Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, April 2, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Absent: Sarah Stroup, Joyce Cooper.
Guests: Patricia Kramer, Marcy Stein, Brenda Williams, Gordon Watts, Robert Gomulkiewicz, Gordon Aamot, Elizabeth Bedford, Cheryl Cameron.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
Thaïsa Way, Faculty Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. The agenda was approved.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Thaïsa Way [Exhibit A]
Chair Way delivered prepared remarks in addition to her report [Exhibit B].

a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit C]
b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit D]
c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit E]
d. Report of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy – Marcy Stein, Council Chair. [Exhibit F]
f. Report of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards – Sarah Stroup, Council Chair [Exhibit H]
g. Report of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs – Chris Laws, Council Chair [Exhibit I]

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, summarized her report and added that she will start work on a survey of faculty priorities to be used for the next legislative session.

In response to questions, Taricani made several points. The general election in November, combined with a number of retirements and resignations, should bring a shift in the power center of the legislature. There must be continued discussion of funding if the University is going to maintain excellence. The recently-added nine-million dollars is one-time only, which is unusual for salary appropriations. Even so, the appropriation is a step forward, but it will not represent a real success unless it is made permanent. Taricani also said that the University budget is handled on a biannual basis, which makes it hard to deal with itemized changes.

Marcy Stein, Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy, and Patricia Kramer, Associate Professor in Anthropology, summarized the revised process for tri-campus curriculum review of program changes at the undergraduate level. By way of introduction, it was explained that there was a time when the Faculty Council on Academic Standards serviced all three campuses. As Bothell and Tacoma grew, this changed so that these campuses now have their own curriculum committees; there is a tri-campus review at the end of the process. As growth has furthered, the reliance on ex-post tri-campus review has become cumbersome, and the thrust of the proposal is to institute tri-campus review at the beginning of the process (Stage 0) by using a Notice of Proposal that is sent out to all potential stakeholders for comment. This allows for issues to be addressed earlier rather than later and the intention is that this would be more productive.

In response to questions, several points were made. As a general matter, the proposal deals with a pathway for program changes; it does not deal with individual courses per se. There is a separate pathway for course-duplication issues, although duplication issues might be addressed by both pathways when new programs involve new courses.
Robert Gomulkiewicz, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice (ACIP3), added some comments to his report. He noted that the Committee began its work this year by considering open access. Recent focus has been GIX. The Committee also has been briefed on CoMotion’s decision to process fewer patents. With respect to this decision, there isn’t no evidence yet of effects beyond a general decrease in overall patenting as people try to figure out how to fill the gap created by CoMotion’s retrenchment. In the Spring, the Committee will look at IP for teaching materials as relates to online courses taught through Continuum College. It will also consider potential changes to EO 36 regarding Intellectual property issues relating to students and faculty.

President Cauce said that the change in patenting strategy is not the result of a budget cut per se, but rather the result of the end of some of the “big-hit” patents that were funding CoMotion. Gomulkiewicz added that most patents do not make any money, but there are other reasons to patent. Provost Baldasty said that there is a University-wide committee working with CoMotion to develop a more general patent-support strategy.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce addressed several topics in her remarks. The University’s commitment to building an inclusive climate and working with the community is starting to play out. Following up on housing of the Special Olympics this year, the UW is in talks with the CEO of the Special Olympics to host a panel on building an inclusive environment for intellectual and physical diversity. The Gates Foundation is looking to the UW to convene a conversation about “root causes” of social inequities such as structural racism, economic inequity, and gender inequality. On another note, a recent article in the Huffington Post asks universities to consider their carbon footprint. The authors go so far as to suggest the possibility of having academic units pay a “carbon offset.” One big contributor is travel. We should be considering whether we can do less physical travel and do more virtually. Cauce finished by noting the impending decisions related to the medical campus’s laundry service. To keep the service in-house would require a substantial capital outlay for modernization. No final decision has been made and discussions with the union continue, but it should be remembered that if classified workers are let go, they get first consideration for other comparable jobs on campus.

There were no questions.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the February 12, 2018, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the March 1, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve Mike Townsend, School of Law and Secretary of the Faculty, as an ex-officio nonvoting member of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, for a term beginning immediately and ending at completion of Secretary of the Faculty term.
   d. Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, JoAnn Taricani, Professor, Music History, as the 2018-19 Faculty Legislative Representative.

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

8. Discussion items.
   a. College of Arts and Sciences Direct-to-Division Admissions Proposal: Dean Robert Stacey, Arts and Sciences. [Exhibit J]
Robert Stacey, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, presented the direct-to-division admissions proposal, summarizing the material in the FAQ and emphasizing how the proposal will have a positive impact on students, parents, unit strength and stability, and the overall reputation of the University.

A number of points were made in the question and answer period. Stacey explained that the 50/25/25 figures are expected graduation percentages. Stacey noted that similar programs have existed at schools like UC Davis for decades. He is not aware of recent implementations of such programs. President Cauce added that discussions about under-utilized capacity are occurring with increasing frequency. Some members noted that ABB assigns funding to meet actual demand whereas this seems to signal a shift to engineer demand to meet capacity. As such, this raises the question of what principles help to decide whether to implement such a shift in a given academic unit, and, if so, to decide its extent. Stacey acknowledged that this is an important issue, but noted that an unfettered acquiescence to student demand may not be sustainable without differential tuition. In addition, it may reduce the UW to the “Washington Institute of Technology.” Moreover, some care must be taken when discussing “demand.” There is a demand for non-STEM degrees that is overlooked by an admissions process whose evaluative metrics appear to benefit STEM applicants and whose metrics do not differentiate among aptitudes for various fields. Thus demand, properly understood, might well provide more students for under-utilized units that currently face fiscal pressures. President Cauce added that such proposals would not mean that a unit is guaranteed a certain number of students. After all, students must be “UW quality.” So demand, however defined, might still cause some units to shrink. Having said that, there will be the ultimate question of whether, and to what extent, the University will maintain units that could not otherwise be sustained by demand.

In response to other questions, Stacey noted that students would not be locked into a division, although in shifting divisions they would be at the end of a queue headed by those who have a guarantee of a major within the new division. It was noted that there will be a lead time whenever such a program is implemented, so some decisions will have to be made in the interim about units with under-utilized capacity. It was suggested that other approaches to aid such units could include re-examining the general-education requirement (e.g. the current ability to use AP credits to satisfy the general-education requirement) or being more effective in pointing out the benefits of non-STEM offerings to STEM students. With respect to the latter, for example, employers are looking for STEM majors with training in the humanities. Concerns were raised about students gaming the system by seeking admission to one unit with hopes to transfer to another, thus recreating some of the frustration problems that already exist. Stacey responded that an admissions process that looks at aptitude and desire together with the opportunity to move within a division should help mitigate that problem. There is no real way to filter out multi-talented students who apply to, say, art with the ultimate goal of moving later to, say, computer science. Stacey noted that some departments cut across divisions (e.g. economics and linguistics). A department can request moving from one division to another. Information about divisional groupings will be made conspicuous for applicants. President Cauce expressed a general concern that UW-quality students who do not get in under direct-admission programs might choose to go elsewhere. In addition, we also do not want the direct-admissions process to create a compartmentalized experience that discourages students from taking courses outside of their hoped-for major.

b. Open Access Policy. [Exhibit K]

Chair Way opened discussion with some prepared remarks. She stressed the importance of open access in UW’s role as a public institution to serve the public good. UW has also been able to learn from other universities that implemented such policies for almost a decade. After consulting with the chairs of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, the Faculty Council on Research, the Faculty Council on Libraries, ACIP3, Library leadership, and Faculty Senate leadership, we are confident in the policy that we will advance at the next meeting.

Gordon Aamot and Elizabeth Bedford from Libraries then summarized their slides. They emphasized that the policy is aimed at addressing the power-imbalance between authors and publishers, dealing with the access inequality, and bridging the gap between the UW and the communities we serve. Joe Janes, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and faculty member in the School of Information, added that the current system is significantly one-sided and may well collapse under its own weight. In response to concerns about the economic viability of society journals, it was asserted that these journals often operate in as one-sided a fashion as the for-profit journals. Moreover, there are disciplines, such as mathematics, in which for-profit and society journals co-exist with robust open access. Way added that journals should continue to exist because they do add value through vetting, aggregation, archiving, and dissemination of final versions. The real issue is the current rent-seeking price structure. In any case, the UW has not canceled any journals because of open access and we will
continue to provide faculty with the value that journals offer. President Cauce said it should be remembered that the cost of the current system is being borne in large part by our students. Chair Way informed the Committee that Class B legislation will be presented to the Senate in May. Members suggested continuing to talk to various stakeholders so that presenters can respond to anticipated arguments. Moreover, presenters should give examples of how the system will work in practice.

   a. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty voting eligibility - second consideration. [Exhibit L]
      Action: Final review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

Chair Way introduced the legislation. A motion was made to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

   b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty lecturer issues - first consideration. [Exhibit M]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Chair Way introduced the legislation. A motion was made to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for first consideration. Joe Janes, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, summarized the legislation and its rationale.

In response to questions several points were made. With respect to the voting provisions, Janes made clear that the change is that assistant professors will no longer vote on lecturer promotions. Several members expressed concerns about the removal per se, which can be seen as a disenfranchisement, as well about as the perception that the legislation implicitly questions the ability of assistant professors to review teaching performance when many assistant professors are hired with, or have since developed, significant teaching experience. In response, it was emphasized by several members that the legislation is not about assistant professors, but about lecturers. In particular, the aim of the legislation is to address the equity concerns. For example, the Bothell report highlighted voting asymmetries between professorial and lecturer tracks. These asymmetries privilege a status-based hierarchy that institutionalizes a lack of respect for lecturers. It was also pointed out that assistant professors with significant teaching and research records do not vote on promotion from assistant to associate. Finally, it was asserted that anecdotal evidence suggests that some assistant professors might well welcome to be relieved of this responsibility, although one member responded that faculty must do many things that make them uncomfortable. President Cauce said that the legislation is consistent with the idea that lecturers are a type of “teaching professoriate.”

The motion passed.

   c. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to promotion and tenure diversity requirement - first consideration.
      Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs [Exhibit N]
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Chair Way introduced the legislation. A motion was made to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for first consideration. Brenda Williams, Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, summarized the legislation and its rationale. She added that Code changes represent just one avenue being considered by the Council for addressing issues of diversity and equity.

In response to questions, several points were made. The change from “may” to “shall” is intended to require consideration of contributions that are produced, not require such production in the first place. This distinction will have to be made clear to avoid the confusion surrounding legislation that led to the current wording. Here, the word “shall” means, as it does in law, “must.” Moreover, the use of “shall” is consistent with other wording in the Code. It was pointed out that, in addition to affecting the promotion process per se, the change can work to protect work that faculty members might otherwise feel that cannot perform; an example was given of science faculty who wish to address demographic diversity issues in the class discussion. Some members wondered whether we should consider some sort of production requirement in the future.

A motion was made and seconded to amend by adding the words “and considered” to line 12 after the word “included.” The motion to amend passed.
A motion was made and seconded to amend by removing the sentence beginning on line 25. The motion to amend passed.

A motion was made to amend by removing the sentence beginning on line 37. The motion passed.

As thrice amended, the main motion passed.

    d. Approval of the April 19, 2018, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit O]
       **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

10. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Thaïsa Way, Chair
Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Thaïsa Way, Professor, College of Built Environments

Happy spring.

**Fiscal stability and faculty compensation**: Although we live in a state with one of the highest GDPs, where wealth is all around us in multiple forms, and we as a university are realizing remarkable success in our campaign, many of us are nonetheless facing inadequate budgets that are being cut on a regular basis. We can no longer do with less, our communities need us to do more and for that we need more resources. Less you think this is merely a chance to point out the downside, fear not, this is a call for us to come together and think differently. The resources are out there- and we need to harness those resources for the greater good that we offer as a research and teaching university- the generation and sharing of new knowledge. So let’s figure this out. It will require change., it will be challenging. We, as an institution, will look different. But if we intend to cultivate a productive healthy democratic culture in our society--then I believe we need strong public research and teaching universities.

One way to think differently is using technology to enhance access to our public good and facilitate our sharing of knowledge with the public. Our Open Access policy builds on that intention. It has been discussed with the chairs of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Council on Research, Faculty Council on University Libraries, Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice, Library leadership, and Faculty Senate leadership. We will discuss it during our meeting this Monday—come prepared because this is critically important to our role as a provider of the public good.

Another way is to consider how our admissions and advising policies and practices impact our potential futures. Direct to college is one idea and we will hear more in our meeting from the College of Arts and Sciences. The College of Engineering is accepting their first Direct to College cohort next year and we all need to pay close attention. These proposals challenge us to consider the nature of the future community we want—this is not merely a fiscal and budget question, but one about who our future students and faculty will be. Faculty need to be deeply engaged in these conversations and decisions if we are going to be the public university that we envision in the future. And so this is a call to join your Elected Faculty Council or one of the Faculty Councils. Now is the time to nominate yourself and your colleagues.

**Strengthening Shared Governance**: Facing serious budget challenges is just a part of our work ahead. Equally important is shared governance. Because the university is grounded in our academic vision and as faculty we drive the academics, shared governance is an essential element of our potential success. We continue to prepare for a new provost as well as a number of new deans. We need both to bring these new leaders into our community and to learn from them--each are coming from successful universities. The most essential element to our success in all of this work is your participation in shared governance. So first, thank you. In particular thank you to Janelle Taylor and Joe Janes for standing for election as Faculty Senate Vice Chair. This is a daunting undertaking and their willingness to put themselves forward is so important. And second,- let’s find ways to bring new people into our networks and join us in this work. How many departments include institutional building, i.e. shared governance activity as a positive part of the tenure, merit, and promotion guidelines?

**Diversity and Equity**: A recent book by a former UW faculty member, Sharon Sutton, titled “When the Ivory Towers were Black,” chronicles Columbia University from 1968 to the early 1970s when they decided to dramatically increase the number of black and Hispanic students. Despite concerns about the pipeline, when they focused on the outreach, they found excellent students and that cohort of students went on to be leaders in a broad range of ways. What would this project look like today? Yes we have a diversity of students, staff, and faculty remarkable for a public university in our state, but we can do better. We can better represent the diversity of our nation and our globe by reaching out to attract a larger number of excellent students from across the country and by more actively reaching out and stewarding faculty from diverse backgrounds. I would add to this the note that where we steward our diversity best is often in the very disciplines that are facing increasing limits on their resources—in the humanities and social sciences. So how do we do better in the disciplines that have more resources and how do we better support our colleagues that are models for their diversity work. Yes this means more $ but it also means re-building our communities to better foster and nurture our colleagues. I believe if we do this, we
will also be strengthening shared governance and our role as a public good—other words these goals all intersect with one another.

**Lecturer career paths:** We see more legislation today from the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs that clarifies the promotion guidelines for principal lecturers and proposes new voting participation guidelines for promotions. Read carefully as this work is important. Our lecturers are critical to our mission of education. And at the same time, I think it is essential to make sure we do this by fostering a healthy environment for all faculty. We need to better support and steward all faculty, tenure track or not, who engage in teaching and/or research and/or service.

**UW/Faculty 2050:** Stewarding our faculty is at the core of the 2050 effort. While some imagine a university in the future where we no longer have tenure nor faculty who engage across teaching, research, and service, others, me included, think we need to avoid that future—because the role of faculty who engage in research and teaching and service is what makes us distinct from other entities from community colleges to industry laboratories. Almost 600 faculty have responded to our faculty survey asking about careers. Faculty identified the following descriptors of UW most frequently: collaborative, research, innovative, diverse, public, excellence, and education, along with bureaucratic and underfunded.

However, it is clear that many, many, many of us pursue community engaged scholarship, public scholarship, and collaborative research and teaching. Our jobs and careers are changing and we need to ensure our university’s policies and procedures reflect those changes. This is a long haul project but we are starting to look at this work building on the excellent work that has already been done by many of our units and programs. UW Tacoma has much to teach us about being an urban-oriented academic community. UW Bothell is leading on interdisciplinary teaching that gives students active research experience. And on the Seattle campus, Education and Social Work are doing remarkable work on recognizing the diverse ways that faculty pursue the generation and sharing of new knowledge. The Elected Faculty Council of the College of Arts and Sciences is engaged in deep conversations about what it means to measure and assess a broad variety of approaches to scholarship and teaching. We need to share this work more broadly amongst ourselves and build on it both centrally and in our home units. Change needs to come from bottom up and top down and middle out.

One way we are supporting this work centrally is through our application for the Carnegie Community Engagement designation. The Classification for Community Engagement is the Carnegie Foundation's only elective classification, requiring self-assessment process by institutions. It is supplemental to the Foundation's main category (UW Seattle is classified as “highest research activities,” formerly R1). The classification is not simply an award. It requires evidence-based documentation of institutional practice to be used in a process of self-assessment and quality improvement for community engagement. The purpose is the process. UW Bothell, UW Seattle, and UW Tacoma are applying separately for the classification, as required by the Foundation, and work group leaders from each campus meet monthly to collaborate. This is a terrific opportunity for us to strengthen our work in community engaged scholarship, teaching, and service all in line with the Carnegie Foundations' definition: "Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the **mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.** The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good."
Chair Way's Oral SEC Remarks

**Fiscal Health**: As we begin to plan for next year, there are some lessons that are important to retain. One that is increasingly critical is the intersections of financial health, public values, and academic mission. I am struck time and again, not just that we need to identify the funds and public support to pursue our academic mission, but we must also reflect the changing landscape in our academy. No, I do not mean we change our academic goals based on the funds available, but rather that as our students and communities engage in the world in different ways, we too are called upon to consider how and in what to engage, pursue, and achieve. This is about how we use technology tools and it is about the content we teach in history and data science and social work, really all of our domains of knowledge. It is because of technology that we can build an open access system and policy - more on that in a bit.

This is the background for an important discussion we are in the midst of - on admissions and advising. Direct to college is one idea and we will hear more in our meeting from the College of Arts and Sciences. The College of Engineering is accepting their first Direct to College cohort next year faculty need to be deeply engaged in these conversations and decisions if we are going to be the public university that we envision in the future.

**Strengthening Shared Governance**: First and foremost thank you to Janelle Taylor and Joe Janes for standing for election as Faculty Senate Vice Chair. Congratulations to Joe Janes for being elected our next Vice Chair.

**Diversity and Equity**: Drawing on shared governance, a challenge that faces all of us today is how we build an inclusive community across our academy - a challenge that would behoove all of us to consider is how we acknowledge that despite all claims to a bubble, whatever that means, and despite all of our remarkable strengths in our diverse faculty (college of education I understand has 30% faculty of color), we have yet to create the culture that fully supports the diversity of our faculty, staff, students, and academic mission. President Cauce called on us to do this with the Race and Equity Initiative, and we need to continue to ask ourselves what we are each doing to steward this critical and essential work.

**Lecturer career paths**: Clearly, we need to better steward all faculty, tenure track or not, who engage in teaching and/or research and/or service. Today’s legislation for lecturers is an important part. Additionally I hope we will consider its impact on all faculty, including assistant professors.

Finally, it has been fantastic to hear from faculty on the importance of President Cauce’s speech last week. From the faculty leading our Certificate in Public Scholarship to our new project - the Othello UW Commons - to the recent public talk by UWB assistant professor Joey Shapiro Key, at McMenamins Pub on “LIGO, Black Holes, and Our New View of the Universe.” To an audience of over 100 members of our public, our spheres of contribution are changing and, as President Cauce noted, our systems of acknowledgement and reward need to change as well. The application for Carnegie Community Engagement designation is just one way we seek to acknowledge and strengthen our contributions to shared democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. Thank you.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. **Vice Chair Update:** Joe Janes has been elected to be the 2018-2019 Vice Chair.

2. **Committee on Committees:** The Committee on Committees is seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees for 2018-19. If you would like to serve on a Council or recommend a colleague, then contact Jordan Smith (jjsmith4@uw.edu).

3. **Dispute Resolution Task Force:** The drafting subcommittee will soon begin redrafting the dispute resolution sections of the Faculty Code.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budget, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions.

In early-March, the SCPB wrapped up its review of the unit adjustment proposals. The UWT and all Seattle academic units, with the exception of Dentistry submitted a unit adjustment proposal. Dentistry intends to submit a proposal to SCPB for review in spring quarter to assure its access to the unit adjustment funds which the Provost has allocated to each of the schools and colleges on the basis of their full professor headcount. In all cases, the committee recommended approval of the proposed unit adjustment.

In March, the committee received a financial update on the Dentistry deficit. Our discussion focused on the scope of the Dentistry deficit and details of Dentistry’s deficit mitigation plan, including the timeframe for deficit reduction and retirement of Dentistry’s overall debt. Members of the committee expressed particular concerns in regards to the implications of the dentistry deficit and overall debt for the fiscal health of the larger institution. The SCPB will receive another update on the Dentistry deficit and progress on deficit mitigation at the end of spring quarter.

In March, the committee reviewed proposed Fee rate increases of 5 percent or greater. Most of the proposed fee increases are intended to compensate for increased program delivery costs. The committee considered the impact of the proposed fee increases on students and assessed their comparability to program fees at peer institutions. The committee approved all proposed fee increases intended to meet increasing program delivery costs that also maintained competitive pricing relative to peers.

At our last SCPB meeting, the committee received an overview of the FY19 Annual Review process and unit budget reports from the Office of Planning and Budgeting. For the first time, the Annual Review process includes a comprehensive, institution-wide, multi-year, multi-fund forecast at the unit level. Over the course of the next month, the SCPB will leverage its initial overview of the Annual unit budget plans and these multi-year forecasts to:

1) Examine more closely those units in trouble or trending toward concern in order to identify the broader strategic and institutional fiscal concerns that might be revealed;

2) Explore where and how strong, moderately and weak performing units line up with broader institutional priorities such as large scale, institution-wide initiatives (e.g. Pop health, race & equity);

3) Focus on determining if there is any particular, or recurring pattern of drivers given units focused on different aspects of the UW’s mission (e.g., UG teaching, grad teaching, health sciences, patient services, etc.) that we need to be aware of and seek to monitor or manage more proactively.

In closing, I encourage any SEC member, Senator or faculty who has questions about the budget or finances to submit his or her questions to me as Chair of SCPB at: senate@uw.edu. The SCPB is currently collecting data in response to a number of questions that were forwarded to the committee at the close of the fall quarter. As soon as we finish collecting data and reviewing relevant analyses, we will be sure to include answers to your queries and a summary of any related SCPB discussions and materials in my upcoming regular reports.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor, Music History

The top priorities of our Faculty Senate this biennium were: (1) faculty compensation and (2) student financial aid and access. On these two points, we have made some progress in the supplemental budget.

The supplemental budget adds $9 million for faculty and professional staff salaries, as one-time funding. The original passed budget for 2017-19 did not have enough funding for faculty salary increases in the second year, plus funded raises at the UW at a lower level than the other four-year institutions. I have described this in reports since last December. This $9 million, even as one-time funding, was very difficult to get into the budget, and I have to credit President Cauce for coming to Olympia many times, but particularly in the final hours before the draft supplemental budgets were released. We had heard this $9 million would not be in the House and Senate proposed supplemental budgets, and she made a very strong case for the necessity of it. Shortly after her visit, we heard the funding was added.

The final supplemental budget also adds $18.5 million statewide for the State Need Grant, a commitment to state students in mid-to-low income brackets. The Senate had proposed $9 million for this, and the House $25 million, so this is a compromise number. It should fund around 4,000 more students in the state. We currently cover the financial aid of students eligible for the State Need Grant via the UW Husky Promise, so any funding coming to the UW on this front will be very helpful in covering those costs. There is also a plan to cover the gap with more increased funding over the next four years; currently, around 20,000 eligible students statewide are not funded. The Allen School has received $3 million per year for increased enrollments in computer science and engineering, a priority of the state and external partners as well as the university; this will allow an increase in the annual number of graduates in that field.

There are several bills that passed that affect financial aid; one scholarship program is of particular interest to students in the health professions (broadly defined, to benefit more fields) who are willing to commit to working in rural areas in the state after graduation. Here is the link to the final bill language, for those who want to understand the details better: [http://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2017-18/Pdf/Bills/House%20Passed%20Legislature/2143-S2.PL.pdf](http://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2017-18/Pdf/Bills/House%20Passed%20Legislature/2143-S2.PL.pdf)

Unfortunately, the faculty regent bill did not pass, although the votes were in place at one point.

Report of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy
Marcy Stein, Council Chair and Professor, School of Education, UW Tacoma

University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination

Introduction

Executive Order IV, Policy Directory, Faculty Code and Governance, Chapter 13, Section 13-23.C: Legislative Authority of the Faculty (3 February 2004) requires the President to refer the following types of undergraduate program changes to the Faculty Senate for coordinated faculty review by all three campuses: undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate or other transcriptable programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature, regardless of campus of origin. The purpose of this process is to enhance the quality of undergraduate course offerings through peer review, promote coordination and communication among the colleges, schools, and campuses, and to promote faculty collaboration that can lead to greater quality and optimal use of resources. This memo describes the process for carrying out the University Campuses Review Process. Please note, however, that no campus has the power or authority to veto a program or program change proposed by another campus. Finally, this review is designed to generate feedback at a point in time where the proposals are developed but not approved so that the originating campus can make full use of any feedback that is provided.

Process

Stage 0: Notice of Proposal

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. In order to facilitate coordination of substantive changes to their curriculum, a unit planning to offer a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, option, or other transcriptable credential or substantive change to any of these, should prepare a Notice of Proposal (NOP). If a unit is uncertain whether or not a change is substantive, they should contact the campus-specific curriculum review committee.

2. Once a unit has drafted an NOP, and had it approved by the appropriate administrators in its School or College, the document should be sent electronically to the University Registrar. Staff will conduct a preliminary review to assure that appropriate information and approvals have been included. Once that review has been completed, the Registrar will inform the appropriate campus academic program review committee that an NOP has been submitted.

3. The NOP will be posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days before it can be submitted to the campus-specific curriculum review process.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Registrar shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, and (4) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

5. If there are no significant comments to be resolved, or if they have been resolved, the unit may go forward with developing the proposal. A record of the NOP will be kept electronically that is password protected, including comments made during the early notice period.

6. Once a full proposal has been developed, the NOP will be included in the official university-wide full tri-campus review.

Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals

1. Following the university-wide NOP review and after. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. After a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the appropriate academic program review committee for that campus.
2. The academic program review committee of each campus shall make an initial determination that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit academic program review. It shall also determine whether the proposed change meets the guidelines for tri-campus review. If a campus academic program review committee has questions about the applicability of the Tri-campus review process, they should consult the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). If the proposal meets this threshold, it shall be forwarded immediately to the University Registrar, Curriculum Secretary. Materials to be forwarded to the University Registrar must include, in electronic form:
   i. A completed university curriculum Form 1503
   ii. The rationale for the proposal
b. If the proposal is not complete, it shall be returned by the University Registrar to the unit of origin for further development.

3. When the University Registrar receives the completed program proposal, it will be immediately posted on the Web immediately electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Registrar shall send an e-mail to notify:
   (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs (DDC) list serve, and (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, and (4) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

5. At the end of the comment period, the University Registrar shall compile all comments made on the proposal and forward the comments to the Chair of the academic program review committee at the originating campus. That committee shall then consider all comments as part of their academic program review process, and shall provide a summary of responses to the comments received from all campuses.

Stage II
1. The originating campus academic program review committee will obtain final campus approvals on the final proposal.
2. When final campus approval has been received the proposal will be forwarded by the appropriate campus official to the University Registrar.
3. The University Registrar shall forward to the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy with a copy to the Chair of the Faculty Senate the following materials: the program proposal, all comments, the campus academic program review committee’s response to the comments, the University Campuses Undergraduate Program Review checklist.
4. The Council on Tri-campus Policy, or a delegated subcommittee of the Council consisting of the chair (or designee) and two council members (one representing the faculty of each of the other two campuses), will convene to determine if the review satisfied the following requirements:
   a. Was the final proposal made available for a 15 business-day comment period?
   b. Did the campus academic program review committee consider comments and respond appropriately in its review? The Council will send, within 14 business days of receiving the proposal, a memo describing the results of their review to the University Registrar. In short, at this stage the task of the Council will be to ensure that the process described in Stage I and the intent of the Executive Order was followed.
5. The University Registrar will forward the final proposal and a copy of the Council’s memo to the President for final action and transmittal to the appropriate dean/chancellor and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

---

1. UW, Seattle: Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)
   — UW, Bothell: General Faculty Organization
   — UW, Tacoma: Faculty Assembly
2. The originating campus’ academic program review committee will review its own proposals, and should consider the following elements, using its own processes and criteria:
   • Fit with campus and university mission
- Academic quality
- Need
- Effects on students
- Effects on other programs
- Feasibility/operational viability
- Adherence to University and Campus policies

3. As stated in the Executive Order, tri-campus review is required for new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature. This includes, but may not be limited to:
   a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.
   b. Changes in pre-requisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor, or option.
   c. Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor, or option.
   d. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

4. The Registrar may grant a 5-business day extension of this deadline to any individual who submits a written request to the Registrar prior to the end of the original comment period.
Report of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy and Practice
Robert Gomulkiewicz, Committee Chair and Professor, School of Law

The Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy & Practice (ACIP3) met several times since my last report to the SEC. We have been studying several intellectual property related scenarios. First, Lara Littleford and Fiona Wills briefed the committee on GIX and the manner in which intellectual property ownership is handled in the GIX context. Second, Fiona Wills briefed the committee regarding ongoing developments on Administrative Policy Statement 59.4 resource allocation. Third, Carol Rhodes and Fiona Wills provided the committee with updates on the disposition of UW intellectual property in sponsored program agreements. These briefings and the committee discussion during the briefings have prepared the committee to examine potential revisions to EO 36 during the spring quarter.

I would be happy to answer any questions that you have about our deliberations.
Report of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Sarah Stroup, Council Chair and Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences

Summary:

During the second third of the 2017 – 2018 academic year (October through early January), the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) met six times in regular meetings, conducting its routine business of approval of new (or changed) undergraduate degrees, majors and minors for the University of Washington Seattle campus; evaluation of admissions and graduation requirements; and the selection of honors medalists and GPA cutoffs. Details of all of these actions may be found in the meeting minutes, which are located on the council’s page on the UW Faculty Senate website. The FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) met five times in this period, conducting its routine business of reviewing all new 1503 proposals (i.e., for new or changed degrees, majors, minors, and programs) arising on the Seattle campus; the FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduation (SCAG) met two times in this period, conducting its routine business of overseeing all changes to UW admissions and graduation requirements, as well as reviewing petitions. The FCAS Subcommittee on Honors did not meet during this period.

In addition to the routine business outlined above, the following non-routine business was completed or is in progress:

- **Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) shift to 65-50% Direct-to-Major admissions**

  Early in the Autumn quarter, the Allen School / CSE began working on a proposal to shift to a 65% Direct-to-Major (DtM) admissions model. As Chair of FCAS, I worked closely with CSE throughout the AU quarter and well into the WI quarter. SCAP reviewed the 1503 in early February; after that, and following the process I used for the CoE proposal last year, I moved the matter to FCAS and institute a series of online meetings / discussions / Q&A sessions using a Catalyst discussion group. This process worked well, and the proposal was ready for an FCAS vote at the end of the WI term. However, about five days prior to the vote, executive leadership stepped in to stop the proposal, indicating that they would not approve a 65% DTM rate. The proposal was hastily withdrawn by CSE. In the time since, I have worked with CSE to revise the proposal to a level of 50% DTM, and it has been resubmitted. It is still hoped that this model will roll out in the 2019 academic year.

- **College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) move to Direct-to-Division admissions**

  CAS is in the process of proposing a shift to Direct-to-Division (DTD) admissions model. This sizable proposal—which has support of the President, Provost, and Deans across campus—will involve both a general CAS 1503 as well as individual 1503s from each department or program (about 39 in total). I have continued to work closely with CAS leadership on this proposal, and indeed meet weekly with Kevin Mihata, CAS Associate Dean for Educational Programs, in the successful crafting of these 1503s. CAS has worked closely with OMAD to develop a diversity plan for their proposal, and has begun to work with SCAG on particulars of the admissions process. I expect now that CAS will be able to submit the college-wide 1503 proposal some time in April 2018, at which point it will begin to pass through the approval process on the model built for CoE. I have advised CAS that it would be best to submit the first “block” of individual departmental 1503s by the end of this year, and that this should be done by Division in order to speed along this very complicated process. I continue to work with Admissions Advisors across campus, and other Colleges and Schools to ensure that any changes to our undergraduate enrollment practices take into account every unit on campus. I can’t say the latter are convinced, but so it goes.

- **FCAS is working closely with the Undergraduate Enrollment Management (UEM) task force to completely review and revise the enrollment practices—both of freshmen and of students transferring in—at UWS.**
At the request of FCSA and Hall Health leadership, in late AU 17, FCAS voted to create a UWS policy on the use of Medical Excuse Notes. I formed a working group of members from FCSA (Chris Laws) and FCAS (faculty, the Registrar, and our ASUW and GPSS representatives), charging them to investigate best practices for this policy, and to propose both policy language and means of notification to students and faculty. I await a report from this group.

At the request of Advising, in late AU 17 FCAS voted to create formal policy on the requirements of AoK (Areas of Knowledge: VLPA, I&S, NW), as no such formal language exists at present. At the first FCAS meeting of January, I established a working group consisting of Dan Feetham (Advising), Janice DeCosmo (Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Research), and Tina Miller (Registrar’s Office) to work on this language. I await a report from this group.

FCAS continues to work with Patricia Kramer and Phil Reid’s office on the creation of a new set of “experience-based” Interdisciplinary Minors. I now hope to see the first proposal for such, submitted by Patricia Kramer, in SP quarter.

FCAS has begun to work on policy language for “Syllabus Best Practices” focusing especially on the need to include clear grading rubric and grade scales (when applicable) on all undergraduate syllabi. I await a report from this working group.

On the request of Patricia Kramer, Chair of UEM, FCAS is in the process of passing policy language on “Best Practices” for any future Colleges, Schools, or Programs proposing any shift to “Direct-To” admissions. This work continues.

Finally, I have worked with the Provost's office and the School of Public Policy on the ongoing issue of a hoped-for (but not currently feasible) undergraduate program.
Report of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs
Chris Laws, Council Chair and Senior Lecturer, College of Arts and Sciences

During the first two quarters of academic year 2017-2018 the FCSA has focused its attention and energies on the following major areas of shared Faculty and Student concerns:

1. Oversight of and support for the implementation of the revised Student Conduct Code and the associated Presidential Advisory Committee on Student Conduct;

2. Review and revision of practices and University regulations regarding Medical Excuse notes, in close collaboration with the Faculty Council on Academic Affairs;

3. Development of International Student support programs as proposed through recent initiatives within the Department of Student Life;

4. College affordability and access issues, primarily in the areas of housing, open-access textbooks, student veteran affairs, and religious accommodations for students.

Over the remaining meetings this year, the FCSA will focus heavily on item #2 above, with the goal of presenting Class B legislation that prohibits (or appropriately limits) the use of medical excuse notes in UW classrooms, by the end of this academic year or early next year. This work is likely to evolve in conjunction with other “accommodation” issues (such as religious accommodations) and proposals for a campus-wide survey on Academic Integrity, initiated and led by our partners in the Department of Community Standards and Student Conduct. Finally, we are also planning to work with the Division of Student Life on issues regarding the recent “Campus Climate Survey” and associated mental health and wellness concerns on campus.
FAQ’S REGARDING DIRECT-TO-DIVISION ADMISSIONS
DRAFT: March 22, 2018

What changes is the College of Arts and Sciences proposing to UW’s admissions processes?

We are proposing that, starting with the entering class in 2020, all first-year students applying to enter the College of Arts and Sciences will be required to indicate, on their admissions application, which of the four divisions of the College (Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences or Social Sciences) they wish to enter. The admissions form will make clear which departments are in each division. Students judged admissible to the University of Washington according to the existing admissions criteria will then be admitted competitively to each of the College’s divisions based on their demonstrated aptitude for and commitment to the work of the division to which they have applied. The number of students admitted to each of the College’s four divisions will be capped so that all students who are admitted into each division will be guaranteed a place in one of the majors within that division when the time comes to choose a major.

Are any other UW Colleges doing something similar?

Yes. Several other UW Colleges already offer Direct First-Year Admission (DFA) to their Colleges. The College of Engineering and the Foster School of Business have offered DFA to a limited number of students for many years. Starting in autumn 2018, Engineering will be admitting half of its entering class through DFA. The Allen School of Computer Science will be admitting up to half of its entering class through DFA starting in 2019 or 2020.

Why is the College of Arts and Sciences proposing this change?

Like the College of Engineering and the Allen School of Computer Science, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) has many more admitted UW students applying to major in some of our departments than we can accommodate. This is especially the case in our Natural Sciences departments, but also includes some departments in other divisions. At the same time, however, we have room for MORE students in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences than we are currently enrolling. Direct-to-Division admissions for all first-year students entering CAS will allow us to maintain the current number of students that we can accommodate in the Natural Sciences, while allowing us to accept MORE students in our three other divisions. This will result in an INCREASE in the total number of students who can earn a UW undergraduate degree.

How will this change affect the student experience in Arts and Sciences?

We believe this change will be good for our students. Students will be identified as future Arts, Humanities, Natural or Social Science majors from the moment they arrive on campus, providing an intellectual focus for their selection of courses right from the beginning of their academic career. They will be part of a cohort of other students with similar intellectual interests and passions, making their first-year experience more like that of a “college within a college” than it is at present. They will also be guaranteed placement into a major in the division that admitted them. This should reduce considerably the number of students who currently find that they cannot gain entry into their first-choice major. We believe this admissions policy will also allow us to admit more students into UW who are passionately committed to their areas of individual academic interest. This new admissions policy will make the University a more interesting and diverse place for all of our students to live, work, and learn.

What about students who want to double or triple major? Will there still be space for them?

Yes. Students will permitted to double or triple major, as they are now, on a space-available basis.

What if a student decides to major in a subject outside the division into which they are admitted? Can they change their minds under this new admissions policy?

Yes. Students who are admitted into one division but decide to major in a different division will be permitted to do so on a space-available basis. Students admitted directly to a specific division will still be encouraged to explore course options across all four of our divisions. All general education and distribution requirements will remain as they are now for all of our students.
What about students who are undecided as to their areas of interest? How will they be admitted to UW?

UW will continue to admit as Pre-majors first-year students who have no direct-to-college affiliation. Pre-majors can later apply for placement into any UW major on a space-available basis. There is no guarantee, however, that a Pre-major student will be placed in their first-choice UW college or major, as there will be for students who are directly admitted into Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Computer Science, the Foster School, or any other UW school or college that offers direct freshman admissions.

How many students who graduate from Arts and Sciences will have been directly admitted to CAS?

We plan to use the same ratios as Engineering and Computer Science have proposed. 50% of CAS graduates will have been directly admitted as freshmen to CAS; 25% will be transfer students; and 25% will be students who did not apply for direct admission to CAS, but who decided to major in an A&S department after they enrolled at UW as first-year students.

Do any other universities have such Direct-To-College Admissions policies?

Yes. Asking prospective first-year students to decide where their academic interests lie, and to apply for admission to the college appropriate to those interests, is quite common around the country at large state universities. For example, the University of Minnesota, the University of Toronto, and the University of California at Davis all admit first-year students directly into colleges and divisions. It is also important to note that at many peer universities, including UC Davis, the four divisions of the UW College of Arts and Sciences (Arts, Humanities, Natural and Social Sciences) would each be a separate college, with a separate admissions process for entry into the College of Fine Arts, the College of Physical Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.
UW Proposed
Open Access Policy

Gordon Aamot, Director, Scholarly Communication & Publishing
Liz Bedford, Scholarly Publishing Outreach Librarian
March 6, 2018

Scholarly Publishing Ecosystem

- Disconnect between creation and ownership/distribution
- Scholarly research is mostly produced with public dollars by researchers who share it freely
  - Governments and foundations provide most of the funding for research
  - Researchers publish their articles without the expectation of additional compensation in the interest of advancing human knowledge, building careers
- But the results are controlled by publishers and usually hidden behind paywalls
Publishing industry vs. authors - huge power imbalance

- Contracts require authors to transfer their copyright to the publisher
- No posting to website, limited ability to share with colleagues and students

OA Policies: addressing the imbalance and making more research freely available to the world

- Harvard the first in 2008
- Over 50 US universities adopted policies based on Harvard’s Model
  - Duke, Florida State, Indiana, Illinois, MIT, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, North Carolina, Texas, all 10 U California campuses...
- UW’s recommended policy based on Harvard model
Proposed policy

Automatic, non-exclusive license to UW to exercise rights under copyright relating to authors’ scholarly articles “for the purpose of making their articles freely and widely available in an open access repository”

Deposit a post-peer-review, pre-publisher-formatting copy of the article in a UW repository

Waiver (opt-out entirely or delayed access) granted automatically when requested by author

Copyright: transfer vs. non-exclusive license
Deposit in UW Repository

Three ways to achieve OA outcome

1. UW Repository
2. Disciplinary repository (non-profit, with preservation)
3. OA Journal
Waiver system

“The Provost or Provost’s designate will waive this requirement or delay access for a specified period of time for a particular article upon express direction by the Faculty member. Grant of such a waiver or delay is mandatory, not at the discretion of any person or group.”

‘Opt out’ vs. ‘opt in’
Why is the license automatic?

• Addresses the power imbalance
  • No longer an individual author negotiating with a publisher— it’s a policy of the faculty of the UW.

• Non-exclusive license precedes any publisher agreement
  • After publication agreement is signed, copyright has transferred and can’t grant the license
The OA Policy does NOT:

• Restrict where authors can or should publish

• Force authors to pay APCs
  
  • In fact, deposit in ResearchWorks is a free way to comply
    with federal OA mandates

• Take copyright away from authors

Questions?

Gordon Aamot
UW Libraries
aamot@uw.edu

Liz Bedford
UW Libraries
ebedford@uw.edu
Background and Rationale
Adoption of a New Open Access Publication Policy by the Faculty of the University of Washington

On April 23, 2015, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved a Class C “Resolution Concerning the UW Open Access Repository and Request for Advice on an Open Access Policy” that was submitted jointly by the Faculty Council on Research and the Faculty Council on University Libraries. In that resolution, the Senate requested that the Provost direct Betsy Wilson, Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives and Dean of University Libraries to "develop an open access publication policy for recommendation to the University and conduct a needs and integration assessment to determine what resources are necessary to enhance the University’s institutional repository, ResearchWorks Archive, to the level of a world-class repository". This resulted in a report to the Provost dated June 13, 2016 that included a new Open Access Policy for faculty at the UW with recommendations for the purchase of the citation harvesting software tool, Symplectic Elements and creation of an additional FTE position for the oversight of the repository.

The class C resolution passed by the Senate in 2015 followed similar resolutions passed by the ASUW and GPSS in 2014 and the establishment of open access policies and repositories at peer institutions including Harvard, the University of California System, the University of Minnesota, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and the University of Arizona. The recommended new policy for the UW is modeled on the guidelines established at Harvard and the recommended software is currently being used by the University of California System. Further justification for the resulting open access policy and for purchase of the citation harvesting software is included in the June 2016 report.

Recommended University of Washington Open Access Policy

Purpose
As a public university, the University of Washington is dedicated to making its research and scholarship freely and widely available to the people of Washington and the broader research community. In addition to the public benefit, the following policy is intended to serve faculty interests by: promoting the visibility and accessibility of their work, resulting in greater impact and recognition; helping them retain distribution rights; and aiding preservation of the scholarly record.

Policy and Grant of Rights
Faculty grant to the University a non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise, and to allow others to exercise, any and all rights under copyright relating to his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, for the purpose of making their articles freely and widely available in an open access repository. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership to the University.

Scope and Waiver
This policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while a person is a member of the Faculty except for articles completed before the adoption of this policy. The Provost or Provost’s designate will waive this requirement or delay access for a specified period of time for a particular article upon express direction by the Faculty member. Grant of such a waiver or delay is mandatory, not at the discretion of any person or group.

Deposit of Articles
To assist the University in archiving and disseminating scholarly articles, the Faculty commit to helping the University obtain copies of their articles. Specifically, each Faculty member who does not obtain a waiver to deposit in the ResearchWorks Archive repository will endeavor to provide an electronic copy of the final accepted (post-peer review) manuscripts of his or her articles to the University for inclusion in the ResearchWorks Archive or notify the University that the article will be available elsewhere on an open access basis.

Implementation and Oversight of Policy
The Provost or Provost’s designate will be responsible for implementing and interpreting this policy and recommending changes to the Faculty from time to time. In implementing this policy the Provost or Provost’s designate will strive to maximize Faculty participation by providing appropriate technology and other support to facilitate article deposit.
OPEN ACESS POLICY PROPOSAL

Goal: To maximize Open Access while respecting faculty control and choice.

Resources: UW Libraries Open Access web pages; http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq

The process of submission of an accepted work would be:
- Faculty writes scholarly article and it is accepted in a peer-reviewed publication
- Faculty may submit final author manuscript at this time on their own volition, to the ResearchWorks Archive
- At time of publication, an email from the “system” will request a faculty member to submit the paper if they have not done so already
- At this point, a faculty member can have one of the following responses:
  - Submit author’s final accepted manuscript and it would be available on the open access repository
  - Direct UW to grant a policy waiver for the article and not deposit it, or delay access for a specific period of time
  - Alert UW that the manuscript has already been deposited in a disciplinary repository, or that the manuscript will be published in an open access forum
  - Ignore email, nothing would happen, this is essentially a soft decline by the faculty member

Policy Implementation Details:

Overall
- Policy would automatically grant to the University a non-exclusive license to faculty’s scholarly articles in order to make those articles freely available via ResearchWorks Archive.
- Faculty do not transfer copyright of their work to the University; rather, the non-exclusive license is a mechanism by which authors can retain their rights that are often lost to publishers.
- The policy only covers scholarly articles and not publications for which the author expects payment.
- The policy would only affect articles created on or after the date that the policy goes into effect.
- The policy would not restrict where authors can or should publish, nor require them to pay open access fees. There is to be no disciplinary or other negative acts of accountability for faculty who choose to NOT submit their works
- There is strong support for a manner of opting out of the process for an undefinable future.

Deposit process
- Faculty would deposit the final, accepted, post-peer review version of their research articles prior to final publisher formatting (“Accepted Author Manuscript” or “Author’s Final Version”) in the University’s institutional repository, ResearchWorks Archive.
- Should they so wish, a faculty member may request and will be automatically granted a waiver from UW to not deposit the article (for example in response to a publisher’s request) or to embargo access to the article for a certain period.
- Fulfillment of the policy may be accomplished through other methods than deposit in ResearchWorks. Faculty who choose to publish their articles in open access journals or via disciplinary repositories such as arXiv and PubMed Central would not be asked to also deposit these articles in ResearchWorks Archive.
- Citation in repository should note whether the version presented has been peer reviewed or if it is the original submitted version. The Policy is specifically aimed at post-peer-reviewed versions (“…will provide an electronic copy of the final accepted (post-peer review) manuscripts of his or her articles…”) but pre-peer-review deposit would also be encouraged.
- All submissions should include full appropriate citations to official publication if that information is available.
- The Libraries and University will strive to provide appropriate technology and other support to facilitate article deposit for faculty authors.
Communications and training
- UW will provide faculty with an author’s addendum explaining the OA policy, which they may attach to publishing contracts. The aim of the policy is to allow all faculty who wish to participate to do so without needing to negotiate with or explain to publishers as individuals. Rather, they are adhering to a university policy and have the weight of the full faculty decision making process behind them.
- UW Libraries will lead a direct communications drive with publishers to alert them that the policy will be going into effect.
- UW policy allows all faculty who wish to participate to do so without explanation to publishers as it is a university policy not an individual choice. (Other schools also provide form letters faculty can send as an addendum to the contract saying that the UW license overrides the contract terms.)
- Online training will be required (but not monitored) for all faculty that will explain process, timing, and choices under control of faculty members
- Process Must be Clear and Concise
- All submissions should require/include full appropriate citations to official publication
- All UW deposited articles in UW’s institutional repository, ResearchWorks, are fully indexed and searchable via Google or another browser.
Open Access Policy Questions and Responses (follow up to FAQs online)

1. **What does it mean to say that UW “has a license for all publications by faculty”**
   In the Open Access Initiative Report, the term “license” is used in two contexts. The most important is the non-exclusive license faculty would automatically grant to UW for their scholarly articles for the purpose of making those articles freely available via ResearchWorks Archive. By granting limited rights to the University prior to signing a publication agreement, faculty authors would be able to retain selective rights that are usually lost when copyright is transferred to publishers. Faculty would not transfer copyright for their scholarly articles to the University.

   The other use of “license” in the report is the license for Symplectic Elements software. This is completely separate from the non-exclusive license that is at the heart of the proposed Open Access Policy. The Symplectic license is an annual contract with a vendor, with terms and conditions.

2. **How is the metadata collected so that publications are google searchable?**
   Symplectic Elements identifies UW authors by searching through large citation databases – Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and MLA International Bibliography. It also searches other sources, such as arXiv and ORCID. Citations drawn from these sources would provide the metadata for these articles and no human indexing should be needed. SE’s subject coverage is heavily oriented toward science, medicine, and the social sciences, although they are actively pursuing humanities data sources. For authors in other areas, whose work is not indexed by the databases above, some metadata would need to be added.

3. **How does UW or the software find out about an article?**
   It works in several different ways. For example, Symplectic Elements identifies UW authors by searching through large citation databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and MLA International Bibliography. It also searches for UW authors in other sources, such as arXiv and ORCID. SE identifies articles after they are published and are available in the sources above. SE’s subject coverage is heavily oriented toward science, medicine, and the social sciences. Authors in other areas, whose work is not indexed by the sources from which SE draws citation data, won’t be included in SE’s citation harvesting and may not receive automated emails.

4. **If a faculty member does not full understand the process, timing, etc., (a) who will help deal with complaints, queries? (b) what is the worst that could happen in a case in which the faculty member did not do the training, or did it and did not understand?**
   a. Responding to faculty author queries would be one of the primary duties of the repository librarian, as would developing outreach and training.
   b. If a faculty author didn’t deposit his or her accepted manuscript, there would be no penalties for noncompliance with the policy. So the worst case would simply be that the repository doesn’t get a copy of the paper.

5. **When can a waiver from submitting to ResearchWorks Archive be requested:**
   An author could direct the University to grant a waiver to the license for an article at any time after an article manuscript has been peer reviewed and accepted by the publisher if they need to submit that waiver to the publisher, and as well as at any time after publication.
Class A Legislation: Statement for Change in Faculty Voting Eligibility

Proposed Legislation:

This proposed legislation is to amend the UW Faculty Code for Voting Guidelines / General Eligibility to allow Senior and Principal Lecturers and Senior Artists-in-Residence to have voting privileges at 50% or greater effort and to be included as retired faculty during quarters that they work part-time. It should be noted that Full Time Senior and Principal Lecturers are already eligible for voting within their unit.

Rationale:

This change in voting rights recognizes the long-term and deep commitment of senior and principal lecturers to high quality teaching and mentoring of students and to the pedagogy of our university. It acknowledges the knowledge these leading lecturers might share in our shared efforts to provide the best education to our students. Furthermore, the voting rights align career flexibility opportunities for non-tenure-track faculty in senior positions with those for tenure-track faculty. This change reflects the respect for Senior and Principal Lecturers and Senior Artists-in-Residence in recognition of their attainments as well as their continuity in service to the university.

Section 21-32 Voting Membership in the Faculty

A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section the voting members of the University faculty are those faculty members holding the rank and/or title of:

- Professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Full-time Principal lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
- Full-time Senior lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- Full-time lecturer,
- Full-time artist in residence, or
- A retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, principal lecturer, or senior lecturer, during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.
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Rationale:

Section 24-34.B.3

The revision to the qualifications for the Principal Lecturer title (24-34.B.3) is intended to clarify the nature and level of expectations for that title, in a more general way than the current more specific list of potential methods of recognition. It is also intended to assist units to more effectively mentor and guide lecturing faculty in promotion to Principal Lecturers.

Section 24-54

Revisions to the section on promotion (24-54) are intended to restructure the language for clarity, and also to reorient voting procedures for promotion of faculty in instructional titles. This follows the recommendation of, among others, the Bothell Lecturers Working Group report from June of 2014, suggesting that “an asymmetry exists within the Code when it comes to personnel matters. Currently tenure track faculty have responsibility to review lecturers, but lecturers do not review tenure track faculty.” Having senior faculty vote is more respectful of the status and experience of the lecturer faculty.

Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability that evidences promise of a successful career.

2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

3. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field, recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.
A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles; these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above) senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) senior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.
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Introduction

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs voted on February 8, 2018, to forward proposed Class A legislation to the Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion was approved by a majority of voting members.

Reasons for Proposed Changes

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs seeks to encourage the recognition of faculty members who contribute significant amounts of time to the University in areas that promote a more diverse campus and that improve the experiences of and opportunities for non-traditional students.

Over the course of this Academic year, the FCMA reviewed and ultimately selected Faculty Code Chapter 24.32 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members) for proposed revision in order to further promote the goal of diversity and equity. Where the chapter as a whole was modified in 2012 to allow that a faculty member’s “service that addresses diversity and equal opportunity” may be considered among the professional/scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion, the FCMA observed that under the current language (“may”), units may choose to discount a faculty member’s contributions to diversity in relation to appointment and promotion, but where the term “shall” is utilized, faculty members with relevant contributions shall have those contributions considered as part of their scholarly and professional qualifications. The proposed legislation is a mechanism to put value on an aspect of faculty work that is traditionally difficult to recognize. The legislation is not intended to mandate that units may only hire/promote faculty with those credentials (service that addresses diversity and equal opportunity), but simply provides that where this service exists, it shall be considered.

Background

At the initial meeting of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs in October 2017, the council reviewed goals provided by Senate Chair Thaïsa Way. Among the goals was a mandate to evaluate relevant sections of the Faculty Code and associated practices through the lens of multicultural affairs, diversity, and difference, with the objectives of strengthening equity and fairness.

During the course of the fall and winter quarter meetings, the Council reviewed various sections of the Faculty Code, paying particular attention to topics that would impact issues relevant to the goal provided by Senate Chair Thaïsa Way. Ultimately, the FCMA honed in on specific sections of the code within chapter 24. Specifically, section 24.32 of the faculty code, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members and the discretionary language utilized for the consideration of contributions “in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity” in appointment and promotion decisions. The Council recommends this Class A legislation modifying the discretionary language from “may be included” to “shall be” included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion.

Section 24-32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. In accord with the University’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.
A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. For each of these realms, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member’s published or other creative work.

Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees. In all these, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included.

C. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;

- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;

- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;

- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;

- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;

- The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and

- The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor’s participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students’ long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University’s educational
function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.
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Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 19, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
Johnson Hall 102

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Thaïsa Way.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.
   d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative – Frank Hodge, Professor, Foster School of Business.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Caucue.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of April 2, 2018.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Confirm JoAnn Taricani, Professor, Music History, as 2018-19, Faculty Legislative Representative

8. Announcements.


10. Discussion Items:
    a. Capital Campaign
       Connie Kravas, Vice President for University Advancement.
    b. Workday Updates.
       Aaron Powell, Vice President for UW Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, Nancy Jagger, Executive Director, Integrated Service Center, UW IT.
    c. College of Arts and Sciences Direct-to-Division Admissions Proposal: Dean Robert Stacey, Arts and Sciences.

    a. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty voting eligibility, second consideration.
       Action: Approve for faculty vote.
    b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty lecturer issues.
       Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
    c. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to promotion and tenure diversity requirements, first consideration.
       Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Approved by: Thaïsa Way, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, April 26 at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102.