

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, April 24, 2008
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The agenda was approved as amended by a change in the order of items discussed (item twelve, New Business, was moved to a position following agenda item seven). The Chair reminded Senators to identify themselves by name and departmental affiliation when speaking.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate.

“As I’ve mentioned before, I came into this job with an agenda. During our last meeting, I updated you on some progress on meeting my stated goals. On the other hand, a characteristic of this job is that unexpected things keep coming up. I already discussed one such issue a couple of months ago with the flare-up when the Seattle Times published a series of articles about the UW football program. I would like to mention two other, hopefully more edifying, unexpected issues.

“Earlier this week, the UW had an accreditation site visit by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, one of six regional agencies that accredit approximately 3,000 colleges and universities in the United States. These higher education commissions are private, nonprofit organizations. Beginning in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, regional accreditation has been a voluntary enterprise, but its “gatekeeper” function has made regional accreditation a major force in American higher education.

“Before serving as Senate Chair, I have to admit that I had little knowledge of or interest in the institutional accrediting process. This is a view I probably share with most of my colleagues. But it is a mistaken view since faculty should play an important role in the accreditation process.

“I was pleased that the Senate leadership was able play a role as I along with David Lowell and Gail Stygall participated in the site visit. I thought it was a very positive experience. The site visitors were inquisitive and engaging to talk with. A full-scale accreditation process occurs every 10 years but this visit was an interim 5-year review to address six recommendations that arose from the last 10-year review in 2003. The six recommendations asked the university to address six problem areas. They were: 1) inconsistencies in perceptions of future relationships among the 3 UW campuses; 2) academic assessment and setting of learning objectives for students; 3) managing scarce resources; 4) how to restore and maintain competitive salary compensation for faculty, 5) addressing information technology security; and 6) efforts to increase the number of faculty and students from underrepresented groups.

“My main reason for telling you about this is to highly recommend that you download and read the document prepared for this site visit. It is called the *2008 Interim Accreditation Report*. This self-study document is a gold mine of information about the university. It is available as a downloadable pdf file on the Faculty Senate Web Page; go to the Faculty Senate web page, then click on Offsite Resources, and then on Decennial Review. Again, click on Offsite Resources, and then on Decennial Review.

“Of particular interest were the actions taken to address the six recommendations and further informational documents about the faculty. For example, there is a section on faculty that lists significant changes in policies and benefits affecting faculty and a table that lists the institutional faculty profile for 2007. This table shows the number of appointments in the various ranks along with salary ranges and years of experience. There is also an appendix with the heading, the *2007 Faculty Fact Sheet*, which gives descriptive statistics about the UW faculty.

“A second unexpected but very enlightening experience has been to serve on what is known as the President’s Advisory Committee on Enterprise Risk Management. V’Ella Warren, who is the Senior Vice President for Finance and Facilities, chairs this committee and she runs a very tight ship. She indeed has her finger on the pulse of the university and worries about the disasters that might befall it. For some of the documents of this effort, go to her home page or search on “Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)”.

“The focus of Enterprise Risk Management is to identify and prioritize risks throughout the institution. Their number and variety is stunning and include compliance risks, such as correctly filling out Faculty Effort Certification forms; financial risks, such as investment of endowment funds in foreign markets; and strategic risks, such as recruitment and retention of top faculty, key staff, and graduate students.

“What makes the meetings of this committee so interesting, besides watching V’Ella in action, are some stunning factoids that are produced on occasion. For example, the expensive housing market in Seattle is increasingly a problem for the university, particularly when it comes to recruitment of faculty and staff. The factoid is that 42% of our faculty and staff face a commute of more than 45 minutes. Our circumstance is that fewer and fewer of our faculty and staff can afford to live in the city where the university is located.

“So now let me introduce the person who has the answers for your questions and concerns! By the way, I understand that the university passed the accreditation review with flying colors.”

3. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – Provost Phyllis Wise for President Mark Emmert.

Chair Dan Luchtel introduced Provost Phyllis Wise, explaining that due to a family emergency, the President was unable to attend today’s meeting. Provost Wise told Senators she had two updates – one on the recent accreditation process and the other on the dean searches.

The recent “interim” accreditation review addressed issues that had been raised at the last major review. It was headed up by then Executive Vice Provost Ana Mari Cauce and Professor James Antony. The UW came through with two commendations, one dealing with tri-campus issues that had been raised and the other dealing with the use and management of resources. There were no further recommendations by the Committee and the next review will be the ten-year review, scheduled for 2013.

The President had reported at the last meeting that their recent choice for Law School Dean had declined the offer. Law school faculty and students have opted to reopen the search immediately rather than wait two or three years. They will soon be appointing a new interim Law School dean and a new search committee for the permanent position. She also reported that Thomas Baillie had been selected as dean of the School of Pharmacy. He will begin in October and will bring a unique combination of experience in the academy and in business.

In addition, she reminded Senators about the grand opening of the UW Tower on Friday. A number of offices have already made the move, and many more will be doing so soon. This weekend is also “Washington Weekend.” The University will be welcoming visiting prospective students, their parents and community members to the campus.

Finally, the Provost introduced Doug Wadden, former chair of the Faculty Senate, who has begun his new appointment as Executive Vice Provost.

4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Gail Stygall, Committee Chair.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) has been concentrating on a number of issues related to Educational Outreach (EO) during its past two meetings. The Committee is primarily looking at total revenues and expenditures generated by the University’s Educational

Outreach programs. Revenues have been rising, and expenditures have also been rising at the same pace. The enrollment is 60,000, with 25% of those students in credit bearing classes. Some of the issues under SCPB Consideration are:

- Summer quarter profits go back to various University operating funds (which is unique among EO programs).
- Enrollments in 600, 700 and 800 level thesis classes.
- The amount charged to matriculated students for “extra” classes offered as an alternative to “bottleneck” classes that constitute graduation requirements.

The SCPB will continue to monitor FY 09 and 09-11 biennial budgets. No dramatic changes are expected in the 09 budget, given the legislature’s response to this year’s supplemental budget proposal. The Committee remains hopeful, however, that faculty may be able to influence the 09-11 biennial budget, and Stygall encouraged Senators to contact their college councils to develop proposal to submit to SCPB for inclusion in Committee discussions with the Provost.

Finally, she mentioned that SCPB is authorized to review parts of self-sustaining programs that effect faculty. Parking rates are going up again, and if Senators are interested in having the SCPB weigh in on this they should contact Stygall.

5. Legislative Report – Professor James “J.W.” Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

JW Harrington reviewed some of the gubernatorial vetoes of policy measures and supplemental budget items that related to the University. He noted that the summer and fall will be dominated by legislative and gubernatorial elections. Attention will then turn to the 2009-11 biennial budget. State revenue forecasts are not favorable, so the University will focus its legislative efforts on the core budget and policy support for performance measures we will agree to meet. Another focus will be continuation of the Regents' authority to set tuition except for resident undergraduates -- the current authority expires after Autumn 2008. Harrington closed by encouraging faculty members to get involved in state-level elections and to let elected officials and hopefuls know of the interest of the faculty here at the UW -- always remembering to use non-State time, equipment, and resources to do so.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of April 7, 2008.

Chair Luchtel explained that the following actions had been taken by the Executive Committee during its meeting of April 7: a. Minutes of the February 25, 2008 SEC meeting and March 13, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved; b. The Secretary of the Faculty presented an update on the proposal to restructure the composition of the Faculty Senate; c. Spring report presented by the Faculty Athletic Representative; d. Briefing from the Search Advisory Committee on the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics; e. Update on the issue of seatbelts in UW shuttle vehicles; f. reports from Faculty Councils included Student Affairs, University Facilities and Services, Academic Standards, and University Libraries.

7. Announcements. There were none.

8. New Business.

Class C Resolution. {Exhibit D}

Title: Resolution Concerning UW Environmental Stewardship.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

Vice Chair David Lovell presented the motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee and introduced Bruce Balick, Chair of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services, to lead discussion about the proposed Class C Resolution concerning Environmental Stewardship.

Bruce Balick displayed a Power Point presentation outlining the background of the Environmental Stewardship Advisory Committee (ESAC). He applauded the work of ESAC as well as the

administration's responsiveness to the Committee's recommendations by enacting many of them, with plans to continue implementation as funding becomes available. ESAC came into existence in July of 2004 at the initiative of then Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig. Since then many reports and recommendations have been forwarded to the Provost and Senior Vice President. The Committee includes administration, faculty (7 members) and staff. Its success is reflected in the fact that its work had been included in an article in the *New York Times* reporting on initiatives involving environmental stewardship.

A "friendly amendment" was proposed that would change the wording of the first paragraph to delete extraneous words as follows:

WHEREAS, the University of Washington ~~is the pre-eminent research university in Washington, the Evergreen State, the UW~~ and its faculty staff and students recognize that we share a responsibility to act as a positive force for the enhancement of local and global environment; and...

The amendment, and then the resolution as amended, were both approved.

9. Requests for Information.

Faculty Senate Restructure Proposal – Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty. **{Exhibit A}**

Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen reported that he had researched a number of efforts had been made in the past ten years to change the structure of the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee, and that none of these had gotten very far. Along with Senate Chair Dan Luchtel, Philipsen decided to develop a proposal that might lead to Class A legislation after a year of vetting the idea with various faculty constituencies. Having brought this up for discussion twice this year, both in the Senate and the SEC, and having brought it to a meeting of chairs of the elected college, school and campus faculty councils, Philipsen feels the version attached to the agenda is something that Senate leadership might send to FCFA later this quarter to develop a legislative proposal that would come back to the Senate for consideration during the next academic year. At each step of this process, revisions were made in response to feedback received. The version attached to the agenda is a result of this process, and Philipsen contends that it could improve governance at the UW. It makes a strong connection with those involved in the work of the college, school and campus faculty councils, and it provides for a smaller and leaner Senate and SEC. It also provides for proportional representations and integrates more understandable voting units.

One Senator began discussion by asking if Arts & Sciences could be broken into smaller units – or if the cap could be lifted for this college, (as well as the School of Medicine) to provide more reasonable representation for these larger colleges.

Senator Marcia Ciol, Rehabilitation Medicine, then suggested one Senator per department. Her department currently has three Senators, which is not necessary if one Senator can attend meetings and report back at departmental meetings.

Philipsen responded that her idea was one that had been considered. There are 129 departments, however, and that would not have contributed to the idea of a leaner Senate. Shifting the communication burden to the 17 colleges, schools and campuses (as opposed to 129 departments) was also an attractive economy.

Senator John Lee, Mathematics, seconded the proposal of one senator per department. He stressed that it is important that there be representation that is close to concerns of individual departments. He cited the case of the Senator from Military Science who, during the last Senate discussion on this topic, explained that Military Sciences has concerns that are unique in the UW and are not likely to be adequately represented by faculty from other departments. But even larger departments have concerns that are unique. He felt that the two-way communications that are accomplished in this room have been very valuable for faculty and provides a great education in how the UW works. There would be less opportunity for faculty to have this experience if there were only four representatives from Arts and Sciences.

Chair Luchtel posed a hypothetical question: How would the Law School feel about having only one Senator? There were no representatives from the Law School present at the meeting and the question remained unanswered.

Senator Kathy Gill, Communication, endorsed the idea of one Senator per department. This is more in line with the structure of the U.S. Senate. Philipsen pointed out that the current proposal is something of a blend between a Senate and a House of Representatives model.

Senator Eric Stern, Radiology, noted that he had been listening to discussions of this proposal over the past year and doesn't feel he's heard a strong argument for changing the current structure. He feels the Senate needs to reconsider taking any action to restructure the Senate. His concerns stem from the appearance of cutting health sciences and the School of Medicine out of Senate operations. He fears that what's been under discussion is cursory, and he fails to see why the current proposal will improve things.

Senate Vice Chair David Lovell noted that he had been attending Senate meetings since 2002, and that there is typically very little discussion. Under the current system it is very difficult to find people, especially from the health sciences, who are willing to serve on the Senate. He is hoping that the proposed model would result in a group that is actively engaged in informed discussion.

Senator Susan Astley, Epidemiology, replied that she had been attending Senate meetings for the past ten years. She agrees that there has been no convincing argument so far that reducing the size of the Senate will help enliven discussions. Her feeling is that the real discussion and productive work of the Senate is done in the Faculty Councils and Senate Executive Committee. Once their work is done, it is forwarded to the Senate in its final form, outside the context of developmental discussion and debate. This makes it difficult for Senators to evaluate what they are asked to approve. In addition, currently about half the number of Senators attend meetings. Why would that change if that number is reduced from 187 to 80?

Chair Luchtel responded that if he were the only Senator representing a department he would be more committed and more engaged in the work of the Senate.

Senator William Wilcock, Oceanography recalled being on the Senate at the time when the teaching assistants were working toward unionization. Senate deliberations during those months were very exciting compared to current discussions which he characterized as "boring."

Senator Kelly Tremblay, Speech and Hearing Sciences, also endorsed the idea of departmental representation. She also suggested a more thorough orientation for Senators. Only now, in her second year, has she felt confident about her contributions to the Senate.

Senator Matthew Conroy, Mathematics, reported that he had been looking at the *Faculty Code* which stipulates that consideration be given to diversity issues in the election of Senators (*Faculty Code*, Section 22-41.E.1). He hoped that any proposal for revising the Senate would include something similar to that provision.

Philipsen acknowledged the point well taken. Any new proposal should meet the spirit of that language.

Senator Christoph Giebel, International Studies, suggested that it would help to have some visual representation as to how this would work – such as a pie chart showing the distribution of Senate representation in the current model compared to what is proposed. He admitted to being startled by the idea that Arts and Sciences would have only four or five Senators. He appreciates the initiative to make the Senate less cumbersome, but he is worried about how feedback could be effectively relayed to departments.

Senator Eric Stern commented that as far as upper campus is concerned, south campus is often considered a black hole. Even if a one-senator-per-department model were adopted, that would still leave a significant number of faculty members unrepresented. For example, Radiology faculty members are currently divided among five separate sites, and hold five separate departmental faculty meetings.

This proposal needs to be fleshed out in greater detail to show how it will impact shared governance as it is currently practiced.

Senator Greg Kinney, Rehabilitation Medicine, expressed concern about the representation of junior faculty and their particular concerns. He would assume that if the number of senators was reduced, those elected would probably be more senior faculty members.

Vice Chair Lovell suggested that the emphasis on reducing the size of the Senate is distracting Senators from the primary purpose of this proposal. Increasing the cap or instituting some different form of representation are certainly aspects of the proposal that we can consider adjusting. The aspect of the proposal he finds much more important than these details is the provision for linking the work of the college, school and campus councils to the work of the Senate. He feels it is critically important to tie the Senate into local issues from the colleges, schools and campuses. In comparison to this issue, the overall size the Senate not quite so important.

Senator Kevin O' Brien, Medicine, spoke of the fundamental principle of fairness. The School of Medicine includes half the faculty. Under this proposal the School of Medicine would have less than 5% of Senate representation. South campus is systematically under-represented, so it's not surprising that those faculty don't participate. He suggested that the current draft of the proposal is going in the wrong direction. He proposed finding out and defining the disincentives to participation in the Senate. For example, meetings in the middle of the day are not going to be conducive to those involved in clinical and research activities.

Philipsen reminded Senators that when the current structure of the Senate was devised, there was less than half the current number of voting faculty. This is not due entirely by the natural growth in numbers of faculty members, but by the fact that significant numbers of south campus faculty were made voting members of the faculty through Class A legislation about ten years ago.

Chair Luchtel thanked the Senate for the lively discussion and assured members that it was not the intention of Senate leadership to disenfranchise the School of Medicine. Given today's feedback, he will consult with Philipsen and consider possible next steps for this proposal. In the meantime he encourages Senators to send any further concerns, comments or suggestions to both Philipsen and himself. In any case, he will give an update on the process at the next meeting.

10. Nominations and Appointments.

- a. Action:** Elect JW Harrington for the 2008-09 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2008 and ending July 31, 2009.

Vice Chair David Lovell presented the motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee. There were no additional nominations. Senator Eric Stern endorsed the candidacy of JW Harrington for this appointment and the motion was approved.

- b. Action:** Elect Patti Brandt for the 2008-09 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative for a term beginning August 1, 2008 and ending July 31, 2008. **{Exhibit B}**

Vice Chair David Lovell presented the motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee. There were no additional nominations. Professor Brandt spoke on behalf on her candidacy. Her statement was heartily endorsed by Faculty Legislative Representative JW Harrington and the motion was approved.

- c. Action:** Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit C}**

Vice Chair David Lovell presented the motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee. There were no additional nominations. Lovell commented that three of those being appointed would be serving as Conciliation Officers on the newly revitalized Conciliation Board. The motion was approved.

11. Memorial Resolution.

Vice Chair David Lovell presented the resolution as follows:

Be it resolved that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Associate Professor Lynn Mandel of Medical Education and Biomedical Informatics who died December 14, 2007, after having served the University since 1983.

Associate Professor Emeritus Lenora Mundt of Social Work who died March 11, 2008, after having served the University since 1956.

Be it further resolved that that Senate Chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

The Senate approved the resolution by a standing vote.

12. Unfinished Business. There was no unfinished business.

13. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate

Senate Restructure April 16, 2008

Composition of the Senate

The membership of the Senate shall consist of the following, all with vote:

- A. The President and the Provost of the University.
- B. The Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.
- C. The elected Chairs of the Faculty Assembly of the Tacoma Campus and General Faculty Organization of the Bothell Campus.
- D. The Chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils of each of the voting units on the Seattle campus
- E. The Faculty Legislative Representative and Deputy Legislative Representative.
- F. The Chairs of the Faculty Councils (Standing Committees) as enumerated in 42-31.A
- G. From each of the eighteen voting units of the faculty, from one (1) to (4) senators shall be elected by the voting faculty of the unit. Eligibility to vote, and to be elected, shall be based on the voting unit in which the faculty member holds her or his primary appointment. Apportionment of senators will be based on one senator for each 100 members of the voting faculty in a given unit, except that each unit will have at least one Senator and no unit more than four. For purposes of Senate apportionment, the voting units will consist of the sixteen schools and colleges of the Seattle campus; the Bothell campus; and the Tacoma campus.

[Note: The above composition provides

- *a smaller Senate (approximately 78 voting members)*
- *that each voting member of the faculty will be represented by at least two senators drawn from his or her primary voting unit*
- *the possibility that larger units have proportionately greater representation than smaller units*
- *that the elected membership exceeds the ex-officio membership.*
- *the elimination of the 10 faculty groups in present use]*

Composition of the Senate Executive Committee

The membership of the Senate Executive Committee shall consist of the following, all with vote, except where indicated otherwise:

- A. The President and the Provost of the University.
- B. The Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.
- C. The Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Senate.
- D. The elected Chairs of the Faculty Assembly of the Tacoma Campus and General Faculty Organization of the Bothell Campus
- E. The Faculty Legislative Representative.
- F. The Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
- G. Six elected members of the Senate, to serve a one-year term (renewable up to three years) to be elected by the Senate at its last meeting of the preceding academic year.
- H. The Secretary of the Faculty (without vote).

[Note: the SEC composition provides

- *a smaller working group of 16 members, 15 voting*
- *considerable breadth of representation, including assured representation of all three campuses and provision of representation of the Senate as a whole by category F above]*

Gerry Philipsen, April 16, 2008

Letter of Interest
Patti Brandt

Re: Deputy Legislative Representative, 2008-09

The position of deputy legislative representative has been of interest to me for several years. I thoroughly enjoy and find meaning in work that brings a collective voice to improve the well-being of others. I am enthusiastic about an opportunity to represent faculty and collaborate with the various constituencies involved such as the Senate Executive Committee, the Council of Faculty Representatives, the legislature, the governor's office, University administrators and students.

I talked with David Lovell and JW Harrington to obtain an understanding of the role and the three year sequence from deputy representative to legislative representative. Both David and JW talked enthusiastically of the position and explained the importance of being onsite in Olympia for selected days of the week during winter quarters. I learned from them that partnership building and leadership skills are involved in this role.

During the past 25 years as a UW faculty, I have been involved in leadership & team building at the School of Nursing, clinical agencies and federal policy building workgroups. At the University level, I have been a member of the Faculty Senate and the Councils of Faculty Affairs and Benefits & Retirement. I was Chair of the Council of Benefits & Retirement and am currently serving another three year term on that Council. My recent research has been focused on team building among health care members to improve the standards of care by using a motivational/collaborative approach with teens who have chronic illnesses and their parents.

When it is timely, I would find it helpful to discuss the pragmatics of this position with you. I am on sabbatical fall quarter, 2008 so it would be important to discuss how best to preserve scholarship time as well as be involved in the essential matters of the representative role during that quarter. I've attached an updated CV. Please let me know what further information would be useful.

Nominations and Appointments.

Nominate for Senate Executive Committee approval and presidential appointment consideration, Gerry Philipsen, Group 2, Communication, as Conciliation Officer, for a term ending September 15, 2009.

Nominate for Senate Executive Committee approval and Presidential appointment consideration, Ronald Moore, Group 4, Philosophy, as Conciliation Officer, for a term ending September 15, 2010.

Nominate for Senate Executive Committee approval and presidential appointment consideration, Michelle Williams, Group 7, Epidemiology, as Conciliation Officer, for a term ending September 15, 2011.

Nominate for Senate Executive Committee appointment, Doug Underwood, Group 2, Communication, as Faculty Council on Instructional Quality member on the *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Quality and Rigor.

Faculty Senate Resolution Concerning the UW Environmental Stewardship

WHEREAS, the University of Washington and its faculty, staff, and students recognize that we share a responsibility to act as a positive force for the enhancement of the local and global environment; and

WHEREAS, the Provost and the Executive Vice President (EVP) established the University of Washington Environmental Stewardship Advisory Committee (ESAC) in 2004 with staff support to help to advise the President and Provost on useful, feasible standards and goals as well as emerging opportunities; and

WHEREAS, ESAC has successfully responded to this charge through extensive discussions and formal recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice President contained in its Annual Reports of 2005, 2006, and 2007; and,

WHEREAS, additional faculty participation, energy, and support is vital for engaging the UW community in a wide spectrum of new activities and research into technical and social issues related to stewardship, and for which the active participation of the Faculty will make a significant contribution; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Faculty Senate applauds and endorses ESAC's collaborative team of students, faculty and representatives of administrative units to successfully promote environmental stewardship at UW during the past three years; and
2. The Faculty Senate strongly supports steps toward stewardship already implemented by the offices of the President and Provost, as well as by various departments, institutes, and programs across much of the campus; and
3. The Faculty Senate encourages the President, the Provost, and the Senior Vice President to expand the scope of planning, coordination, implementation, and evaluation of best stewardship practices, and to provide the resources that may be needed to foster the participation of the entire UW community; and
4. The Faculty Senate urges the Provost and the Senior Vice President to facilitate the exchange of new ideas and best practices in which ESAC undertakes an active role in the comprehensive review, evaluation, oversight, promotion, and dissemination to the UW community and beyond; and
5. The Faculty Senate stands ready to collaborate in new initiatives to the extent that resources permit, including frequent liaison activities through the Faculty Committee on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS), ESAC, and similar standing committees and task forces.

*Submitted by:
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
April 7, 2008*

*Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 7, 2008*

*Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 24, 2008*