

**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 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 2:35 p.m. The agenda was approved. Professor Stygall reminded the senators to identify themselves by name and departmental affiliation when speaking.

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

Here follow Professor Stygall's remarks:

"Good afternoon. Welcome to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the Winter Quarter 2007. Today we move into our own legislative work. For the first time this year, we will consider Class A legislation. Class A legislation amends the Faculty Code, Volume 2 of the University Handbook. It requires two votes by the Faculty Senate and today will constitute the first vote. Our legislation today comes to us from the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy and was passed to the Senate from the Senate Executive Committee. As you know, the Bothell and Tacoma campuses received their first entering freshman class this fall and the movement of each campus into the realm of a four-year campus requires us to examine how those campuses are treated in the Faculty Code. Marcia Killien, chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy will provide background for the legislation.

"We will also consider two Class C resolutions today. One of those Class C resolutions comes to us from the Senate's Special Committee on Legislative Matters and the Senate Executive Committee. This resolution asks us to adopt a legislative agenda, something the Senate has done in the past but not in recent years. As the legislative session in Olympia is now under way, this Class C resolution is timely. David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative, will provide background for this legislation. The second Class C resolution concerns Student Lobby Day. This is an annual request from the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Profession Student Senate asking the faculty to encourage their participation in a visit to the legislature.

"At the next Senate meeting, on March 1, we are likely to see legislation coming from at least two other councils. First, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is planning to bring forward legislation on how we select a Secretary of the Faculty. This will be Class A legislation. Second, the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach appears to be ready to bring forward legislation on whether we continue to note a "distance learning" designation on student transcripts when students take courses within the typical quarter time frame. This will be Class B legislation, legislation that amends other volumes of the University Handbook. Looking toward the Spring Quarter, we are likely to see legislation on a merit addition to our current salary policy. We are also likely to have a discussion about possible changes in Executive Order 64, more familiarly known as the 2% policy.

"Finally, the Secretary of the Faculty, Donna Kerr, has resigned. She is now on special assignment to the President's Office. Gerry Philipsen, Professor of Communication, and former Faculty Senate Chair, has agreed to serve as Secretary of the Faculty. We offer our thanks to Donna for her service and a warm welcome to Gerry. Gerry still has obligations set before this appointment and so will be delayed in arriving at today's meeting. I will introduce him when he does arrive. In his place, he has deputized Jan Sjøvik, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and Professor of Scandinavian Studies, to take today's minutes. I look forward to a productive meeting today, and we'll move next to the report from the Provost."

3. Report of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs / Opportunity for Questions – Provost Phyllis M. Wise.

Provost Phyllis M. Wise opened her remarks by reporting that President Mark Emmert is currently in Olympia, working with the Washington State Legislature.

Provost Wise next reported on the extensive process by which the vision statement of the University has been formulated. The statement consists of three brief sentences: “The University of Washington educates a diverse student body to become responsible global citizens and future leaders through a challenging learning environment informed by cutting-edge scholarship. Discovery is at the heart of our university. We discover timely solutions to the world’s most complex problems and enrich the lives of people throughout our community, the state of Washington, the nation, and the world.”

The Provost described how the University of Washington is in a position to help solve some of the most pressing problems of the world. Next, she discussed six core values that characterize the University of Washington, integrity, diversity, excellence, collaboration, innovation, and respect. The University of Washington’s standard of excellence, our academic community, our position as world leaders in research, our celebration of the beautiful physical place in which we are located, our spirit of innovation, our commitment as world citizens, and our position as a public institution of higher learning are all important characteristics of this institution. The Provost singled out several local companies that have re-shaped our reality as consumers and mentioned the pride that we can all share as residents of an area of the world that is as characterized by innovation as is the locale in which the University of Washington is situated. Faculty, staff, and students all have a reason to cherish and be proud of the University of Washington.

Noting that the vision statement is an organic document that will most likely need to change over the years, the Provost stated that it nevertheless offers guidance for all of us. She also mentioned such important programs as the “Husky Promise” and “Students First,” which make it possible for students in need of financial aid to attend the University of Washington. She was pleased to observe that the University of Washington is the only university of a comparable size that has a program like the Husky Promise.

Provost Wise next discussed the Governor’s state budget proposal. Noting that both the operating and capital budget proposals are very favorable to the University of Washington, she detailed some of these advantages. Cautioning that there may be changes in the final state budget, she also noted that a favorable final budget will place significant expectations on the university, but that the institution is well prepared to meet these expectations.

4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Ashley Emery, Committee Chair.

Professor Emery reported that the SCPB has discussed the RCEP process, the university’s budget proposal, and particularly the question of how well the university is making progress toward a better salary structure. He noted that past salary increases have been inadequate, but that there is now a reasonable hope for a significant improvement in compensation. These matters will no doubt remain under discussion until the state budget has been finalized.

5. Legislative Report – Professor David Lovell, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Professor Stygall noted that Professor Lovell will defer his report until later in the meeting, when the “Resolution Concerning Principles of State Higher Education Policy” will be considered.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues and Actions of January 8, 2007.

a. Minutes of the November 13, 2006 Senate Executive Committee meeting and November 30, 2006 Faculty Senate meeting were approved; b. Susan Astley, Group VII Representative, brought the issue

of “Challenges Facing Non-tenured Faculty” to the SEC. Information on this topic is at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/issues.html>; c. Information items included: Timeline on Seatbelt Issue, **{Exhibit A}**; Global Support Project, Ann Anderson, Assistant Vice President and Controller, **{Exhibit B}**; and the Computer Security Policy, Kirk Bailey, Chief Information Security Officer, **{Exhibit C}**.

7. Announcements.

There were none.

8. Requests for Information.

There were no requests for information.

9. Statement from Candidate for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel nominated David Lovell as Vice Chair of the Senate, and Senate Chair Gail Stygall then asked if there were additional nominations from the floor, of which there were none. After declaring the nominations closed, Stygall quoted from a letter in which the nominating committee details Professor Lovell’s qualifications.

David Lovell, Research Associate Professor, Psychosocial & Community Health and Faculty Legislative Representative, presented his remarks, as follows:

“Good afternoon, friends and colleagues. My name is David Lovell. I’m a research associate professor in the Department of Psychosocial and Community Health; that’s in the School of Nursing, which in itself is not mysterious, but it is a little puzzling to me since my doctorate is in philosophy and my masters’ degree, almost twenty years later, was in social work—from this fine institution. It’s a long story, most of which I will spare you today.

“Most of you know me as your legislative representative, and I’m here to seek your vote as the Vice-Chair of the Senate for the coming academic year: not that the nominating committee has left you much choice in the matter, but—there it is. I’ve read the speeches of the last few candidates, and indeed heard most of them, and I’ve noted that they all describe the nomination as an honor. I would like to be more specific.

“Because the job of legislative representative involves a lot of public relations, one of its perils is that one may lapse into clichés. In my case, upon finding that I was the sole nominee for this position, there were two: First, I’m Not Worthy! Second, Fools Rush In Where Angels Fear to Tread. The first reflects my admiration for my predecessors, the breadth of experience as teachers and scholars they’ve accumulated and the sophisticated understanding of the ways of the university that they represent. The second, the feeling—admittedly from a partial perspective—that so much of what has brought this honor to me in recent years has been my willingness to raise my hand and say, I’ll do it: first as a senator just after voting membership was extended to the research faculty, then as Group 8 representative, then legislative representative; which also incidentally, given the way faculty have habitually been sidelined in state educational policy, has involved going to a lot of meetings and raising your hand in the belief that you have something to say.

“Just about thirty years ago, in what I now realize was my raw youth, I thought my academic career was over. Since then I’ve worked in prisons as a teacher, counselor, consultant, and—since joining the faculty here—as someone conducting research and program evaluation with our state’s institutions that manage the criminal, the mentally ill, and the addicted—the people least tolerated in our community. Before joining the faculty, I worked at the university as a temporary office assistant, then as a classified staff member; and I’ve also been a student, both matriculated and non-matriculated. So I’ve been around the university for 22 years, but only twelve as a faculty member.

And guess what—given the other options I’ve had or seen played out in the lives of others—I do not see myself now as a member of an especially oppressed or exploited class.

“(At this point, to prevent misunderstanding, I feel compelled to insert a footnote. Individual abuses exist, of course, and where institutional habits allow or encourage them they must, of course, be resisted or corrected by every principled means at hand. Our faculty code must have the machinery and the teeth to prevent those with more power from derailing the careers of those with less; and by the same token, our code of conduct should also prevent faculty from harassing or habitually screaming at secretaries. I’m digressing here just to reassure you that I’m not taking an overly rosy view of how things work around here.)

“For me, it is indeed a privilege to serve this institution as a faculty member. But the longer I’ve been in this role, particularly since having the opportunity to teach classes in recent years, the more I’ve come to understand what a responsibility it is: it’s a responsibility to the institution, it’s a responsibility to our students, it’s a responsibility to the object of our research or creative work—and all of these are among the reasons I see so many of my colleagues on their way home in the evening wheeling a suitcase full of work, and others remaining in labs or studios all night—but what elevates all of these to a righteous claim to share the governance of the institution, and to a share in our society’s public resources, is our responsibility to the **values** that make this work possible.

“I think you know what those values are. As I’ve reminded policymakers in Olympia, the model of a university as a community of scholars, discovering and exercising independent judgment about what constitutes knowledge or expertise in their fields and sharing that understanding with students, has for one thousand years allowed higher education to play the progressive role in society that we all respect. As we reminded ourselves several years ago in response to special inquiries into grants, undertaken by the National Institutes of Health in response to political pressure, freedom of inquiry and expression is the lifeblood of this community and we must resist short-sighted attempts to curtail it. The Faculty Code exists both to protect those freedoms and to establish how we will regulate our affairs and relationships as members of a community dedicated to advancing the arts, sciences, and applied professions. The Faculty Senate is the custodian of the code, and, as we had to remind the departed predecessor of President Emmert, it is a binding contract.

“Looking over the addresses of past nominees, I am struck by one change. Instead of bemoaning a continuing crisis of underfunding, we have a promising higher education budget. Faculty are working together with their administrations to increase the chance that, after decades of losing ground, we will be able to maintain this momentum over the coming decade. While the threat to our livelihood seems to have lessened, for the time being, we still need to work on explaining and maintaining the values of which I’ve been speaking. I want to mention first how this applies in our relationships with the state legislature and its constituents. I hope—and I won’t tell you how I propose to do this, since I haven’t figured it out—that as faculty we will take more responsibility for coming to understand the legitimate concerns of legislators and executive branch policymakers, whose decisions are so consequential for our work. In my experience, on both sides of the aisle there are decent, hard-working, and very intelligent people who are attempting to act in the public interest; we should help them do so, while helping them gently to understand that the university is and must be more than a workforce training program.

“I also believe that on both sides of the UW aisle, the faculty and the administration, there are decent, hard-working people, many with better-than-average intelligence, attempting to act in the interests of this community. Here, in contrast to the budget picture, there is great continuity with the themes of past Senate chairs. Progress has been made, and there is more work to be done. Without describing all the issues—grievance procedures, tri-campus policy, planning and budgeting, pay equity—I want to mention one that illustrates the task before us.

“Fifteen months ago, new procedures for faculty effort certification were promulgated, and training developed, that left many research faculty, particularly those fully federally funded, in an impossible situation. I’ve been talking with people in various committees and other settings about it since then, and have come to understand why it happened, and where some short-term solutions may be found.

But this understanding is still not shared by the hundreds and hundreds of faculty directly affected. The administrators with whom I've discussed this problem also appreciate the dilemma in which we've been placed, although at first I'm not sure they fully appreciated just how upset many faculty were. So I don't see any intentional disrespect on the part of the individuals involved. But there was no institutionalized process of consultation and communication that recognized, and acted on, the fears these procedures would induce in affected faculty and the very real risk that in the absence of dialogue, they would perceive the administration as solving its problem by passing liability to the faculty.

"Whose failure was this? It was not a failure of individuals but a failure on both sides to share responsibility for the situation. The Faculty Senate should have been perceived, and should have perceived itself, as a vehicle for establishing dialogue, and spreading it down into the departments, between administrators and faculty about the Catch-22 in which the federal government has placed us. But we didn't do this, so we shouldn't just point our finger at the administration for the painful effects of this situation. It is my hope that by continuing the work of past chairs, and by finding ways to help faculty take their own share of governance more seriously, we can avoid episodes like this one in the future. I will see the absence of such episodes as a measure of our joint accountability for regulating the affairs of this community: not only a community of scholars, but one of skills and of creativity, as the Provost has just reminded us; and also, let us hope, a community of justice.

"I want to close by recalling the principal theme. I have often succumbed, reluctantly, to the temptation to quote Henry Kissinger, who famously said that "university politics are so vicious precisely because the stakes are so small." Though amusing, and perhaps serving to remind us not to take our particular issues too seriously, this quote—the more I think about it—also reveals a failure to take seriously what moves us. Perhaps at Harvard, where we may think everyone was well paid, faculty were reduced to arguing over parking spaces. And for one such as Kissinger, accustomed to thinking only in terms of powers and interests, it may be difficult to understand that what is really moving us, in our disputes with each other, are *values* and *principles*. And if we remember that it's values and principles that are at stake, perhaps we won't have to be vicious.

"Thank you for your support, and I look forward in coming years to working together with all of you on behalf of the public good this institution represents."

#### 10. Nominations and Appointments.

**a. Action:** Election of Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Senate Chair Stygall asked senators to mark their ballots for their choice of Vice Chair. The ballots were collected and counted, with the understanding that the result would be announced later during the meeting.

**b. Action:** Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **{Exhibit D}**

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel first thanked Professor Lovell for his address, after which he nominated members of Faculty Councils and Committees as detailed in Exhibit D. All were approved.

#### 11. 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 Francis A. Brown of Education who died on November 17, 2006 after having served the University since 1953.

Clinical Professor Emeritus Theodore Dorpat of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences who died on October 3, 2006 after having served the University since 1953.

Professor Harold Goldberg of Medicine who died on December 27, 2006 after having served the University since 1980.

Professor Emeritus Richard A. Johnson of Business who died on December 13, 2006 after having served the University since 1956.

Clinical Professor Thomas W. Jones of Surgery who died on October 31, 2006 after having served the University since 1956.

Assistant Professor Deborah Kaplan of Communication who died on November 12, 2006 after having served the University since 2003.

Clinical Assistant George Cannon Pugsley of Ophthalmology who died on November 13, 2006 after having served the University since 1975.

**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.

## 12. New Business.

### a. **Class C Resolution. {Exhibit E}**

**Title:** Resolution Concerning Principles of State Higher Education Policy.

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

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel moved the resolution, after which Professor Lovell spoke about its background. The resolution originated in the Special Committee on Legislative Matters, which wanted to support a set of principles rather than endorsing a specific bill or sets of bills. The resolution passed.

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

**Title:** Resolution Regarding Student Lobby Day.

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

Vice Chair Dan Luchtel moved the resolution, which passed.

### c. **Class A Legislation – First Consideration. {Exhibit G}**

Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.

**Title:** Proposed 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.

**Action:** Conduct first 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. Professor Marcia Killien then offered a brief introduction to the history of the legislation, which originated in the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy. She noted that the growth of the University of Washington made it necessary to clarify what is to be understood by “campus” in the University Handbook, and especially after last year’s legislative mandate to expand the Bothell and Tacoma campuses to four-year institutions. The Bothell and Tacoma campuses have now been in existence for approximately seventeen years, and it is necessary to bring the language of the Handbook into line with the realities of how they function.

A number of senators responded to Professor Killien’s invitation to ask questions. Professor Ethan A. Merritt, Biochemistry, asked for clarification of how the policies of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses are congruent with the University Handbook. Professor Killien stated that their policies will be

consistent with the Handbook. Professor Michael Forman, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Tacoma, asked about how much independence the Bothell and Tacoma campuses would have with regard to admission and graduation policies. The response was that some requirements, such as the 180 credits required for graduation, would be in force at all the three campuses, while others were under local control. Hence, each campus would need to be a distinct governance unit, and this need is addressed by the legislation. Senate Chair Stygall noted that the university wide requirements are detailed in a part of the Handbook that is different from the legislation currently under consideration.

Professor Christine Disteché, Pathology, expressed her concern about understanding what the Senate was asked to actually vote on. Professor Killien indicated that a major purpose of the legislation is to make explicit certain points that are already reflected in current practice. Professor Sarah C. Stroup, Classics, spoke in support of the legislation, but indicated that she thought the legislation needs additional work. Professor Nathaniel Watson, Neurology, wondered if the Bothell and Tacoma campuses are accredited separately from the Seattle campus. Professor Killien responded that they are not. She also explained that there would not be separate faculty senates at Bothell and Tacoma, as the University of Washington Faculty Senate is both a faculty senate for the entire three-campus university and, effectively, a faculty organization for the Seattle campus.

Professor Marcy Stein, the Faculty Assembly Chair of the University of Washington at Tacoma, stated that the legislation is not an attempt to break the ties between Bothell/Tacoma and the Seattle campus. Professor Marcia A. Ciol, Rehabilitation Medicine, indicated that most of the faculty members in Seattle have an inadequate understanding of the workings of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, and stated that she wanted to vote for the legislation in order to support her colleagues there, who because of their day to day experience have a clearer sense of what their needs are.

Professor Killien concluded that there is a need to distinguish between the responsibilities of the faculty at the college level and on the campus level, and the legislation will address this need.

The question was called and the vote was taken. The motion passed.

13. Adjournment. **Adjourned at 4:11 p.m.**

PREPARED BY: Jan Sjøvik, acting for Gerry Philippsen, Secretary of the Faculty  
APPROVED BY: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate

## SEATBELTS IN UW SHUTTLE VEHICLES

### History of Issue:

- In 1999 an email inquiry was sent to former President McCormick after a staff forum was conducted asking why seatbelts were not provided in the Health Sciences Express (HSE) buses.
  - There was broad-based discussion held in Transportation Services and Facilities Services involving the following staff:
    - Fleet Manager
    - Property and Transport Services Manager
    - Shuttles Operations Manager
    - Transportation Services Director
    - Associate Vice-President for Facilities Services
  - After the discussions, it was determined not to install seat belts based on the additional liability the University would incur because drivers would not be able to enforce the use of seat belts.
- In February, 2001 an email was sent from the Director of Transportation Services to the Attorney Generals Office regarding asking for an opinion regarding the issue of whether seat belts should or should not be factory installed in the new fleet of buses being purchased. The Executive Vice President also requested a review of whether seat belts should or should not be installed in the new buses before bus specifications were finalized with the manufacturer.
  - The Attorney Generals Office referred the issue to Risk Management.
- In March, 2001 Risk Management rendered an opinion regarding seat belts in buses, concluding that the use of passenger restraints on buses would create liability exposure for the University.
  - Based on the Risk Management opinion, the Director of Transportation Services made the decision to not have seat belts installed in the new HSE buses.
- In January, 2006 UW Shuttles received an inquiry from a faculty member regarding lack of seat belts in the South Lake Union shuttle vehicles.
- In March, 2006 UW Shuttles consulted with its shuttle service partner, Gray Line of Seattle.
  - Gray Line stated that safety studies conducted regarding whether having seat belts in coaches or other large buses would make them safer have been inconclusive. Gray Line has adopted the industry standard and does not have seat belts in their large buses.
- In March, 2006 UW Shuttles sent a request to Risk Management to review the issue based on current laws and safety information and to render an updated opinion.
  - In March, 2006 Risk Management rendered an opinion which concurred with Risk Management's March, 2001 opinion.
- On November 6, 2006 the Risk Management Office reviewed the issue again and rendered an opinion that was in agreement with previous Risk Management opinions stating the following:
  1. There is no state or federal regulation requiring seat belts in large buses.
  2. Similar public transit buses in the Seattle area do not use seat belts.
  3. By installing the seat belts, the UW would be exceeding community standards; therefore creating more liability for itself.
  4. If seat belts are installed, drivers will be required to insure compliance with their use and will be required to limit passengers, i.e. no standing passengers on the bus.

**University of Washington  
Global Support Project  
January 2007**

## Project Concept

The University of Washington (UW) needs an institutional administrative framework to effectively support global activities. While the UW has been engaged in global research and education for many years, administrative processes to support these activities are insufficient to handle increasing volume, scope and complexity. The support mechanisms need to be redesigned to better **enable global activities and provide services that are easy to use, timely and effective, and also address associated risks**. This project aims to establish mechanisms to better facilitate global work, including enhanced collaboration on administrative matters related to global activities.

Objective: To engage members of the tri-campus community in a discussion focused on identifying and establishing the components of an institutional framework to administratively support global activities.

***Project activities will be closely aligned with institutional global strategies and initiatives, while at the same time working to address current challenges.***

### I. Phased approach and Timeline

- Phase I - Sponsored Projects, (to be completed mid-2007)
- Phase II - Education and Programmatic Activities, (to be completed in Fall 2007)
- Phase III - Other Global Activities (e.g., foreign visitors) (to begin Winter 2008)

While each phase will inform the others, initial focus will be developing strategies to support sponsored projects. The greatest degree of growth, complexity and institutional risk involves externally funded research and training. In addition, with institutional strategy being mobilized towards global health, focus on administrative processes to support this strategy is timely and appropriate.

### II. Campus-wide involvement (refer to Global Support Organizational Chart)

- Core Working and sub-working groups
- Critical project stakeholders
- Campus-wide communication

### III. Potential deliverables

- Tools and guidelines (e.g., Web portal to relevant administrative procedures)
- Country by country matrix on key issues/challenges
- Data and information
- Policies and procedures (e.g., foreign office opening)

### IV. Other potential outcomes

- On-going organizational and communication structure to address emerging issues and reassess current structures
- Partnering with selected universities involved in global research and education activities

### V. Funding

No central funds to support the project are needed at this time. Depending on services or systems needed to support this activity, requests may result as the project evolves.

### VI. Next steps

- Process improvements based on priority areas identified by faculty/staff in focus groups
- Assess additional issues encountered in Education and Programmatic Activities

**Contacts:**

Karin Johnson  
Global Support Project Manager  
Financial Management  
[kejohnso@u.washington.edu](mailto:kejohnso@u.washington.edu)  
206-616-1603

Ann Anderson  
Assistant Vice President and Controller/Project Co-Lead  
Financial Management  
[andera@u.washington.edu](mailto:andera@u.washington.edu)  
206-543-4993

**Team members:**

Susan Jeffords  
Vice Provost for Global Affairs – Project  
Co-Lead

Constance Adams  
Office of Global Affairs

Doug Breckel  
CFO, Treasury, Financial Management

Jean Brouelette  
Administrator, Center for Studies in  
Demography and Ecology

Kim Dinh  
Administrator, Provost's Office

Steve Gove  
Buyer, Purchasing

Karen Long  
Director, Financial Services, Financial  
Management

Rebecca McIntyre  
Assistant Director, UW Real Estate

Frank Montgomery  
Special Projects, Financial Management

Ted Mordhurst  
Assistant Director for Compliance, Grant  
and Contract Accounting, Financial  
Management

Linda Nelson  
Director of Finance & Administration  
College of Arts and Sciences

Lawrie Robertson  
Director of Finance & Administration  
School of Public Health and Community  
Medicine

Mani Soma  
College of Engineering; Associate Vice  
Provost for Research

Jeanne Semura  
Quality Improvement Manager, Financial  
Management/  
Global Support Project Facilitator

Ysabel Trinidad  
Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services,  
UW Tacoma

Amy Van Dyke  
Project Specialist, Office of Administrative  
Services  
UW Bothell

Daren Wade  
Program Manager, Global Health Resource  
Center, Health Science Administration

Sally Weatherford  
Assistant Director, Center for AIDS and  
STD, School of Medicine

Carol Zuiches  
Assistant Vice Provost for Research, Office  
of Sponsored Programs

**Project Advisors:**

Elizabeth Cherry, Risk Management  
Bill Nicholson, Attorney General's Office  
Maureen Rhea, Internal Audit  
Karen Van Dusen, Environmental Health and Safety

# DRAFT

## Minimum Data Security Standards (Data Classification and Related Measures of Protection)

University of Washington

September 2005 // Revised 10/24/05 // Revised 12/06/05 // Revised 1/10/06  
Edits (EL) 1/20/06, Edits (KS) 3/6/06, Edits (KB) 10/11/06

*Prepared by:*  
Privacy Assurance and Systems Security Council (PASS Council)  
Kirk Bailey, UW Chief Information Security Officer, Chair

*Prepared for:*  
The University Technology Advisory Committee

### Table of contents

- 1. *Background*..... 12
  - 1.1. Context ..... 12
  - 1.2. Purpose ..... 12
  - 1.3. Applicability..... 12
  - 1.4. Audience..... 12
- 2. *Data Classification and Examples* ..... 12
- 3. *Controls for Protection of Data* ..... 15
  - 3.1. Records Management (Retention and Disposal of Data) ..... 15
  - 3.2. System Owners and Data Custodians: Roles and Responsibilities ..... 15
  - 3.3. Access Control Principles..... 15
  - 3.4. "Controlled" Computer ..... 15
  - 3.5. Controlled Application ..... 16
- 4. *Protective Measures for Data* ..... 16
  - 4.1. Protective Measures for Public Data ..... 16
  - 4.2. Protective Measures for Restricted Data ..... 17
  - 4.3. Protective Measures for Confidential Data..... 17
  - 4.4. Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures ..... 17
- Section 5. Exemptions* ..... 19
- Section 6. Reporting* ..... 19
- Section 7. Enforcement* ..... 19
- Appendix A. Glossary* ..... 20
- Appendix B. References*..... 21

## Section 1. Background

### 1.1. Context

The University of Washington (UW) and its affiliated institutions solicit, acquire, generate and maintain an enormous amount of information as part of business operations, education programs, and extensive research efforts. This information is a core asset for the UW and central to its ability to succeed in its mission.

This document describes the measures the UW and certain affiliated organizations take to protect electronic information entrusted to its care. A companion UW document, *Minimum Computer Security Standards*, describes the measures used to protect computers at the UW.

This document covers standards that are specific to the protection of UW information assets in electronic form (data). The intent of these standards is to support existing UW policy and information protection objectives by defining a minimum set of security standards that also support the UW's compliance requirements.

Proper protection of data is determined by a combination of compliance requirements mandated by state and federal government statutes and regulations, accepted best practices, and institutional risk management decisions. The approach taken at the UW is to adopt a classification scheme for all data and to define measures and practices that provide appropriate protection for each class of data.

### 1.2. Purpose

These standards define a classification scheme for data and related measures that employees and others working with data must take to protect it. This standard, in conjunction with the [UW Information Systems Security Policy](#) and the [Minimum Computer Security Standards](#), provides the basic directions for the protection of UW data from:

- Unauthorized internal access
- Unauthorized external access
- Inappropriate use
- Loss, corruption, or theft

### 1.3. Applicability

This minimum data security standard applies to all data associated with UW business; to any other data caches covered by statutory or regulatory compliance requirements that are found in all UW colleges, schools, departments, and other business units; and to data caches on UW affiliates' information systems. Data associated with UW hosted research efforts that represent significant intellectual property interests also are subject to this standard, and, in addition, may be subject to other specific protective requirements.

Any questions about the applicability of this standard can be forwarded to the UW Chief Information Security Officer for review by the PASS Council.

### 1.4. Audience

The targeted audience for this standard includes all UW *system owners* and *designated data custodians* (see Appendix A, Glossary). It also is for all individuals who have access to and use UW information systems and data assets.

## Section 2. Data Classification and Examples

The nature of the data largely determines what measures and operational practices need to be applied to protect it. To help clarify the various minimum requirements for UW data security, three categories of data have been defined. It is essential that those who are accountable for protecting the data (e.g., system owners and data custodians) understand and inventory their data assets according to these categories.

- **CATEGORY A – CONFIDENTIAL:** Data that is very sensitive in nature and typically subject to federal or state regulations. Unauthorized disclosure of this data could seriously and adversely impact the university or the interests of individuals and organizations associated with the university.
- **CATEGORY B – RESTRICTED:** Data that is generally circulated and subject to disclosure laws, yet sensitive enough to warrant careful management and protection to ensure its integrity, appropriate access, and availability.
- **CATEGORY C – PUBLIC:** Data that is published for public use or has been approved for general access by the appropriate UW authority.

Table 1. clarifies the nature of each data category and provides criteria for determining which classification is appropriate for a particular set of data. When using this table, a positive response for the most restrictive (highest risk) category in any row is sufficient to place that set of data into that category.

**Table 1. Data Classification Categories**

	<b>Category A CONFIDENTIAL</b>	<b>Category B RESTRICTED</b>	<b>Category C PUBLIC</b>
<b>Legal Requirements</b>	Protection of data is required by law. (See examples of specific HIPAA and FERPA data elements below.)	UW has a contractual obligation or best practice (due care) reason to protect the data.	
<b>Risk Level</b>	High	Medium	Low
<b>Examples of Risk</b>	The UW’s reputation is tarnished by public reports of its failures to protect sensitive records of employees, students, or clients.	Data is disclosed unnecessarily or in an untimely fashion, which causes harm to UW business interests or to the personal interests of an individual.	Confusion is caused by corrupted information about enrollment and tuition that is displayed on the official UW Web site.
<b>Examples of Specific Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">HIPAA</a> – protected data <i>when associated with a health record</i><sup>1</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Patient names</li> <li>- Street address, city, county, zip code</li> <li>- Dates (except year) for dates related to an individual</li> <li>- Social Security Numbers</li> <li>- Health conditions and symptoms</li> <li>- Prescriptions</li> <li>- Account/Medical rec. #s</li> <li>- Health plan beneficiary information</li> <li>- Certificate and license #s</li> <li>- Vehicle ID and serial #s</li> <li>- Device ID and serial #s</li> <li>- Biometric identifiers</li> <li>- Full-face images</li> <li>- Any other unique identifying</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UW NetID account information</li> <li>• Contact information between the UW and business partners or vendors</li> <li>• Library use records</li> <li>• Employee Internet usage</li> <li>• Telephone billing information</li> <li>• Parking permits</li> <li>• Location of assets</li> <li>• Critical infrastructure blueprints or schematics</li> <li>• Specific physical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus promotional material</li> <li>• Annual reports</li> <li>• Press statements</li> <li>• Job titles</li> <li>• Job descriptions</li> <li>• Employee work phone numbers (with special exceptions)</li> <li>• Employee work locations (with special exceptions)</li> <li>• Employee email addresses (with special exceptions)</li> <li>• Value and nature</li> </ul>

	<p align="center"><b>Category A CONFIDENTIAL</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Category B RESTRICTED</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Category C PUBLIC</b></p>
	<p>number, characteristic, or code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Payment guarantor's information</li> <li>- Telephone and fax #s</li> <li>- Email, URLs, and IP #s</li> <li>• <a href="#">FERPA</a> – individual student records<sup>2</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grades</li> <li>- Courses taken</li> <li>- Schedule</li> <li>- Test scores</li> <li>- Advising records</li> <li>- Educational services received</li> <li>- Disciplinary actions</li> <li>- Student ID #</li> <li>- SSN</li> <li>- Student private email (with exceptions related to UW business)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">Export Controls</a> (e.g., ITAR)<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• <a href="#">Gramm-Leach-Bliley</a> (GLB)<sup>4</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employee financial account information</li> <li>- Student financial account information (aid, grants, bills)</li> <li>- Individual financial information</li> <li>- Business partner and vendor financial account information</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Employee information                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social Security Number</li> <li>- Date of birth</li> <li>- Home address or personal contact information</li> <li>- Performance reviews</li> <li>- Specific benefit selections</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Donor information</li> <li>• Trade secrets, intellectual and/or proprietary research information</li> <li>• Information required to be protect by contract</li> <li>• Vendor non-disclosure agreements</li> <li>• Attorney/client privileged records</li> <li>• Restricted police records (e.g., victim information, juvenile records)</li> <li>• Computer account passwords</li> <li>• Certain <a href="#">affirmative action</a> related data<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>	<p>security measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific technical security measures</li> <li>• Proprietary research</li> <li>• UW employee business-related email (including student employees, but only their work-related email)</li> </ul>	<p>of fringe benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of Washington business records</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup>For more information on HIPAA: [http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/faq\\_hipaa.html](http://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/faq_hipaa.html)

<sup>2</sup>For more information on FERPA: <http://www.washington.edu/students/reg/ferpafac.html>

<sup>3</sup>For more information on Export Controls: <http://www.washington.edu/research/osp/ecr.html>

<sup>4</sup>For more information on GLB: <http://www.ftc.gov/privacy/glbact/glb-faq.htm>

<sup>5</sup>For more information on UW Affirmative Action Policy:  
[http://www.washington.edu/admin/eoo/hb\\_Vol-IV\\_Non-discr.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/eoo/hb_Vol-IV_Non-discr.html)

### **Section 3. Controls for Protection of Data**

This section outlines the controls that are necessary to implement the protective measures outlined in Section 4, Protective Measures for Data.

#### **3.1. Records Management (Retention and Disposal of Data)**

This standards document is specific to measures and practices necessary for the protection of electronic UW data. Everyone who is accountable for the management or use of UW data must also become familiar with other university-wide and departmental policies and procedures related to records management that are published separately. These include records retention policy and procedures for the proper disposal of electronic media and paper records. For details, see the Records Retention and Confidentiality Web page: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/pol.proc/cdl/recordsReten.html>

#### **3.2. System Owners and Data Custodians: Roles and Responsibilities**

Section 6 of the *UW Information Systems Security Policy* defines the specific roles and responsibilities of groups and individuals within the university. These roles and responsibilities form the basis of accountability for and functional requirements of the protection of UW information systems. The roles of the *system owner* and *data custodian* are key to successful data protection practices. All individuals who have been designated as a *system owner* and/or *data custodian* should review their responsibilities as specified in these *Minimum Data Security Standards*, the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*, and the *Minimum Computer Security Standards*.

#### **3.3. Access Control Principles**

A required measure for protecting both confidential and restricted data is an *access control system* (see Appendix A, Glossary) that has physical, technical, and procedural elements. Any access control measure established by a *system owner* or *data custodian* must be implemented and maintained in compliance with the *principle of least privilege* and the *principle of separation of duties* (see Appendix A, Glossary) as specified in the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*.

#### **3.4. "Controlled" Computer**

All computer systems that host confidential data or applications that use restricted data must be carefully controlled in terms of their configuration, operation, maintenance, and security measures.

It is the responsibility of the owner of the controlled computer to ensure that all management requirements are met. Controlled computers must be managed with a level of care and professional support that includes the following:

**3.4.1.** Controlled computers will meet all UW minimum computer security standards.

**3.4.2.** *Controlled* computers must be managed to professional standards, preferably by well-trained or certified employees or contractors with sufficient knowledge and resources to ensure that data on them are properly secured.

**3.4.3.** Operating systems and applications on controlled computers must be patched to and maintained at the most current level provided by their manufacturers.

**3.4.4.** Controlled computers should run no programs or services that are not necessary to their core purpose. For example, controlled computers that contain sensitive data should not run Web or file-sharing services, since these are frequently targeted and compromised by outsiders. Network-aware client software on controlled computers, such as Web browsers or email readers, should block the automatic execution of attachments, graphical files, or other common carriers of computer viruses, Trojans, or worms.

**3.4.5.** Controlled computers must prevent unauthorized users from running programs or accessing raw data. For example, there should be no "guest," shared or general-purpose accounts on controlled computers. User accounts should be limited to the minimum necessary for the operation of the computer and its core functions. Accounts with substantial system-administration privileges should be granted only to a few individuals with general management responsibility for the systems in question, and never to individuals without UW faculty or staff appointments. In general, system-administrator and similar "root" accounts should be used only when strictly required, and never when use of a less privileged account could achieve the same purpose.

**3.4.6.** User-authentication processes must encrypt or otherwise protect username and password exchanges from interception. In general, login or shell access to controlled computers must be restricted to the campus network and/or with secured remote access (security industry best practices) including two-factor authentication mechanisms.

**3.4.7.** All user passwords associated with administrative access to controlled computers should meet or exceed UW policy for complexity guidelines. In addition, users with extensive access to controlled computers should avoid using the corresponding passwords for other purposes.

**3.4.8.** Controlled computers must be reasonably secured against unauthorized access, including data interception and compromise. For example, controlled computers must connect to the network using technologies that are reasonably secure from sniffing, which excludes unencrypted hub or wireless connections. Controlled computers must run antivirus and anti-spyware software, updating definition files frequently. They should run host-based firewall or equivalent port-blocking software, configured to disable all ports not necessary for system functioning.

**3.4.9.** Controlled computers must be provided physical security measures necessary to prevent theft, tampering, or destruction.

**3.4.10.** Controlled computers must subscribe to a regimented backup process to ensure data integrity, system availability, and business continuity functions as required.

### **3.5. Controlled Application**

All applications that handle restricted data must be written in a way that ensures that restricted data is not inadvertently exposed, either through errors in design or coding or by not implementing appropriate security measures (e.g., encryption, authorization, and authentication). In addition, Web application code should be securely developed to meet Open Web Application Security Project standards (see Section 4.3.2).

## **Section 4. Protective Measures for Data**

This section outlines the specific measures that must be taken and practices that must be followed by university units and personnel in order to adequately protect data owned or managed by the university.

### **4.1. Protective Measures for Public Data**

The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host public data. In addition, public data must be protected by the specific measures identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

#### 4.2. Protective Measures for Restricted Data

The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host restricted data. In addition, restricted data must be protected by the specific measures identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

#### 4.3. Protective Measures for Confidential Data

**4.3.1.** The UW's minimum computer security standards are required for all computer systems that host confidential data. This basic requirement, along with several other specific measures, is identified in Section 4.4 of this document, Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures.

**4.3.2.** Applications that are linked to databases or data files that contain sensitive data must meet the Open Source Web Application Security Project (OWASP) standards for secure coding (<http://www.owasp.org>). Owners of such applications are required to demonstrate compliance with these standards when audited or when requested by the UW CISO (Chief Information Security Officer).

**4.3.3.** Loading confidential data onto laptops and other portable computing and data storage devices (e.g., USB flash drives, CDs, PDAs, BlackBerries, etc.) is discouraged and restricted to unusual operational circumstances that require such action. If it is necessary to load confidential data on to a portable computing or portable data storage device, the data must be encrypted and password protected, or an equivalent access protection measure must be taken. A laptop or other portable computing device that has confidential data stored on it must be treated as a "controlled computer." It must also have additional security features to prevent unauthorized use of the system if it is lost or stolen.

\* **4.3.4.** *Contractor and vender controls and practices... (implementation of strong risk transfer approach...standard contract recitals for data sharing, indemnification and oversight). Also, preferred management practices associated with outsider data privileges and access.*

#### 4.4. Reference Matrix for Data Protection Measures

At a minimum, every computer on or directly connecting to the campus network is required to be a "controlled computer" and must meet minimum computer security standards. In addition, the data on a UW computer may need to be protected with additional security measures, which are summarized in the matrix in Table 2.

Table 2. Matrix for System Security Measures for Data Classifications

PROTECTIVE MEASURE	DATA CATEGORY		
	CONFIDENTIAL	RESTRICTED	PUBLIC
Minimum Computer Security Standards	Yes	Yes	Yes
Access Control Measures (Authorization)	Yes (documented and audited for compliance once every three years)	Yes (documented)	Yes (limited to system administrators)
Log Reviews and Alerts	Logging alerts and regular reviews	Regular reviews	Basic logging and random periodic reviews
Authentication	Yes (two-layer Minimum)	Yes (two-layer recommended)	Configure computer access to: yes for "write," none for "read"
Firewall Protection	Yes (per controlled computer requirements)	Yes	Yes (if feasible)
Backup and Recovery Processes	Yes (per controlled computer requirements)	Yes	Yes
Physical Security	Yes	Yes	Yes
Encryption (During Transmission)	Yes	Yes	No
Encryption (Storage)	Recommended	Optional	No
Personnel Criminal Background Check	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)	Yes (as specified by UW Human Resources)
Audit of Security Measures	Yes (minimum of once every three years and more frequent audits, if possible)	Yes (random sampling)	Recommended (random sampling)

**Section 5. Exemptions**

While rare and unwelcome, there are situations that may require exemptions from these standards. In accordance with the *UW Information Systems Security Policy*, the PASS Council is empowered to grant exemptions. For details, see *UW Information Systems Security Policy Development, Revision, and Exemption Processes*:

<http://www.washington.edu/computing/security/pass/is.sec.pol.revision.html>

In the case of UW Medicine, exemption requests must follow UW Medicine IT Services procedures before submission to the PASS Council.

**Section 6. Reporting**

When a breach of security is discovered that may have caused the compromise of confidential data, including a breach of security on a controlled computer, it is required that the incident be reported as soon as possible to C&C Security Operations.

**Section 7. Enforcement**

Enforcement of these minimum data security standards is the responsibility of the UW Chief Information Security Officer and the PASS Council, with support from Risk Management, Internal Audit, and Computing & Communications.

## Appendix A. Glossary

(From UW [Information Systems Security Policy](#), Definitions)

**Access Control System:** Physical, procedural and/or electronic mechanism that ensures that only those who are authorized to view, update, and/or delete data can access that data.

**Authorization:** The process of giving someone permission to do or have something; a system administrator defines which users are allowed access to the system and what privileges are allowed for each user.

**Confidentiality:** An attribute of information. Confidential information is sensitive, contractually protected, or information whose loss, corruption, or unauthorized disclosure could be harmful or prejudicial.

**Data Custodians:** As defined in the UW Information Systems Security Policy, individuals who have been officially designated as being accountable for protecting the confidentiality of specific data that is transmitted, used, or stored on a system or systems within a department, college, school, or administrative unit of the UW and certain affiliated organizations.

**Encryption:** The process of turning readable text into unreadable (cipher) text, which requires the use of a decipher key to render it readable.

**Ownership:** The term that signifies decision-making authority and accountability for a given scope of control.

**Personally Identifiable Information:** Personally identifiable information is defined as data or other information that is tied to, or which otherwise identifies, an individual or provides information about an individual in a way that is reasonably likely to enable identification of a specific person and make personal information about them known.

Personal information includes, but is not limited to, information regarding a person's home or other personal address, social security number, driver's license, marital status, financial information, credit card numbers, bank account numbers, parental status, sexual orientation, race, religion, political affiliation, personal assets, medical conditions, medical records or test results, home or other personal phone numbers, non-university address, employee number, personnel or student records, and information related to the UW [Affirmative Action Policy](#)

**Principle of Least Privilege:** Access privileges for any user should be limited to only what they need to have to be able to complete their assigned duties or functions, and nothing beyond these privileges.

**Principle of Separation of Duties:** Whenever practical, no one person should be responsible for completing or controlling a task, or set of tasks, from beginning to end when it involves the potential for fraud, abuse or other harm.

**Privacy:** An individual right to be left alone; to withdraw from the influences of his or her environment; to be secluded, not annoyed, and not intruded upon; to be protected against the misuse or abuse of something legally owned by an individual or normally considered by society to be his or her property.

**Security:** An attribute of information systems practices that includes specific policy-based, procedural, and technical mechanisms and assurances for protecting the confidentiality and integrity of information, the availability and functionality of critical services and the confidentiality of sensitive information.

**Sensitive Information:** General term for any information that requires access controls and other control measures to meet legal, policy and/or ethical requirements.

**System:** A network, computer, software package, or other entity for which there can be security concerns.

**System Owners:** As defined in the UW Information Systems Security Policy, individuals within the UW community who are accountable for the budget, management, and use of one or more electronic information systems or electronic applications that support UW business, client services, educational, or research activities that are associated or hosted by the UW.

**Users:** Any individual that has been granted access and privileges to UW computing and network services, applications, resources, and information.

## Appendix B. References

Washington State Information Services Board IT Security Policy, Standards and Guidelines (<http://isb.wa.gov/policies/security.aspx>)

[UW Information Systems Security Policy](#)

[Minimum Computer Security Standards](#)

**Faculty Council on University Libraries**

Retman Sonnet, Group 4, American Ethnic Studies, for a term of September 16, 2006 – September 15, 2009.

Mark Kot, Group 3, Mathematics, for a term of September 15, 2006 - September 16, 2009.

***The following are nominated to serve a term of September 16 – September 15, 2007:*****Academic Standards**

Erin Shields, ASUW

**Benefits and Retirement**

Andrew Everett, ASUW

**Educational Outreach**

Angela Ju, ASUW

Jonathan Ting, GPSS

**Educational Technology**

Linda Lane, ASUW

**Faculty Affairs**

Erin Shields, ASUW

**Instructional Quality**

Erin Shields, ASUW

**Multicultural Affairs**

David Kim, ASUW

Sara Diaz, GPSS

**Research**

McKinley Smith, ASUW

David Foster, UWRA

**Student Affairs**

Anna Batie, GPSS

Erin Shields, ASUW

**Tri-Campus Policy**

Paul Fleurdelys, ASUW

**University Facilities and Services**

Adel Sefrioui, ASUW

**University Libraries**

Jessica Albano, ALUW

Jessica Mortensen, ASUW

**University Relations**

Scott Macklin (with Suzette Ashby-Larrabee as alternate), PSO

Nataly Bankson, ASUW

John Bolcer, ALUW

**Women in Academia**

Kelly Gilblom, ASUW

Pamela Yorks, ALUW

**Resolution Concerning:****Principles of State Higher Education Policy**

WHEREAS, Higher education enables citizens to better understand their world and adapt throughout their lifetimes to a changing social landscape; and

WHEREAS, Higher education is increasingly a prerequisite for participating in a knowledge-based economy through rewarding occupations that take advantage of the intellectual and creative talents of our people; and

WHEREAS, The social and economic welfare of all people in a region, not just those who go to college, is advanced when excellent higher education is widely accessible; and

WHEREAS, Policymakers in Washington State, through the "Washington Learns" process, have identified a set of eight "global challenge" states with advanced, knowledge-based economies that compete on a global stage; and

WHEREAS, Washington State ranks last among the global challenge states in the percentage of high-school freshmen who go on to complete baccalaureate degrees; and

WHEREAS, The University of Washington's combined funding from tuition and state sources per full-time equivalent student is approximately \$4,000 below the average of peer institutions in the global challenge states; and

WHEREAS, Competitive levels of per-student funding will enhance the ability of students to serve the public welfare and take advantage of the opportunities our economy offers; and

WHEREAS, Faculty share the governance of the institution with the administration, with primary responsibility for setting admissions and degree requirements, hiring and promoting faculty, and maintaining academic standards; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate endorses the following principles for state higher education policy:

1. Extending its paramount duty to make ample provision for the education of all children, the state should provide affordable access to higher education for all persons living in Washington, at a level consistent with their needs, abilities, and interests;
2. To provide the quality of education that Washington students need and deserve, public funding of four-year institutions, in combination with affordable tuition payments, must rapidly reach a level competitive with peer institutions in the global challenge states;
3. Faculty are ready to contribute their talents and experience to educational policy and believe that such consultation will promote the public benefits of a widely accessible, high-quality college educational system.

*Submitted by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
January 25, 2007*

**Class C Resolution Concerning Supporting Student Involvement in Lobby Day**

WHEREAS, Lobby Day will be held Thursday, February 15, 2007; and

WHEREAS, this is an opportunity for all University of Washington students to present their opinions regarding higher education to their legislators; and

WHEREAS, Thursday, February 15, 2007 is a scheduled class day; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the proposal of the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate that the faculty of the University of Washington make every effort to facilitate student involvement in Lobby Day by excusing them from class on Thursday, February 15, 2007.

*Submitted by:  
Senate Executive Committee  
January 25, 2007*

**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 23-23. Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments: Definitions**

For purposes of the University Handbook:

- A. The word "campus" refers only to those listed in Section 23-11A. Campuses shall have the full range of powers and responsibilities required to serve the needs of their students and other stakeholders in accordance with their respective campus missions, including the powers to determine their curricula, academic standards, and admissions policies.

**Rationale:** No definition of "campus" is given in this section, in spite of its title. The wording here clarifies that the campuses are entities designed to serve different sets of stakeholders in accordance with different mission statements that were established through the Washington State legislature and prior action of the university faculty. It thus acknowledges a greater degree of institutional complexity and autonomy than that of a school or college. Although this may not be the ideal place to enumerate powers specific to campuses, a "campus" is distinguished from a "college" or "school" in part by the additional functions required to provide seamless, self-contained graduate and undergraduate degree programs that are responsive to a student population largely distinct from that served by other campuses.

- B. The words "college" and "school" refer only to those listed in Section 23-11B.
- C. The word "department" refers to any separately organized unit within a college or school which has been established by the Board of Regents or by the President, to any department-level interdisciplinary unit which has been established by the dean of a college or school, and to any department-level interdisciplinary unit involving two or more schools or colleges which has been established by the Provost.
- D. An academic program is an area of specialization which has one or more of the following characteristics: has program as part of its title; grants a degree or a credential; has a sequence of courses with a common prefix; has been identified as a program by a distinct faculty action. Ordinarily, an academic program shall be smaller than an administrative unit such as a department and larger than the activities of a single faculty member.

**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 college or school other than the Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure except as stipulated in Subsection B. ~~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 college faculty.~~ The faculty of campuses, schools and colleges shall have the right to review decisions on organization and rules of procedure determined by the faculty of their academic sub-units.
- 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. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each college's or school's procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.

- C. 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 campuses and fields of graduate study.
- D. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty governance organization that, in addition to the responsibilities set forth in Sub-section B, also advise their Chancellor and Vice Chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses.

**Rationale:** Faculty councils at the UWB and UWT preside over organizations that are more integrated and self-contained than those of schools and colleges. They also serve student populations and other stakeholders different from those served by UWS. This section acknowledges that the “general welfare” of these campuses is not necessarily identical to that of UWS, and that it is the responsibility of the elected faculty councils on these campuses to uphold it.