

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2007
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Professor Gail Stygall, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. The agenda was approved. The Chair reminded Senators to identify themselves by name and departmental affiliation when speaking.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate.

“Good afternoon and welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring Quarter. We have our usual full agenda today, and I want to provide an overview of that agenda.

“Now that the legislature has adjourned we will hear reports from President Emmert and our deputy legislative representative, J.W. Harrington, on how the University fared in the final budget. Ashley Emery, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, will update us on current discussions about the budget here on campus. Faculty salaries, as you know, have been our focus in both the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and in the Special Committee on Salary Plans. Between the last Senate meeting and this one, the Special Committee on Salary Plans and the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs both sent forward legislation on salaries to the Senate Executive Committee. As you will see under Item 6 on the agenda, this legislation was brought to the SEC and thoroughly discussed. The legislation added a mandatory merit increase and a permissive compression increase to the *Faculty Code*. These changes were brought in anticipation of a possible weakening of the current 2% policy in Executive Order 64. After a lively discussion between the SEC and President Emmert, we concluded that now was not the best time to consider changes in Executive Order 64. At this point the proposed legislation was tabled until it becomes clearer what, if anything, the Regents want to do with Executive Order 64.

“Today we will have two reports under Requests for Information. One is the annual Intercollegiate Athletic Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative, Pat Dobel, and Todd Turner, Athletic Director. As you may remember, when Pat Dobel took on the task of Faculty Athletic Representative, he promised good communication between the FAR and the Faculty Senate. Today’s report is part of that good communication. Our second report, given by University of Washington Police Chief Vicky Stormo and Vice President for Human Resources Mindy Kornberg is on workplace violence. As the events of last week at Virginia Tech remind us, it is often the faculty who are the first to know of turbulence in our student’ and co-workers’ lives. Vicky and Mindy are providing information to us on what the current University protocols are in violent situations.

“We also will complete the legislative process on two pieces of Class A legislation today. The Tri-Campus legislation, amending the *Code* to recognize current practices at our Bothell and Tacoma campuses is back after the Committee on *Faculty Code* and Regulations and President Emmert reviewed the legislation. We will also vote on the Class A legislation changing how the Secretary of the Faculty is selected. On both of these pieces of legislation, our vote today is up or down, after our first reading and review by the “code cops” and the President. We also have a Class C resolution to present today on the Faculty Senate’s support for the students’ Husky Tee project.

“Finally, each of you should have picked up a piece of blue paper coming in titled “My Recommendations.” As Chair of the Faculty Senate, I am often the point person for making sure that the faculty as a whole are represented on various university and faculty governance committees, beyond the Faculty Councils. Most of these committees meet irregularly or rarely, but the faculty still need to be represented and represented by someone willing to think about the faculty as a whole. Some of the requests I’ve had this year include a faculty representative to the Investments Board, to

the Academic Technology Committee, to the University Disciplinary Committee and Intercollegiate Athletics. In addition, sometimes committees are appointed jointly by the administration and Faculty Senate on current issues, meeting for a short time with a particular goal in mind. Examples of those include the Provost's Committee on Compression and the Provost's Committee on Schools and Colleges Organization. I am coming to you today to ask for your recommendations for faculty members who might ably fill some of these temporary committee and issue assignments. You know who the good citizens are in your departments, schools and colleges. You are yourself a good citizen by your membership in the Faculty Senate. Please take a moment, right now, and jot down a name or two and the interest area and please feel free to add interest areas that you think might be relevant or areas that need attention.

"Thank you."

3. Report of the President

The President opened his remarks by saying that he and Mindy Kornberg had appointed a committee of faculty and staff to review current UW practices and procedures addressing the issue of violence, and shootings in particular, on campus. Relationship violence and the availability of guns in our society is a volatile mix that requires aggressive attention if we are to ensure the safety of our students, faculty and staff.

The legislative session in Olympia concluded last week and there were favorable outcomes for all of education, including the University of Washington. The UW had the largest increase in its operating budget in the past 20 years and the largest increase in capitol budget in the past 10 years. This new money will go to fund several new programs and will increase space for students in high-demand programs.

In addition to increasing general funding to the University, the legislature also authorized up to a 7% increase in tuition at all state institutions of higher education. He applauded the legislature's understanding of the critical relationship between state funding and the need for flexibility in setting tuition. If this kind of support continues over the next two or three biennia, there's even a chance of hitting the University's target of a reasonable per student funding level.

The President also commented on the Faculty Salary Policy discussion at the Senate Executive Committee meeting. He hopes to return UW salaries to the 75th percentile within the "HEC Board 24" list of universities. A while ago, the UW was 12% behind. Currently it's about 6% behind. He and the Provost will continue to pursue bringing faculty salaries closer to the 75th percentile goal, and he will have a more thorough report for the Senate at its May 24 meeting.

The capitol budget includes a proviso for a UW campus in Snohomish, Island or Skagit Counties that would focus on science, engineering and technology and would include freshmen and sophomores as soon as practicable. The President will be putting together a small working group to develop a recommendation about the siting and nature of the campus. The working group will consider the program focus, its relationship to the other UW campuses (especially Bothell), its size, projected growth curves, and how this campus will be funded. Four million dollars has been set aside for planning, site selection and the purchase of land. The prospect of this new campus will not be pursued, however, if its development comes at the expense of the existing three campuses or if its role, scope or values are at variance with the UW's.

Finally, the President reported that a new Chancellor had been appointed for the Bothell Campus. Kenyon Chan, from Occidental College in Los Angeles, will begin his tenure at the Bothell Campus in July of this year.

In response to a question from Laurie George (Department of English) about the nature of the "spirited discussion" about the faculty salary policy in the Senate Executive Committee meeting, the President emphasized that he meant that it had been a good conversation. There had been a clear

agreement among everyone present that we need to make every effort to fund faculty salaries appropriately, while recognizing the multiple problems associated with those efforts. The way the current policy has evolved has contributed to instances of salary compression and inversion. Nevertheless, the President suggests leaving the current policy as is, despite its drawbacks and despite the Regents' discomfort, in order to find ways to better and more comprehensively address the Regents' concerns *and* the salary gap with peer institutions.

Janelle Taylor (Department of Anthropology) asked why, if we are getting the best state budget in 20 years, are salaries limited to 2 and 3 percent? The President assured her that those percentages did not reflect a cap on salary increases and that other sources of funding, will be used to make faculty salary increases significantly higher than 2 or 3 percent. The question is how much higher.

4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Ashley Emery, chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting presented the slides to illustrate the salary gap between UW and HECB peer institutions, the salaries for professors at all 24 HECB comparison Institutions, the relationship between the percent change in general fund and the percent change in faculty salaries; the relationship between the percent change in general fund plus tuition and faculty salaries; and other related comparisons.

He reported that the President is assuring faculty that salaries are a priority. The state budget is up 15% and tuition will be up 7% for an overall increase of 12% to the UW Budget. A 7.5% raise each year for faculty would amount to \$32 million/biennium. This may not be possible given that there are many UW programs that need to be developed, improved or sustained.

The President commented that if SCPB statistics were to include funding made available for compression adjustments and the Storti settlement, faculty salaries could be seen to have increased 6% during the past year.

5. Legislative Report

JW Harrington, Deputy Legislative Representative, gave the Legislative Report instead of David Lovell. Harrington also addressed the outcome of the legislative session, applauding the 15% increase in the UW's operating budget. The largest amount is in the form of additional enrollment with an increase in the overall per student funding level. He described it as a "landmark year" in terms of commitment to per student funding and the capping of tuition increases to 7%.

Looking ahead to the next legislative session, Harrington anticipates more of a focus on policy issues than budget -- including "leakage" in the educational pipeline with drop-out rates increasing significantly; increasing opportunities to transfer from community colleges to the UW; access to high-demand majors; and assessment of student outcomes.

After a number of other questions from Senators concerning the budget, the President interjected that he would be much better prepared to address the Senate at its next meeting, having gotten significantly further along in the internal budgeting process at the UW by May 24.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of April 9, 2007:

a. The minutes of the February 12, 2007, SEC meeting and the March 1, 2007, Faculty Senate meeting were approved; b. Faculty Council on Educational Technology's plagiarism report was presented by Council Chair Werner Kaminsky. The SEC will revisit this issue at the May 7 meeting **{Exhibit A}**; c. A Dependent Tuition Benefit Proposal created by the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement was presented by Council Chair Robert Bowen. The proposal was referred to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting **{Exhibit B}**; d. Faculty salary policy legislation was proposed and after a lengthy discussion between the SEC and President Emmert, the legislation was tabled indefinitely.

7. Announcements.

There were no announcements

8. Requests for Information.

a. Intercollegiate Athletic Report: Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative and Todd Turner, Athletic Director.

Patrick Dobel began the presentation with a review of UW teams' progress, given the NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR). All teams are above the "cut line;" no penalties have been incurred since the inception of the program; eight teams were at 1000 last year; and all teams were close to or above the national average for Division I.

With regard to the NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR): the UW was at 82% for four-class cohort most recently measured; it was best among public institutions on the west coast; it was higher than Division I average; 11th among Division I-A public institutions; second in Pac-10 Conference (behind Stanford); and compares to 72% rate for overall student population (federal rate).

The grade report for Winter Quarter 2007 reveals that the average team GPA was 3.05 (3.03 cumulative); the average student-athlete achieved a GPA of 3.00 (2.98 cumulative); and the average undergraduate GPA was 3.19 (cumulative 3.19). Fourteen teams had above 3.00 GPA; 104 student-athletes were on the Dean's List (18%) and 340 student-athletes achieved at 3.00 GPA or better (58%).

Dobel addressed concerns about "easy" majors and professors, and about grade changes. The latter has been addressed by a systematic process for review of requests for grade changes, and he is confident that the process is working.

Todd Turner reviewed the recent ICA Facilities Study. The purpose of the Study was to find a way to continue "creating winners," develop a vision for the future and determine the *what* (versus the *how* and *when*). The study was managed by HOK Sports, design consultants that were appointed by the Regents on March 17, 2005, with input from the on-campus Facilities Study Committee.

Guiding principles for the study included: create a cohesive "athletics village" that complements the UW main campus; maximize and protect the setting and views; respect tradition; remain true to the Husky/collegiate tradition; enhance game-day experience – improve spectator facilities; improve vehicular and pedestrian circulation; and welcome visitors to the UW and to ICA.

Facilities needs include: a renovated Husky Stadium, a new football operations center, a relocated track, renovated baseball and soccer stadium, renovated locker rooms for most sports, relocated athletic administration offices and support offices, renovated or new aquatics facility, improved or relocated outdoor tennis stadium, an indoor training center for golf, improved site circulation, and new signage and graphics throughout all facilities and sites.

He then projected images of what a new stadium and athletic facilities might look like in relation to Sound Transit and possible SR 520 changes in the area.

He concluded with listing items to be addressed in the plan for Husky Stadium:

- Preserving the iconic nature of Husky Stadium
- Bringing all stadium services up to today's standards
- Providing a front door to ICA
- Maintaining current seating capacity
- Providing new football support facilities

- Bringing seating closer to the field
- Providing as many covered seats as possible
- Replacing press box
- Allowing for circulation around the entire stadium at one level
- Increasing restrooms and concessions
- Preserving the tailgate experience
- Providing adequate operations facilities to service the Stadium
- Replacing bleachers with permanent seats in the east end zone
- Improving ADA access and seating opportunities
- Improving ingress, egress and vertical circulation
- Designing these changes to be phased in as funding allows
- Providing funding opportunities from premium amenities

A study committee appointed by the President will deliver its final recommendations for a plan and scope of changes in the summer.

b. Workplace Violence: Vicky Stormo, UW Police Chief and Mindy Kornberg, Vice President for Human Resources.

Chief Stormo began the presentation saying that during her 8-year tenure as Chief there have been two murder/suicides – one in 2000 in addition to the recent incident. Extensive workplace violence plans have been put in place and she referred to a handout distributed at the check-in desk. That handout is now under revision and will be circulated widely once the revision is finished. But she encouraged faculty to post the handout in a readily accessible location. Her primary concern is that everyone know that if there's any possibility of a threat, to call 911. UW has its own 911 call center that goes directly to the UWPD, allowing for a very quick response.

A Workplace Violence Assessment Team is in place that includes members from the AG's Office, Human Resources, the Provost and Student Life offices, faculty, staff, and students. This Team can be assembled in two hours to assess and act on any threat to the health and safety of the campus community.

Vice President Kornberg emphasized the importance that if there is a threat involved – even in a confidential conversation – that confidence cannot be kept. Doing so could have disastrous results.

The President and Provost have asked for an Advisory Committee with broad representation to look at the policies, procedures, and best practices related to work place violence – including communications and education – and to make recommendations about short- and long-term goals concerning the protection of the University community from workplace violence.

Senator Sarah Stroup (Classics) encouraged those involved in reviewing the handout to check for spelling and grammar. She also asked whether there are warning signs for victims as well as for perpetrators. Stormo assured Stroup that UWPD had developed programs to teach supervisors and teachers what to look for and can provide that training if requested. She also assured Stroup that Norm Arkans and his staff would be involved in reviewing and editing the revised handout.

Senator Michael Forman (Tacoma, Interdisciplinary Studies) asked if there is a policy for faculty who are stalked by students – other than the advice to go out and get protection orders. Stormo advised Forman to contact her at the UWPD where she can coordinate efforts to help protect such a faculty member through various means.

Senator Scott Stage (Education) expressed a concern about overall communications with the campus community during violent events like the most recent one. Senator Marcy Stein (Tacoma, Education) requested that members of Tacoma and Bothell campuses be included on the Advisory Committee.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

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

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel nominated members of Faculty Councils and Committees as detailed in Exhibit C. All were approved.

b. Action: Confirm James "J.W." Harrington as the 2007-2008 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2007, and ending July 31, 2008.

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel made the nomination, and candidate James Harrington was approved by a unanimous vote of the Senators present.

10. Memorial Resolution.

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

Professor Emeritus Thomas F. Archbold of Materials Science Engineering who died on March 19, 2007 after having served the University since 1961.

Professor Emeritus Ruthanna Boris of Music who died on January 5, 2007 after having served the University since 1965.

Professor Robert Hugh Dickinson of Psychiatry who died on March 17, 2007 after having served the University since 1958.

Professor Emeritus James B. Gerhart of Physics who died on February 24, 2007 after having served the University since 1956.

Professor Emeritus Betty Gilson of Health Services who died on March 23, 2007 after having served the University since 1969.

Associate Professor Emeritus Patricia A. Nolan of Education who died on March 22, 2007 after having served the University since 1965.

Senior Lecturer Elizabeth Ann Roberts of Social Work who died on March 2, 2007 after having served the University since 1982.

Professor Emeritus Norman H. Roberts of Industrial Engineering who died on February 9, 2007 after having served the University since 1955.

Affiliate Associate Professor Olav M. Sola of Surgery who died April 17, 2007 after having served the University since 1973.

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

11. Unfinished Business.

a. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration **{Exhibit D}**.
Jan Sjøvik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Title: Proposed changes concerning the process for designating the Secretary of the Faculty.

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

Senate Chair Stygall explained the process followed when adopting Class A legislation, after which Vice Chair Dan Luchtel presented the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion was passed by a unanimous vote of the Senators present.

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

Marcia Killien, Chair Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

Title: Proposed changes to clarify the definition of campus and distinguish campuses from schools and colleges.

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

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel presented the motion, and Council Chair Killien gave a brief review of the status of this legislation. The motion was passed by a unanimous vote of the Senators present.

12. New Business

Class C Resolution **{Exhibit F}**.

Senate Executive Committee

Title: Faculty Senate Endorsement of the Husky Tee Project.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel presented the motion. There was no discussion and the motion was passed by a unanimous vote of the Senators present.

13. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Gerry F. Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate

Faculty Council on Educational Technology

Contact: Werner Kaminsky (Chair: kaminsky@chem.washington.edu, tel. 543 7585)

Recommendation on responding to the increasing problem of plagiarism

Summary

The problem

With the increasing prominence of the Internet in the life of students and faculty alike, improper use of this technology has drastically increased. Estimates range from 30% to 50% of all students who use information from the internet do so without proper disclosure of their sources. Included in these estimates are students who make use of fraudulent "paper mills" to represent their own original work. Of even greater concern, plagiarism among faculty has also increased. In general, a growing number of members of university communities fail to understand how or when to appropriately cite references or to recognize the importance of intellectual property and potential consequences of copyright violation. However, cases of plagiarism reported in newscasts outside the secured university environment indicates that the general public judges plagiarism much more seriously [See (g) and attachment 1].

Relevance to the University of Washington

The University has an important legal and ethical responsibility to teach students about appropriate use of intellectual property, implications of copyright, and the consequences of violating University rules on these issues. We also have an opportunity to take a leading role among our peer institutions to establish a culture of citation that faculty and students learn from and participate in. Institutional failure to do so could harm the reputation of the University thereby diminishing the value of a UW degree. It could indeed have larger legal consequences if no active anti-plagiarism measures are taken, and the institution is challenged as the "home site" of increasing numbers of students and faculty who fail to observe the rules of copyright. A failure to instill ethical conduct, provide training, and create acceptance of intellectual property rights among our students will also negatively impact our graduates' future careers and ethical behavior.

Recommendations for Action

An approach of working with the UW community to inform, educate, and build acceptance for appropriate use of intellectual property is recommended (for details, see section on proposed strategy). The program would start by building enthusiasm and would include tools for easier and proper citing intellectual matter.

- a) Provide all entering students with- and discussed at orientation- an information package covering Intellectual Property Rights and the consequences of Plagiarism.
- b) Develop a UW 'Code-of-Honor' that specifically addresses the forms of Plagiarism that are undermining the educational process.
- c) Provide students technical assistance – example: mandatory training on proper citation techniques, and access to online educational resources.
- d) Installation of some form of electronic identification of plagiarism in student papers for students to use, starting with a 2 month free pilot program.

Proposed Strategy

- a) The **information package** should contain a letter with a phrasing that is close to the language spoken by freshmen. The example given in the appendix [See (g) and attachment 6] may serve as guidance. Input from students is welcomed to find a text that reaches out to increase their awareness of the problem. Similarly, a 'memo' to faculty and staff in appropriate formulation would be useful.

A more direct language is complementary to that used in the Student Conduct Code. At the earliest opportunity during students' orientation, their attention should be drawn to

- o Resources for students on how to avoid plagiarism and cite sources correctly, as well as information about the scholarly process and academic culture

- Information about discipline-specific issues surrounding plagiarism [See (g) and attachment 2]
- Resources about UW policies

b) Code of Honor

In cooperation with ASUW, the 'Code-of-Honor' needs to be formulated and forwarded to all members of the university including undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, the administration, and visiting faculty and students. A possible text can be found here:

<http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/docs/AI.Acknow.pdf>

c) Technical Assistance

In cooperation with the C & C, UW Libraries and Catalyst, technology that guides the process of proper citation is compiled and made accessible to all members of the University of Washington community.

There are various groups on campus that are already engaged in education about plagiarism. Below is a preliminary list of groups that have expertise and information that would be useful to an educational endeavor. Other partners should also be identified.

- UW Libraries
- CIDR
- 4x4 Initiative
- UW Writing Centers
- TRIO
- Committee on Academic Misconduct

Additional measures could also include general strategies implemented by teachers to make plagiarizing more difficult [See (g) and attachment 5].

d) "Site by Site" Plagiarism identification

After implementation of the steps (a) to (c), a mechanism to measure and administer the progress of creating awareness of plagiarism, easy to use detection tools are needed. The different possibilities include:

- The commercial service 'turnitin.com' on a limited scale. The company has offered a two-month free pilot program to test the software and its feasibility and ease of use at UW. Turnitin's standard method includes the collection and storage of student work in their database. As a result, there are FERPA concerns to consider. Under pressure from FCET, Turnitin has offered to modify their standard system to avoid some of these concerns [See (g) and attachment 3]. This service has been used before on campus. [See (g) attachment 4].
- Collect university - internal papers of students on a database with search options arranged via software to be provided by C & C or Catalyst enabling faculty to compare a student's submission electronically.
- Microsoft Research is under consideration to discuss the possibility of an alternative contextual search and detection tool.
- It may be possible to use Google in conjunction with Catalyst tools to complete more complex searches. This approach seems feasible, but more discussion and exploration of the project is needed at present.

When students are given these tools, they can **ON THEIR OWN** compare their work with available intellectual property and refine their writing skills. This "**Site by Site**", one site representing the text written by the student, the other site the report by one of the above listed technologies is a key element in engaging the students rather than the faculty in enhancing the citation climate on our campuses.

e) Develop an Academic Protocol for cases of Plagiarism

It was reported to the FCET that students often managed to avoid the consequences of plagiarism, and that retaliation toward faculty by students who had plagiarized poses a significant problem especially for non-tenured teachers. This problem needs to be discussed by all other Faculty Councils to devise a proper protection strategy on one hand and a **universal protocol** for handling plagiarism on the lowest possible level.

Level 0: as outlined in (d), the students should be encouraged to use some sort of plagiarism analysis to screen their works and on a faculty's request may submit a plagiarism report together with their papers to certify this effort.

Level 1: after the detection of plagiarism by a faculty, the faculty member informs student, rejects paper, and allows one (UW policy allowed) resubmission within reasonable time.

Level 2: plagiarism identified in 2nd submission. Faculty rejects paper and (UW policy) reports the case to the Intellectual Property Center (to be set up) for independent review, preservation of students' rights, avoidance of retaliation, and to connect students to classes on citation practice.

f) Time Line

It would be useful to start the 2 month free pilot with Turnitin.com parallel to other possible efforts outlined in (d) after Summer Break 2007 with the returning students. During this study, some training on how to use Turnitin.com or other tools may need to be provided.

The number of plagiarism cases should be monitored and the result presented to the Senate (or subcommittee) for evaluation. If it seems necessary, one or other automatic plagiarism identification process should be implemented with the start of spring term 2008.

g) Attachments

[1] On plagiarism

COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM June 2006/Vol. 49, No. 6 23

ACM Publications board policy: <http://www.acm.org/pubs/plagiarism%20policy.html>

Brian Martin Article: <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/94jie.html>

Russell Hunt Article: <http://www.stthomasu.ca/~hunt/4reasons.htm>

[2] Faculty Resource on Grading: <http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/gprevent.htm>

[3] Turnitin.com and FERPA



IPARADIGMS, LLC PRELIMINARY POSITION ON 8 FABHEP 13 (GPCO 2006)

September 28, 2006

iParadigms, LLC is currently reviewing its response to the recent FPCO clarification on FERPA standards in the context of institutions dealing with companies that offer services related to detecting plagiarism (in this case, the Company's Turnitin service). A preliminary legal document is being drafted by its corporate counsel, Foley & Lardner, a leading national firm and the Company's intellectual property attorneys.

Prior to the issuance of a formal legal opinion, iParadigms, LLC strongly recommends the following best practices be put in place by its users to best ensure compliance with FERPA.

- When reasonably possible, Turnitin institutional clients should direct its instructors to submit anonymous documents to the system with some identifying code that is kept by the faculty, and not the Turnitin system. As stated by FPCO, "this is permissible...it would not be considered a 'disclosure' under FERPA."
- When reasonably possible, Turnitin institutional clients should have their students submit their own papers. Their acceptance of our Terms & Conditions suffices as voluntary consent to the submission of personal data. The institution should allow the student to decline submission to the Turnitin service. The consequences of this denial should be consistent with the institution's own current policies and/or Student Handbook.

Further upgrades to the Turnitin service's current technology (slated for release in late 2006 - early 2007) to counter the instances in which an instructor submits the work of a student using personally identifiable information (e.g. email address) will most likely include the following:

- Encryption of all Turnitin student users' personally identifiable information upon entry into the Turnitin system
- Decryption of all Turnitin student users' personally identifiable information only granted to the relevant class instructor

We will continue to update the academic community as concrete timelines and tactical steps are identified.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Barrie'.

John Barrie, Ph.D.
iParadigms, LLC CEO

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Melissa Lipscomb'.

Melissa Lipscomb
iParadigms, LLC COO

- [4] Use of Turnitin.com at the University of Washington
<http://depts.washington.edu/trio/center/howto/write/writing/avoid/index.html>

Sharon Primm-Dayot
Curriculum Coordinator
Instructor in Technology, Research, Writing
TRIO Training
University of Washington
Office of Minority Affairs
580 Schmitz Hall
Box 355845
206-543-9288 office
206-685-2457 fax

TRIO programs are federally funded through the Department of Education and are dedicated to prepare low-income and non-traditional students, often at-risk, for college, graduate/professional school, and a successful life in this society's economic and social cultures. TRIO represents three tiers of programs which work with middle school, high school and higher education students. The topics of intellectual honesty and appropriate attribution are a priority in our trainings with TRIO staff and students. Although we provide numerous resources and tutorials on our web site, Turnitin is one of the most powerful teaching tools that we use.

One of the best examples of using Turnitin as a teaching tool within our training is during one of our TRIO Quest activities, TRIO ThinkQuest (TTQ). TTQ is a national competition for middle and high school students who participate in TRIO programs. This competition challenges students to research, write, and create educational web sites with the goal of preparing them for college-level writing. Students and staff are informed that sites will be submitted to Turnitin for plagiarism checks and are instructed to use our plagiarism resources to learn about intellectual honest and appropriate attribution.

Once we receive the originality reports from Turnitin, we share the results with our participating staff and students. For our students, being able to see a highlighted line that is similar or exact to another document gives us that "teaching moment" to illustrate how to quote and cite properly in order to maintain academic integrity. It is surprising that they do not seem threatened by the reports; they are so hungry to improve their skills in order to be accepted into college that they embrace the learning moment and the results show after they make corrections.

Because technology makes it easier to find sources, and even easier to copy and paste information, Turnitin plays an extremely important role in helping our students understand intellectual honesty. The visual strength of Turnitin's reports allows our students to literally see the similarities between their writing and others on one page. Along with the teaching moments that result from reports, we are seeing less and less plagiarism within our educational web site competition.

For more information on plagiarism rules for the TTQ activity, go to:
<http://depts.washington.edu/trio/quest/rules.html> and click on TRIO ThinkQuest Rules where you can view rules on plagiarism (NOTE # 4 and # 6).

If you are interested in the students' work, click the TRIO Quest tab at the top of the page. You can explore the winning educational web sites created by these students and note how intellectual honesty is emphasized within them. I need to emphasize that these students are non-traditional and many come from poor urban and rural school districts. TTQ is often the first experience that these students have to this type of research and writing.

- [5] Anti-Plagiarism Strategies for Research Papers: <http://www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm>

The Libraries sponsored a workshop in February 2005 on pedagogical approaches to preventing plagiarism and materials from this workshop can be found at
<http://www.lib.washington.edu/about/events/academic/>.

On February 9, 2007 the Libraries will be presenting a half-day workshop for faculty. The workshop, entitled "Helping Students 'Do the Right Thing': Preventing Plagiarism Through Assignment Design," focuses on what many librarians feel is the most productive approach to this

challenge: rethinking and restructuring research-and-writing assignments to minimize the opportunities to plagiarize and to maximize student engagement and deep learning. The workshop is co-sponsored by CIDR, the Teaching Academy, and the Libraries. A companion website should be available soon.

[6] Example to address freshmen:

"Do you want words you wrote being used by someone else under his/her name? If not, don't do it yourself.

Do you want a graphic you worked on being used by others without giving you the credit? If not, don't do it yourself.

Do you feel angry at the thought of putting the results of your own hard work on the internet for others to benefit, only to see it being used by someone else pretending it was his/her work? If you would, don't do this yourself.

Each of these cases is a form of plagiarism; all are viewed by the general public, and the law, as criminal acts.

Learn how to cite references and sources correctly; avoid academic sanctions and possible prosecution.

Help and information on proper citation is available from the Librarians at the University of Washington, please ask. From the online tools perspective, many of the online databases licensed by the UW Libraries include a "cite this" feature which properly formats citations at the point of discovery. Such a feature allows researchers to indicate their preferred style (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago/Turabian) and the citation is automatically formatted.

Be aware that the University of Washington has mechanisms installed that allow detecting plagiarism"

**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Dependent Tuition Benefit Proposal
April 2007**

Background: UW Faculty and staff currently have a UW Tuition Exemption Program benefit:

“The University of Washington Tuition Exemption Program, established under the authority of [RCW 28B.15.558](#), enables University of Washington employees, state of Washington employees and members of the Washington State National Guard who have been admitted to the University of Washington, to have tuition waived for up to six credits when enrollment is on a "space-available" basis. The Tuition Exemption Program is available at the University of Washington Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma campuses.” Reference: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/APS/22.01.html#1>

Current eligibility for the program is as follows:

“Professional staff, faculty, librarians, and permanent classified staff who meet all of the following criteria are eligible to participate in the Tuition Exemption Program:

- Employed half-time or more;
- Employed on the first day of the quarter;
- Paid monthly (except for employees in the Print Plant Craft Bargaining Unit) and not hourly; and
- For classified staff new to the University, have completed the probation period prior to the first day of the quarter. “

Proposed Tuition Waiver Benefit

A Tuition Waiver Benefit developed within the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR) would build on the current program and provide an expanded benefit:

- Dependent children of faculty, professional staff, and librarians¹ receive a quarterly tuition waiver equivalent of up to 50% of the full-time, standard, resident, undergraduate tuition at the UW (benefit is linked to undergraduate standard tuition rate, regardless of the program in which dependent is enrolled).

The proposed new benefit would be a recruiting and retention tool that could be very attractive to a wide range of faculty, librarians, and professional staff. It serves as a recruitment benefit by offering prospective faculty, librarians and staff the security of knowing that their service at UW will be rewarded by offering support for their children’s education. It serves as a retention benefit because the proposal recommends that the dependent benefit be made available for most employees after 5 years of employment. This rewards commitment and longevity in one’s position.

Parameters of the Benefit

Student Status

- 50% waiver benefit recipients would have full student status (**not** space available) and
- must qualify for admission through standard guidelines (no special admission status for these students).
 - Enrollments would count against UW enrollment cap.

¹ The FCBR represents faculty, professional staff and librarians. Thus our proposal does not speak to benefits for other employees.

Parameters of the Benefit (cont'd)**Dependent Status**

- Definitions match current PEBB medical/dental dependent eligibility:
 - Dependent children through age 23
 - A 15-quarter limit per dependent

Employment service requirement

- Proposed eligibility requirement is 5 years
- POSSIBLE: Faculty offered tenure at employment, librarians offered permanent or continuing status at appointment, and newly hired senior administrators (grade 10 or above) may receive benefit immediately on employment.

Restrictions:

- Benefit may only be used by one eligible dependent at a time.
- Benefit cannot be additive between two married/same-sex partner employees, but each could support a different eligible dependent.
- Benefit would not cover additional tuition costs beyond full-time, standard, resident, undergraduate tuition.
- Benefit for enrolled students only (not non-matriculated).
- Benefit would be taxable.

Peer Institutions – as of 2004

- HECB list: 58% offer some tuition benefit ranging from 50% – 100% of tuition costs
 - Includes Ohio State, Michigan State, University of Pittsburgh.
- OFM Peer list: 50% offer tuition benefit ranging from 50% – 75% of tuition costs
 - Includes University of Oregon, University of Arizona, University of Illinois

Funding

- The 'cost' of the tuition waiver in Table 1 attached represents tuition foregone. Our estimate is that, in equilibrium, the total cost estimate to fund tuition waivers for dependents of faculty, professional staff and librarians is approximately \$1 million per year – based on 2006-2007 tuition rates and employment/enrollment figures from 2003-04. The estimated cost would be less than \$250,000 in the first year and then costs would increase gradually over five years as eligible dependents under this benefit are added to each freshman class, approaching \$1 million in the fifth year.
- The estimate assumes that student slots occupied by dependants of faculty/professional staff/librarians would displace other *full-tuition* paying students. To the extent that student slots remain vacant or are filled with subsidized students, foregone tuition would be less and could even be zero. If *out-of-state full-tuition* paying students are displaced, these amounts could be understated.
- While the number of students served by this benefit may remain relatively stable, the cost of the benefit will increase as the cost of UW tuition increases.
- The estimate was based on actual enrollments of dependents of employees in 2003-04. While this waiver would likely attract more applications from dependents of employees, it is a self-regulating benefit because University Admissions are very selective and would not consider a student's dependent status.
- Table 1 includes an estimate of the incremental cost to fund a tuition waiver for classified staff.

TABLE 1. Cost Estimates for Dependent Tuition Benefit.

Personnel Type	Student Level	Number of Students	Annual Waiver Amount
ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS	1. UG	12	\$66,831
EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH	1. UG	2	\$11,970
FACULTY	1. UG	78	\$461,344
LIBRARIANS	1. UG	3	\$17,955
NON-GRADUATE STUDENT	1. UG	1	\$5,985
PROFESSIONAL	1. UG	79	\$463,385
RESIDENTS/INTERNS	1. UG	1	\$5,985
CLASSIFIED	1. UG	160	\$943,531
CLINICALS	1. UG	1	\$6,106
Faculty/Professional Staff/Librarians		175	\$1,033,455
All Faculty & Staff		336	\$1,983,092

Notes:

Estimates prepared by Carol Diem, Office of Institutional Studies, University of Washington with the following conditions: 1) only dependent children under 24, 2) only one child at a time for an employee, 3) employees with 5 yrs at UW, and 4) excluding waivers for costs beyond full-time, standard, resident undergraduate tuition.

The number of dependent students by employee group is estimated from 2003-04 enrollments.

The annual waiver amounts are tuition dollars lost relative to a student paying 100% of the posted in-state tuition.

This is a steady-state estimate assuming the program had been in place approximately 5 years. To the extent there are vacancies, (i.e., some full-tuition paying students are not displaced), these amounts are overstated.

To the extent out-of-state full-tuition paying students are displaced, these amounts are understated.

While the number of students served by this benefit may remain relatively stable, we assume that the cost of the benefit will increase as the cost of UW tuition increases.

Faculty Council and Committee Nominations:**Educational Outreach:**

William Erdly, Group IX, Computing & Software Systems, as Chair, for a term ending September 15, 2007.

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations:

Mícheál Vaughan, Group I, English, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Karen Boxx, Group V, Law, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Adjudication Panel:

Thomas Andrews, Group V, Law, as Chair, for a term beginning immediately through September 15, 2010.

Representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees:

Nominate for Senate appointment, effective immediately, Paul Zuchowski, Professional Staff Representative (alternate) member of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services for a term ending September 15, 2007, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty council.

Proposed Handbook Changes for Designating the Secretary of the Faculty

Changes to Volume Two, Part 2, Chapter 22, Section 22-56

Section 22-56. The Secretary of the Faculty

- A. ~~The Secretary of the Faculty shall be a member of the faculty with tenure. The term of service shall normally be five years. He or she shall be appointed by the President from a list of not less than three nominees submitted by the elected members of the Executive Committee. The secretary shall serve at the pleasure of the President.~~
- B. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be elected by a majority vote of the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by a majority vote of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate shall publish the name of the individual elected by the Senate Executive Committee in the agenda of the Senate meeting in which confirmation is sought.
- C. If the position of the Secretary of the Faculty falls vacant, a committee consisting of the Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, and immediate past Senate Chair shall appoint a temporary Secretary of the Faculty, pending a prompt election and confirmation process for a permanent successor.
- D. ~~B.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall keep the minutes and the records of the Senate.
- E. ~~C.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall administer the Office of University Committees. He or she shall also maintain a file of council and committee rosters and provide the Executive Committee with lists of nominees for council and committee appointments.
- F. ~~D.~~ The Secretary of the Faculty shall perform the additional duties prescribed in ~~this Chapter~~ the Faculty Code.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964: with Presidential approval.

Rationale: In the current system for designating the Secretary of the Faculty, a faculty committee provides a list of three nominees from which the President chooses one. It is desirable to replace this procedure with one in which the Secretary is chosen by representatives of the faculty.

While the Secretary could, in principle, be chosen in several different ways, the Senate Executive Committee seems to be the most appropriate body in which to vest this power. Comprised of the President of the University, the officers of the Senate, the group representatives, the council chairs, and representatives of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, its members have a broad understanding of the role of the Secretary of the Faculty and are well prepared to make an appropriate choice. As the Faculty Senate is given the power to confirm this choice, it retains ultimate control of the process.

**Proposed Handbook Changes to Clarify the Definition of a Campus and Distinguish
Campuses from Schools and Colleges**

Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 and 23-45

Section 13-31. Organization of the Faculty and the Allocation of Powers and Duties

By authority derived from statutes of the state, from resolutions of the Board of Regents, and from executive orders of the President, the University faculty:

- A. enacts Sections -31 to -99 in each Chapter of the *Faculty Code* (Part II of this *Handbook*) and thereby:
1. establishes its own organization as set forth in Chapter 21;
 2. establishes the Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee as its legislative and executive agency operative under the powers and duties set forth in Chapter 22;
 3. confers upon the **chancellors**, deans and faculties of the independently organized **campuses**, colleges and schools, and the departments thereof, the powers and duties set forth in Chapter 23, and authorizes the faculty in each of these to effect its own organization and to delegate to committees, councils, or departments such of its powers and duties as it deems appropriate;
 4. establishes the rules and procedures governing faculty appointment and promotion which are set forth in Chapter 24;
 5. establishes rules and procedures governing faculty tenure which are set forth in Chapter 25;
 6. authorizes the Faculty Senate to initiate amendment of the *Faculty Code* in the manner set forth in Chapter 29.
- B. establishes standing committees of the University faculty, and defines the powers and duties of each as set forth in Part IV of this *Faculty Handbook*, and vests in the Faculty Senate authority to establish or abolish standing or other committees of the faculty, and to define or redefine their powers and duties;
- C. establishes the rules which are set forth in Parts V and VI of this *Faculty Handbook*.*

S-A 20, April 16, 1956; S-A 50, January 22, 1976: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-31. Delegation of Authority by the University Faculty

[For delegation by the University faculty of powers and duties to the faculties in colleges and schools, see Section 13-31, Subsection A.3.]

Section 23-41. Governing Body of a Campus, College or School

The faculty of a **campus**, college or school is its governing body, and under the provisions of this chapter may exercise direct control of its affairs or may delegate such control as it deems appropriate to an executive committee, council, or other committee or committees.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-42. Campus, College, School, and Department Faculties: Composition

- A. Except for the Graduate School faculty, the faculty of each **campus**, college, school, or department is organized in the following manner.
1. It consists of those members of the University faculty, whether full-time or part-time, whose official appointments are to positions within it.
 2. Its voting members are those of its personnel who are voting members of the University faculty

under Section 21-32.

- B. The graduate faculty consists of those members of the University faculty who have been designated by the Dean of the Graduate School, with the advice of committees established for this purpose.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 54, March 7, 1977: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-43. Campus, College and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23, 13-24, and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty grant to the faculty of each campus, college and school, with exception of the graduate faculty, the powers and duties enumerated below. This authority is subject, however, to the power of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University (Section 22-32, Subsection B) and to the procedures set forth in Sections 23-47 and 23-48 for the coordination of campuses, colleges and schools. Except for the graduate faculty, the faculty of each campus, college or school:

- A. shall, with respect to academic matters,
- 1 determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
 - 2 determine its curriculum and academic programs;
 - 3 determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
 - 4 recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
 - 5 exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;
- B. shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Section 25-41;
- C. may, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties specified in paragraphs A and B of this Section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-44. The Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections 13-23 and 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty confer upon the graduate faculty the powers and duties enumerated below. The graduate faculty shall:

- A. determine requirements for the admission of graduate students;
- B. recommend to the Board of Regents the designations of graduate degrees;
- C. approve the requirements for graduate degrees;
- D. determine which departments or undepartmentalized colleges or schools are qualified (Section 23-24) to give courses of study leading to graduate degrees;
- E. determine those courses for which students may receive credit toward a graduate degree;
- F. recommend to the Board of Regents those graduate students who qualify for degrees;
- G. determine the scholastic standards required of graduate students;
- H. promote research by members of the faculty.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval. (Subsection H added silently in 1956 edition)

Section 23-45. Campus, College and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure

- A. Subject to the provisions of Section 23-46, the faculty of each campus, college or school other than the Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure except as stipulated in Subsections B and C. The organization and rules of procedure of a department may be determined by the department faculty, but shall be subject to review by the appropriate campus, school or college faculty.
- B. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty council or councils that shall advise their respective chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses, matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each campus shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.**
- ~~C.~~ B. Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advise the dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each school or college shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.
- ~~D.~~ ~~G.~~ The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each campus's, college's or school's procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.
- ~~E.~~ ~~D.~~ The Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure. It may directly control its affairs or may delegate to a council, executive committee, or other committees any of its powers, provided that such council or committees shall be representative of the various fields of graduate study.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 80, December 11, 1989: both with Presidential approval.

Section 23-46. Prescribed Procedure in Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments

[For Program Termination, see Section 26-41]

- A. Except as provided in Subsections B and C, a proposed action or proposed rule of a campus, college, school, or department faculty under the authority of Sections 23-43 and 23-44 is effective if passed by a quorum majority of its voting members present at a meeting or responding by mail, or of its authorized council or committee, and if approved by the chancellor or dean. Approval by the chancellor or dean is not required in internal department matters.

"Quorum majority" means:

1. in the case of a vote taken at a meeting, a majority of those members voting at a meeting at which at least half the members entitled to vote are present; and
 2. in the case of a vote taken by mailed (written) ballots, a majority of those voting, provided that at least half of the members entitled to vote have cast ballots.
- B. When conducting a mail ballot, as described in Subsection A, campus, school and college faculties (but not departmental faculties) shall have a choice either to require a quorum majority or to follow Faculty Senate procedures as described in Section 29-36, Subsection C. Under these procedures proposed actions or rules of a campus, school or a college, except as stated in Subsection C, shall become effective in the case of a mail ballot either if approved by an affirmative majority vote of the

eligible voting members of the faculty, or by a two-thirds majority vote of those casting ballots, provided that at least 45% of the eligible faculty members cast ballots. Campus, school and college faculties shall decide, by means of a quorum majority vote, whether to change their rules for procedures governing mail ballots.

- C. When a proposed action concerns a faculty employment recommendation, such as appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion, it will be effective only if passed by a majority of all eligible voting members of the unit, and in accordance with the appropriate procedures as specified in Sections 24-51 to 24-55 and 25-41.
- D. Campuses, Colleges, schools, and departments may vote by mail in matters of faculty employment, provided that they use specific procedures they have adopted and published and that these procedures provide for:
 - 1. reasonable opportunity for each faculty member of the unit to study all information relevant to the employment action,
 - 2. secrecy and security of the ballot, and
 - 3. security and impartiality of the ballot count.
- E. In a departmentalized school or college, the chairperson or director of a department shall transmit to the dean for approval a copy of any action by the department which may affect college or school policy. If the chairperson or director does not concur in the action, he/she may also submit his/her own recommendation.
- F. Subject to the provisions of Subsections A, B, C, D and E, and of Sections 23-47 and 23-48, a proposed action or rule of a campus, college, school, or department becomes effective at the time indicated in the action or rule.
- G. When requested by one or more voting members of a campus, college, school, or department faculty the vote upon any matter before it shall be by secret ballot.
- H. Upon request, the chancellor of a campus, the dean of a college or school or the chairperson of a department shall provide a member of his or her faculty with information concerning salaries, teaching schedules, salary and operations budget requests, appropriations, allotments, disbursements, and similar data pertaining to his/her campus, college, school, or department.

Section 13-31, S-A 20, April 16, 1956; S-A 43, November 14, 1972; S-A 56, February 21, 1978 and S-A 74, January 2, 1987: all with Presidential approval.

Section 23-47. Coordination Among Campuses, Colleges and Schools

In exercising its authority under the provisions of Sections 23-43 and 23-44, the faculty of a campus, college, school, or department shall carefully consider the effect of its actions upon other campuses, colleges, schools, and departments. The chancellor of a campus and the dean of a college or school considering any action shall consult with the chancellor of each campus and the dean of each college or school which may be affected by it.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956: with Presidential approval.

Section 23-48. Procedure for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campuses, Colleges and Schools

[This section was entitled "Coordination Among Colleges and Schools: Procedure" in 1956, 1964 and 1969.]

- A. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 to 23-46, and the action so taken deals with admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, graduation, honors, personnel policy,

schedules, registration, or student discipline, the **chancellor or** dean shall file copies of it with the President and with the Secretary of the Faculty for transmittal to the appropriate faculty committee, or if there is no other appropriate committee, to the Senate Executive Committee. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.

- B. The action becomes effective 60 days after such filing of copies, unless:
1. it has been approved at an earlier date by both the President and the faculty committee, in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or
 2. the President within the 60-day period suspends its effect, in which event he shall notify the faculty committee to which the matter has been assigned; or
 3. the faculty committee within the 60-day period suspends its effect on grounds either
 - a. that it fails to conform with general University policy or regulations, or
 - b. that it requires review by other **campuses**, colleges or schools which may be affected by it, and refers the matter to the President for final decision.
- C. When a matter is so referred to the President by a faculty committee, the President, after a hearing, shall decide whether the proposed action becomes effective. In so doing the President may employ whatever procedures he or she deems necessary or helpful.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 27, March 31, 1961: both with Presidential approval.

Class C Resolution Concerning Endorsement of the Husky Tee Project

WHEREAS, the Husky Tee program design competition began in February 2007; and

WHEREAS, the project entails a T-shirt designed annually by a student and sold for profit; and

WHEREAS, all proceeds from the T-shirt sales will go to the Husky Pride Fund; and

WHEREAS, the Husky Pride Fund will distribute proceeds to three different initiatives: emergency funds, a holistic academic scholarship program and campus engagement grants; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the project and encourages the university community to participate.

*Submitted by
Senate Executive Committee
April 26, 2007*