

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS**

The Faculty Council on University Relations met on Wednesday, **February 27, 2002**, at 1:30 p.m. Chair Christina Emerick presided.

**PRESENT:**     *Professors* Emerick (Chair), Crittenden, Dziwirek, Robertson and Thorud;  
                  *Ex officio members* Arkans, de Tornyay, Doherty and Whang;

**ABSENT:**     *Professors* Fridley, Goldblatt, Hicks, Kozuki, Regnier and Seifer;  
                  *Ex officio members* Anderson, Ludwig, Russell, Sjavik and Whitney.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of January 30, 2002 were approved as written.

**Announcements – Christina Emerick**

1) *FCUR membership*

Council members will be contacted before long about continuance on the council and possible renewal of membership. Terms for regular voting members are three years, with one renewal of membership open to all members. Also, faculty may wish to serve on another council when their FCUR membership has expired, to see another facet of faculty governance.

The council needs a new chair for the 2002-2003 academic year. Christina Emerick is completing her second consecutive year as chair of the council. Please contact Emerick ([tina@ocean.washington.edu](mailto:tina@ocean.washington.edu)) if you are interested in serving as chair.

2) *Faculty Council reorganization movement*

Emerick said discussions are continuing in the Senate Executive Committee on faculty council reorganization, and particularly in the specially-appointed subcommittee charged to assess the possible merging of certain existing councils. Emerick said that, thus far, the Faculty Council on University Relations has not been brought up as a council likely to be merged with another. She will keep the council abreast of further developments in the discussion of possible council reorganization.

**Honorary Degree – Christina Emerick**

Emerick distributed the current draft of the Honorary Degrees criteria and protocol document for council review.

De Tornyay, Arkans and Crittenden suggested it would be best not to allude to “political motivation” in references to candidates for Honorary Degrees. As Crittenden pointed out, it can never be known when someone is a candidate, or is going to be a candidate. The council thought it best to say that no “declared candidate” could be considered for an Honorary Degree.

The council agreed that it is important to state that current members of the Faculty, Administration and Board of Regents of the University of Washington are not to be considered for Honorary Degrees. The University has other honors which are more appropriate for members of our own academic community.

Arkans said it would be a good idea to suggest that the number of Honorary Degrees be limited at any one time with each candidate recommended solely on his or her own merit rather than ranked with others. He said the entire focus should be on the merits of the individual candidate: Who is this person? Is he or she worthy of this honor? Does this person meet the standard of accomplishment and distinction we have set for the Honorary Degree?

Asked whether Honorary Degrees will be conferred almost exclusively at Commencement, Arkans said, “In the course of things, most of these will be commencements, but by no means all. Some may be convocations, or other kinds of events. We don’t want to *link* Honorary Degrees with commencements.”

As to the process for nominations, Thorud said it would be good to have limits in the timeline. The council decided that the deadline for distribution of nominations to FCUR members should be “no later than six months prior to the event at which the Honorary Degree would be conferred.” It would be far preferable to submit the nominations as much as possible before this deadline. The nominations should be specifically directed to the chair of the Faculty Council on University Relations.

The council thought it best not to ask for a candidate’s date of birth. (The age of the candidate will most likely be included in the material he or she submits to the council, and if it is not, it is not important.)

Crittenden and Arkans both suggested that council members should know the candidates well enough, if indeed they are viable candidates, not to need incidental biographical details. And they pointed out that, if required, the council can ask those who nominated the candidate for further information.

Arkans said there should be some description of the candidate’s expected visit to the campus: the occasion (Commencement, lecture, convocation, other event) because of which he or she will be coming to the campus. He said a Commencement address would represent “one end of the spectrum”, but that many other possibilities remain. “It is good to have some mention of an anticipated event,” he said. Thorud added that doing so “would draw in the administration, which might be able to help in a practical way.”

The council liked the four titles Emerick chose for Honorary Degrees: Doctor of Arts, Doctor of Humane Letters, Doctor of Laws, and Doctor of Science. Crittenden and Arkans advocated keeping the titles broad. Arkans said the council might want to notify the Board of Regents that these are the Honorary Degrees the council believes the University should be offering.

An article on Honorary Degrees will be placed in University Week. Emerick will let the council know in which issue the article will appear. It was also recommended that both undergraduate and graduate students be informed of what is transpiring with Honorary Degrees.

What follows is the Honorary Degrees criteria and protocol document as amended by today’s council discussion. (This is a work-in-progress; timelines for nomination and review have not yet been fully defined.)

## **HONORARY DEGREES**

### **I. Criteria & Guidelines**

- Honorary degrees should recognize those who have made profound and enduring contributions to scholarship, culture, and improved quality of life in society at large. Achievements of national or international significance deserve priority consideration. It is important that recipients be persons of great integrity, as the choices we make reflect our values as an institution.

Conferral of Honorary Degrees will be extraordinary events, and need not occur every year.

- There are some necessary restrictions to be considered:

In accordance with state statute, “No degree shall ever be conferred in consideration of the payment of money or the giving of property of whatsoever kind.” RCW 28B.20.130

Current members of the faculty, administration and Board of Regents of the University of Washington shall not be considered for Honorary Degrees, as the University has other mechanisms for honoring its own.

Declared candidates running for public office are also not appropriate nominees for Honorary Degrees.

Finally, Honorary Degrees will not be conferred in absentia.

## **II. Process for Nominations**

- Nominations for candidates may come from a variety of sources, including faculty councils, committees, departments, programs, schools, colleges or campuses.
- The Chairperson of FCUR will solicit nominations by distributing appropriate guidelines to the University community.
- Timeline:  
Nomination materials should be submitted to the Chair of FCUR at least 6 months in advance of the proposed event at which the nominee would be honoured.
- Nominating Materials:  
The quality of the materials sent in support of nominees is extremely important, as the Council may not have independent knowledge of the nominees' accomplishments.  
The nominating proposal should:
  1. Be signed by the proposer(s).
  2. Give the reasons that make it particularly appropriate for the UW to honor this individual.
  3. Contain supporting information such as a Vita or short biography, including pertinent information:
    - a. Full name of nominee for award
    - b. Degrees received and granting institutions
    - c. Relevant career history or experience relevant to the nomination
    - d. Significant honors, achievements, contributions
    - e. Societies, associations for which a nominee holds membership.
  4. Describe the type of even and timeframe in which the nominee would be visiting the University of Washington. For a specific, already-planned event, the proposers should identify the units or organizations that are sponsoring the nominee's visit.

## **III. Review & Selection Process**

- Timeline:  
Distribution of nominating materials to FCUR members \_\_\_\_\_.  
Deadline for the Council's final deliberations on candidates \_\_\_\_\_.
- Titles of Honorary Degrees  
Doctor of Arts (D.A). -- design, visual and performing arts  
  
Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.) -- service to society (humanitarianism), and scholarship in the humanities (journalism, communication, history, philosophy, language, literature) and social sciences  
  
Doctor of Laws (LL.D) -- law, policy,  
  
Doctor of Science (Sc.D.) -- science, medicine, engineering, and related fields.

## **IV. Notification**

- Following deliberation and a positive vote for a particular candidate, the Chair of FCUR will notify the president and the Senate leadership, in writing, and request that the present forward the candidate's name to the Board of Regents.
- Only after action by the Board of Regents should the nominee be informed of the honor; this will be coordinated by the Office of University Relations.

- If the Council decides not to accept a proposal, the Chair will inform the proposers accordingly.

#### **V. Conferring**

Honorary Degrees will be presented at either a commencement ceremony or a formal academic convocation. These events are planned by the Committee on Public Exercises.

#### **VI. Confidentiality**

Every effort will be made to ensure that individual nominations and discussions of nominees by FCUR remain confidential. No publicity shall be issued regarding the nominee(s) until final approval by the Board of Regents.

- VII.** *In recent years there have been some recipients of honorary degrees from other institutions who have listed these on their vitae as actual (earned) degrees, or have attempted to gain employment based on the degrees. [Should we include a clause here that says HD from UW may not be used in this way?]*

#### **Light Rail update – Theresa Doherty**

Doherty said the Sound Transit potential alignments for Light Rail (there are now three possible alignments running north through the University District) are advancing to Draft SEIS status. She addressed the north section of the Light Rail project only, the section directly impacting the University and the U-District.

She delineated the three potential alignments and distributed a map showing their routes across Portage Bay and north through the U-District. One route would go under the Montlake Cut and diagonally traverse the campus, meeting the Light Rail Station at N.E. 45<sup>th</sup> St. and 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. N.E. A second route would go under Portage Bay and skirt the west campus as it wends northward, with one or possibly two Light Rail Stations near N.E. Pacific St. A third route would go under Portage Bay and travel up Brooklyn Avenue N.E., with a station near N.E. Pacific St. and Brooklyn Ave. N.E., and another at N.E. 45<sup>th</sup> St. and Brooklyn Ave. N.E.

Doherty said the University has concerns about vibration and EMI impacts if Light Rail were placed directly under the campus, particularly near buildings containing research laboratories that would be negatively impacted by vibrations from Light Rail. And she said the University is adamant in its opposition to Light Rail terminating at N.E. 45<sup>th</sup> St. It is of paramount importance to the University that Light Rail continue northward to Northgate. A northern terminus at N.E. 45<sup>th</sup> St. would be calamitous for the University.

#### **Budget cuts, hiring freezes, tuition hikes – brief discussion of Public Relations implications**

Emerick said projected budget cuts (the state legislature anticipates a \$1.6 billion shortfall) may adversely affect ways of increasing the flow of information across the campus. The cuts would obviously affect information systems prevalent at the University. Arkans said the budget cuts would to some degree be offset by a raise in tuition.

Emerick said Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt would like to hear from faculty councils about the faculty's role in the budget cut process. Crittenden said, "Reallocation issues are what faculty most care about. Each faculty member wants to know: What are the University's priorities? How will the reallocations affect my department?"

The Faculty Senate believes that college councils and faculty councils could be useful in this campus-wide discussion, Emerick said. Arkans said any campus-wide meeting should only take place when the University is more certain of what is happening with budget cuts and possible reallocations.

#### **Next meeting**

The next FCUR meeting is set for Wednesday, April 3, 2002, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder