Minutes *(Video Recording)*  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Thursday, May 17, 2018, 2:30 p.m.  
Johnson Hall 102

1. **Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.** (Video Time Stamp 0:00:00—0:00:11)  
   Chair Way called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. The agenda was approved.

2. **Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Thaïsa Way.** (0:00:50—0:07:33) *[Exhibit A]*  
   Way began by acknowledging that May 18 is the 80th anniversary of the Faculty Senate. She also noted some milestones in the history of shared governance.

   She went on to recognize, commend, and congratulate Nancy Bradshaw, Assistant to the Senate Chair, on her many years of service to shared governance at the University of Washington.

   She then gave some prepared remarks. She highlighted a number of issues facing faculty and the community today: sexual harassment, the detention of a UW student by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, travel issues for faculty, and that the proposed tax plan may include changing the tax exemption for graduate student tuition waivers. Faculty need to work together and work with President Cauce to help come up with solutions to these problems.

3. **Reports and Opportunity for Questions.** (0:07:35—0:22:06)  
   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. *[Exhibit B]*  
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting. *[Exhibit C]*  
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.  
   d. Report of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice. *[Exhibit D]*  
   e. Faculty Council Activities Report. *[Exhibit E]*  
   f. Report of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning. *[Exhibit F]*  
   g. Report of the Faculty Council on University Libraries. *[Exhibit G]*  

   JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke to issues in Olympia. With respect to the upcoming general election, Taricani noted that the Democrats currently hold a slim majority in the State and things could go either way. The annual faculty survey questionnaire will be distributed shortly, and the results will be very helpful. She explained that there is a disconnect between the legislative and University views on the budget. The legislature tends to be backward-looking, emphasizing the absolute increase in revenue over the last ten years, but the University tends to be forward-looking, emphasizing projected increases in expenses as well as the constraint the undergraduate tuition-cap puts on increasing tuition revenue overall. The UW must educate legislators and shift their perspective. In this regard, individual faculty members contacting their legislators is important.

   During discussion, several points were made. Some members suggested that the legislature is focused on the undergraduate part of the picture and needs to be informed about the graduate and research parts. President Cauce added that it is important the legislature understand that our ability to raise graduate and out-of-state undergraduate tuition is limited. Moreover, our graduating students tend to remain in Washington and support the State, but tuition increases affect our ability to attract students who will remain. Taricani noted that the way in which increased funds could be spent typically would be up the University; the legislature does not normally attach strings to general funding increases.

4. **President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.** (0:22:07—0:38:25)  
   President Cauce began by addressing several topics related to the upcoming legislative session.

   Cauce said that the UW is planning to go to the legislature hand-in-hand with the other institutions of higher education, including the community and technical colleges. The idea is to present a common general agenda. The advantage of joining the community and technical colleges is that most legislators have one or the other or both in their districts.
Cauce said that the top priority of all institutions is compensation, mainly for faculty, but also to some extent with respect to staff. The UW faculty is behind global peers and that fact provides ammunition for a good argument. But compensation gaps will not be fully addressed in one legislative session. K-12 faculties have built in COLA’s, and this is something that the higher education would like to see considered for their faculties.

Cauce said she has spoken as UW President in favor of higher taxes, and has spoken as a private citizen in favor of state income and capital gains taxes because they are progressive. Cauce said that it is important to address funding issues by at least getting back to 2008 levels because at some point there will be another recession.

Cauce said that higher education must also highlight the difficulties of using tuition to put the funding burden on the back of students and their families. As the hollowing out of the middle class continues, future students will not be as wealthy. This raises questions about our commitment to access. Moreover, tuition bases are becoming skewed. At the UW, for example, 25% of the students (mainly out-of-state and international) pay about 70% of the tuition. Although the UW continues to do well with respect to such students, Cauce said she is worried about depending on this going forward. Other countries, such as India and China, are working hard to create their own strong higher-education systems.

Cauce said that funding is one side of the budget picture. Higher education must also be more cost-effective in the way it does teaching and research.

Turning to the UW specifically, Cauce said she continues to be worried about how the local cost of living affects the ability to attract faculty, students, and staff. She said that the UW is looking into public-private partnerships on housing. But this issue cannot be fully addressed until the University’s Master Plan is passed by the City.

Cauce ended by saying that good progress has been made on lecturer issues.

There were no questions.

5. Requests for Information. (0:38:26—00:38:45)
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of May 7, 2018.
   a. Approval of the April 2, 2018, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the April 19, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes;
   c. Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement ad hoc Committee on Faculty Pre-retirement Planning Report (remanded to FCBR for further vetting) [Exhibit H];
   d. 2018-19 Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate meeting schedule [Exhibit I];
   e. Bylaw Review Report (referred to FCFA for review and possible code revisions to EFC membership) [Exhibit J].

There were no requests for information.

6. Memorial Resolution. (0:38:43—0:40:16)

The memorial resolution was presented by George Sandison, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. The resolution was approved by a standing vote.

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

Assistant Professor Peter Ways of Medicine who died on April 6, 2018, after having served the university since 1954.

Clinical Associate Professor William Friend of Medicine who died on April 7, 2018, after having served the university since 1971.

Lecturer Jake Tiefel of the School of Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics who died on April 26, 2018, after having served the university since 2015.
Professor Emeritus Martha Fales of Dentistry who died on April 29, 2018, after having served the university since 1959.

7. Consent Agenda. (0:40:17—0:40:30)
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit K]
   b. Approve nominees for 2018-19 Senate Executive Committee. [Exhibit L]

The consent agenda was approved.

8. Announcements. (0:40:31—0:42:35)

George Sandison, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented Chair Way with a plaque to commemorate her service as Faculty Senate chair.


There was no unfinished business.

   a. Class B Legislation – Open Access Policy. [Exhibit M]

   On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, George Sandison, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, moved that the legislation be sent to the faculty for review as Class B legislation. Gordon Aamot, University Libraries, spoke to the motion, providing an overview of how the open-access policy would work in practice.

   During discussion, several clarifications were made. The policy is a collective effort aimed at the goal of making faculty research available to the widest possible audience. There are studies showing citations increase under open-access systems. The policy will not hurt publishers but will address shortcomings in the current publisher-based system. Faculty members can submit materials for inclusion to the repository with an embargo period. The opt-out nature of the policy was vetted for legal issues by the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy, and Practice and was approved by the Senate Executive Committee. As an "opt-out" policy, it is consistent with the policies at many other universities, it protects authors vis-à-vis publishers through an up-front license that can be presented to publishers as a pre-existing university policy, and it addresses participation problems with an "opt-in" approach.

   The motion passed.

   b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty lecturer issues – second consideration. [Exhibit N]

   On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, George Sandison, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, moved that the legislation be sent to the faculty for approval.

   There was no discussion.

   The motion passed.

   c. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to promotion and tenure diversity requirements - second consideration. [Exhibit O]

   On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, George Sandison, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, moved that the legislation be sent to the faculty for approval.

   There was no discussion.

   The motion passed.
d. Class C Resolution regarding Faculty Effort Certification. [Exhibit P]

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Class C resolution. Aaron Katz, member of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, spoke to the motion, summarizing the background provided in the Exhibit. He also described the Faculty Effort Certification process in which faculty members are asked to certify that their overall work efforts correspond to the funding provided in the sponsoring grant and the UW. In particular, they must certify that the University is covering any time spent on non-sponsored activities such as applying for another grant. A recent faculty survey indicated that some faculty members feel that UW funding is not adequately covering such time, leading faculty members to lie on their certifications, devote inadequate time to non-sponsored activities, or in effect volunteer time (which itself is not allowed). This resolution is aimed at finding out the extent of the problem at the UW.

During discussion, several points were made. Although there is a forthcoming federal survey covering some of the same issues, the proposers decided to proceed with the resolution for several reasons. First, the resolution is an attempt to engage the parties at the UW. Second, the general UW issues actually cover faculty members who are not federally funded. Finally, the federal survey results might not be granulated enough for UW purposes. With respect to the last two reasons, there still were concerns expressed about whether the expense to carry out the resolution would be worth any additional information generated. Moreover, the argument was made that the issue is really dependent on individual context and would be better served by starting conversations between faculty members and Chairs/Deans. Indeed, some members wondered why the proposers hadn’t started working at the School level first and said they would feel more comfortable supporting the resolution knowing that local efforts had failed.

The motion passed.

e. Class C Resolution regarding Housekeeping Changes. [Exhibit Q]

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Class C resolution. Janelle Taylor, Arts and Sciences, spoke to the motion, summarizing the background contained in the preamble. She emphasized that substantive changes to the Faculty Code requires Class A legislation and argued that the changes made to Section 25-71 under the guise of housekeeping are in fact substantive.

During the discussion, President Cauce made several comments. She said the underlying compliance issues could have been handled by Executive Order, but the administration decided to leave the issue in the first instance to the faculty, whose leadership came up with the housekeeping approach. She said that if mistakes were made it should be remembered that all concerned acted in good faith. Moreover, she said that the matter is already getting serious attention. There is an ongoing adjudication that could be ruling on the validity of the changes. In addition, there is ongoing work that will result in an overhaul of the dispute procedures in the Faculty Code. Cauce said that she was not arguing that the Senate could not act, only that the resolution might complicate these ongoing efforts. She said that she takes this issue very seriously, and if a mistake was made, then it would be fixed.

During the discussion, Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate at the time of the changes, made several comments. She was concerned about the assumption that the changes were not valid. She suggested that a better approach would be to take the question to the SEC for consideration. As opposed to the Senate, the SEC is a more nimble body and is designated as a Code interpreter. Barsness remembered discussions about the research-misconduct changes and said leadership accepted on good faith the previous Secretary’s assertion that the corresponding Code changes could be implemented through housekeeping. Other members recalled that the Faculty Council on Research did vet changes to Executive Order 61 relating to research misconduct and gave their input to the SEC. Another member noted that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs was aware of the possibility of some general housekeeping changes, but not about the specifics.

During the discussion, members from the floor made several comments in support of the resolution. It was argued that the process for making changes to Executive Orders is separate from the proper process for making any accompanying changes to the Faculty Code. Members also questioned whether the existence of an ongoing adjudication, the SEC’s interpretive role, or the possibility of future legislation on the dispute
provisions in the Code should preclude the Senate from passing the resolution. They argued that the Faculty Senate, as the faculty’s legislative body, has every right to express its will on such housekeeping changes made to the Faculty Code. They said that the resolution is an instance of the legislative side of the faculty regulating itself. Moreover, the Faculty Senate cannot and should not rely on the judicial side to rectify the matter. Finally, adjudication is about an individual case, not about the general issue of the appropriate use of housekeeping.

Several other comments were made. Members also wondered what affect this would have on past or current adjudications. A member suggested that the relevant Executive Order should also be checked for changes during the relevant period. Several members asserted the need for a better way of handling housekeeping, and that other approaches should be considered by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.

In response to questions during the discussion, Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, briefly described the adjudication process, indicated how an adjudication might result in a consideration of the validity of housekeeping changes, said that the effect of the resolution on other adjudications was an unknown.

The motion failed.

11. Discussion Items: (1:58:30—2:15:30)
   a. Population Health. [Exhibit R]
      Derek Fulwiler, Director, Project Strategy and Communications, Population Health.

Derek Fulwiler, Director of Project Strategy and Communications, gave a presentation on Population Health, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

   b. UW 2050 Faculty Survey Results. [Exhibit S]

Chair Way described the results of the 2050 survey.


A member requested that the Senate Leadership report in due course on how the issues underlying the Class C resolution on housekeeping would be addressed, including the way housekeeping changes are made. The member argued that ongoing or future adjudications should not postpone dealing with such issues. Speaking on behalf of the Senate Leadership, Chair Way agreed.

Chair Way led the Senate in one more round of applause for Nancy Bradshaw.

Chair Way reminded Senators that the President’s end-of-year celebration would begin after the meeting.


The meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Thaïsa Way, Professor, College of Built Environments

This has been an intense academic year as many activities draw to a close with the end of the spring quarter or being prepared for a next phase in the fall. Noting this season of change, I would like to take a moment to recognize the leadership of Provost Baldasty, for his partnership with faculty leadership and his trust in shared governance has made us a stronger university. We have partnered with him to review the university’s fiscal health and the role of ABB and supplements, to foster partnerships between deans and their Elected Faculty Councils, to explore new ways to support incoming departmental chairs, and the potential of a more connected U across all three campuses. Moving forward he has been a partner in our UW Faculty 2050 project, in the curation of discussions around holistic admissions and enrollment management, and in re-evaluating intellectual property. He has been a partner with Deans and faculty leadership on the Othello-UW Commons in South Seattle. It was a delight to meet our latest cohort of Husky 100 students, an idea that started with Provost Baldasty. We will miss his wisdom and humor—thank you, Jerry.

We are also excited to welcome incoming Provost Mark Richards. We will present him with our UW Faculty 2050 report reflecting the aspirations of many of our faculty as gathered in focus groups and our recent faculty survey. However, most important is that we will welcome him into an institution that stewards strong shared governance with faculty and leadership contributing to the greater whole. I can’t think of a more important time than right now to be strong as a faculty and as a university serving the public.

**Strengthening Shared Governance:** Our work in shared governance reveals a number of threads including a focus on student and pedagogical challenges. This is reflected in the work to establish a policy for students who need accommodations related to class attendance for religious reasons, the challenges of open source / online textbooks, and holistic admissions and direct enrollment proposals. The Undergraduate Enrollment Management task group, under leadership of Patricia Kramer, has streamlined the 1503 process and eased the way for transfer students.

A significant partnership of faculty, staff, and leadership has focused on Open Access policy and practices. The Open Access legislation on our upcoming agenda is the culmination of three plus years of work on the part of members of the Faculty Council on Research, the Council on University Libraries, and the Faculty Senate leadership as well as our librarians. While I hope this important legislation passes, the next challenge will be the details of implementation including the cost of the software and staffing the project. This is a significant undertaking, but one that we as a public university should be tackling head on, in my opinion.

As noted in the fall, we are currently engaged in the process of a faculty governance review of our disciplinary and dispute resolution system as outlined by the faculty code. We have established a framework of guiding principles and values to inform the review process of the current system, which is the accreted product of 30 years of incremental changes. Our intent is to develop a system that facilitates access while assuring greater fairness, accuracy, and efficiency. Our goal is to have a draft ready for review in the fall in partnership with the FCFA and other appropriate councils.

Our “code cops” have reviewed the bylaws of our elected faculty councils and have referred recommendations to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. The council will consider ways to strengthen the role and contributions of these participants in shared governance.

**Diversity and Equity:** While we have accomplished much in our efforts to create a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive community, there remains significant challenges and work ahead. The challenges of diversity and equity are evident in efforts to establish equitable benefits for adoptive parents, wellness rooms for nursing mothers and those needed a private space for medical purposes, and to increase the value of diversity scholarship. Addressing the need to recognize the contributions of diversity scholarship, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs has proposed legislation to alter our code so that scholarship and teaching on diversity “shall” be considered by promotion committees when requested and submitted by the faculty member. This does not require that we engage in diversity scholarship, teaching, or service,
but requires that when we do we have the right to expect it to be acknowledged and considered in a review of our work as faculty. With Workday established the UW is collecting better data so that we can accurately and productively assess our efforts to build a diverse and inclusive community.

Our Faculty Council on Women in Academia will be active participants in discussions on the prevention and reporting of sexual and racial harassment in our communities. President Cauce recently shared the launch of new training videos. The next questions are how to assure that every faculty member engages in this training and in turn, that we report when we suspect someone is being harassed. This will assure equitable access to resources for every individual in our community. This work will extend into the fall – stay tuned.

**Fiscal stability and faculty compensation:** We continue as faculty leadership to be concerned with the fiscal health of the university as well as with the need to address faculty compensation across schools, colleges, and campuses. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting has been working hard with the Provost to review unit budget plans and while some units appear to be doing well, and others are recovering appropriately, there remain those who are struggling. Recently I listened to a group advocate for “free” u-passes for all UW employees without acknowledging that the cost for this would be $13.4 million, equivalent to approximately a 3+% salary increase for faculty. Is that the right set of priorities? These are informed discussions we need to have. Developing priorities and strategies is increasingly essential and we will be looking to Elected Faculty Councils and frankly each of you to continue to partner with leaders in this challenging work.

**Lecturers:** The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has submitted two pieces of legislation this year: for voting rights and for clarifying promotion criteria. A task force is compiling a handbook for lecturers to assure that everyone has access to the information needed, and to correct the misperceptions that remain. It is currently being reviewed and readied for further review by the FCFA.

**Community partnerships:** Finally, JoAnn Taricani, our Faculty Legislative Liaison, and I have sought to strengthen the faculty voice with our state legislators. Over a number of months, I have met with those legislators representing UW and my district (I live in the UW district) including Representative Nicole Macri, Speaker Frank Chopp, and Senator Jamie Pedersen to understand their perceptions of the University and our potential to be stronger partners. In turn, as JoAnn does on a regular basis, I have advocated for our faculty and our university. Our leaders have tough choices before them and it is important that we are viewed as active partners.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. **Committee on Committees:** The Committee on Committees has met, and, pursuant to their discussion, the Office of University Committees is filling out a roster of new Faculty Council members for approval.

2. **Dispute Resolution Task Force:** The drafting subcommittee, Chaired by the Secretary of the Faculty, has started to meet and plans to have a working draft of Code revisions by the Autumn Quarter.

3. **Nancy Bradshaw:** Our long-time office manager and Assistant to the Chair is retiring at the end of this academic year.

   The underlying responsibility of the Secretary is to coordinate the efforts required to make possible our system of shared faculty-administration governance. Simply put, that has not been possible without Nancy. In this sense, she has, for the past fifteen years, been of critical importance for the smooth functioning of the highest levels of the University.

   Nancy has been invaluable in training new personnel. In our office, these have included numerous new Senate Chairs, Faculty Secretaries, and office associates. Without her institutional memory and skilled tutelage, transitions quite literally (not figuratively) would have ground to a halt. Her experience in this regard also has extended to helping situate a number of other important Gerberding figures who hold important staff and assistant positions.

   In the day-to-day operation of the office, people constantly call on her expertise and knowledge. The Provost’s Office needs help with RCEP procedures—ask Nancy. The Senate Chair wants to know how to bring up a last-minute resolution for a vote in the Faculty Senate—ask Nancy. The Secretary of the Faculty needs information on how a particular provision of the Faculty Code has been implemented—ask Nancy. Worried that you are reinventing the wheel—ask Nancy.

   Her sick day, her vacation day, a holiday—it doesn’t matter; as long as there is a phone or email, she will respond. I remember reaching out to her about some pressing matter during what I thought to be one of her vacation days only to discover later that she had answered her phone (she knows my office number) while in the midst of a family crisis of her own. That’s a dedication you just don’t see much of anymore.

   In my twenty-five years at the University of Washington, I have met no one more deserving of recognition and praise than Nancy Bradshaw. Congratulations and thanks for your service. You will be greatly missed!
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 Budgeting 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 this last report of academic year 2017-2018 to the Senate, I briefly review the year’s activities of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) and provide a more substantive review of our most recent work reviewing the Annual reports of each of the academic and central administrative units.

SCPB exists to provide advice from the faculty to the Provost on a wide range of issues of the Provost’s or the committee’s choosing. The Provost integrates SCPB advice with advice, sometimes contradictory, from many other sources, including but not limited to the Board of Deans and Chancellors and the Provost’s Advisory Committee for Students. Advice and recommendations from these diverse sources are considered by the Provost to inform his decision making.

In the course of the year, the Provost requested our advice on a range of issues. Many of these involved “one and done” consultations for our group, such as our review of various proposals from the office of Ceremonies for achieving cost reductions. Other issues were discussed at several meetings, and because of their importance and complexity will no doubt be recurring topics at SCPB for years to come. In general, the SCPB continued the efforts of recent SCPB chairs to focus the group’s work on the identification and examination of those issues of greatest strategic importance and most significant fiscal concern to the university.

Values for Decision Making. To assist us in our advisory work, the SCPB developed and endorsed a framework of values and principles to guide its provision of advice to the Provost. The SCPB Values to Frame Decision Making was subsequently used as a framework to inform our review of proposals brought before the committee. Going forward this framework will be shared with any parties bringing proposals to the SCPB in order to assist them in their preparations for SCPB review. And, as it is intended to be living document, the framework will be reviewed each fall and updated as needed.

Compensation. One differentiating feature of our work this year was the depth of and regularity of our conversation around compensation. We reviewed unit-level expenditure data and assumptions about compensation; we engaged unit elected faculty council chairs and deans in strategic conversations about priorities through unit adjustment plan reviews; and we discussed long-term prioritization of compensation policy and strategies for securing support for faculty compensation in Olympia. In this way, compensation discussions became salient in both unit adjustment and long-range financial plans at the unit level. The SCPB will continue its focus on compensation and what has been a productive collaboration with the Board of Deans and Chancellors and unit elected faculty councils to support academic units’ continued efforts to realize their faculty compensation goals and to assure commitment to sustaining faculty salaries commensurate with peer institutions and which are responsive to the rising cost of living in Seattle.

Deficits. This year, SCPB reviewed deficits at a more granular level, and saw quarterly updates to both large deficits, as well as smaller, and forecast ones. We have been tracking the following deficits closely: Dentistry, Law, UW Press, UW Video, UW Primate Center, UW Police, Intercollegiate Athletics, and UW Medicine. The committee has focused its reviews on the progress being made on units’ deficit mitigation and debt reduction efforts. We provide advice to the Provost as to the appropriateness of the proposed timeframe for deficit resolution established in the unit’s Deficit Resolution Plan and, after assessing the progress being made on reduction/elimination of the deficit and the unit’s associated outstanding debt, whether central support for the deficit should be sustained or phased out. As the final round of these reviews is in progress, we have not yet finalized our advice to the Provost in regard to central support for any specific deficit.

Continuum College. At our May 14th meeting, SCPB received a report from Rovy Branon, Vice Provost of Continuum College, on the sustainability of fee-based programs, the state of the English Language Program and the general finances of Continuum College. The fiscal health of unit is solid with 76% of fee-based programs demonstrating positive net revenues. In 2017, fee-based programs generated $91
Million in revenues for campus partners, $17 Million in net revenue to the UW and contributed $12 million to UW overhead. Vice Provost Branon reported that Continuum College, employing its current financial model, does well supporting small fee-based programs. The financial model does poorly, however, supporting programs designed to scale up (e.g., large online programs) as the current model generates insufficient funds to allow for the kinds of substantive investments in information technologies and other activities required to grow and support a more significant portfolio of online programs. With the exception of the English Language Program, net revenues associated with non-partner programs (i.e., those not directly affiliated with any academic unit) are generally increasing or stable. The English Language Program (ELP), which historically has been a positive net revenue generator, is currently in deficit. Vice Provost Branon reported that these deficits reflect a competitive shakeout occurring as nation-wide enrollments in English Language Programs have declined. Continuum College will be assessing the competitive landscape and challenges facing the ELP over the next 18 months to determine the appropriate path forward. They are also in the process of evaluating the financial model Continuum College relies upon and considering other alternatives.

Finance Transformation. SCPB also received a report on the status of the UW Finance Transformation effort from Jeffrey Scott, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration at our May 14th meeting. The report focused on the reasons why this effort is being undertaken; the risks of postponing transformation of this critical institutional infrastructure; the benefits of migrating to a modern finance system; and the governance structure for the project. Means for assuring faculty involvement and timely input over the course of the project were also discussed.

Other Reports. SCPB requested and received informative presentations including a report concerning the status of Research funding and indirect cost recovery from Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research. Prior to the end of the current academic year, SCPB will receive a presentation on the proposed capital budget for the 2019-2020 biennium and status of deferred maintenance of university facilities (Michael McCormick, Associate Vice President for Capital Planning and Development).

Activity Based Budgeting. A joint task force of SCPB and BODC members worked together to consider modifications to the hold harmless component—or supplement—of the ABB framework. The Joint ABB Task Force on Supplement Distribution, co-chaired the Chair of the SCPB, and Mike Bragg, Dean of the College of Engineering, was charged by the Provost to design a forward-looking, realistic set of recommendations regarding supplement distribution that sought to minimize financial duress to individual units and recognize the significant circumstantial changes in tuition revenue distribution and program delivery. The Joint ABB Task Force on Supplement Distribution Report was delivered to the Provost at the end of March and endorsed by the full SCPB.

Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination Procedures (RCEPs). SCPB advises the Provost on whether proposed RCEPs should proceed through a full process or the “limited” process associated with changes that are relatively non-contentious. One proposal for the Establishment of a Department of Health Metrics in the School of Medicine (SOM) was reviewed by SCPB on multiple occasions this fall. After discussions with the Dean of the School of Medicine and the Dean and elected faculty council of the School of Public Health, SCPB urged the creation of a Joint Work Group on Collaboration sponsored and staffed by the School of Medicine and School of Public Health to promote collaboration between the new department and faculty elsewhere in the university and to assess the impact on existing degree programs of any new degree programs proposed by the new department. The SCPB endorsed a limited RCEP procedure contingent on the creation of such a collaboration work group. The work group was established and the Provost authorized a limited RCEP process. The committee anticipates reviewing one more request for a limited RCEP in early June.

Proposed Changes to Tuition and Fee Levels. The committee reviewed proposed Fee rate increases of 5 percent or greater. Most of the proposed fee increases that were reviewed are intended to compensate for increased program delivery costs. The committee advised support for all proposed fee increases intended to meet increasing program delivery costs that also maintained competitive pricing relative to peers and had support from relevant stakeholders in the proposing program.

Biennial State Budget Process. The committee reviewed the proposed budget request to Olympia, which again emphasized the need for state funds for compensation increases. The committee was regularly
apprised of developments in Olympia, including discussion of the proposed Governor’s, House, and Senate budgets.

Longer Term Issues

Undergraduate Enrollment Management. The committee requested and received a detailed report on undergraduate enrollment management from Phillip Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment and Undergraduate Admissions. The report looked closely at student admissions and enrollments over the past ten years highlighting those areas that have seen significant changes. By reviewing admission data alongside that of enrollment in majors (competitive, capacity constrained, and open majors), the presentation emphasized the need for faculty to engage more fully in a broader discussion of academic planning. It also emphasized our need to address the student pipeline in its entirety, from application to admission to major and matriculation. There has been a tremendous shift in recent entering freshman classes due to the rise of STEM. Direct-to-College admissions for the College of Engineering and Allen School is one response to the evolution of student interests that is on the verge of implementation and has also been proposed for the College of Arts & Sciences. Yet, we don’t know how Direct-to-College admissions will affect our tuition blend in future years. It also poses other important questions that we need to engage. Independent of fiscal considerations, what do we want our mix of students to look like in terms of the proportion pursuing degrees in STEM versus the humanities; the proportion of undergraduate to graduate students; and the mix of domestic resident, domestic non-resident, and international students?

Other issues that the committee discussed include: implications of the increase in the average cost of degree production given the significant migration of students to STEM that has occurred; the financial implications for the College of Arts & Sciences as the number of students arriving with advanced placement and running start credits continues to increase reducing demand for general education service credits delivered by the college; and the financial implications of direct to college admissions for different schools and colleges.

It is important to note that Direct-to-College admissions is not a magic bullet and may create reduction in ABB funding for schools and colleges that adopt the model, even as it increases the predictability of enrollment and ABB funding. For example, the College of Engineering anticipates a decrease in ABB funding related to material reduction in enrollment in 200 level courses with the migration to Direct-to-College admissions. And, as STEM increasingly constitutes a larger proportion of our total degree production, our ability to cross subsidize those higher degree production costs diminishes. State provisos to support additional STEM degree production, while critical, don’t sufficiently compensate for the decrease in net marginal tuition revenue lost with the shift from a higher proportion of humanities to a higher proportion of STEM degrees produced. With the growth in students coming in with AP and running start credits, we also lose the opportunity to cross-subsidize the higher costs if teaching smaller upper division and higher cost courses (e.g., labs) through the teaching of lower cost entry level service courses at scale. This is a challenge already familiar to UWB and UWT, who have historically served and continue to serve large numbers of upper division transfer students. Given the challenges posed by current limits on our ability to set resident undergraduate tuition, now capped at approximately 2% per year by state law, the committee discussed strategies for communicating more clearly to the legislature in Olympia how the base level funding for the university needs to increase in order to compensate for our now higher average cost of degree production. In sum, these are complex, critical issues and challenges that the committee will continue to engage going forward.

Student Financial Aid. The committee received a detailed report on Student Financial Aid from Kay Lewis, Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment. Our discussion of financial aid explored the impact of our current policies on student access. We also discussed at length the financial implications of our commitment to the Husky Promise and cost to the institution of assuring aid for all students eligible for the State Need Grant regardless of whether or not they are funded by the state. Unfortunately, our commitment to access, prioritizing faculty compensation and our ability to ensure continued excellence are now coming into direct competition for limited institutional resources. Fully funding the Husky Promise currently costs the institution approximately $25M per year. These are funds that otherwise might be used to cover a one-time faculty salary increase, or meet other critical institutional needs. SCPB discussions of
financial aid and the fiscal challenges that constrain our ability to achieve our compensation goals highlighted some of the hard choices we now confront as an institution.

Annual Unit Reviews and Unit Fiscal Health. Each year the committee reviews the annual reports of each of the academic and central administrative units. Annual reports from the academic units are developed by the Dean/Chancellor in consultation with their unit elected faculty council and submitted to the Provost. You can review units’ (academic and administrative) FY19 annual review submission at: https://ops.washington.edu/fy19-annual-review-submissions. This year the SCPB focused its review of the annual reports on a select set of units to allow for a deeper examination of issues confronting a variety of unit types: large academic units, smaller professional schools, key central administrative units, and the smaller campuses. As a part of our study, we examined each unit’s Annual Review Submission as well as a summary of its multi-year fiscal forecast. Our review of the following units--College of Arts & Sciences, College of Engineering, Evans School, College of the Built Environment, Finance and Administration, Libraries, Office of Research, UWT and UWB—revealed several important longer term trends, issues, concerns and opportunities confronting the institution that SCPB will continue to engage over the near and intermediate term.

While structural deficits are already present in several units (e.g., School of Dentistry, School of Medicine, Evans School), our review the fiscal vitality summary for all academic units reveals that in others it is just a matter of time, baring environmental/contextual changes, before they too enter into deficit. Many schools report that continuous internal funding of merit and unit adjustment increases is not sustainable without tuition increases and/or enrollment growth at the undergraduate level. Enrollment and revenue from graduate level programs are also beginning to flatten in several schools (e.g., College of Engineering) presenting the possibility of fiscal challenges down the road. While many schools retain flexibility to adjust fees in their self-sustaining programs (e.g., College of Engineering), the smaller professional schools are more constrained, several having already reached the limits of their ability to increase tuition in their self-sustaining programs without impacting their competitiveness with peer institutions (e.g., School of Pharmacy, School of Dentistry, Evans School). Few units, moreover, appear to be demonstrating limited engagement on assessing their academic curricula, program/degree portfolios, program fiscal vitality, delivery modes or staffing strategies in order to enhance their operational efficiency—at least as revealed by their annual reports. Those that did speak to such efforts in their reports, anticipated adding undergraduate or other programs to support growth in faculty lines and student services that has already occurred. Several schools and colleges also reported cannibalizing vacant lines to fund existing operations. In short, units are experiencing significant stress in their current operations and are less clear in their reports on their efforts to review their operations substantively or make structural changes that would assure sustainability.

The committee’s review of the unit Annual reports and discussions on other fronts during the year indicate a significant need for us to assess true costs of educating our students across the board — at both the undergraduate and graduate level. What are the true costs of our academic programs and the curricular and program design, delivery models and staffing choices we’ve made along with associated institutional resources demands (e.g., space, educational infrastructure, academic technologies, student affairs – advising, internships, etc.). In addition, there is a need for us to assess growth within the institution and where growth should be encouraged to occur. Given that many smaller schools and colleges are premising their fiscal health on the development of undergraduate programs or growth in enrollment in their existing undergraduate programs, this likely means reductions and underutilized capacity elsewhere if we persist in a flat to low growth enrollment environment at the institution level. And, if we can’t have every unit growing, if for no other reason than we don’t have the physical capacity to do so, what is the equilibrium or level of controlled growth that is sustainable? These are much needed university-wide conversations which SCPB will continue to encourage and continue to engage.

Other challenges facing units across the board include the declining trend in sponsored project awards, despite an overall increase in proposal submission; large, additional compliance burdens associated with federal regulations; and increasing technology and infrastructure costs associated with increases in hybrid/online teaching and distance learning. And, of course, there is the need to assure adequate cost of living increases for faculty and staff in response to our local economic climate which is exacerbating challenges associated with maintaining competitive salaries relative to peer institutions and programs.
Our review of the units, however, also revealed creative ongoing initiatives and indicated interesting opportunities to pursue. The School of Medicine and College of Engineering reported success on several of their legislative strategies and efforts to increase directed funding from the state. The College of Arts & Sciences and College of Engineering are exploring areas and opportunities to reduce costs through shared services and activities. The School of Medicine is likewise engaged in an effort to increase shared services at the unit level and enhance the efficiency of its administrative services. Our review also highlighted that Summer Quarter opportunities are currently under exploited and not well understood. A year round operating model should be explored with summer as 4th quarter. Such a model could facilitate the student experience at same time it allows for more efficient use of resources (e.g., space, people) and supports more rational staffing strategies (e.g., allocation of faculty teaching loads over 12 rather than 9 months).

In sum, the committee’s review of unit annual reports confirmed dynamic changes happening at the unit level. It also emphasized the need for continued discussion of the university’s strategic goals and a reexamination of our strategic priorities. Faculty and staff compensation, assuring access, sustaining our breadth of offerings, building and sustaining excellence all demand resources that are in limited supply. The SCPB has and will continue to work in collaboration with the Provost, to explore the challenging tradeoffs we face and identify the means that will allow us to sustain our commitments in all those areas core to our values as a faculty and a public institution of higher education.
Report of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice
Robert Gomulkiewicz, Professor, School of Law, Committee Chair

The ACIP3 was established last academic year and, in partnership with Thaisa Way, Chair of the Faculty Senate, and Margaret Shepherd, our representative from the Executive Office, we developed a work plan for this academic year with four areas of focus: Pathways to Open Access; Co-Motion and issues of patent support; GIX and related IP issues; and Continuum College and online course materials.

In the fall we focused on Open Access policies and provided a report of recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee in November. As the Chair of ACIP3, I participated in a task force established by Thaisa Way to advance the Open Access policy toward final implementation. The ACIP3 also received a briefing from Vikram Jandhyala and provided comments on new directions for CoMotion’s policies and practices regarding patent support necessitated by the sun setting of the Hall patents, and in the winter we received an update from CoMotion regarding ongoing developments on Administrative Policy Statement 59.4 resource allocation. In the winter we also received a briefing and provided comments on the intellectual property policies and practices presented by the Global Information Exchange (GIX). In the spring we received a briefing and provided comments on intellectual property allocation in sponsored research and updates to GIM 40, as well as copyright ownership in Continuum College course materials. In our final meeting, we assessed what our year’s work plan had suggested about potential changes to EO 36. We concluded that ACIP3 should devote time next academic year to evaluating several potential changes to EO 36:

1. Does our experience addressing Open Access suggest changes to EO 36’s Copyright Policy (e.g., Sections 2.A and 2.B)?

2. Does the briefing we received on Continuum College (including the “Developer” contracts we received) suggest changes to EO 36’s Copyright Policy (e.g., Sections 2.A-2.E) and/or suggestions about Continuum’s approach to copyright ownership, usage, or licensing?

3. Does the briefing we received about GIX suggest changes to EO 36’s approach to ownership by students (e.g., Sections 1.C. and 2.B) or ownership of software (e.g., Sections 1.A and 2.C)?

4. Does CoMotion and faculty experience with the Outside Work Form suggest any incongruence between EO 36 and the Form?

These questions will help frame the ACIP3 work plan for 2018-19, in addition to regular briefings on CoMotion’s activities.
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to the normal business of reviewing curricular changes, the following are major policy issues that FCAS is undertaken or has recently completed:

- Vetted and approved proposal submitted by the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering to change to an admissions model in which approximately 50% of its annual Computer Science cohort is admitted directly to the Computer Science major as incoming freshmen, and the remaining approximately 50% are admitted as Currently Enrolled UW students (~34%) or Entering Transferring Applicants (~16%). This proposed change will apply only to the Computer Science major.
- The council is currently engaged in development of:
  - “Best Practices for Direct-to Admissions Proposals”
  - “Best Practices for Syllabi”
  - Definitional language for UW’s Areas of Knowledge.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

- Received reports on the Seattle and Puget Sound housing market from members of the UW Runstad Center for Real Estate Studies, as well as on Affordable Housing Resources currently or planned to be offered by the university from UW External Affairs Regional Relations.
- Received a substantive final report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Pre-Retirement Planning and drafted summary letter to be forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.
- Continues to investigate needs associated with parental leave (and associated policies) for faculty at the UW. Associated draft Class B legislation has been developed to alter Faculty Code Chapter 51 (Faculty Leave and Vacations) given findings; the council is engaged in resolving questions/criticisms related to the legislation before it can be forwarded through the Class B legislative process.
- Investigating potential methods to implement a tool that would allow UW employees to estimate income from supplemental retirement plans.
- Received report from Aaron Powell (Vice President for UW Information Technology and Chief Information Officer) on the plan to retire UW Deskmail.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Developed and advanced Class A legislation amending Faculty Code Chapter 24 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members) 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. The legislation passed its first reading in the Faculty Senate on April 19.
- Gathered and analyzed UW faculty demographic data and sorted findings by campus and college via the Faculty Demographic Trends Tool.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Advanced Class A legislation on lecturer voting eligibility amending Faculty Code Chapter 21-32 (Voting Membership in the Faculty) 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. The legislation is currently out for faculty vote as part of the Class A legislative process.
- Advanced Class A legislation on faculty lecturer issues amending Faculty Code Chapter 24-34 (Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles) and Chapter 24-54 (Procedure for Promotions) to clarify the nature and level of expectations for the Principal Lecturer title in a more general way than the current more specific list of potential methods of recognition, and to reorient voting procedures for promotion of faculty in instructional titles and restructure language for clarity. The legislation’s second reading in the Faculty Senate will occur on May 17.
Faculty Council on Research

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the following are other activities undertaken by the FCR:

- Developed draft revisions for Executive Order No. 8 (Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research) to lessen the amount of restricted contracts the FCR has responsibility to review based on type of restriction; the revisions will seek to transfer authority to the UW Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) to review and decide internally on approval for research contracts restricted on certain grounds. The Executive Order has yet to be formally revised.
- Vetted the Final Report of a Task Force focused on Faculty Effort Certification (FEC) issues.
- Received updates on the status of federal research regulatory reform.
- Received a report on the Lab Safety Initiative (LSI), an effort on behalf of UW Environmental Health & Safety, which shows documented success in increasing safety/safe preventative practices within many UW laboratories. FCR arranged for Jude Van Buren (Senior Director, Environmental Health & Safety) to give a similar presentation to the Faculty Senate during winter quarter of 2018.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

- Continues to address issues related to medical excuse notes and UW’s Hall Health Center by way of development of a Medical Excuse Note Policy.
- Received reports and provided feedback on various new university initiatives, programs, and offices, including:
  - Textbook affordability, Open Access Textbooks, Open Educational Resources (OER)
  - Final Report of the International Student Services Executive Sponsor Steering Committee (ISS ESS C)
  - Report from UW Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life
  - Report from the UW Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Frank Hodge
  - Report on ongoing initiatives/operations of Student Veteran Life
  - 2016 Climate Survey & JED campus suicide prevention program
  - UW’s Emergency Aid (EA) program
  - Resolution from the Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) concerning religious accommodations for students

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

Individual subcommittees of the FCTL are working to address areas of interest relating to pedagogy in the following areas:

- Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments
- Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges
- Diversity- and Equity-Informed Pedagogies
- Teaching and Learning effectiveness
- Learning Analytics

In addition, the council has:

- Addressed feasibility of and evaluated desire to begin UW’s fall quarter on a Monday rather than Wednesday. Ultimately, the council chose not to recommend altering the fall quarter schedule due to the many programmatic operations at the university that depend on the Wednesday-start, as well as the desires of student members who wanted to retain the current schedule.
- Received report and provided feedback on initiative out of Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) to improve course evaluations and their utility at the UW.
- Analyzed issues surrounding UW’s final exam schedule, including the proliferation of faculty holding final exams on Saturdays after dead week, which was found to occur in 115 sections at UW Seattle in autumn quarter, 2017, affecting 6,923 students; 952 of those students had two finals on one day, 96
students had three finals on one day, and five students had four finals on one day due to unregulated holding of Saturday finals. FCTL continues to address the issue.

- The council continues to analyze and provide feedback on UW-IT development of new information technology solutions, new online academic tools, as well as policies relating to use of student data as part of learning analytics.

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

- Formalized revisions for the University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination process (aka. “tri-campus review”) via the Senate Executive Committee; the revisions significantly reduce involvement of the FCTCP in the curriculum coordination process as well as add a Notice of Proposal (NOP) provision within a newly-defined “Stage O” of the 1503 approval process. The Office of the University Registrar is working to implement the changes during spring, 2018.
- Engaged in new initiative to assess the state of faculty/shared governance on the three UW campuses, making part of that task the gathering of information concerning critical issues on each campus in relation to faculty governance. The council has so far evaluated Elected Faculty Council bylaw development on the UW Tacoma and UW Bothell campuses.

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

- FCUFS has reviewed the following topics and provided feedback/oversight to administrative guests during academic year 2017-2018:
  - One Capital Plan
  - Burke Museum
  - Seismic Upgrade Plans for 25 buildings on the UW Seattle campus
  - UW Affordable Housing Projects
  - Population Health Building
  - Deferred Maintenance
  - North Campus Housing Project
  - Transportation Services and Parking
  - Annual Classrooms/learning spaces update
  - 45th St. Light Rail Overbuild
  - Kincaid Hall Renovation

**Faculty Council on University Libraries**

- Received report on UW Libraries’ Open Educational Resources grants for faculty.
- Continues to receive updates on the Associated Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) initiative to grant UW librarians “faculty” status.
- Reviewed and provided feedback on Digital Preservation Network and Data Refuge project, Libraries’ Strategic Planning Process, and Library Loan Limits revisions.

**Faculty Council on Women in Academia**

- Developed and forwarded Class C resolution concerning wellness rooms to the Faculty Senate (approved March 1), which recommends that “at least one wellness room be included as a requirement for all new buildings (or more based on population capacity of the building), and that functioning wellness rooms be provided close enough to existing buildings on campus so as not to cause undue hardship for those individuals who require access.” The council followed up outcomes related to the resolution with administrative guest, Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) in its most recent (April) meeting.
The FCTL began the year with the charge to explore four central issues:

- **Explore rotating the final exam schedule - each year, not each quarter.** With the help of Phil Reid and his team, we discovered that one of the central challenges with the final exam schedule is the proliferation of "rogue" finals being held on Saturdays, creating situations where students might have multiple finals on the same day. We are continuing to explore this challenge and will have some initial recommendations at the end of the academic year.

- **Explore the advantages of setting the start of each quarter on a Monday, rather than a Tuesday or a Wednesday:** After considerable discussion, it was determined that there is significant infrastructure built around a Wednesday start date (e.g., First Year Programs, Program Orientations, etc.), and so it was decided that the advantages of moving the date to a Monday would not be worth the significant disruption it would cause across campus.

- **Make recommendations to aid in governing/setting policies for the use of learning analytics at the UW:** Tom Lewis (Director, Academic Experience Design & Delivery, Information Technology) and his team continue to help us make sense of this complicated challenge on all three campuses. Tom will be giving a report on his progress at our final FCTL meeting of the year, and we hope that this can lead to some recommendations from the FCTL.

- **Explore the challenges associated with using Student Evaluations of Teaching in the merit and promotion process:** With the help of Jason Johnson (Senior Associate Dean and Associate Vice Provost, Undergraduate Academic Affairs), the committee is exploring current initiatives on campus exploring new metrics for measuring teaching and learning success, and possible alternatives (e.g., "mid-term" course evaluations).

During the academic year, we had two ASUW resolutions brought to the council for discussion and consideration.

- The recommendation that course exams should not contain questions that penalize students for picking the incorrect answer: This resolution was sent back to the ASUW for more information and consideration of some of the council's questions.

- A resolution in support of institutionalizing religious accommodations across campus: The council supported this resolution, and has contacted the Faculty Council on Student Affairs to explore possible joint messages of support.

We distributed the work for the year into 5 subcommittees. Below is a listing of each of the subcommittees.

- **Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments:**
- **Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges**
- **Teaching & Learning Effectiveness for Part-Time Lecturers**
- **Diversity and Equity-Informed Pedagogies & Teaching Effectiveness**
- **Teaching & Learning Effectiveness: Excellence in Teaching**
Report of the Faculty Council on University Libraries
Trent Hill, Senior Lecturer, Information School, Council Chair

As of May 9, 2018, the Faculty Council on University Libraries has completed its scheduled meetings for this year. In addition to our work in advising the Libraries on routine policy matters (such as eliminating overdue fines, in most cases), the Committee provided input and oversight on two main topics:

1) The emerging Open Access policy: Over the course of several meetings, FCUL held discussions on the university’s Open Access policy, which will be debated in the May meeting of the Faculty Senate. In our meetings, we explored the possible implications of Open Access to academic publishing, and specifically to UW Press, and debated the relative merits of the plans under consideration. We arrived at a broad consensus that in spite of some reservations, some form of “opt-out” policy was best suited to protect the rights of University researchers while enabling interested faculty to share their research with a broader state, national, and international public via Open Access platforms. The chair shared this consensus with a working group of Senate chairs and stakeholders.

2) Faculty status for University librarians: For several years, UW librarians have been exploring the possibility of changing their employment status from professional staff to faculty and have been working primarily with FCFA on examining the kinds of changes that would require in the faculty code. At our March 14 meeting, we received a report from librarians Jessica Albano and Judith Hench on the current state of discussion of the proposal among UW librarians. While there appears to be broad support among librarians for the shift in status, it’s not clear how that would translate to a specific implementation, which would have implications for promotion, raises, tenure, and salary. From the faculty perspective, while it’s clear that librarians perform many functions that are similar to what faculty do, the parallels aren’t consistent. While the committee seemed broadly supportive of the initiative, it recommended that the strongest case for the change in status would be to address the question: What would having faculty status enable librarians to do that they can’t do now?

In the coming year, I anticipate the question of faculty status for University librarians will be a going concern, and I look forward to working with the librarians and my colleagues on FCUL on the issue as I continue my work as council chair.
Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Ad hoc Committee on Retirement Report
April 29, 2018

To: Thaisa Way, Faculty Senate Chair
From: Stephan Siegel, chair, Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Re: Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Faculty Retirement

Dear Thaisa –

At its recent meeting on April 23, 2018, the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR) discussed the attached Report and Recommendations, prepared by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Faculty Retirement. The subcommittee, chaired by Mícheál Vaughan, reviewed current policies and practices at the University of Washington related to retirement planning, transitioning into retirement, as well as the continued participation of retired faculty.

While several of the topics in the report have previously been discussed by FCBR, the comprehensive nature of the review as well as the specific recommendations by the subcommittee provided FCBR with a valuable opportunity to discuss retirement-related topics.

FCBR’s discussion, which benefitted from the participation of Cheryl Cameron, Pat Dougherty, Tanya Eadie, Amy Hawkins, Mindy Kornberg, and Mike Townsend, revealed broad support for the following recommendations:

- **Improve the communication and presentation of information related to retirement planning, including the material provided online by HR and AHR** (Recommendations A.1, A.3, A.7, and B.1).

In addition, Recommendation A.6 calls for restoring and publicizing individual retirement transition agreements. Cheryl Cameron explained that since the introduction of the voluntary retirement incentive (VRI) option, individual agreements have become rare. While FCBR has not discussed whether or not they should be reintroduced, the council feels that transparency about retirement options and their specific choice variables is crucial.

Recommendation A.8 asks HR to provide faculty with more information regarding possible supplemental retirement income prior to the retirement decision. FCBR has been working with HR on this topic for some time and hopes to have at least an approximate solution in the near future.

- **Increase the participation of AHR in the work of FCBR, such that FCBR is better informed about and can better influence policy choices, for example with respect to the VRI option, than in the recent past** (Recommendation A.5).

As you know, AHR used to participate in FCBR meetings until the President’s designee was changed from AHR to HR. This change has made it more difficult for FCBR to be engaged in retirement related issues that fall into the domain of AHR. As previously discussed, AHR has agreed to attend future FCBR meetings when AHR related topics will be discussed. Increased interaction between FCBR and AHR should ultimately improve Faculty retirement matters.

- **Make the voluntary retirement incentive (VRI) option a regular, as opposed to occasional, retirement option** (Recommendation B.3).

While FCBR understands that the uncertainty with respect to the future availability of the VRI option acts as an additional retirement incentive, making the VRI option regularly available would allow faculty to better plan for retirement, while still reducing expenses for the University as some faculty choose the VRI option over the more expensive 40% reemployment option.

- **Create more opportunities for retired faculty to remain engaged with the University** (Recommendations A.2 and C.3).
FCBR recognizes the value of the experience and institutional knowledge of retired faculty and therefore supports recommendations to employ retired faculty members, for example, as consultants for faculty members considering retirement or as members of faculty councils and other university committees.

The report also recommends revising the Faculty Code to more explicitly outline retirement options and processes as well as the status of emeritus faculty (Recommendations A.4, B.2, and C.1). FCBR plans to review these recommendations in more detail in the coming year. However, FCBR would value feedback from the SEC on the recommendation to include specific retirement options, such as reemployment or the voluntary retirement incentive, in the Faculty Code.

Finally, after the FCBR meeting, Cheryl Cameron informed FCBR that AHR already sends a formal appointment notice to newly appointed emeritus faculty members, as suggested by Recommendation C.2. Such an appointment letter could be one out of several opportunities, mentioned in the attached report, to more explicitly spell out the rights and benefits of emeritus faculty at the University.

If you and the SEC agree with the above recommendations, I ask that you convey them to the administration where appropriate, implement them as far as they relate to the Office of the Faculty Senate, or provide feedback to FCBR for the council’s future work. If you and the SEC feel that further discussion is in order, please let me know as well.

Please do not hesitate to contact me in case of any questions you might have. Sincerely,

Stephan Siegel
Professor of Finance & Business Economics
Michael G. Foster Endowed Professor
Michael G. Foster School of Business
University of Washington
Report and Recommendations
of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Faculty Retirement
(25 February 2018)

Executive Summary

Appointed in August 2017 at the request of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement, this ad hoc subcommittee was charged to look at ways to improve pre-retirement planning by faculty and to encourage continuing participation by retired faculty in contributing to the University community.

The subcommittee comprised four emeriti, three current faculty, and the director of Retiree Relations. In addition to meetings with various UW faculty and administrators, the subcommittee also consulted colleagues at other peer institutions and reviewed materials in an effort to identify what might be best practices in regard to faculty pre-retirement planning and post-retirement engagement.

Our report to the Chair of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement and the Chair of the Faculty Senate offers fifteen recommendations under three headings: A) information and resources for retirement planning; B) transitioning to retirement; and C) continuing participation of retired faculty.

The recommendations in A address matters such as distributing an annual letter to all faculty clarifying the various retirement options available to faculty; appointing a panel of retired faculty to provide confidential, personal consultation to colleagues; coordinating information on various UW websites; restoring a representative of the Provost’s Office as a regular member of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement; reinforcing the need for chairs/deans to document their regular meetings with senior faculty; and seeing that information about supplementation (for those eligible for it) is made available to faculty before they retire.

The recommendations in B call for a single online portal designed specifically for faculty and spelling out in detail their options as they consider retirement, including their vested right to partial reemployment; and ask the Provost to examine the possibility of making the VRI option a regular, predictable part of faculty retirement planning.

The recommendations in C address the need for a clearer articulation in the Faculty Code of the specific benefits and privileges of emeritus faculty as members of the University Faculty; call for a formal notice of such appointments when they are made; request the Secretary of the Faculty to publicize the opportunities available for retired faculty to continue their service to the various parts of shared governance; and encourage local units to involve their retired faculty in their collegial and social activities.

*    *    *    *    *

Background

The members of the ad hoc subcommittee were:

- Charles Chamberlin (Librarian Emeritus, University Libraries)
- Pat Dougherty (Director, Retiree Relations Office)
- Patricia Moy (Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs)
- Mary O’Neil (Associate Professor, History)
- Gerry Philipsen (Professor Emeritus, Communication)
- Mícheál Vaughan (Professor Emeritus, Comparative Literature and English), Chair
- Lea Vaughn (Professor, Law)
- Doug Wadden (Professor Emeritus, Design)

The ad hoc subcommittee on faculty retirement planning was established in August 2017 by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) at the request of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR). It was charged to “look into options for improving the access of faculty to information about and guidance in pre-retirement planning, in particular related to matters of pensions and healthcare coverage, with the goal of encouraging and enabling the continuing participation of retired faculty in contributing to the University community.”
The subcommittee has met a number of times since its initial organizational meeting on 11 July. We met, in order, with the following individuals:

- Chuck Sloane (UW Ombud)
- Cheryl Cameron (Vice Provost for Academic Personnel)
- Tanya Eadie (Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel)
- Sandra Archibald (Dean, Evans School)
- Robert Stacey (Dean, Arts & Sciences)
- James Jiambalvo (Dean, Foster School of Business)
- Greg Miller (Associate Dean, Engineering)
- Amy Hawkins (Executive Director, Total Benefits)
- Gerald Grohs (Benefits Consultant, Total Benefits Office)
- Neil Hawkins (Emeritus Professor, Civil Engineering)

On January 17-18, the subcommittee also sponsored a series of meetings, public presentations, and other events with two colleagues from UCLA: Carole Goldberg (Jonathan D. Varat Distinguished Professor of Law and former Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel) and David Lopez (Emeritus Professor of Sociology and currently UCLA’s Faculty Retirement Liaison). Subsequent meetings to discuss the subcommittee’s report and recommendations were held in late January and in February. In addition, ad hoc subcommittee members met or communicated with individual colleagues, both retired and those at “retirement age” (however loosely defined), and have thereby gathered useful, if anecdotal, information about the situation facing retired colleagues and those thinking about retirement.

We gathered information from UW, other institutions and public resources on the ad hoc subcommittee’s Google drive and this information we have examined and discussed with a critical eye to identifying and articulating “best practices” that we might consider as a basis for our recommendations, as best suited to the UW’s situation.

**General Conclusion:** In view of the absence of mandatory retirement for faculty as well as the current age-distribution of tenured faculty, the University of Washington as a whole—and individual members of its faculty—would greatly benefit from facilitating retirement (pre-)planning as an identifiable, and more easily managed, stage in faculty development. By ensuring that clearer and fuller information about the financial, medical, psycho-social, and collegial aspects of retirement are made available to faculty, the University would provide continuing opportunities and incentives for long-serving faculty to approach the next stage of their academic careers in a more thoughtful and fruitful way. Our specific recommendations will, we are convinced, have important benefits for the University as well: by enabling well-informed decisions about retirement, the University would, we believe, be able to plan for and open up positions now held by senior faculty for junior colleagues who will maintain and advance the achievements of their senior colleagues and continue the growth and excellence of the University of Washington. In addition, implementing these recommendations will encourage the continued involvement of retired faculty in the life of the University and demonstrate for junior faculty the continuing arc of a faculty member’s career at UW. It would also create in our active retired faculty a currently untapped, rich resource for the advancement of University programs.

In moving toward these conclusions, the ad hoc subcommittee has focused on identifying potential ways to improve faculty “access” to “information about and guidance in pre-retirement planning” and has done so with respect to three separate temporal categories where improvements may be made:

A. by generating more robust and consistent resources and general information for faculty about the UW retirement plan (UWRP) and about other aspects of retirement planning;

B. by improving access to informed, personal assistance for individual faculty while they are in the process of transitioning to retirement (or considering doing so in the near-term); and

C. by identifying some additional ways the UW might continue to draw upon and engage the active participation of retired faculty in service to our larger community.
A. Information and Resources for Retirement Planning

Details about faculty retirement plans should be readily available to colleagues at all points of their career. Since they participate in a defined contribution plan their future income depends on well-informed decisions about their contributions and the extent to which the University matches those contributions. Having access to financial advisors is crucial, but advice ought to extend beyond the financial and the institution should provide access to clear and stable statements about the various options faculty have at important stages of their careers. Some of these stages are already well marked: at age 35 faculty members’ (matched) contributions to their pension accounts rises from 5% to 7.5%; and at age 50 they may choose the option to increase the (matched) contribution to 10%. (We understand that the FCBR is discussing making this latter an opt-out rather than opt-in choice, and we would applaud that as an improvement.) While there may be reasons why colleagues would decline their increased contribution to their pension funds, the benefits of the increased contribution and match should be made clear to everyone. During the remaining years of a faculty member’s career, however, there are no formally established points at which crucial financial (or other, retirement-related) decisions are directly engaged. The option to make additional contributions to the Voluntary Investment Plan (VIP) or to shelter some income in tax-deferred ways are available to those who seek them out. Nevertheless, we believe that encouraging colleagues to keep in mind their eventual retirement is a positive contribution to their well-being, and the university should be proactive in providing such encouragement.

There are, of course, rich resources about benefits and retirement options available in published documents on the University’s web pages. Faculty do have access to their options with respect to contributions to their pensions and health care. Clear explanations of these options are readily accessible, since details about the features and options under the UWRP are maintained on the UW Human Resources (HR) webpages: http://hr.uw.edu/benefits/retirement-plans/uw-retirement-plan/.

In addition, pertinent information about the vested reemployment option (for up to 40% per year for up to five years after retirement) is also available to future retirees once they know where to look for it: i.e., on the webpage maintained by Academic Human Resources (AHR) (https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/retirement/working-after-retirement/). However, we note that this retirement option is not mentioned on the HR page mentioned above, nor on HR’s “UWRP: Preparing to retire” page (http://hr.uw.edu/benefits/retirement-plans/nearing-retirement/uwrp-preparing-to-retire/), nor on Fidelity’s linked page on the UWRP’s details (https://nb.fidelity.com/public/nb/uw/planoptions/plandetails?planId=71809&option=planBasics).

It is unfortunate that these present resources at UW, especially those available through administrative offices and their webpages, are neither as complete nor as well coordinated as they might be. As a result faculty are often confused or become anxious when they first begin to think about their retirement. This lack of close coordination between HR and AHR (and Fidelity) points to the further absence of any single stable, well-known, central resource that provides a coherent entry point for access to the manifold details of faculty retirement, and particularly any that consider broader, and more personal, aspects of retirement planning. A more coordinated and focused web-page entry point, or “portal,” for those interested in faculty retirement procedures and options is clearly needed.

For example, information about other options for faculty planning their retirement--e.g., the availability of the occasional Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) offerings; the existence of individualized retirement transition agreements--are even less accessible on public resources. The availability of the VRI, for example, is only declared when a decision has been made centrally to announce its availability and it is communicated directly to eligible faculty and their administrative officers. This practice impedes the ability of faculty and their academic units to engage in the rational long-term planning required for retirement.
RECOMMENDATION (A.1)
Request that the Provost distribute, annually, a letter to all faculty who are active retirement-plan participants, outlining in detail all the available options for late-career faculty, including planning resources for future retirement and pointing to online and other resources that are available for consultation.

Rationale: Since administrative colleagues are actively, and quite properly, discouraged from introducing the topic of retirement with individual faculty, lest such discussions appear to be exerting pressure or breaching age-discrimination statutes, the most obvious way of raising the issue of a faculty member’s retirement plans is not available. The unfortunate effect of such a “Don’t Ask” policy is that many faculty are ill-informed about their options. Also, many faculty respond by adopting a “Don’t Tell” policy of their own: treating retirement decisions as fully private, even secret, with the result that their colleagues are unable to engage in their own longer-term (and even shorter-term) planning for their programs. As a result, conversations about, and even preliminary thinking about, retirement are long postponed and, even, never occur until an individual faculty member delivers the required notice to the chair/dean one quarter before the effective date of retirement. This state of affairs is dysfunctional for all involved.

One easy means of countering the deleterious effects of such a “Don’t Ask” policy is to ensure that there are more regular communications from the Provost/Deans/Chairs to all faculty inviting them to meet with their chair/dean to discuss retirement options. An annual letter from the Provost to all faculty would be an efficient and effective way of reminding colleagues that considering the details about retirement ought not be postponed indefinitely, and that resources are readily available to assist colleagues in planning for such an event. Such a letter would articulate the various options and other considerations that would impinge on any decision to retire, and point to the availability of online resources and financial advisors (i.e., Fidelity) and others who can provide more detailed and trustworthy personalized information and advice. It would detail the workshops and seminars available from HR and UWRA.

An example of this kind of annual “retirement planning memo” is the one provided all University of California academic personnel: e.g., that from UCLA’s Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel: https://apo.ucla.edu/archive/vice-chancellor-memos/2016-17-retirement-planning-memo.

RECOMMENDATION (A.2)
Ask the President to appoint a panel of experienced retired colleagues who would make themselves available to those contemplating retirement for confidential consultation and information about their options and the process of transitioning to retirement as a UW faculty member. This faculty panel might reasonably be placed under the supervision of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Rationale: Since faculty often may be hesitant about going public about their plans to retire, and administrators and staff are chary—and rightfully so—about asking individuals if they are thinking about retiring, even enrolling in HR workshops and seminars may seem to some too “public” a declaration of “intent.” Identifying experienced retired colleagues no longer in the “chain of command” to serve as a confidential resource for individuals who are considering retirement would provide a collegial ear and voice that would be able to assist them as they negotiate their approach to retirement, providing resources and information about their available options and required procedures.

Much of the information is of course available on webpages (or, like the “retirement checklist,” in a linked PDF). However, the information is sometimes incomplete and often uncoordinated and scattered (as we have noted above). Some faculty have even expressed their willingness to pay for assistance in negotiating the bureaucratic maze leading to retirement.

As already noted, chairs and deans are properly hesitant about introducing questions about their retirement plans with individual colleagues, for fear of breaching legal (or other) boundaries. Furthermore, as the focus groups with chairs conducted in connection with the 2014 ACE/Sloan survey by the Office of Academic Personnel revealed, a number of chairs frankly acknowledged that they lacked “training and knowledge about retirement options and how to discuss these options with faculty members.” If experienced administrative colleagues suffer from a lack of information and “how to discuss [available] options with faculty members,” one can be sure so do many of the faculty who are considering retirement.
And when individual faculty may be uncomfortable about introducing the topic with those above them in administrative positions, for fear of (un)foreseen repercussions on their remaining years, the problems are compounded. Consulting colleagues (whether already-retired or not), or the UWRA, may provide some assistance or referral, but neither of those sources can carry the “official” weight of the UW and, thereby, help allay faculty members’ uncertainties and anxieties. More clear and secure official resources would be welcomed, as would access to a collegial, confidential individual consultant.

Faculty, as they begin to think about whether and when they will retire, would benefit from having personal access to knowledgeable colleagues who can provide trustworthy and confidential information and guidance toward negotiating the intricacies of the UW bureaucracy. Some, of course, talk with colleagues here and elsewhere, with their family, with financial advisors inside and outside the University setting. But some faculty clearly remain quiet, even secretive, about the fact that they are thinking about retirement, for fear that admitting their plans might affect their reputations, duties and responsibilities in their home units. Others, of course, are more confident and open about their plans, but it would be unwarranted to assume that all, or even that most, fall in this category.

Nevertheless, we strongly believe that the process of transitioning to retirement would be much enhanced, and attendant anxieties and uncertainty lessened, by providing senior faculty with access to informed and confidential consultation with colleagues outside the administrative hierarchy of their units. Consulting these colleagues would allow faculty to draw on the experience and know-how of individuals that would permit them to feel the institution’s concern for them personally as they approach for the first time the threshold of retirement, with all the ‘identity’ questions—who will I be when I retire?—that hover around this transition. For some faculty, retirement qualifies as a “near-death” experience of sorts—or perhaps a second adolescence where “Who will I be when I grow up?” offers challenges and attendant anxieties. Just as the UW works effectively and personally to facilitate the on-boarding of new faculty, it could do a lot more to assist and support established colleagues in a more personal way as they transition to retirement.

RECOMMENDATION (A.3)
Revise current UW retirement information (webpages, podcasts) to articulate coordinated access to the various components of, and available options for, retirement planning available at UW. Provide clear links between HR and AHR pages that deal with various aspects of retirement options and retirement planning.

Rationale: Unit administrators such as deans and department chairs do not, as far as we have been able to determine, regularly take any active role in raising retirement issues with their colleagues as a group, and are actively discouraged from introducing such matters in discussions with individuals because of potential legal risks. They may, of course, respond to requests that come from individuals. But not all administrators are well-informed about these issues and faculty are not always comfortable with raising them, either because they have not been encouraged to do so or because they are concerned about the possible responses to such an inquiry. As a result, faculty who are thinking ahead to retirement in this era of non-mandatory-retirement lack clear access to neutral, trustworthy, and confidential resources (beyond the financial and medical). Such information should be provided and there are a number of ways to do so, through letters, email, and web-based resources.

RECOMMENDATION (A.4)
Retirement options and procedures should result from discussions by and with the faculty and should be defined as a distinct stage of a faculty member’s career and incorporated into the Faculty Code.

Rationale: It may be worthwhile to consider articulating the existing retirement options in the Faculty Code rather than leaving them as administrative policies that are not well publicized nor well understood as rights available to faculty. These should be matters aired prominently in the FCBR and Faculty Senate, and asking the Faculty Senate to consider legislation dealing with these issues would give prominence to the gaps in our shared understanding of the various options and the required procedures.
RECOMMENDATION (A.5)
Request that a representative of the Provost’s Office/AHR participate as a regular member of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR).

Rationale: As the faculty body charged with primary responsibility “for all matters of policy relating to faculty retirement, insurance and benefits,” the FCBR needs to assert its place in discussions of faculty retirement matters. In recent years, the discussions and actions of the Council have focused for the greater part on the “benefits” portion of their charge. The President’s delegate to the Council has been limited to the Vice President of HR, and the absence of any recent continuing involvement from the Provost’s Office (AHR) has meant that even when retirement has been discussed it has been largely limited to the practicalities of pensions, medical programs, and Social Security, and the Council has not addressed broader collegial and personal matters associated with continuing membership of emeritus colleagues in the University faculty. This has had the unfortunate effect of narrowing and delaying the range of the Council’s discussions, recommendations, and actions. Regular participation in FCBR discussions by AHR (as indeed had been the case in the not-too-distant past) would enable the Council to fulfill its mandated responsibility “for all matters of policy relating to faculty retirement……” In addition, this would ensure that collegial and personal issues beyond the fiscal and practical could be more regularly and directly considered by the FCBR, and it would provide a forum for continuing deliberations about proposed AHR actions that fall within the Council’s purview. It is striking to us that, for example, decisions about offering retirement incentives (such as the VRI) have reportedly not been discussed at the Faculty Council that is charged with considering such matters of policy.

RECOMMENDATION (A.6)
Restore and publicize the availability of the option for faculty to arrange mutually beneficial “individual retirement transition agreements”; and articulate in more detail the kinds of adjustments permitted, the length of the “time line for retirement,” who may negotiate such agreements and on what grounds, and by whom, they may be approved.

Rationale: Not widely known, or made use of, the UW has allowed individual faculty to negotiate “individualized retirement transition agreements … where a tenured faculty member with a vested right to partial reemployment voluntarily agrees to forgo that right and to set a definitive and irrevocable time line for retirement in exchange for adjusted workloads and responsibilities before retirement that facilitate the fulfillment of career-culminating activities.” (quoted from Cheryl A. Cameron and Rhonda Forman, “University of Washington Retirement Transition Options For Tenured Faculty,” in Faculty Retirement: Best Practices for Navigating the Transition, ed. Claire A. Van Ummersen, et al. [Sterling VA: Stylus, 2014], p. 203). Although 63 colleagues (of the 349 faculty) availed themselves of such individual agreements in the period 1999-2007 (Cameron and Forman, p. 210) few faculty are aware of the option for these individualized retirement transition agreements. Indeed, aside from the article in Van Ummersen’s collection, there seems to have be no public notice of the option. For example, it appears nowhere in current UW webpages or policy statements: a search on the UW Website for “individualized retirement” (on 2 February 2018) pointedly reports ‘No Results.” Where has this option gone?

There is a rather indefinite reference to “some phased-out structure” and (unspecified) “several options available to faculty to reduce or end their active involvement with the University” in the AHR webpages https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/actions/adding-updating/emeritus-retiree-appointments. But the option “individualized retirement transition” option has been used in the past and its ad hoc nature may well militate against its usefulness by raising questions of equity and favoritism when one becomes aware of a colleague’s having taken advantage of the option. It does, however, offer an attractive option for individuals who wish to transition gradually toward retirement and regularizing the parameters of such individual arrangements would be advantageous.

Providing clear guidelines about when and to whom these arrangements would be available is essential. (A useful model may be found in the negotiated contracts in the UCLA “Pathways to Retirement” program: https://apo.ucla.edu/faculty-retirement-resources/pathways-to-retirement.) That said, it may be that simply “daylighting” this option would mitigate against charges of favoritism as it becomes more generally known and discussed among faculty. Similarly, it is unclear who has the authority to approve these agreements, though presumably a dean (and probably the Provost) would need to approve such an arrangement before it could be effected. In any case, such details need to be clarified and publicly articulated as well.
RECOMMENDATION (A.7)

Request that the Provost draw the attention of administrators and senior faculty to the existing requirements of Faculty Code Section 24-57.C and D and emphasize the importance of documenting multi-year plans and goals for both individual faculty and their units. Such regular conferences will, quite naturally, open space for discussions of retirement options and possible timelines.

Rationale: Since the Faculty Code constitutes the “contract” between individual faculty and the University, it provides in the required “regular conference” between department chairs and their senior faculty and thereby provides a context in which individual faculty must regularly discuss their “career goals” with the head of their academic unit. The Faculty Code mandates such a conference “at least every three years” for Professors (see: Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations--Section 24-57.C). It further specifies that “[t]he purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals.” Those “career goals” would include consideration of the individual’s trajectory of teaching, research and service in the context of the department’s prospects and its own stated goals. Such conferences provide occasions for an individual faculty member to broach the topic of retirement, whether full or phased-in. Indeed, faculty members in these conferences would naturally at some point indicate retirement as among their future plans and provide the chair/dean an opportunity to point to the options available to the faculty member. Furthermore, since the plans and goals discussed in these conferences are documented and they will become “part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit.” They will provide occasions, at the next “regular conference” for discussing retirement and the kinds of pre-retirement planning faculty should consider.

RECOMMENDATION (A.8)

Ask HR/AHR to provide on their Retirement web pages the Supplementation Plan formula, so that faculty may have access to this information for planning prior to their retirement.

Rationale: The status of pension supplementation has been a recurrent topic for discussion at the FCBR (and FCRIB, its previous incarnation), and elsewhere (the Regents, President’s Office, AHR). It has also been removed as an option by State Legislative action for those employees who were hired after 30 April 2011. As faculty consider the financial aspects of their future retirement, it would be useful to them to know whether they potentially will be eligible for such supplementation, and to do their own estimate of how much it might be, even if the final determination can only be made after the date of actual retirement. While the actual determination can only be made by the UW after one has retired, faculty colleagues should have the opportunity to incorporate their estimate of possible supplementation into their planning for retirement. This formula, forms of which are available on-line at several state public institutions, should be posted with the disclaimer that any calculation done in advance of retirement is only an estimate and that factors influencing the final calculation will only be known and considered following an individual’s retirement, as determined by designated authority of the Total Benefits office. Washington State University in its Retirement Plan provides their faculty with the statutory criteria and the formula for computing whether one may receive supplementation: https://regents.wsu.edu/meeting-materials/200901F-9Plan.pdf.

B. Transitioning to retirement

Late-career faculty—those approaching retirement—need clear access to all the necessary steps they must consider as they proceed toward retirement. The HR’s “UWRP: Preparing to retire” web page (mentioned above) itemizes when one can retire and what steps should be taken as one approaches retirement. However, the first item on this list—“Set a target retirement date”—immediately offers a challenge that frequently is fraught with anxiety and concern. And the absence of any mention there of reemployment, or other options, contributes further to the potential for confusion or misinformation.

The available HR-sponsored workshops and seminars provide a great deal of information. The three-hour “Retiring from UWRP: An Overview” workshop is regularly offered by HR (though often quickly oversubscribed and only offered “live” in Seattle) and provides the kind of practical information pre-retirees need in a straightforward checklist of sequenced (and overlapping) steps. This list provides details, from the need to inform one’s chair to the range of external issues that need to be addressed in
the month before retirement, but it is almost exclusively directed toward practical issues: institutional rules and deadlines, financial planning, Social Security, Medicare, et al. Negotiating these practicalities is itself often a challenge for faculty, many of whom have spent their years at UW benefiting from, and dependent on, the expertise and personal attention of professional and classified staff who have insulated them from such practical bureaucratic concerns. When retirement appears on the horizon that attention and experienced help are either no longer available, or are the source of awkwardness.

As an essential component for any preparation for retiring, the checklist (in a two-page PDF) is usefully available via a link on the “UWRP: Preparing to retire” web page; is also more prominently shown on the University of Washington Retirement Association (UWRA) “Resources for retirees and pre-retirees” web page. Greater prominence should be given to this checklist. However, for faculty (and others) there is more to planning retirement than meeting deadlines and assessing practicalities like those in the checklist. This includes reemployment, individualized retirement transitions, and the Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI).

RECOMMENDATION (B.1)
Provide a clear, easily and directly accessed, online portal designed especially for faculty that spells out the various options available to them and the specific requirements for each.

Rationale: The availability of the option to be rehired for up to 40% and for up to five years after retiring is fairly well known to faculty, although even otherwise well-informed faculty are less than fully clear about the specific details and constraints on such re-appointments. For instance, some faculty report that they have been told that such reemployment offers are exclusively intended for instructional purposes, yet they are also aware that colleagues have been frequently rehired under this program to perform other essential duties, e.g., administrative or managerial; research. Similarly, it is unclear whether this option requires one or two quarters “in residence” to meet the 40% requirement.

The “Partial Reemployment Policy” section of the “Working after Retirement” page on the Academic Personnel Website opens with the following statement:

State of Washington law permits a faculty member to be reemployed up to 40% time, after retirement. The University of Washington has, by policy, granted to tenured faculty members the prerogative of requesting reemployment. By policy, the University has vested in tenured faculty members the right beginning at age 62, to be reemployed up to a maximum of 40% time for instructional and/or research purposes for five years after the date of retirement.

Lower down in this same section appears the following:

Arrangements for instructional, research, or other designated duties of reemployed retired faculty members are to be made by agreement between the Department Chair/Program Director or Dean of undepartmentalized College, and retiring faculty member.

Similar references to “State law” and “University policy” are made on the “Retiree rehire” webpage under HR Operations (http://hr.uw.edu/ops/hiring/retiree-rehire/), and it also links the reemployment rights of tenured faculty to the AHR page quoted above.

RECOMMENDATION (B.2)
Include in the Faculty Code a clear, stable account of the options faculty have at the time of their retirement. At a minimum this should spell out the parameters of the reemployment option, the individualized retirement transition arrangements, and the VRI.

Rationale: There is nothing in the Faculty Code that mentions the retirement options for faculty, including what is acknowledged to be the “vested” right to reemployment. And there is no statement of the underlying “policy”—indeed there is virtually no mention of faculty reemployment aside from the notice (in Section 21-32.A) that “retired faculty” are accorded voting rights while “serving on a part-time basis.” A search of the UW Policy Directory (including AHR Policies) produces no clearer articulation of the underlying “policy.” The Faculty Code would appear to be a prime location for such statutory matters.
As far as state law is concerned, we have found little relevant beyond RCW 28B.10.420.2(d), which does state that part-time reemployment “shall not exceed forty percent of full time employment during any year.” However, since it says this applies to faculty who retired “not later than the end of the academic year next following their seventieth birthday” (420.1), we might question whether this is still in force, since the federal statute against mandatory retirement became effective for tenured faculty in 1994.

Nevertheless, this RCW section remains, it would appear, unrevised, since it remains in the RCW with its 1979 language.

Even if this recommendation were not adopted, the conditions of the faculty member’s “vested right” in partial reemployment should be more clearly articulated, as should other, alternative arrangements that are available.

Indeed as our conversations with deans indicated, there may be need for a serious reconsideration and re-articulation of that reemployment right in light of the shift to ABB budgeting that leaves the funding for such reemployment to the deans. As the ACE Sloan funded survey revealed, a number of deans felt there was a “[n]eed for ‘new’ rules for reemployment now that funding is coming from units.” These might include greater specificity about what exactly reemployment could entail and what requirements individual units might define as meeting the “up-to-40%” limit. In the case of the VRI, redefinition of the rules governing the awards might entail local authorization of such awards rather than the current “universal” availability. (On the last, see B.4 and B.5 below.)

**RECOMMENDATION (B.3)**

Consider asking the Provost to request the Regents to revise their 2010 action to make the periodically available VRI a *regular* option available to all faculty retirees. Funding a tax-free medical expense account will not only enhance the health-care options for faculty retirees, but will also encourage more thoughtful planning for retirement.

**Rationale:** This recommendation specifically addresses expressed interest by retirement-age faculty in another, more recent “incentive” that has functioned well to induce faculty actively to consider retiring: the Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI). Its acknowledged success was noted by Vice Provost Cameron in her meeting with us and upon reflection we have concluded that it should be made a regular part of our faculty retirement plans. Our *ad hoc* subcommittee members felt strongly that the VRI should be offered on a regular, yearly basis. Making the option a standard one will enhance the ability of individual faculty to plan earlier and thus make longer-term discussion of replacement options available to colleagues in their home units. Making this a regular option associated with faculty retirement will require revisiting fundamental features of this option and its relationship to the reemployment right.

On March 18, 2010, the Board of Regents approved the administration’s recommendation of an “alternative retirement benefit available to all eligible tenured faculty who elect to forego their vested right to partial reemployment upon retirement.” The Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) makes available a “tax-free medical expense account” and addresses directly faculty members’ “uncertainty and concern regarding health care costs,” which was reported as an “influencing factor” in the decisions of a number of eligible faculty “to dela[y] their retirement plans.” The health savings account (HSA) has been “administered as a Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA) under rules established in the Internal Revenue Code.”

The Regents’ action established the following procedure:

The VRI option will be available only when the Provost announces an open election period, at which time eligible faculty members can declare their intent to retire during a specified interval of time and elect this alternative retirement benefit. Upon retirement of a participating faculty member, a VERA account will be established and receive a lump-sum contribution from the nine or twelve month state-funded position that is vacated by the tenured faculty member. The contribution will amount to 25% of the five year value of the state-funded 40% reemployment, except that there will be a minimum contribution of $25,000 and a maximum contribution of $100,000.
In the background to that motion, it was further noted:

The option is modeled after a program already available to librarians, professional staff, classified non-union staff, and contract classified staff at the time of retirement. For these retirees, the VEBA account is funded by 25% sick leave cash-out, a program authorized by the Board of Regents in 1999.

The Provost has authorized this option to retiring tenured faculty six times since 2010 after consultation with the Board of Deans and Chancellors. Its attractive inducement of a funded HSA account has encouraged a number of faculty to retire sooner than they might have otherwise. It has proved a very attractive incentive by enhancing the health-care coverage of our retired colleagues. The funds made available through the VRI has provided faculty with welcome additional resources for their retirement years, and after the repeated offerings faculty approaching retirement have begun to expect its being announced again. The popularity of the incentive indicates (we believe) that for those faculty (and perhaps others) the post-retirement reemployment option has become a less attractive incentive for those approaching retirement. As noted above, this sort of VEBA account has been regularly available to retiring librarians and non-academic staff as a partial buy-out of their accumulated, unused sick leave. Since faculty do not accrue sick leave (or vacation time), this has not been regularly extended to them.

However, since getting the VRI is dependent on faculty’s waiving their vested interest in the 40% reemployment option at retirement--not to mention their forgoing the vested property value of their “tenure”--the VRI would appear to be not only an attractive but a cost-effective option. After all, an HSA at 50 percent of a year’s salary computes to equal approximately 25% of the salary that would be expended to pay faculty members for 5 years at 40% of their salary (to say nothing of benefits and ancillary space and staff costs). Though only an occasional offer with direct and important health-care benefits, faculty (and some deans) have looked forward to being able to avail themselves of the VRI, and it may be time to consider adding it to the standing options for those negotiating retirement.

The success of recent offerings of the VRI and conversations with retirement-age colleagues regarding the most recent offering make it clear that the VRI is often a decisive inducement for faculty to consider and to advance their plans for retirement. Indeed, it is so attractive that some have recently delayed or postponed their retirements while they waited expectantly for the announcement of the next VRI offer. As an incentive to consider retirement it has proven effective, and faculty who might otherwise avail themselves of the up-to-40% reemployment option choose the VRI instead, especially when their reemployment might entail taking on large new teaching assignments. Since a similar option is a regular part of retirement for other UW staff, it would be reasonable to extend it to faculty. In view of this, the UW should seriously consider how to make this a regular option for faculty and provide them with an attractive inducement that already exists as a regular feature for other UW retirees.

A pair of ancillary points may also be worth mentioning in this context. First, from conversations with a few deans, it is clear that the costs of funding the VRI are unevenly distributed across schools and colleges at any given time, and their support for offering their faculty the incentive is impacted by local budgetary pressures and the age-distribution of their faculty. As long as the VRI remains an across-the-board offer extended to all retirement-eligible faculty on the decision of the Provost, it might be wiser to recommend that the Provost consider ways to address these local budgetary pressures. Perhaps the costs of paying for the VEBA HSAs could be shared by central and local budgets, or the Provost might be able to make bridge funds available if needed to cover exceptional local costs, perhaps (if necessary) spread over a three- to five-year budget cycle. This could reduce the need for extended discussions and negotiations occasioned by the differential impact on the budgets of individual deans and chancellors, which might make them hesitate to support offering the VRI to all faculty because of local budgetary concerns.

Second, and alternatively, if central funds are not used to reduce the cost of the VRI health savings account to individual schools/campuses, serious consideration might be given to removing the across-the-board requirement, permitting individual deans and chancellors to avail themselves of this option when they judge that encouraging retirements in this fashion would be beneficial to their units, and the attendant costs would be within their budgets.

C. Continuing participation of retired faculty
The third stage—encouraging and enhancing post-retirement activity in the UW community, and beyond—is, in part, the responsibility of the UW’s Retiree Relations office, and of the UWRA. The latter is, of course, a privately funded 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and through its staff and board provide a range of social and educational events and other opportunities for engagement by retired UW staff and faculty, not limited to its dues-paying members. Through UW Encore it guides and encourages UW retirees toward continuing involvement in and engagement with UW programs and units, and in the larger community. General information about UW retiree privileges and opportunities is detailed in the Retiree Privileges brochure, available online through the UWRA web site and also as a printed document, updated annually: http://www.washington.edu/uwra/?attachment_id=1236.

What is less clear, however, is the degree to which the Provost’s office of academic personnel takes responsibility for working with/for this growing body of UW faculty.

**RECOMMENDATION (C.1)**

Define more clearly in the *Faculty Code* and publicize what the benefits and privileges are of emeritus faculty as continuing members of the University Faculty.

**Rationale:** Emeritus faculty remain, officially, members of the University faculty (FCG Section 21-31) and while they no longer are given voting rights (or UW paycheck) they do retain certain benefits and privileges as members of the faculty. As reported in the Academic Personnel web page regarding “Emeritus and Retired Faculty Titles” (https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/retirement/designations/)

“Retired/Emeritus status provides substantial privileges to the University faculty member, including continuation of Library borrowing privileges, access to University email accounts, discount prices on University productions and museums, among others.” While the practical benefits to retirees are specifically enumerated, the vagueness of “among others” deserves attention, especially those that accrue to those with an emeritus appointment. It is not clear exactly what those privileges are and some clarification (perhaps in the *Faculty Code*) should be articulated. And, at least, it should be made clearer what roles these members of the faculty may play as continuing members of the University faculty, and (in that regard) what services and recognition they might expect from the Provost’s (or Dean’s) office. A useful model for a web page delineating the privileges and benefits of being emeritus can be seen in this example from the University of California, Berkeley: https://ofew.berkeley.edu/welfare/retirement/privileges-and-benefits-conferred-upon-all-emeriti.

**RECOMMENDATION (C.2)**

Ensure that formal notice of appointment as emeritus is sent to faculty members when it is approved by the President. This should be accompanied by a document articulating the benefits and privileges discussed in the preceding recommendation.

**Rationale:** Once appointments are approved by the requisite procedures, it is usual for official notice to be sent to the appointee. Even though their appointments are the result of faculty votes and approvals by department their chair, their dean, and the President, those appointed to the emeritus title are not regularly informed that they have been so appointed.

**RECOMMENDATION (C.3)**

Encourage the Secretary of the Faculty to publicize more broadly the opportunities for retired faculty to serve on Faculty Councils and on other committees of the University and its constituent units; and advise retired faculty of other opportunities as they become available.

**Rationale:** One denominated role for retired faculty is to serve on our Faculty Councils, and the UWRA has for a number of years recruited and nominated candidates to serve on these important bodies of faculty governance. It ought not, however, be the sole responsibility of the UWRA to seek out and encourage such collegial service; it should also be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Faculty and the leadership of the Faculty Senate to publicize to and recruit such retired faculty members to serve, as they do with other members of the faculty. Also, emeritus faculty are eligible to serve as Conciliation Officers (FCG Section 27-41.A) and as members of the Adjudication Panel (FCG Section 28-33.B). Their experience and neutrality may be especially beneficial in dealing with cases involving collegial dispute.
RECOMMENDATION (C.4)
Initiate programs to encourage academic units to involve their retired faculty in the life of the units, not simply by including them in social events but also drawing on their accumulated experience and wisdom in other ways.

Rationale: The UW Retiree Relations office is overseen by the Associate Vice President of Alumni and Constituent Relations, who also serves as Executive Director of the Alumni Association. As Associate Vice President, he reports to the Vice President for University Advancement. The evidence of retirees’ philanthropic participation in contributions to the UW is impressive, well beyond the participation rates of current faculty and staff. It is clearly in the best interests of the UW to maintain (and expand) that channel of support and increasing the University’s openness to continued meaningful engagement is also beneficial to the retirees themselves, as it may be for their colleagues and students. Many retired faculty remain in the Seattle area and welcome their continued connection to the UW: they value their access to parking on campus and their inclusion in events sponsored by the departments, schools, colleges and the UW at large.

But retired faculty often wish to avail themselves of opportunities for other sorts of collegial engagements—serving on departmental committees, mentoring younger faculty, advising students, offering lectures or other presentations in a colleagues’ class, to mention a few. Retired faculty would also welcome opportunities to interact in less-structured ways with colleagues and students and efforts to provide space for such interactions would we welcome. We realize of course that providing individual office space would be prohibitively expensive in the constrained geography of the University, yet identifying shared, communal spaces suitable for temporary personal use might provide an attractive alternative and encourage and support personal engagement by retired faculty. These could be provided by departments or larger units, or even by the three UW campuses, along the lines of “commons” areas currently available to students in the Libraries and the HUB.

The UW Encore program (managed by UW Retiree Relations) has made efforts to identify and publicize opportunities for similar engagement for faculty and other retirees (e.g., the Husky Leadership Certificate) on campus and off. Complementing (or broadening) this program through outreach to academic units would open up additional opportunities for retired faculty to continue their long relationships with the colleagues and with the institution at large. These engagements will enhance the lives of our retired faculty and contribute to the life of the University as a whole. At virtually no cost to the institution the University can draw upon the accumulated expertise and wisdom of retired colleagues for service to the larger academic enterprise and the collegial workings of shared governance.
## 2018-2019

### Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>December 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>January 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>April 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senate** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102.

**Executive Committee** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in 142 Gerberding Hall.

**Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
Bylaw Review Report
March 6, 2018
Rich Christie, Chair, Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

These comments represent the views of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, having been circulated to the members and revised based on their comments.

Summary
In the fall quarter of 2017 the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (ACFCR) received a request from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to “engage in a thorough review of each campus’s, college’s, or school’s procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the requirements of [Faculty Code] Section 23-45.” The request specifically noted “… it is critical that the composition of Elected Faculty councils are elected faculty only” and states that there have been instances in the past decade where “units have included Chairs, Directors, and other administrators on EFCs [Elected Faculty Councils]” and where “the Dean appoints members of the EFC or where Chairs self-appoint.” The request states “Such practices are not in accordance with the spirit or letter of the Code.”

The ACFCR therefore reviewed the bylaws of the 27 campuses, colleges and schools listed in Executive Order IX as having been established by the Board of Regents against the provisions of Faculty Code Section 23-45 (FC 23-45). Executive Order IX is found at http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EOIX.html

The bylaws reviewed were those posted on the Faculty Governance web site at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/schools-colleges-campus/

The Faculty Code section 23 is found at http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html

A rubric, attached as an appendix, was used for initial review the bylaws.

Seventeen sets of bylaws were reviewed, raising general issues discussed below and with individual comments also listed below. Seven schools, recently created at Bothell and Tacoma, did not have bylaws posted. One school, ROTC, does not require bylaws. A comprehensive review of the School of Nursing bylaws has been recently completed and is not replicated here. A comprehensive review of the School of Medicine bylaws is pending on completion of their accreditation, and not done here.

The ACFCR recommends that the SEC consider changes to the Faculty Code to explicitly bar administrators from voting membership on EFCs and to clarify that EFC members must be are elected by the voting faculty of the campus, school or college without administrative involvement in the nomination process. The ACFCR recommends that the Secretary of the Faculty follow up with specific units about specific comments or missing bylaws.

Issues
The Faculty Code Does Not Bar Administrators From EFC Membership
FC 23-45C provides that “Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advise the dean on matters
involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each school or college shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.”

Similar language for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses appears in FC 23-45B.

FC 23-45A states “Subject to the provisions of Section 23-46, the faculty of each campus, college, or school other than the Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure except as stipulated in Subsections B and C of this section. The organization and rules of procedure of a department may be determined by the department faculty, but shall be subject to review by the appropriate campus, school, or college faculty.”

FC 23-46 deals principally with voting mechanisms for establishing and changing bylaws and for P&T and faculty employment votes. Election of faculty councils is not specifically mentioned.

Thus there is no specific language in the Faculty Code barring faculty in administrative positions (Chairs, Directors, etc.) from serving as members of Elected Faculty Councils (EFCs). Campuses, schools, and colleges are free to bar or permit this practice.

The SEC clearly has an expectation, which is shared by the ACFCR, that faculty in administrative positions should not serve on EFCs, as they have a separate path to advise the dean and different interests than the general faculty. The ACFCR recommends that the SEC consider changes to FC 23-45 to explicitly bar administrators from serving on EFCs. In doing so, the SEC may wish to consider the range of administrators to be barred (for example, Associate Deans, Associate Chairs), to bear in mind the endless creativity of administrative titles, to consider the case of departments with very few faculty. Language barring administrative membership on EFCs can be found in several sets of bylaws, as noted below.

The Faculty Code Does Not Require That EFC Members be Elected by the Voting Faculty

FC 23-45 requires that EFCs be elected, and that the campus, school or college “shall determine for itself ... the procedure by which the members are elected.” As written, bylaws could allow some members to be elected by, for example, other elected committees (there is one such instance), or theoretically even “elected” by the Dean. Moreover, the nomination process is completely determined by the campus, school, or college, and may involve the Dean, Chairs or other administrators.

The ACFCR recommends that the SEC consider changes to FC 23-45 to specify that EFC members are elected by the voting faculty and that the nomination process not involve administrators.

Ex-Officio EFC Membership

Some bylaws list the Dean and/or Associate Deans as ex officio members of the EFC. This seems acceptable provided the membership is specified to be without vote.

Standing Committees

Many bylaws establish standing committees to deal with subsets of the EFC responsibilities. For example, there is often a separate committee to deal with P&T cases, and also often a separate committee to deal with academic issues like course changes and graduation requirements. In most cases these committees operate in parallel with the EFC, that is, the EFC is charged with advising the Dean on P&T in general, while the P&T committee advises the Dean on specific P&T cases. The Faculty Code is silent on the specific topic of standing committees at the campus, school or college level.

The ACFCR considers that if the EFC is authorized to advise the Dean on, e.g., P&T in the bylaws, the existence of a parallel advice path is not prohibited by the Faculty Code. Best practice would be for the
EFC to have some interaction with the standing committee, such as an annual report, but this is not required.

Similarly, while the P&T committee composition and election is prescribed elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the ACFCR considers that other standing committees may be appointed or elected, and may include non-faculty voting members such as advisors and students. While there is an expectation that these committees would be elected by the voting faculty or appointed by the EFC without administrative involvement, appointment by the Dean (one case exists) is not prohibited by FC 23-45. ACFCR considers that the latter practice should be discouraged, but that amending the Faculty Code to deal with standing committees would become too complicated.

**Individual Review Comments**

**College of Arts and Sciences**
Bylaws do not explicitly exclude Deans, Divisional Deans, Associate Deans and Chairs from voting membership in the College Council.

(Astonishing that eight Council members can substantively review all P&T cases and all education policy actions in the huge College of Arts and Sciences.)

**College of Built Environments**
No issues.

**College of Education**
Although not as clearly expressed as they could be, the basic topics on which the College Council (the EFC) advises the Dean are present: P&T, academics and budgets. It would be better to quote FC 23-45C.

Bylaws do not explicitly exclude Associate Deans and Division Directors (administrators) from voting membership in the College Council (the EFC).

The Director of the Division of Teacher Education (or designee) is specifically a College Council member ex officio, and the voting status of this position is unclear. As student positions are explicitly described as non-voting, the implication is that the Director can vote. This would be a violation of the FC 23-45C requirement that EFC members be elected.

**College of Engineering**
Bylaws do not explicitly exclude Associate Deans and Department Chairs from voting membership in the College Councils.

**College of the Environment**
Bylaws do not explicitly exclude Associate Deans and Department Chairs from voting membership in the College Councils.

**Evans School of Public Policy and Governance**
No explicit exclusion of administrators from Council positions, but Dean and Associate Dean are explicitly ex officio members without vote, and the school is non-departmentalized, so all administrators appear to be accounted for.

It appears that the actual work of curricular review and P&T review is performed by committees of faculty appointed by the Faculty Council. The committees are described as reporting to the Faculty Council, which is described as advising the Dean.
In the Curriculum and Student Affairs Committee, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Director of Student Services (the latter a staff position) are described as ex officio members, but with or without vote is not specified. This should be specified. (In fact no Director of Student Services is listed on the Evans School Web site. The top listing on the Student Services web page is Carrie Evans, Assistant Dean of Students, who is not faculty.)

Foster School of Business
The Dean is an ex officio member of the Faculty Council. With or without vote is not specified. Without vote should be specified.

Associate Deans are explicitly not eligible for the Faculty Council, but Department Chairs are. While legal under the Faculty Code, this is not desirable.

Department Chairs nominate two candidates for the Faculty Council from the department faculty, who then vote on them. The involvement of Department Chairs in the nomination process is legal under the Faculty Code but not desirable. Note that the separate P&T committee is carefully elected without the involvement of Department Chairs.

P&T committee membership does not explicitly exclude the Dean, Associate Deans or Department Chairs. It should, although this is not a FC 23-45 issue.

Information School
The iSchool Bylaws posted on the faculty governance web site at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/schools-colleges-campus/ are not current. Joe Janes provided a current copy dated May 19, 2017. The comments below apply to the current version.

Associate Deans are not explicitly excluded from membership in the Elected Faculty Council.

Program Committees (which deal with academic issues) and the Academics Committee are appointed by the EFC and do not always report back to the EFC. Program advisors and student members are voting members of the Program Committees. This is acceptable.

The Article III Preamble says that standing committees are appointed by the EFC. The Personnel Committee is a standing committee, but it is elected. The Bylaws should be revised to be consistent.

The Personnel Committee does the P&T work and is elected from the faculty. Only the Chair of the Committee is explicitly not allowed to be an Associate Dean. This should probably be extended to all members. The membership of the Extended Personnel Committee (which appears to evaluate specific P&T cases) is not specified in the bylaws, with the exception of its chair. The complete membership should be described.

Ex officio members of the Academics Committee are not specified as with or without vote. This should be specified.

ROTC
Bylaws not required, according to the web site. ROTC faculty are not tenure track and do not do P&T. The faculty are militarily subordinate to administration of the Department, which ill-accords with the notion of an elected group of them advising senior officers.
Dentistry
No explicit exclusion of administrators (Associate Deans, Department Chairs) from elected Faculty Council positions.

The ex officio graduate faculty position on the Faculty Council should specify non-voting. If voting, the position must be elective to comply with the Faculty Code.

The discussion of mail ballots is out of date.

School of Law
No explicit exclusion of administrators from Council and standing committee voting positions.

The elected faculty council (the Executive Council, or EC) delegates the appointment of standing committee members to the Dean or Dean’s designee in the bylaws. While permitted under the Faculty Code this is inappropriate. The EC should retain the power to appoint committee members. Perhaps the EC should consider the Dean’s recommendations when making appointments. That way when a conflict between EC and Dean arises, the EC would prevail. (Note that the P&T Council is elected, but see below.)

The Curriculum standing committee, and other standing committees, do not report through the EC. Best practice would be to retain a channel of reporting from standing committees to the EFC, in addition to interaction between the standing committees and the Dean or Associate Deans.

The Admissions standing committee has an Associate Dean ex officio. With or without vote is not specified.

The candidates for the elected P&T council are proposed by the Dean! This is permitted under the Faculty Code but clearly inappropriate. The EC should propose the slate of P&T candidates, perhaps after considering the Dean’s recommendations.

The process followed by the P&T committee is not described in the School of Law bylaws, but rather in a separate policy document. This process should be included in the bylaws.

School of Medicine
A complete review of the School of Medicine bylaws is awaiting completion of accreditation. Therefore no thorough review is done here. However, it is known that the School of Medicine bylaws explicitly allow Department Chairs to serve on the elected faculty council(s).

School of Nursing
ACFCR has recently completed a comprehensive review of School of Nursing bylaws.

School of Pharmacy
No explicit exclusion of faculty in administrative roles from the EFCs.

School of Public Health
No explicit exclusion of faculty in administrative roles from the EFCs.

The elected Curriculum Committee has membership criteria set by the EFC in a document outside the bylaws. As the document is not in the bylaws, it is not available for convenient review. These criteria be incorporated in the bylaws.

School of Social Work
There is a reference to FC 23-45 in the preamble, but the specific duties of the Faculty Council do not include advising the Dean on P&T or academic policy.
The Section 1 preamble states that the Faculty Council (the EFC) is responsible for the election of the chairs of the standing committees, but Section 1.d.(1) states that the Faculty Council proposes a slate of candidates for the (complete membership of the) standing committees. Probably the preamble is incorrect.

The Dean is an ex officio member of the Faculty Council. With or without vote is unspecified. Later, other ex officio standing committee membership is specified without vote. The Dean’s membership on the FC should be specified as being without vote.

There is no explicit exclusion of administrators from the Faculty Council or standing committee positions, except that the Dean is specifically excluded from election to the Faculty Council, implying that Associate Deans and Chairs can be so elected.

**UW Bothell**
The explicit bar on administrators being GFO chair or vice chair is a best practice.

For EC membership, the list of administrative positions that are ineligible to serve does not include the general “other faculty holding ... administrative positions” language used for the GFO positions. The two constraints should be consistent and the GFO language is preferred. (In practice, at present, no administrators could serve on the EC. However, if department chairs start to appear, they would be covered by the GFO language but not by the EC language.)

The elected P&T committee (called CCPTF) explicitly excludes only the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and Deans from membership. Program Heads, School Directors, future Department Chairs and Associate Deans could therefore serve.

**UW Bothell – School of Business**
No bylaws posted.

**UW Bothell – School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences**
No bylaws posted.

**UW Bothell – School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics**
No bylaws posted.

**UW Bothell – School of Educational Studies**
No bylaws posted.

**UW Bothell – School of Nursing and Health Studies**
No bylaws posted.

**UW Tacoma**
The explicit bar on administrators being Faculty Assembly chair or vice chair (and thus EFC chair) is a best practice.

The presence of standing committee chairs as voting members of the Executive Council (the EFC) is mildly concerning. The standing committee chairs are elected to that position by standing committee members who have in turn been elected to their positions by the faculty. Thus the standing committee chairs are not directly elected to the EFC by the faculty. However, Faculty Code section 23-45B permits Tacoma to determine the “procedure by which the (EFC) members are elected.”
UW Tacoma – Milgard School of Business
The Faculty Council is the EFC of the Milgard School of Business. In Section III.1.A the Faculty Council “advises the Dean on pending matters.” The complete list of topics from FC 23.45C should be listed, perhaps concluding with “and other pending matters.”

UW Tacoma – Institute of Technology
Article V cites FC 23-45B for the advisory duties of the Faculty Council. FC 23-45B applies to the EFC advising the Chancellor at Bothell or Tacoma. As a school the Institute of Technology Faculty Council is controlled by FC 23-45C. The language is the same, so it’s just a citation issue.

UW Tacoma – School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences
No bylaws posted.

UW Tacoma – School of Education
No bylaws posted.

Appendix: Bylaw Review Rubric
School or College ____________________________

Pursuant to the SEC request to review school and college bylaws to “assure that the councils are established in conformity with the requirements of 23-45”, and to limit the review solely to that issue, this rubric is applied.

Does the School or College have bylaws? Yes   No   (Circle one)

Do elected faculty council(s) exist to cover advising the Dean on:

P&T                     Yes   No
Academic Policy         Yes   No
Budgets                 Yes   No

Remark on any No answers:

Do any of the elected faculty council(s) have impermissible involvement by the administration e.g.

Dean appoints members or chair   Yes   No
Department chairs appoint representatives to college councils Yes   No
Dean or Associate Dean are voting members Yes   No
Dean or Associate Dean schedules council meetings Yes   No
Other impermissible involvement of administrators Yes   No

Remark on any Yes answers:

Make any additional general comments on back.
2018-2019 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30)

- Joel Thornton, College of the Environment, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Champak Chatterjee, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)

- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Ellen Covey, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 11:00)

- Mary Pat Wenderoth, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Dawn Lehman, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Aaron Katz, School of Public Health, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Mondays at 12:30)

- Brenda Williams, School of Law, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Jeff Ban, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Gautham Reddy, School of Medicine, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Research (Meets Wednesdays at 9:00)

- Sara Kover, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Donald Chi, School of Dentistry, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Charles Frevert, School of Medicine, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Erika Harnett, College of the Environment, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 1:30)

- Duong (Rita) Than, UW Tacoma, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Selma Powell, College of Education, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Andrea Carroll, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Christopher Campbell, College of Built Environments, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)

- Sri Devi Duvvuri, UW Bothell, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Fred Bookstein, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Timea Tihanyi, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Kathleen Peterson, School of Public Health, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00)

- Lawrence Goldman, Information School, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Marcy Stein, UW Tacoma, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00)

- Rich Christie, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30)

- Julie Nicoletta, UW Tacoma, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Trent Hill, Information School, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Trent Hill, Information School, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Fridays at 11:00)

- Carrie Brennan, College of Education, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Judy Chen, School of Medicine, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Whasun Chung, School of Dentistry, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Angelisa Paladin, School of Medicine, as Chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Lynly Beard, ALUW, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2018.

Adjudication Panel

- Michelle Garrison, School of Medicine, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Paul Manner, School of Medicine, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Marian Harris, School of Social Work, as member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Pietro Paparella, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Ellen Covey, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Matthew Thompson, School of Medicine, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
- Jeff Ban, College of Engineering, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.
Nominations for 2018-19 Senate Executive Committee Positions

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Barnhart, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Manner, Orthopaedics and Sports Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gautham Reddy, Radiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sutton, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janelle Taylor, Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terri DeYoung, Near Eastern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Christie, Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other health science colleges 1 – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Ramsay, Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Built Environments – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorenz Hauser, Aquatic and Fishery Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Schools 2 – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shailendra Jain, Marketing &amp; International Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theo Myhre, Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Council Nominations

1. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
2. Faculty Council on Academic Standards
3. Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

---

1 Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work
2 Business, Education, Evans, Information, Law, ROTC
Nominating Committee:

Charge

Nominate at least one candidate for each of the eight Executive Committee positions and the three Faculty Council Chairs.

Section 22-63 of the Faculty Code provides guidance: “The Chair and immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate shall appoint a nominating committee that shall nominate at least one candidate for each Executive Committee position. Nominations of Faculty Council Chairs shall consider the relationship of the Council’s work to the Senate’s upcoming agenda. The nominations as a whole shall provide broad representation across academic disciplines, such as Health Sciences, Arts and Sciences, and other schools and colleges, and shall endeavor to balance continuity and turnover of representation.”

How Nominees were selected

Executive Committee seats were allocated on the basis of academic geography. The eight elected SEC positions were allocated as follows:

- School of Medicine – 2 positions
- College of Arts and Sciences – 2 positions
- College Engineering – 1 position
- Other health science colleges (Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work) – 1 position
- College of the Environment and College of Built Environment – 1 position
- Professional schools (Law, Business, Education, Evans, Information, ROTC) – 1 position

The Nominating Committee sent a request for nominations to all current and incoming Senators, listing the eight contested positions; self-nominations were received, all were placed in their corresponding positions. The Committee then added to the list as needed.

The faculty council chairs were selected based on a list of upcoming issues that were given to us by the faculty senate vice chair.

Members of the nominating committee:
Mike Townsend, School of Law and committee chair
Bill Erdly, Representing UW Bothell
Lauren Montgomery, Representing UW Tacoma
Paul Sutton, Representing the School of Medicine
Ken Yocom, Representing College of the Environment and College of Built Environments
Joey Burgess, Council Support Analyst
George Sandison, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
Class B Legislation regarding an open access policy

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.

Open Access Policy presentation can also be viewed on the Scholarly Publishing & Open Access website.

Recommended University of Washington Open Access Policy

Faculty Code and Governance
Chapter 54 Open Access Policy

Section 54-31 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.

Section 54-41 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.

Section 54-51 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.
Section 54-61 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 Institutional 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 institutional repository or notify the University that the article will be available elsewhere on an open access basis.

Section 54-71 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.

Submitted by:
Joe Janes, Vice Chair Elect
May 7, 2018

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2018

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
May 17, 2018
Legislation proposing changes to Faculty Code, Chapter 24 Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

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. It should be noted that this does not affect the voting procedure for merit described in Section 24-55.

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) superior 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.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 2, 2018

Approved by
Faculty Senate
April 19, 2018

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2018

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
May 17, 2018
Legislation proposing changes to Faculty Code, Chapter 24 Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

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, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal
opportunity may shall 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.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 2, 2018

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 19, 2018

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2018

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
May 17, 2018
Class C Resolution requesting that the Deans and Elected Faculty Councils assess the extent of faculty effort expended to generate funding proposals to further the missions of the University of Washington.

Overview:

I. Fast Facts - Frequently Asked Questions
   a. What is this resolution about? This resolution seeks to confirm or refute whether there is adequate UW support for employment required faculty effort to write grants.
   b. Why is this resolution coming forward? This resolution addresses a problem which was identified last spring in a survey of faculty in the SOM and SPH used to identify potential faculty senate issues.
   c. Wasn’t this issue addressed by the “Faculty Effort Task Force Report”? No, that Task Force focused on clarifying rules and processes to discuss and document faculty support. The report specifically excluded addressing the question of whether support was adequate.
   d. To which schools does this resolution apply: Schools of Medicine and Public Health (because this issue was identified in a survey of those two schools).
   e. How big an issue is this? Many faculty in the Schools of Medicine and Public health are appointed without tenure (WOT). Their jobs require them to write grants. For full time employees, the University is required to cover the costs of time spent writing grants. The survey which identified this issue had over 600 respondents, 68% of the SOM and 90% of SPH faculty noted this to be an issue. Ensuring adequate support in important for continued employment. In addition, inaccurate federal faculty effort reporting is a potential compliance problem for the faculty member and for the UW.
   f. Does this resolution propose a specific outcome? Beyond asking that the problem be examined and reporting back to the Senate and Provost, it does not propose a specific outcome or support. It only seeks to confirm or refute the existence of a problem and if the problem exists characterize the magnitude and urge the deans and elected faculty councils to propose a path forward.

II. Statement of the Problem: The University of Washington is a leading research institution. Faculty play a crucial role in creating knowledge by designing, seeking funding for and implementing research projects. The recent Task Force on Faculty Effort report lays out a constructive approach to effort reporting (FEC Task Force Report). The Task Force report, however, lays out a process that could result in faculty getting adequate support for writing grants or could also lead to a reduction in the faculty member’s FTE. For this reason, it is important that additional information on the effort to write grants be far better characterized. Because the available data come from a survey of School of Medicine and School of Public Health Faculty the resolution is narrowly tailored to address this issue first in the Schools of Medicine and Public Health.

The Task Force’s report had a number of key findings:
   a. Specifically excluded assessing whether there was adequate support for writing proposals (p5);
   b. Was explicit that faculty should be paid for time spend writing proposals (p17);
   c. Noted that lack of funding “could potentially foster underestimates of proposal preparation activity in FEC reports” (p 5);
   d. Noted that one option if there is not sufficient support is to reduce faculty members FTE support; and
   e. Encouraged a “collaborative effort between deans, elected faculty councils and chairs to assess average faculty effort on proposal writing” (p 5).
   f. Made an explicit recommendation for conversations between chairs and unit heads and faculty members.

The proposed Class C Resolution seeks to encourage a systemic approach to creating an evidence base around the extent of effort required for faculty to write proposals.

III. Goals:
   a. Confirm or refute the Senate Faculty Survey Result identifying a substantial gap between faculty effort to write proposals and support provided.
   b. Assess faculty effort to write proposals either as PI’s or as collaborators.
   c. Provide, based on evidence, general guidelines for how much time it likely takes faculty to write proposals which can be used as a key element in discussions on faculty support / faculty effort as per Recommendation 7.
IV. Key Data Needed to Assess Faculty Effort for the School of Medicine and School of Public Health
   a. Analysis of Office of Sponsored Programs Data (e.g. for the prior year): 1) Number of new and
      continuation proposals submitted by faculty (by faculty rank, grantors, grant type, total direct and
      indirect funds requested, and grant duration) (These data should specify if the faculty are
      included as PI or as a collaborator); 2) success rate for new proposals;
   b. Departmental support for the prior year by faculty member for writing grants or other unsponsored
      activities (excluding funding received for teaching, advising, clinical or other service);
   c. Assessment of level of support for each faculty member by number of new grants submitted
      either as PI or as a collaborator;
   d. Survey (collected anonymously because of the risks of underestimation (see Task Force Report
      P 5)) of all faculty members submitting grants through OSP on the faculty members estimates of
      effort required for each type of grant they have submitted or participated in over the prior year.
   e. Consider qualitative surveys (e.g. focus groups) to assess level of support and level of effort.

V. Process
The Deans of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health are requested to work with their respective
Elected Faculty Councils to review the request and the reasons for the request and to provide the
above data for consideration by the Dean and the EFC. Deans and EFC’s are welcome to modify the
study / data collection so long as the results meet the spirit and intent of the request. The Deans and
EFC are asked to provide within one year a report on: 1) The results of the above surveys; 2)
Address the question of whether there is sufficient support provided; 3) The estimated effort to write
common major grant applications (e.g. NIH); and 4) If there is a gap between support and effort,
recommend a path forward to address the gap.

Appendix

Faculty Effort Task Force Report Recommendation 7.

Recommendation 7:

Faculty members and chairs should be explicitly encouraged and supported to regularly engage in
discussion of the type and level of support appropriate to fulfill goals and expectations mutually agreed
and set for the faculty member’s non-sponsored activities. This includes preparation of new or competitive
renewal grant proposals.

The process for negotiating support of non-sponsored activities and ensuring clarity of any agreement
reached is advised to include the following process steps:
Dean-level RCR distribution policy transparency to facilitate chair budget planning;
Departmental budget transparency between a chair and their faculty to facilitate individual negotiation of
non-sponsored activity support;

A first negotiation of non-sponsored activity to occur at the time of a faculty member’s initial appointment
and with continuing faculty at each annual or multi-year performance review. To ensure clarity of a
negotiated agreement between the parties, issuance of a signed written record of the agreement made
regarding distribution of the faculty member’s effort and funding or other compensation options in support
of their non-sponsored activity; and A conciliation process that complies with the Faculty Code in the
event agreement between the parties cannot reached.
Resolution:

WHEREAS ensuring the University of Washington (UW) remains competitive as a leading research university requires the ability to generate competitive proposals—particularly for applications to the US Government, and

WHEREAS Provost Baldasty and Senate Chair (2016-2017) Barsness charged a Task Force on Faculty Effort to produce a report (Final Report Task Force on Faculty Effort Certification (TFFEC)) (Task Force Report) addressing clarification of rules for FEC and the process for discussions between chairs and faculty on level of support for faculty to prepare proposals;
—Whereas many UW faculty have, as explicit parts of their jobs, the requirement to generate research proposals, and UW Policy requires that the cost of proposal preparation by full time faculty be covered (TFFEC page 17), and

WHEREAS a survey of over 600 School of Medicine (SOM) and School of Public Health (SPH) faculty showed SOM faculty reported spending on average 15% to 28% FTE on non-sponsored activities and receiving on average 9.6% FTE support from their department. SPH faculty reported spending on average 14% to 30% FTE on non-sponsored activities and receiving on average 10.6% FTE support from their department, and

WHEREAS 68% of SOM faculty and 90% of SPH faculty report their departments do not provide them with additional FTE support when their level of effort on non-sponsored activities exceeds the level of non-sponsored effort typically supported by their department, and

WHEREAS the TFFEC made multiple recommendations including explicitly endorsing open discussions between faculty and chairs on type and level of support for non-sponsored activities (Recommendation 7), and

WHEREAS Recommendation 7 of the TFFEC notes that outcomes of the faculty and chair discussions may include, but are not limited to, provision of adequate support to generate proposals as may be required to fulfill job expectation or reduction in the faculty members full time equivalent (FTE) support but with full knowledge of the usual costs for proposal preparation, and

WHEREAS the Task Force, as a proactive measure “encourages a collaborative effort between deans, elected faculty councils and chairs to assess average faculty effort on proposal writing within their units,” therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the UW Faculty Senate strongly urges the Deans and Elected Faculty Councils of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health to: 1) assess the effort required by faculty to generate proposals; 2) assess whether there is adequate support to generate proposals; and 3) if the support is not adequate to recommend a path forward.

The specifics of the proposal which is requested to be provided within one year to the Faculty Senate and Provost should include:

I. Key Data Needed to Assess Faculty Effort for the School of Medicine and School of Public Health

a. Analysis of Office of Sponsored Programs Data (e.g. for the prior year): 1) Number of new and continuation proposals submitted by faculty (by faculty rank, grantors, grant type, total direct and indirect funds requested, and grant duration) (These data should specify if the faculty are included as PI or as a collaborator); 2) success rate for new proposals;
b. Extent of departmental salary support for writing grants or other unsponsored activities (excluding funding received for teaching, advising, clinical or other service) for the prior year by faculty member;
c. Assessment of level of support for each faculty member by number of new grants submitted either as PI or as a collaborator;
d. Survey (collected anonymously because of the risks of underestimation (see Task Force Report P 5)) of all faculty members submitting grants through OSP on the faculty members estimates of effort required for each type of grant they have submitted or participated in over the prior year.
e. Consider qualitative data gathering (e.g. focus groups) to assess level of support and level of effort.
II. Process

The Deans of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health are requested to work with their respective Elected Faculty Councils to review the request and the reasons for the request and to provide the above data for consideration by the Deans and the EFC. Deans and EFC’s are welcome to modify the study / data collection so long as the results meet the spirit and intent of the request. The Deans and EFC are asked to provide within one year a report to the Faculty Senate and Provost on: 1) The results of the above surveys; 2) Address the question of whether faculty receive sufficient support for writing proposals; 3) The estimated effort to write common major grant applications (e.g. NIH); and 4) If there is a gap between support and effort, recommend a path forward to address the gap.

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
May 17, 2018
Class C Resolution: Protecting the Faculty Code

Preamble

The Faculty Code details the rights and responsibilities of faculty members. It is the legally enforceable governing document and changes to the Code require Class A legislation that must be approved by a vote of the Senate Executive Committee, a vote of the full Faculty Senate, approval of the University President, and finally a vote of all eligible members of the faculty.

On February 12, 2016, substantive changes were made to the Faculty Code without Class A legislation and without the approval of the Senate Executive Committee or members of the Senate. The changes were made to Section 25-71, which deals with Standards of Conduct, and were substantive and consequential, altering protections and procedures for handling allegations of wrongdoing on the part of a faculty member.

Instead of the required process for revising the Code, the 2016 alterations were made by the Rules Coordination Office, an administration unit which, according to the UW Policy Directory, “publishes simple housekeeping amendments to the Faculty Code and Governance that correct typographical errors; make address, name, or contact information changes; or clarify language without changing its effect.” (emphasis added)

The 2016 alterations may or may not have been reasonable and important. That is not the issue. The fact that the changes were substantive and introduced without the knowledge and participation of the Senate and Senate Executive Committee is the issue. This represents a clear violation of the Faculty Code itself and a threat to the principle of shared governance; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Senate calls upon the Rules Coordination Office to reverse the changes to Section 25-71 made on February 12, 2016 until such time as the Senate, SEC, and President Cauce can evaluate the issues and complete Class A legislation; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Senate Executive Committee, which is charged with interpreting the code, is instructed to monitor implementation of this request and report to the Senate at its second meeting next year.

Submitted by:
Janelle Taylor, Faculty Senator, Arts and Sciences
Brad Holt, Faculty Senator, Engineering
Mark Jenkins, Faculty Senator, Arts and Sciences
Gail Stygall, Faculty Senator, Arts and Sciences

Motion failed:
Faculty Senate
May 17, 2018
**Addendum:** Below is a table showing Section 25-71 before and after the changes recorded on February 12, 2016. Both are from the Internet Archive WayBack machine. One was recorded on January 19, 2016, the other on February 19, 2016. There have been no further changes to Section 25-71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 19, 2016 version from Internet Archive WayBack machine (url below)</th>
<th>February 19, 2018 version from Internet Archive WayBack machine (url below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 25-71 Standard of Conduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 25-71 Standard of Conduct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The University is an institution having special public responsibility for providing instruction in higher education, for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research, and for providing related services to the community. As a center of learning, the University also has the obligation to maintain conditions which are conducive to freedom of inquiry and expression in the maximum degree compatible with the orderly conduct of its functions. For these purposes the University is governed by rules and regulations which safeguard its functions, and which, at the same time, protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. All members of the academic community, including members of the faculty, have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments.</td>
<td>A. The University is an institution having special public responsibility for providing instruction in higher education, for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research, and for providing related services to the community. As a center of learning, the University also has the obligation to maintain conditions which are conducive to freedom of inquiry and expression in the maximum degree compatible with the orderly conduct of its functions. For these purposes the University is governed by rules and regulations which safeguard its functions, and which, at the same time, protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. All members of the academic community, including members of the faculty, have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. If a member of the faculty is alleged to have violated a rule or regulation of the University, its schools, colleges, or departments, the department chair or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college shall fully inform the faculty member of the nature and specific content of the alleged violation and shall offer to discuss the alleged violation with the faculty member and with the party raising the issue. The faculty member and the party raising the issue may each be accompanied by one person. The matter may be concluded at this point by the mutual consent of all parties.</td>
<td>B. In cases concerning allegations of research misconduct against a member of the faculty, the procedures outlined in Executive Order No. 61 shall apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. If he or she so wishes, the department chair, the dean, or the faculty member may initiate conciliatory proceedings at any time by contacting the University Ombud as provided in Chapter 27, Section 27-41.</td>
<td>C. In cases concerning allegations of unlawful discrimination, harassment or sexual harassment, or retaliation against a member of the faculty, where the dean has determined under Executive Order No. 31 that the allegations require an institutional investigation, the matter shall be referred to the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. If a mutually agreeable resolution is not achieved under Subsections B or C of this section, and if the dean (after consultation in the case of a departmentalized school or college with the department chair and the faculty member) determines that the alleged violation is of</td>
<td>D. In cases where a member of the faculty is alleged to have violated another rule or regulation of the University, its schools, colleges, or departments, the following procedure shall apply:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal statement of charges that might lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension for more than one quarter, he or she shall follow one of the following procedures:

1. In cases concerning allegations of unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment, the dean shall request an investigation by the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO) as provided in Administrative Policy Statement 463.

2. In cases concerning allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct as defined in Section 25-51, the dean shall proceed as provided in Executive Order No. 61, "Policy for Addressing Allegations of Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct."

3. In all other kinds of cases the dean shall appoint a special investigating committee of three faculty members who are not directly involved in the matter being considered. The committee shall assist the dean in the informal and confidential gathering of information and documentation and shall advise the dean in its interpretation. If as a result of the foregoing investigation the dean concludes that further action is not merited, then the matter shall be dropped (although a faculty member aggrieved as a result of these activities has recourse to the conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27 and to the adjudicative proceedings described in Chapter 28, Section 28-32, Subsection A).

1. The department chair or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college shall inform the faculty member of the nature and specific content of the alleged violation and shall offer to discuss the alleged violation with the faculty member and with the party raising the issue. The faculty member and the party raising the issue may each be accompanied by one person. The matter may be concluded at this point by mutual consent of all parties.

2. If he or she so wishes, the department chair, the dean, or the faculty member may initiate conciliatory proceedings at any time by contacting the University Ombud as provided in Chapter 27.

3. If a mutually agreeable resolution is not achieved under Subsections D.1 or D.2 of this section, and if the dean (after consultation in the case of a departmentalized school or college with the department chair and the faculty member) determines that the alleged violation is of sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal statement of charges that might lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension for more than one quarter, then:

   a. The dean shall appoint a special investigating committee of three faculty members who are not directly involved in the matter being considered.

   b. The committee shall assist the dean in the informal and confidential gathering of information and documentation and shall advise the dean in its interpretation.

   c. If as a result of the foregoing investigation the dean concludes that further action is not merited, then the matter shall be dropped.

   d. A faculty member aggrieved as a result of these activities has potential recourse through the conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27 and the adjudicative proceedings described in Chapter 28, Section 28-32, Subsection A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**E. If, after engaging in the procedures specified in Subsection D.2 or D.3 above, the dean concludes that further action is warranted, he or she shall deliver to the Provost a written record stating that reasonable cause exists to adjudicate charges of wrongdoing brought against the faculty member, with enough of the underlying facts to inform the Provost of the reasons for this conclusion. Upon filing of the written report with the Provost, the case shall be decided in the manner prescribed in Chapter 28.**


**Sources:**

January 19, 2016 version: Internet Archive WayBack Machine


February 19, 2016 version: Internet Archive WayBack Machine

Population Health Initiative

How we describe population health

> Revolving around three pillars:

- Human health
- Environmental resilience
- Social and economic equity
How is the initiative engaging faculty?

Through initiative governance

> Driven by a 30-member interdisciplinary and tri-campus executive council
> Annual rotations to ensure broad representation
> Current and past faculty representation from:
  - Arts & Sciences
  - Bothell
  - Built Environments
  - Education
  - Engineering
  - Environment
  - Evans
  - Law
  - Medicine
  - Pharmacy
  - Public Health
  - Social Work
  - Tacoma
Through pilot research grants

> Innovations addressing critical components of the three grand challenges put forth by initiative
> Encourage development of new interdisciplinary collaborations among UW investigators
> Awardees represent 42 different departments on across all three campuses

Through external partnering work

> Case study:
  - Aga Khan University
    > International internship agreement for students
    > Solidifying next areas for institutional partnership
  - AKU Medical College of East Africa
    > Have launched a distinguished lecture series, on-the-ground training to build local capacity for clinical research, and joint grant submissions (three successful)
  - Aga Khan Development Network
    > Six exploratory partnering discussions underway or soon to begin with UW faculty
Through internally-focused projects

> Experiential, Interdisciplinary, and Community-Based Training and Education
  > Create more experiential education and training opportunities
  > Strengthen needed interdisciplinary connections across schools
  > Bolster community partnerships and engagement

> Population Health Fellowships
  > Investment of training and resources for undergraduate-plus-one students, graduate students, and pre- and post-doctoral trainees

> Grant Development
  > Better support the development and submission of complex, interdisciplinary, and/or collaborative population health proposals

> Promotion and Tenure
  > Improve alignment of criteria to realities of interdisciplinary and collaborative research, teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and community engagement

Building a home for population health
Opening in 2020

> A hub for collaboration across disciplines at the University
> Also the home for the Department of Global Health, Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, and portions of the School of Public Health
Goals of the UW Faculty 2050 Survey

- Identify support for shared values
- Identify how faculty perceive merit, promotion, and tenure criteria in relation to their careers
- Identify support for ways in which diversity and inclusion could be strengthened
- Identify how faculty perceive the role of the institution as a public good
- Identify how faculty careers are perceived as changing
- Identify other areas where faculty identify challenges and opportunities in their academic careers

Survey Structure

- 10 closed response questions (1 question included 6 sub-prompts)
  - Questions about: UW Core Values; Types of Teaching, Service, Research; Influences of MPT Criteria on Teaching, Service, Research; Demographics (Rank, Campus included)
  - Response Rate: 98.97% was the highest response rate, 95.03% was the lowest response rate

- 9 open response questions (‘short’ answer)
  - Questions about: Views on the UW; How to Improve MPT Criteria for Teaching, Service, Research; Ways to Strength DE; UW’s Contributions to the Public; Faculty Policies; Looking Ahead for New Faculty, the Next Decade.
  - Response Rate: 85.08% was the highest response rate, 31.90% was the lowest response rate.

Survey Demographics

- 583 Unique Responses
- 515 Seattle, 37 Tacoma, 15 Bothell
- 235 Professors, 143 Associate Professors, 79 Assistant Professors, 30 or less in all other categories (e.g., research professor, emeritus, lecturer)
- 278 Females, 259 Males, 4 Other, 42 Unclassified
- 75 underrepresented in their discipline
- 9 self-identified LGBTQIA+
- 9 self-identified racial/ethnic minorities
- Other self-identified social categories: first generation college student, first generation immigrant to the US, parents.
How faculty view the UW

“List three words that capture UW from your perspective as a member of the faculty”

Based on these results:

Respondents most strongly believe that our role as a public institution of higher education, the ability to inspire and innovate, and academic freedom capture UW core values.

Responses suggest that we could strengthen efforts to build a diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment as a UW core value.

Respondents seem the least sure that human centered learning and teaching and strong and sustained shared governance are UW core values. (note that some commented they were unsure what we meant by human centered learning)

What do you think is most important for faculty to be thinking about in the next decade?

Funding: “How can we sustain the teaching and research loads without increasing state funding? In other words, what can we do to impress upon the [Washington State] public the need to fund the university? Are we comfortable with private donors funding research agendas?”

Teaching: “How to assure the highest quality teaching for undergraduates. [W]e need to graduate undergraduates who are fully prepared for a challenging future, with strong communication skills and a deep appreciation for learning.”

Changing Culture & Structure: “The shift in demographics of student interests, in part governed by the struggles of graduates during the great recession and in part governed by the changing world around us, is a big challenge. How is the university to remain vibrant given those shifts or how we can impact those shifts? We cannot let the humanities be hollowed out...”
What do you think is most important for faculty to be thinking about in the next decade?

Engaging the Public: “As a public institution, we need be engaged with communities (local, national, international) in ways that support real needs/problem-solving through teaching, research and service.”

Increasing Diversity: “[E]nhanced teaching skills to train the next generation. [W]e need female/diverse leaders and talent - as role models and mentors for next generation, doctors for our diverse patient population, and to simply increase pool of representation and talent. I strongly believe the future depends on this diversity to enhance talent and fairness.”

---

Next Steps - Data Collection and Analysis

Several respondents noted issue with survey design:
Questions seem biased in language, leading
Scales, questions were non-equivalent
Jargon was not explained (e.g., what is meant by “human-centered”?)
New faculty understandably unsure how to answer PMT questions

Surveys were a good start, but we can do more:
Focus groups
Semi-structured interviews
Further analysis of survey data