

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Gowen Hall, Room 301
2:30 p.m., Thursday, 24 April 2003

Introductory Remarks – Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate

Chair Sandra Silberstein began the meeting noting the amount of legislation on the agenda,. Silberstein reviewed the salary materials that had previously been forwarded to senators. These materials allow us to understand what it would take to catch up with our peer institutions. Then, we can proceed with our budget and salary discussions and recommendations in an informed way. Second, for the first time, the Faculty Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee and the Board of Deans have agreed on a set of long-term compensation goals and principles. Agreeing that we want to be a great state university, these two groups believe that faculty quality is a key driver for this goal. The policy restates the legislative and institutional goal of reaching the 75 percentile of our HEC Board peer group, as well as reaffirming the "shalls" of the faculty salary policy. One new point is the requirement that the 2 percent salary allocation shall be included in the straw budgets as a line item. This would prevent salaries from being the University "budget balancer" in the same fashion that higher education is used to balance the overall state budget. It makes faculty compensation a part of the institution's permanent commitments.

Another discussion has been based on the understanding that faculty are not the only people on whom the success of the institution rests. While we may not understand all of the details for other categories of employees, we can commit ourselves to an improved salary base for all employees. This statement was endorsed by the SCPB, the Board of Deans, the Librarians, Professional Staff and Classified Staff. Silberstein pointed to these achievements as an attempt to find common ground with other groups in the University community in our attempts to improve the quality of the University.

While there will be cuts, those decisions will be made in large measure by deans at the level of the college; therefore, people will need to be involved in these budget discussions at their local level. For example, Arts and Sciences will be holding a meeting of the entire college to discuss possible cuts. Silberstein urged senators to discuss budget issues with their colleagues on their unit's college councils.

Silberstein then asked senators to spend a few moments brain-storming ways to improve quality. She noted that she and Provost Thorud will be forming a joint group on quality that will focus on what needs to be protected in a time of retrenchment. This part of the meeting drew attention to the following areas:

- Teaching assistants rather than having less-trained part-time people in order to protect the quality of teaching
- Writing Instruction
- Infrastructure for research, e.g. machine shops, technical facilities
- Fellowships and other funds for graduate student recruitment
- Professional Staff Funds
- Libraries
- Structural support for instruction – teaching facilities
- Feedback from students

- Support for students to do their work – e.g., computing facilities
- Faculty retention
- Finding non-financial ways to reinforce excellence
- Faculty research time

Silberstein asked senators to e-mail any other ideas that they may have.

Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) – Douglas Wadden, Chair

Since the last meeting, SCPB has approved three Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Program (RCEP) proceedings under Chapter 26 of the *Faculty Code*. These are the first full RCEPs since the inclusion of these provisions in the *Code*. Wadden expects that we will learn a great deal about these procedures, and the experience may trigger a re-thinking of the RCEP procedure, citing as an example, the lack of clarity about what triggers an RCEP, questions about the Program Identification Committees, and the timeline. The RCEPs are taking place in the College of Forestry, the College of Education and the Biology Program in the College of Arts and Sciences. None of these are in a confidential phase; the faculty have been informed and involved in the process.

The second item of discussion has been the budget. The Committee has been looking at the criteria for making decisions about differential cuts, and whether, indeed, they should be made in an across-the-board fashion. These discussions are simultaneously being discussed at the Board of Deans, the Senate, and the Regents. At the same time, the capitol budget and our need for funds for deferred maintenance have been discussed. Other questions have been raised about the UIF fund, including questions about what should be done with the substantial unspent funds in the UIF budget. There is a similar discussion about unallocated enrollment funds, which may amount to \$700,000 to \$1.1 million. The Committee is still reviewing a great deal of data, and awaiting a final budget.

Legislative Report – Gail Stygall, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative

Stygall noted that at this moment, there are two budgets, House and Senate, and we are waiting to see what will happen. The House budget is more favorable to higher education, and both must be considered. This morning, it was announced that Jim West, Senate majority leader, has cancer, and it is not clear how this will affect the budget process.

First, she reviewed the Senate budget. There is a nine percent tuition increase in this budget. There are several difficulties, including what she characterized as “fantasy revenue.” For example, she cited Bill 5135 that will charge students the full cost of their education if they exceed 125 percent of the credits necessary for graduation. The budget assumes an unrealistically high number of students will pay this amount. The senate budget also moves some facilities maintenance to the capitol budget. We would net a five percent cut.

Looking at what she described as the more cheerful budget, the House budget, she noted first that it recommends a 1.2 percent cut in the University's funding. This budget is more realistic in terms of actual costs, but does not solve all of the budgetary problems. At the current time, this budget assumes a sales tax increase of .2 percent for two years; no one

believes that this will pass. The House has been trying to generate revenues; if this cannot be done, there will be budget cuts. Given the cuts last year, the cumulative effect will be substantial.

On other fronts, the budgets preserve retention and recruitment, and preserve graduate and professional school tuition setting authority. There is also a bill that begins a study of a compact bill with accompanying performance measures. This has not always worked in other states – the state will back out even when institutions meet the performance measures. There will be faculty members involved in the study group, as well as many other stakeholders. Another issue that concerns the legislature is better articulation with the community colleges. Silberstein added that the proposed Senate budget translates into a five percent cut at this University.

Report of the President – Lee Huntsman, Interim President

Huntsman first reviewed his perspective on the situation in Olympia. Recalling the message that the University has been sending, and its success, he noted that it is still a great disappointment to see these budgets and the legislature's inclination to increase the micromanagement of higher education. This is in contrast to other states which have released control of their universities. In fairness, he pointed out that the House budget is better, and that there are some good points in the capitol budget. It is also important to note the deep fracture in the House Democratic caucus over the budget. If House members cannot come to some agreement, it is likely that the Senate budget, which is the worst for us, will prevail. While we have received a great deal of encouragement on an individual basis, collectively there has not been much improvement. He cited the graduate and professional school tuition bill "pushback" as an example of this.

While there are several bills based on some type of performance ideal, there is, Huntsman noted, one relatively clean bill that advances the compact notion. This would be a forthright vehicle to discuss the relationship between the legislature and the University. At the very least, he is hoping that this generates a body of legislators that understand our dilemma. He also noted that many states are facing similarly desperate times and measures. These nationwide conversations will have long-term consequences for the University. To this end, he recommended a recent article titled "Colleges in Crisis" appearing in Business Week. At the same time, he said that many of the article's remarks about universities are highly unfavorable.

Meanwhile, the University is still a place of great and remarkable accomplishments. For example, today the University received a gift of \$70 million from the Gates Foundation for the genomic sciences. He thanked and acknowledged faculty and staff who have worked diligently to secure this gift to fulfill our vision of excellence.

Questions/

David Bachman (Jackson School) asked about last year's failure to receive a 2 percent salary increase and the relationship between salaries and indirect costs. Huntsman explained that indirect costs are not a profit line, but support the actual costs of the research enterprise. This year will be a base year for conducting negotiations on the rate. If we had spent this money on salary rather than research, it would ultimately have led to a decrease in funding for research. While we have some flexibility with these funds, not using them for the research enterprise will "come back to bite us."

Finally, the salary policy in the *Code* said that the priorities are promotions, continuing merit and floor adjustments. It is important to recognize that there is a conditional clause in front of that policy: "If there is going to be a compensation adjustment," you must do "shalls" before the "mays." This means that there could be no centrally funded retention adjustments and he felt that this year the administration lived by that interpretation. He viewed the policy as a statement of aspirations. Are we going to live by the policy? Yes. How are we going to find the funds? Last year we did not, but this year we are trying to find those funds. He noted that there may be years where it is not possible to find funding for salary increases, and there may be a decision that the trade-offs cannot be made to take deeper cuts for salary adjustments. Ultimately, the only positive way forward is to find more revenue.

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda

At this point, the meeting was called to order and the Agenda was **approved**.

Summary of Executive Committee Actions

Announcements

1. We are currently holding Senate elections. Ballots are due May 2nd.
2. The President is holding a reception for the Senate after this meeting at his home.
3. The Day of Reflection was well received, and the faculty made a remarkable contribution to a difficult time.

Requests for Information

None.

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: Assistant Professor Carrie Cheney of Epidemiology, who died on March 14, 2003 after having served the University since 1990. Professor Emeritus & Vice President Emeritus for Research of the University George Wells Farwell of Physics, who died on April 11, 2003 after having served the University since 1976. Associate Professor Alan Fisher of English and Comparative Literature, who died on March 31, 2003 after having served the University since 1968; Professor Emeritus Donald C. Hawthorne of Genome Sciences, who died on March 19, 2003 after having served the University since 1958; Professor Emeritus Abraham Hertzberg of Aeronautics & Astronautics, who died on March 27, 2003 after having served the University since 1966.; Clinical Instructor Carol Hooper of Medicine, who died on April 2, 2003 after having served the University since 1992; Professor Emeritus Edward Clay "E.C." Lingafelter, Jr. of Chemistry, who died on April 7, 2003 after having served the University since 1939; Professor Emeritus Henry Reitan of Education, who died on March 17, 2003 after having served the University since 1967; Professor Emeritus George Strayer of Education, who died on March 26, 2003 after having served the University since 1949; Affiliate Instructor James Strother Terry of Medical History and Ethics, who died on April 2, 2003 after having served the University since 1993; Professor Emeritus Wade Volwiler of Medicine, who died

on February 20, 2003 after having served the University since 1949. 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.

Nominations and Appointments

Wadden introduced the nomination of Gail Stygall as the 2003-2004 Faculty Legislative Representative. **Approved Unanimously.**

Class A Legislation – Final Consideration: Policy Regarding Designation of Emeriti Faculty; Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 24, Section 24-34.B.10.

Kate O’Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)

Approved Unanimously.

Class A Legislation – First Consideration: Provisions Relating to Voting and Elections – Electronic Initiative; Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 21-71, 22-47, 22-48, 29-36

Kate O’Neill, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)

Silberstein first introduced Mark Farrelly from the Catalyst group who is here to answer technical questions. Then Kate O’Neill explained the legislation. Its basic intent is to make the voting procedures and publication requirements for the University Handbook media neutral. Thus, most of the changes are minor and technical, and largely consist of removing the word “print” from the current legislation. This would reduce the amount of paper that needs to be sent to the Faculty. Similarly, the University Handbook would be primarily published in electronic format, and the reference stations will be phased out. The principle rationale is to save money, paper, and to take advantage of the electronic environment. It has been reviewed by the FCFA, the Code Cops, and the Attorney General’s office for compliance with the Open Meetings Act, all with approval.

Discussion/

Brian Johnson (Architecture) noted first that he has a colleague who refuses to use e-mail, and asked how this situation would be handled. Second, he asked about the presence of people when ballots are counted. O’Neill responded that Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn’s memo does address that point. Farrelly explained that the program writes to a database recording the ID of the subject although not their individual identity. It is possible to look at that and one could look at an individual ballot as well as aggregate totals. There would not be a paper record unless it was printed out. Johnson asked about the necessity for the presence of the SEC during balloting. Farrelly said that tallying is instantaneous but further analysis could be done in another format and reviewed. Johnson pointed out that one of the functions of the SEC review is accuracy, and that we need some body to assure that the count is accurate. On the first point, O’Neill suggested that some kind of verification could be made. On the second, she noted that while Vaughn said this legislation would be “technology forcing,” some type of limited opt-out will be provided. The SEC will review this issue on a regular basis.

Eric Smith (Anthropology) suggested that the word "counted" be changed to "verified." This was given to Faculty Affairs to consider. Paul Beame (Computer Science and Engineering) pointed out that the point of the Catalyst tools was radically different than the purpose of voting. People who are the subject of surveys do not expect verification, but there could be concerns about verification in tight ballots. The Catalyst tools, he asserted, are not appropriate for this purpose. This same problem has also arisen in state electronic balloting proposals, and he suggested we look for other tools that might be better. Farrelly responded that while Catalyst was developed for classroom use, it has been adapted for human subjects research, and that a verification process has been developed. These tools have been held to rigorous standards, and have been used for voting by the ASUW and other bodies on campus.

Marc Lange (Philosophy) asked what "confidential" means in this context. Farrelly said that Web Q will work this way: You will vote on screen, and it will record a unique identification number that cannot be traced back to your identity. There is no translation in the software to trace this back to a person. This will be how confidentiality is assured. At the same time, votes can be tallied at any point. O'Neill pointed out, holding up a paper ballot, that most of the paper ballots come back with the address label. Smith asked about anonymity. Farrelly said that it is theoretically possible to construct this, but that it is not part of the software so there is relative anonymity. Don Janssen (Civil Engineering) asked whether the rationale memo Vaughn prepared will be part of the minutes. Silberstein said yes.

Vote: Approved.

Class B Legislation – First Consideration: Award of Honors for All Three Campuses; Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, Section 3

Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards and Jan Carline, Chair, Faculty Council on Instructional Quality

Plumb began the discussion of the legislation, noting that it would be an additional way to recognize student achievement on all three campuses. It has been under discussion for two years, and she outlined the review in the Faculty Councils. This legislation addresses the fact that transfer students have little chance of receiving this honor, even though the Handbook says that they are eligible. This is also a problem for Running Start students. Combined, this affects about one-half of the graduating students. In Council discussion, the members felt that this change would not dilute the value of the medal. Additionally, it is a way to recognize the contribution of the community colleges in our system, especially as articulation issues become more important.

Discussion/

Paul Beame (Computer Science) asked about the discrepancy between the requirements in section one and section two as to the numbers of credits required, and how this would affect transfer students with between 45 and 60 credits. Laura Newell (Anthropology, member of FCAS) explained that Tim Washburn had worked out the credit hour requirements. (Tim Washburn was not available to answer questions.) It was agreed that this should be considered. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, recalling the discussion at the SEC, said that it may well be that there are students who fall through a gap but that the general intent was to cover transfer students from the community colleges, or those who had acquired three-quarters of their credits here. Thus, it was intentional that some transfer students may be excluded.

Mary Gillmore (Social Work) noted that the present *Code* language does not specify degree requirements, while parts of this new legislation do. She asked about the rationale for this distinction. Jack Meszaros (Bothell) stated that this would allow the Bothell and Tacoma campuses to develop their own internal criteria for these awards. Plumb added that these two campuses have only transfer students. Gillmore then inquired why it is not in the current legislation. Plumb responded that this had to be specified when transfer students were added to the mix. Susan Coldwell (Dentistry) explained that she has been working with Heritage College students, and encouraging them to transfer. Those students would be excluded from this award, she claimed, although they attend Washington colleges. Olswang explained our contractual obligation to community colleges under the articulation agreement. Arrangements with Heritage College will be covered under that agreement.

Beame stated that it seemed that the old language worked reasonably well, although it excluded transfer students. He wondered why we did not retain the language of part A, and find a different name or title for an award for transfer students. This, he commented, would be simpler. Plumb stated that this was not the intention of the legislation. Newell added that the committee did not want a situation in which the medals would be "ranked"; the committee explicitly decided that the names should be the same for all.

Dale Durran (Atmospheric Sciences), noting how difficult it is to identify the recipient, commented that the three-quarters requirement of the first section of the legislation seems superfluous because only a student who had been here for a lengthy period would qualify. Similarly, in the transfer category, if the required number of credits is lowered, then students with fewer credits will also be disadvantaged within that category. He then suggested that the three-quarters requirement be eliminated in the first, and that the sixty-hour requirement be retained in the second part. Newell explained that the committee's opinion was that a student should be required to spend three quarters of their time here for the first medal, especially given how easy it is to graduate from the University with very few in-residence credits. This decision was the result of years of experience in selecting an award recipient because the award should reflect work done at the University of Washington. Plumb noted that the committee did try to address all of the possible permutations and come up with criteria that were fair. Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges (English) stated that if you want the award to reflect work done at the University, there needs to be parallelism between the different parts of the legislation. Don Janssen (FCAS member) urged senators not to micromanage the credit requirements in the award, noting that the committee wanted to create two separate pools. Washburn had carefully developed credit requirements that would meet the goal of the committee. In reality, the gap between forty-five and sixty credits is not that great because the course loads typically taken by transfer students exceed the 180 credits required for graduation. Jan Carline (Medical Education; Chair, FCIQ) noted that the transfer requirements allow ninety credits from a community college. Another senator moved to postpone the issue to the next meeting. **Vote: Postponed to the next meeting.**

Adjournment

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate

Secretary of the Faculty

Memo

To: Senate Executive Committee
From: Lea B. Vaughn
Date: 6 April 2003
Re: Rationale for "Electronic Initiative" Class A Legislation

Revised, for submission to Faculty Senators on 15 April 2003 based on comments from the Senate Executive Committee. I will not be able to be present at the meeting so I am submitting this memo to you. I have tried to anticipate all questions and comments that you may have. Thank you.

Background: Currently, the *Faculty Code* requires paper balloting for senatorial elections and for Class A and B legislation. This process is costly: it consumes many hours of personnel time and costs a great deal of money. For example, staff must print all of the senatorial ballots on different batches of colored paper, and then hand count them when the ballots return to the office. Similarly, we estimate that paper balloting can cost between \$5000 and \$15,000 in any given year, these costs going for paper, copying charges, and mailing service charges.

Similarly, the *Code* requires that the University Handbook be maintained in a paper format. This requires maintenance of extensive paper copies in every reference station of the three campus University. At the same time, the *Code* requires transmission of information to Faculty on a regular basis, usually in the form of Class C bulletins. One typical Class C bulletin mailing can cost \$3500 to \$4000. Similarly, this quarter we have budgeted \$6,000 for the copying and mailing of Faculty Senate ballots, and Class A legislation.

In the meantime, the University has increasingly moved to an electronic system of communication and records maintenance. E-mail is now the default mode of communication for faculty, staff and students. Rebecca Deardorff, who heads the Administrative Procedures Office, has ceased publication of the paper *Operations Manual*. It has been replaced with the electronic *Administrative Policy Statements (APS)*. Similarly, there will be limited paper publication of the University Handbook (see below). Despite the provisions in the Handbook, for the last several years the only accurate and up-to-date copy of the Handbook has been on the web.

Some notice of these proposals was given to the Faculty in an article I wrote for University Week last year. These proposals also result from on-going talks with Senate leadership to identify ways to modernize governance and be more responsive to Faculty.

Process: I began working on this legislation almost two years ago. As noted, I consulted with my staff, the Administrative Procedures Office, the Academic Personnel Office, and Computing & Communications (Catalyst). I drafted the legislation in Summer 2002, and forwarded it to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs in the fall. As a result of that review, the "Code Cops" and the Attorney General's office reviewed the legislation in addition to Council members, all with approval.

Purpose: The purpose of this legislation is two-fold: to provide for electronic balloting for all senate elections (Senators, Class A and B legislation), and to move to an “electronic” handbook. The legislation is phrased, however, in media neutral terms so that adjustments will not have to be made every time technology changes.

In truth, we have already moved to a largely electronic University Handbook. This part of the legislation, then, will make the *Faculty Code* conform to what is already current practice. Similarly, Class B and C bulletins have been sent electronically for the last two years.

The voting legislation, however, will be a change from the current system of paper ballots sent to departments, and then returned to the Faculty Senate office. This legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Faculty to use electronic means to hold elections, whether it is for senators or Class A legislation.

Voting: This legislation removes language that specifies a particular form for conducting ballots. We propose to move to a Catalyst based system for holding elections. Over the last year and a half, the Secretary of the Faculty and her staff have met with personnel in the Catalyst office, which also provides the voting platform for ASUW elections. In the course of several meetings, we became convinced that we could use catalyst to handle faculty elections for both senate seats and legislation. At the same time, we have also met with Academic Personnel staff, so that we could begin the process of coding faculty into a database. The Office of University Committees, supervised by the Secretary of the Faculty, and organizationally separate from the Faculty Senate, has maintained a database of all voting faculty for years. We have met with Academic Personnel, however, to assure that we would have enough information to work through the Catalyst system, and we have been assured on that front. Currently, the Assistant to the Secretary, Tasha Taylor, maintains an extensive Access database of faculty that is used for the current system of paper ballots, augmented by checking the Higher Education Personnel database.

Electronic Handbook: This legislation proposes technology neutral publication of the Handbook. This is in line with recent Washington law which states:

Electronic Distribution. (1) In order to provide the greatest possible access to agency documents to the most people, agencies are encouraged to make their rule, interpretive, and policy information available through electronic distribution as well as through the regular mail

RCW 34.05.260 (1997). Similarly, by a letter dated 1 November 2002, Asso. Vice President Norm Arkans announced the end of the paper based Reference Station system. The current number of reference stations will be reduced from 390 to around 50 stations. The proposed legislation will make publication of the Handbook consistent with these changes.

Concerns:

1. Confidentiality and Anonymity: One of the most important concerns facing faculty will undoubtedly be confidentiality. We can guarantee, as we do now, confidentiality. The Office of University Committees staff, who count the ballots, understand that any information they gain connecting a ballot and a faculty member is confidential. This happens fairly often because most faculty return ballots with their mailing label, indicating their name, to us without first removing the label. All of the staff understands that this information is confidential.

Catalyst would also have a role in this process. The Catalyst project has developed a tool to allow the confidential collection of data intended to protect the rights of human subjects participating in survey research. The Human Subjects Division has reviewed the tool and when other conditions of research are met, e.g. informed consent, has found that this tool provides the necessary protection for subjects. While this tool does not provide anonymity because there is a record of each person having responded to the survey (which is necessary to prevent repeated responses), it does provide confidentiality – the link between the respondent, and the content of the response is not retained. If this tool were to be used as a web-based platform for faculty senate ballots, there would be a record of who voted, but not how that vote was cast. The ASUW also uses this system for its elections; in fact, they report that participation has increased since moving to an electronic system.

As the SEC discussed this issue at its meeting reviewing this legislation, it decided to amend the legislation, removing “secret” and replacing it with “confidential.” In part they did this not because of this pending legislation, but rather because it became clear that current state legislation such as the Open Meetings Act made the guarantee of secrecy illusory regardless of what system of balloting we use.

Finally, the *Code* already authorizes the use of “mail” voting in departments and colleges. Many departments have successfully adopted procedures for e-mail voting on departmental or college issues.

2. Maintenance of Legislative Histories: One advantage of a paper copy of the Handbook or Faculty Code is that one can trace changes in the document by going back through paper copies. This capacity is lost when the document is maintained electronically. Although this legislation permits the publication of an electronic handbook, it does not prohibit maintaining paper copies. As noted above, there will still be limited paper publication of the University Handbook. Moreover, the Office of University Committees/Faculty Senate will continue to maintain a paper copy of all legislative changes made to the Handbook.

3. Opt-outs: Frankly, this proposal is technology forcing. It will require every Faculty member to use an e-mail account. At this point in time, all Faculty have been assigned a net ID. A recent inquiry to Computing & Communications revealed that 4 out of 345 research faculty, and 428 out of 3723 voting faculty do not show e-mail addresses on their HEPPS records. Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, told us that, on the other hand, e-mail is now the default mode of communication for the University, and that all Faculty are issued user IDs, even if they choose not to use them. All Faculty have computer access through either their own personal or office computer, their department’s lab, or at a nearby University library. Although it may be necessary to provide a limited number of paper ballots to those who opt-out, it is anticipated that this number will drop steadily every year until everyone uses this system. The Secretary of the Faculty will draft election procedures that account for Faculty who choose to opt-out, although this will not be encouraged. Additionally, the SEC shall review the voting procedures the Secretary of the Faculty designs before they can be used. This review would take place any time there is a proposed change in the voting procedures under the *Faculty Code*.

Additional Benefits

1. Polling of Faculty: Increasingly, it has become apparent that it would be useful to be able to poll Faculty. This need has arisen in Councils and in the Senate. If we should vote to move to electronic voting, we will also be able to use this capacity for polling. This was done about two years ago for the UIF survey, and it was quite successful.

2. Greater Involvement: We are hopeful that a switch to electronic voting will result in more faculty voting. Granted, it is as easy to push "delete" as it is to toss a ballot, but this format means that Faculty can vote from any location, at their convenience.

3. It saves paper!

4. Greater Awareness of Handbook changes: Currently, knowledge about the Handbook is sketchy. Even fewer Faculty track changes to the *Code*. The Faculty, however, are not the only audience for the Handbook. Its provisions also affect students, administrators and staff. After talks with Rebecca Deardorff and University Week, it is likely that we will move to something akin to Federal Register notice of changes. This will enable the entire University community to be aware of changes in the Handbook.