ of the President, March ____, 2009

March 5 February 18, 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*