

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, January 26, 2012, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Susan Astley at 2:33 p.m.; the agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Report of the Chair. **[Exhibit A]**

Senate Chair Astley referred the senators to her written report. She reminded attendees of the logistics for being recognized to speak and mentioned the full agenda. She asked the Senators for their assistance in respecting the time parameters of the meeting.

There were no questions to Astley about her report.

3. Report of the President – President Michael K. Young

In his remarks, President Young updated the Senate on developing discussions and bills in the State legislature with respect to higher education. President Obama spoke in his recent State of the Union address about rising college tuition. The University of Washington responded in an Op-Ed to the Seattle Times, highlighting the changing proportion of funding coming from the state versus tuition, and is also communicating with officials in the federal government to provide information about the situation in Washington State.

President Young announced that Dean O'Donnell, Engineering, has announced his resignation; there will be upcoming searches for that position and three other Deans in Nursing, Arts and Sciences, Dentistry.

There were no questions or comments in response to the President's report.

4. Opportunities for Questions on Reports and Requests for Information.

- a. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of January 9, 2012.
 - i. Approval of the November 14, 2011, SEC minutes.
 - ii. Approval of the December 1, 2011, Faculty Senate minutes.
 - iii. Report of Faculty Council Activities. **[Exhibit B]**
- b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. **[Exhibit C]**
- c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. **[Exhibit D]**
- d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. **[Exhibit E]**

Senate Chair Astley invited SCPB chair Gail Stygall to present some additional information about her report. Stygall highlighted two models of retention raises that have occurred within the faculty. The School of Medicine uses retention routinely with about one third of their faculty receiving retention annually. This rate compares with about 2-3% of faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences receiving retentions. There appears to be an increase in pre-emptive retention offers within the University. Stygall has asked Secretary of the Faculty Killien for a report on departmental policies about faculty involvement in retention offers. Holt reminded Senators that there is a default policy in the *Faculty Code* that requires faculty consultation prior to making a retention offer. Stygall also noted that there is no language in the *Faculty Code* about the criteria or process that should be used in considering pre-emptive offers.

In response to Stygall's report, Senator Christoph Giebel reviewed his understanding of the history of retention emphasizing his ongoing concern that retention raises are being allowed when there is no equal percentage of regular merit being awarded. He remarked that he is pleased there will be a joint faculty and administrative committee to discuss possible revisions to the salary policy [EO64]. Chair

Astley reported that a first meeting of this group has been set for February 6 and she will be providing regular updates to the Senate.

No additional questions were asked about reports from the Senate Executive Committee or Senate officers.

5. Consent Agenda.
Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. **[Exhibit F]**
The consent agenda was approved.

6. Memorial Resolution.

The memorial resolution was presented by Senate Vice Chair Jim Gregory and approved by a standing vote of the faculty.

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:

Lecturer Helen Denise Adams of Accounting who died on November 25, 2011, after having served the University since 1992.

Professor Emeritus Jeanne Quint Benoliel of Psychosocial and Community Health who died on January 23, 2012, after having serving the University since 1970.

Professor Emeritus Kenneth Clark of Physics and Earth & Space Sciences who died on December 28, 2011, after having served the University since 1948.

Professor Emeritus Robert Fletcher of Law who died on December 10, 2011, after having served the University since 1956.

Associate Professor Vanick Galstaun of Drama who died on May 28, 2011, after having served the University since 1961.

Former Faculty Senate Chair and Professor Emeritus Donna Gerstenberger of English who died on January 16, 2012, after having served the University since 1960.

Professor Emeritus Alvin Merendino of Surgery who died on September 10, 2011, after having served the University since 1948.

Professor and Dean Emeritus Sidney Nelson of Medicinal Chemistry and the School of Pharmacy who died on December 9, 2011, after having served the University since 1977.

Professor Emeritus William "Robbie" Robertson of Pediatrics who died on November 30, 2011, after having served the University since 1963.

Professor Emeritus Cyrus E. Rubin of Medicine who died on December 19, 2011, after having served the University since 1954.

Professor Emeritus Davida Y. Teller of Psychology and Physiology & Biophysics who died on October 12, 2011, after having served the University since 1965.

7. Announcements
There was none.

8. Unfinished Business.
There was none.

9. New Business.

a. Nomination of Candidates for 2012-13 Faculty Senate Vice Chair

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Vice Chair James Gregory presented the nominees for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for 2012-13. The nominees were: Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Sciences and Mechanical Engineering; Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics.

There were no additional nominations from the floor and nominations were closed.

b. 2012-13 Faculty Senate Vice Chair Candidates' Presentations. **[Exhibit G]**

The nominees each presented remarks to the Senate.

Following the remarks, Senate Chair Astley announced that the vice chair election will occur electronically within a week. There was no objection from the floor. Election results will be announced via E-mail following the election certification.

c. Class A Legislation – First Consideration. **[Exhibit H]**

David Takeuchi, Chair, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs.

Title: Code Revisions to Chapters 24-31 and 24-32: Revisions related to appointment and promotion of faculty.

The motion was made by Vice Chair James Gregory. David Takeuchi., chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) and Luis Fraga, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and Presidential designee to FCMA presented the background and rationale for the proposed legislation http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/blog/fcma_presentation.pdf. They highlighted the goal of the legislation was to align the University's commitment to inclusion and *the Faculty Code's* statements about promotion and tenure. The presentation included information that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) had raised concerns about the proposed legislation, including that involvement in diversity work would become mandatory for promotion. They asked that the Senators share their perspectives on this matter.

In the discussion that followed, Senators were reminded that this is the last opportunity to make any amendments to the proposed legislation. A statement from a member of FCFA indicated that Council recommended against the proposed legislation but instead recommended inserting a statement of diversity as an academic value into Section 24-33 of the *Faculty Code*. Another FCFA member comment that the Council was not speaking against diversity, but concerned about placement in the *Code*, and also questioned if inserting diversity in the language would be effective in changing the lack of value for this work by reviewers. FCFA was also concerned about starting a precedence of adding more specifics to this section of the *Code*.

Sandra Silberstein presented a formal endorsement of the proposed legislation from the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, arguing that just because the legislation will not change promotion standards, we still need it. The statement read:

“As you know over the past several years FCWA has released three reports on three major studies of UW faculty. One thing these surveys have documented is the substantial contributions underrepresented faculty are called upon to make to their disciplines (certainly in service, cultivating new voices, but also of course in disciplinary scholarship), as well as to this community because of their status and expertise as underrepresented faculty. Obviously 'minority' faculty are not the only scholars at UW who might focus on diversity issues, but there is a particular burden that falls on these colleagues. Contributions to diversity is part of our institutional mission and mission statement. It is something that we should explicitly announce that we acknowledge.

From the point of view of College Council deliberations, it seems to me that it would be very helpful to have an explicit acknowledgment that diversity contributions can and should be recognized and credited.”

Additional discussion included the following comments in support of the proposed legislation. The legislation shows that the University does not just recognize diversity work but takes it seriously. Faculty commitments to diverse communities may prevent them from moving forward with promotion. It can be hard to include 'extra service work' in promotion consideration and such work then becomes marginalized or interpreted as trying to make a special case for someone.

Comments made in opposition to the proposed legislation included the perspective that diversity is already taken seriously, that the language would be interpreted as a mandatory expectation for all faculty, and that it could be used to stifle academic freedom (e.g. someone who's scholarly work addressed challenges to diversity laws).

Other comments noted that this is a complicated issue. Several Senators voiced disagreement with how the legislation was written, citing confusion about who the legislation addressed (i.e., candidates or reviewers) or that diversity was not clearly defined. Others remarked, in response to the suggestion that language about diversity as an academic value be added to Section 24-33, that doing so privileges diversity over other values or that there are additional values not included in the *Code*.

A proposed amendment to reword the proposed legislation failed to pass. Failing amendment: Section 24-32, new paragraph, strike "and given recognition in the evaluation of the faculty member's qualifications."

It was moved by Senator Jack Lee to refer the matter to a special committee, to include representatives of FCMA and FCFA, to recommend a substitute motion that considered the views expressed in the discussion. The motion was seconded and passed by a vote of the Senate.

Senate Chair Astley announced she would appoint the committee to include but not be limited to members from both FCFA and FCMA and would ask them to bring the matter back to the next Senate meeting on March 1, 2012.

- d. Update Report on University of Washington Retirement Plan (UWRP).
Bob Breidenthal, Member, Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement and Fund Review Committee introduced Katy Dwyer, Executive Director of Benefits to provide an update as shown in **Exhibit I**. Recommendations to Provost Cauce can be found in **Exhibit J**.

Questions from the faculty indicated substantial confusion about what changes will be coming, when, and the implications for individual faculty. Specific questions included will there be options, are social choice funds included, what happens to existing funds, what fees may be involved in moving funds? It was suggested that this change will be "huge," but that a goal is for lower fees and to "put more money in your pocket." Senators were urged to attend and encourage their colleagues to attend upcoming forums. The final decision is in the hands of the Provost and the Regents. Senators were asked to send comments to benefits@uw.edu.

10. Good of the Order.
There was none.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate

Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Susan Astley, Professor, Epidemiology and Pediatrics

Welcome Provost Cauce.

- I would like to extend a warm welcome to Provost Ana Mari Cauce. Provost Cauce's term started January 2, 2012. We look forward to a productive new year.
- Faculty expressed strong support for President Young's selection of Ana Mari Cauce.
- Members of the SEC and faculty expressed deep concern regarding the search *process*. What was initially proposed to be an open search for an internal candidate, became a closed search when most of the finalist candidates expressed they would drop out if their names were released as finalists. On November 17, 2011, President Young [announced](#) Dr. Ana Mari Cauce as his preferred candidate for UW Provost. He also announced he would set up opportunities for members of the University community to hear Dr. Cauce discuss her plans as our chief academic officer, to ask questions, and to share with him any feedback University members would like him to consider. This public process took place the week of November 19th, prior to formal confirmation of the appointment. President Young announced his decision to appoint Dr. Cauce as Provost on December 6.
- At the December 1, 2011 Senate meeting, the Senate passed a Class C Resolution "[Concerning the Provost Search Process](#)" expressing its clear expectation that future searches for academic administrators include open public forums with finalists.

Class C Resolution "Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy" Passed by Senate.

- A Class C Resolution on "[Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy](#)" was introduced by Senator Giebel at the October 2011 Senate meeting. Discussion ensued with members voicing both support and concern for the Resolution. Following discussion, a motion was approved to refer the Resolution to a committee. The committee's charge was to bring a revised motion for action to the December 2011 Senate meeting.
- Zoe Barsness, chair of the committee presented the revised motion to the Senate. The [resolution](#) passed with a unanimous vote of the Senate.
- Discussions are underway to establish a Faculty Salary Policy Workgroup to address immediate and long-term salary policy issues.

Proposed Changes to the University of Washington Retirement Plan (UWRP)

- The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Gerry Philipsen, Chair) has been working with the Benefits Office and the Fund Review Committee (FRC) on proposed changes to the [UWRP](#) (see [FCBR minutes](#) for Nov 1, 2010 through April 25, 2011). The FCBR submitted a [memo](#) to Provost Wadden on Dec 28, 2011 requesting the Office of the Provost elicit comments from Plan participants regarding the proposed changes before approving the changes. Bob Breidenthal, FCBR and Katy Dwyer, Executive Director of Benefits provided an update to the SEC on Jan 9, 2012. They will also provide the Senate with an update later in today's meeting. And two information forums were to be held on January 20, 2012, hosted by the Benefits Office but were postponed due to inclement weather. All UWRP participants were invited to attend to learn about the changes, ask questions, and provide feedback. Benefits will be sending another E-mail as soon as the information and webcast sessions are rescheduled.

Class A Legislation, Proposed Code Revisions Related to Faculty Appointment and Promotion

- The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) presented [Class A Legislation](#) to the SEC on Jan 9, 2012. Their proposed changes in the *Faculty Code* in Section 24-32 are designed to allow that the work done by faculty in research, teaching, and service that enriches diversity at the UW be recognized in the processes of appointment and promotion. The SEC approved an amended version of the proposal be submitted for Faculty Senate consideration. This item is on today's Senate Agenda.

Faculty Council Activities Senate Executive Committee

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:

1. Policy for handling students enrolled in programs selected for termination or that have been terminated.
 2. Enrollment restrictions imposed on students in fee-based programs.
 3. Academic credit for life experiences.
 4. Satisfactory progress guidelines.
-

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

1. Will work with the Provost and Fund Review Committee to review a Request for Proposals for University of Washington Retirement Plan changes.
 2. Monitoring proposed legislation related to benefits and retirement
 3. Review benefits costs including health, life and long-term disability and retirement plan costs and personal cost options and ensure consistency and comparability with best practices for such plans.
 4. Provide through the faculty senate process information to faculty on costs and potential alternatives for university-based and SEBB insurance
-

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

1. Adjudication Issues in response to SEC resolution. Three sub-issues have been identified:
 - a. Interaction of EO61 (OSI) and the informal dispute resolution process in the *Faculty Code*.
 - b. Ability of Deans to assign disciplinary measures without adjudication.
 - c. Notification of rights during dispute resolution process, and rights of appeal.
FCFA is currently in the issue discussion
 2. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.
 3. Adjudication Revision – A general reworking of the adjudication process, with ties to item 2, but broader in scope. This is presently in the hands of a task force and will come to FCFA for review.
 4. Senate Restructuring Cleanup – Alternate delegates for Senators, SEC nomination process, SEC Faculty Council Chair elections, double Senators (elected and *ex officio*).
-

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

FCMA has drafted and proposed changes to the *Faculty Code* in order to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions.

Faculty Council on Research

FCR is continuing to monitor and promote activities strengthening the research environment at the University (our goal as stated in October, 2010).

One of FCR's activities is to review proposals from UW researchers containing restrictions of various sorts (publication policies, personnel, data transfer, etc). FCR dealt with one such proposal of this sort fall quarter.

At FCR's monthly meetings over the fall, FCR has heard several presentations by the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Research personnel on items including challenges for the Research at UW, changes in the Grants Information Memoranda, conflict of interest training, revision of federal Human Subjects regulations, the impact of Activity Based Budgeting model on research, and changes in compliance rules for human and animal research, and the "Request for Outside Work" form.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students, including recent topics on admissions policies and standards, campus renovations, revisions within the Student Conduct Code, student-athlete issues (sports psychology and missed class time), and the faculty appeal board.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

FCTL continues to discuss strategies for faculty development in the use of educational technology, issues of using technology to increase class size, and increasing student engagement. Current agenda items include technology priorities across campus (Canvas, Tegrity and e-texts), competency based learning models, Classroom Support Services issues, student engagement and discussions with the Senate Chair and Provost on their sense of priorities in the area of teaching and learning.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

1. Conducting a review of tri-campus information dissemination and faculty member representation between the three faculty governance structures.
 2. Examined processes for issues related to student conduct code violations and how they are disseminated and treated if/when student seeks cross-campus enrollment.
 3. Examination of processes for reviewing cross-campus degrees/minors.
 4. Coordinated Faculty Senate communication of tri-campus awareness regarding governance, policies, new issues, budget, etc.
 5. Budget and legislative representation related to tri-campus strategic planning.
-

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

FCUFS continues to examine current construction projects, including the Stadium, HUB, housing west of 15th, Intellectual House, and police relocation from the Bryant Building, as well as the impact of Sound Transit, 520 bridge, bicycles, and the Burke-Gilman Trail.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

1. Implementation of the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence, as approved by the Faculty Senate. Fund website is located at https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift?source_typ=3&source=LIBFAC.
 2. Facilitation of Open Access publishing at the UW. The FCUL will continue to seek to engage faculty and students in submitting documentation of their past, current, and future research (i.e., archival and grey literature) to the open access repository ResearchWorks.
 3. Strengthening educational partnerships/ the development of a sustainable academic business plan. The FCUL will continue to investigate ways to bring emerging Libraries technologies and initiatives into UW courses. The strategic plan will consider a wide variety of issues, including fee-based and distance courses and programs.
 4. Employment of multi-institutional approaches. The FCUL will provide input to continuing Libraries efforts to lead and leverage multi-institutional Libraries initiatives, related to e.g., the Hathi Trust, the Western Storage Trust, and Orbis Cascade activities.
 5. Libraries issues related to capital projects. The FCUL will continue to monitor the Odegaard renovation and the provision of HUB services in the Libraries.
 6. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009-2011 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.
 7. General planning for collections, services, and staff. The FCUL will advise the Libraries on changes in collections, services, and staff in support of its strategic plan and necessitated by continuing budget constraints. Initial topics include the subject librarian framework, physical and virtual space planning, etc.
-

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

1. Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty – Dissemination of the report based on last year's work of FCWA, and follow up with administration to pursue report recommendations.
 2. Faculty Mentoring Program – Followup on creation of sub-committee on mentoring by Board of Deans, providing information gathered by FCWA in 2010-11 and supplementing that information as required.
 3. Review of issues relevant to women on campus.
-

Reminder: Approved council minutes are always available online at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html>

Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The nominating committee has been contacting and interviewing candidates for Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2012. The Committee presented two nominees, Professor Jim Fridley and Professor Jack Lee, to the Senate Executive Committee on 1/7/12. These candidates will address the Senate on 1/26/12.
2. Three proposals for changes in academic programs were reviewed and approved by SCPB to move forward in the limited RCEP process. These programs are: the transfers of the Institute for Public Health Genetics and the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Nutritional Sciences from the Graduate School to the School of Public Health, and the transfer of the Public Health Undergraduate Major from the College of Arts and Sciences to the School of Public Health. The Secretary of the Faculty has notified the affected faculty for these three programs in the School of Public Health and College of Arts and Sciences that they have until January 31, 2012, to petition the Provost if they believe the full RCEP process should be followed.

Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Gail Stygall, Professor, English

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting continued to meet throughout the fall quarter and covered a number of issues in their deliberations. We discussed the final report of the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) Steering Committee. In reaction to the report, SCPB requested that three members of SCPB including the Chair be made a part of the reconstitution of the University Budget Committee (UBC). UBC is proposed as the possible oversight committee for ABB. SCPB met both with and without administrators during this period of time. From ABB, we turned to a discussion of tuition approaches, including differential tuition of different types (by school or college, by lower or upper division) and reserved further discussion until such time as there is a proposal before us. We also had an information meeting in which we were provided data from Philip Ballinger on Admissions, Carol Diem on faculty and class statistics (who will return in the first meeting of the spring quarter), and Cheryl Cameron on retention. We also approved for limited RCEPs (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures): the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Nutritional Sciences and the Institute for Public Health Genetics moves from the Graduate School to the School of Public Health; and the Public Health Undergraduate Major from Arts and Sciences to the School of Public Health.

Retention

Attached to this report are the materials provided to SCPB by Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Cheryl Cameron. These materials cover the years 2008-09 through the current academic year. Records of SCPB also provided earlier data from the years 2003-04 through 2007-08. We are providing two additional charts: one comparing Arts and Sciences retention with School of Medicine retention; the other examining retention offers divided into preemptive and competitive. From these materials we can make two observations. First, different schools and colleges have quite different cultures for retention. In the School of Medicine, the percentage of faculty receiving retention offers reached as high as 31.3% of the entire faculty, while in the College of Arts and Sciences, the percentage of faculty receiving retention offers only reached 3.7% of the faculty at its highest. Second, across the university, the preemptive offers dominate the number of competitive offers. Although the *Faculty Code* provides for departments to choose how they want to review retention offers, there is no Code-approved procedure for preemptive offers to be made. It is possible that in one department a preemptive offer may be made on the possibility that a faculty member might be recruited, while in another department a faculty member must be invited for a campus visit to receive a preemptive offer. This variation in process for preemptive offers may well contribute to the concerns faculty have about how these offers are created.

At the Faculty Senate meeting on January 26, 2012, I will speak briefly about each of the documents appended here.

**RETENTION COMPARISON: A & S and MEDICINE
2003-04 through 2011-12**

	UW total			Arts Sciences			Medicine		
	total retention	total faculty	% retention	total retention	total faculty	% retention	total retention	total faculty	% retention
2003-04	693	5007	13.8	21	1272	1.7	621	1981	31.3
2004-05	842	5154	16.3	48	1261	3.8	544	2070	26.3
2005-06	497	5185	9.6	24	1261	1.9	330	2122	15.6
2006-07	546	5282	10.3	28	1255	2.2	453	2188	20.7
2007-08	554	5455	10.2	43	1258	3.4	411	2303	17.8
2008-09	683	5455*	12.5	47	1258*	3.7	491	2303*	21.3
2009-10	81	5455	1.5	27	1258	2.1	44	2303	1.9
2010-11	324	5455	5.9	8	1258	0.6	277	2303	12.0
2011-12	220**			23**			135**		

*Total faculty not provided in any of the categories for 2008-2012; we used the last figure given.

**Partial figures for this academic year. These include both the retentions that took effect through 10/31/11 and the commitments made for retention from 11/1/11 through 9/16/12

**COMPARISON: PRE-EMPTIVE v. COMPETITIVE RETENTION
2003-04 through 2011-12
SCPB**

Year	Total Preempts	Medicine Only	Non-Medicine Preempts	Total Competitive	Medicine Only	University-Wide Totals
2003-04	665	621	44	28	1	693
2004-05	808	544	264	34	0	842
2005-06	467	330	137	30	1	497
2006-07	519	453	66	27	7	497
2007-08	533	411	122	21	0	554
2008-09	513*	491*	22	19	0	683*
2009-10	32*	28*	4	14	11	81*
2010-11	157*	145*	12	43	37	324*
2011-12**	47+19 (66)	17	8	17+11 (28)	14	220*

*Categories changed between 07-08 and 08-09. Actual total count for 08-09 on is higher than represented here.

**2011-12 has two separate counts, one from 7/1/11 through 10/31/11 and another that begins 11/1/11 and continues until 9/16/12. New salary commitments may have been made that do not start until later in the year.

Year	Total Preempts	Total Competitive
2003-04	665	28
2004-05	808	34
2005-06	467	30
2006-07	519	27
2007-08	533	21
2008-09	513*	19
2009-10	32*	14
2010-11	157*	43
2011-12**	47+19 (66)	17+11 (28)

Year	Non-Medicine Preempts	Total Competitive w/o Medicine
2003-04	44	27
2004-05	264	34
2005-06	137	29
2006-07	66	20
2007-08	122	21
2008-09	22	19
2009-10	4	3
2010-11	12	6
2011-12**	8	14

KEY for Retention Charts

Competitive Offers:	An offer made by the school or college in response to an offer of employment to a faculty member here from another college or university.
Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers	An offer made by the school or college in anticipation of a faculty member receiving an offer of employment from another college or university; a pre-emptive offer may be made at any point in the process—from a sense that it is likely that the faculty member will be recruited up to the point that a faculty member is making an on-campus visit to another college or university.
Locally-Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form	Although all of these offers are now locally funded, these offers do not need to receive the Provost's approval because they are 5% or less of the faculty member's current salary.
A/B Retentions	An A/B salary represents a situation in which the faculty member could be paid more by an outside source (e.g., grant or contract) and gives up some percentage of his or her tenure so that the faculty member will receive all of his or her previous salary plus the additional sums that can be paid by the outside source. An A/B retention might represent an initial switch into the A/B salary plan for a faculty member or it might represent the faculty member giving up an additional tenure percentage, with additional outside funds, in a retention situation.
.5% Retention Pool	When the state of Washington last provided raises for the employees of the UW, the Provost set aside .5% of the total funds allotted to raises for a retention pool. There were no raises allotted in the state budget so no retention pool was set aside after the 2009-10 academic year.

							2009-10
Arts and Sciences	2	2	16	1	6	27	
Business	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Dentistry	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Engineering	0	0	0	3	0	3	
Evans School	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Medicine	11	28	4	0	0	44	
Public Health	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Ocean and Fishery Sciences	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Social Work	0	1	0	0	0	1	
UW Bothell	0	0	0	0	1	1	
2009-10 Totals:	14	32	23	4	8	81	

							2010-11
Arts and Sciences	4	2	2	0	NA	8	
Built Environments	0	1	0	0	NA	1	
Dentistry	0	0	0	1	NA	1	
Engineering	0	0	0	5	NA	5	
Education	1	0	*2	2	NA	5	
Law	1	0	0	0	NA	1	
Medicine	37	145	95 (12*)	0	NA	277	
Pharmacy	0	0	0	1	NA	1	
Public Health	0	2	15	0	NA	17	
Social Work	0	6	0	0	NA	6	
UW Bothell	0	1	1	0	NA	2	
2010-11 Totals:	43	157	115	9	NA	324	

							2011-12
Arts and Sciences	4		11 (1*)		NA	15	
Dentistry				1	NA	1	
Engineering			9	1	NA	10	
Eduacation				1	NA	1	
Foster School	2				NA	2	
Law		1			NA	1	
Libraries	1				NA	1	
Medicine	9	45	46 (1*)		NA	100	
Pharmacy				1	NA	1	
Public Health			5		NA	5	
Social Work	1				NA	1	
UW Bothell		1	2 (1*)		NA	3	
2011-12 Totals:	17	47	73	4	NA	141	

*In response to competitive offer.

2010-11 Retentions

80 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2010 and October 31, 2010

7 (8.7%) funded with State funds

73 (91.3%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - \$139,101

Mean value of State funded retentions - \$19,872

Median value of State funded retentions - \$18,090

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$1,325,206

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - \$18,180

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$13,872

Mean % increase - 13.5%; Median % increase - 10.0%

26 (32.5%) in response to known competitive offers

39 retention salary adjustments were effective between November 1, 2010 and January 31, 2011

2 (5.1%) funded with State funds

37 (94.9%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - \$70,404

Mean value of State funded retentions - \$35,202

Median value of State funded retentions - \$35,202

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$635,409

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - \$17,173

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$11,088

Mean % increase - 11.8%; Median % increase - 9.0%

16 (42.1%) in response to known competitive offers

84 retention salary adjustments were effective between February 1, 2011 and April 30, 2011

1 (1.2%) funded with State funds

83 (98.8%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - \$74,079

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$1,725,234

Mean Value of Non-State funded retentions - \$20,786

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$16,902

Mean % increase - 14.1%; Median % increase - 14.1%

9 (10.7%) in response to known competitive offers

121 retention salary adjustments were effective between May 1, 2011 and June 30, 2011

0 funded with State funds

121 (100%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$2,278,351

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - \$18,829

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$13,776

Mean % increase – 14.6%; Median % increase – 12.3%

5 (4.3%) in response to known competitive offers

2011-12 Retentions

141 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2011 and October 31, 2011

24 (17.0%) funded with State funds

114 (80.9%) funded with Non-State funds

3 (2.1%) funded with a combinations of State and Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - \$412,817

Mean value of State funded retentions - \$15,290

Median value of State funded retentions - \$7,614

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$2,519,916

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - \$21,355

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$12,732

Mean % increase – 13.79%; Median % increase – 10.0%

20 (14.2%) in response to known competitive offer

	Competitive Offers	Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers	Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form	A/B Retentions	Total	Academic Year
						11/1/11-9/16/12
Arts and Sciences	6	1	1	0	8	
Engineering	0	1	35	0	36	
Medicine	5	17	13	0	35	
Total:	11	19	49	0	79	

Retention Adjustments Approved Effective 11/1/11 and Beyond

79 retention salary adjustments were effective between 11/1/11 and 9/16/12 as of 11/22/11

43 (54.4%) funded with State funds

36 (45.6%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - \$403,822

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - \$1,072,776

Mean value of State funded retentions - \$9,391

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions – \$29,799

Median value of State funded retentions - \$7,470

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - \$14,256

Mean % increase – 12.23%; Median % increase – 8.98%

11 (13.9%) in response to known competitive offer

As of 22 November 2011

Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jim Fridley
Professor of Environmental and Forest Science
Professor of Mechanical Engineering

The 2012 Session of the Washington State Legislature convened on Monday January 9th and is scheduled to adjourn sine die on Thursday March 8th. It is a 60 day "short session" this year, supposedly intended to consider only legislation that is necessary to make essential mid-biennium corrections to the budget and policy. This particular short session will be unusual however because mid-biennium corrections to the budget are not only essential but, as is known by everyone who is even vaguely aware of Washington state government and politics, they will be extremely difficult and painful reductions. The severity of the state's budget problems and the economic crisis that has caused them will also bring policy proposals that while probably not truly essential mid-biennium corrections will be seen by many as necessary to help the state and its citizens through these very difficult economic times.

In what seems to be real progress, the legislature's higher education related and budget related committees and the governor appear to be genuinely supportive of higher education in general and our university in particular. The text below is from the intent section of legislation that was recently requested by the governor and sponsored by a number of legislators:

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

The legislature recognizes that increasing educational attainment is critical to the social and economic well-being of Washington...

The legislature finds that increasing educational attainment is essential for maintaining the health of a democratic society and the competitiveness of the state in the global economy. It is necessary to have educational opportunities that meet both the educational and economic requirements of the state. Increasing educational attainment means Washington needs more students with high school diplomas, postsecondary certificates, associate degrees, bachelor's degrees, and graduate degrees. According to a fall 2010 study by the Georgetown University center on education and the workforce, Washington will rank sixth in the nation in jobs that will require postsecondary education or special training.

The legislature finds that educational attainment is a powerful predictor of well-being. Students who have completed higher levels of education or training are more likely to achieve success in work or life than those who have not. Education is perhaps the most important engine of economic growth and individual and financial health. Success in growing a stronger economy and democracy and lifting incomes and well-being depends upon increasing educational attainment. It is the intent of the legislature to focus on the increased educational attainment as a key priority and closely track progress towards meeting this goal.

There will be ample opportunity for leaders, administrators and faculty from higher education to offer suggestions for improvement to legislative proposals as the legislature works to help (or require) us to become more efficient and effective in our work. But an emphasis on becoming a state with increasing educational attainment, along with a general appreciation of the many contributions we make, is a vastly better situation from the one where everything about us was constantly questioned.

The work of the legislature will not be all good news to us though. In the Autumn 2011 special session the House and Senate's Ways and Means Committees heard lots of testimony in their respective sets of public hearings about the Governor's proposal for the supplemental (in this case supplemental means very severely reduced) budget. Some relatively small portions of the cuts proposed to address their \$2 billion problem were met with little negative response from the public. As a result the legislature passed a supplemental budget that cut about \$323 million in expenditures and directed about \$106 million in fund transfers. This is reasonably seen as having solved about 25% of the problem they face. The University of Washington's share in this initial action was a reduction of about \$250 thousand. But that reduction is

arguably not really a budget cut to UW since it is essentially the state capturing savings it generated for itself through policy changes enacted in the 2011 regular session.

In the current 60-day session, the most necessary work of the legislature is solving the remaining three quarters of its budget problem. If there is good news for the University of Washington it is that the importance of higher education to the state as a whole is becoming increasingly well recognized by the legislature, the governor and the business community. There is genuine appreciation for the wisdom of investing more not less in higher education right now. Unfortunately though, it's hard to believe that this appreciation for the importance of higher education can ultimately be enough when there are so few options available for solving the budget problem. Additionally there are reasons to expect that problem to grow when the next economic and revenue forecast report is released in February. In the end I expect that we will be seeing for the University a mix of budget cuts, budget cut restorations that depend on the public's acceptance of legislation for new revenue, specific budget "adds" that intend to increase our participation in educating more students to be more competitive for jobs with companies in technology and manufacturing, policy intended to allow (or force) higher education to be more efficient in the use of its resources, and policy to encourage/force the education system in general to change in ways that result in more Washingtonians attending college and earning college degrees.

I will be back in touch when specific bills warrant your time and attention. Recently Professor Paul Hopkins, Chemistry, generously gave up his Martin Luther King, Jr. Day to come with me to testify in the House Higher Education Committee. His testimony was extremely well received by legislators and also the broad higher education community. When you see him be sure to express your appreciation!

I am looking forward to working with any and all of you this session. I will use Twitter to communicate to you on a daily basis (@uw_fac_leg_rep). Please sign up and "follow." Less frequently, but regularly I hope, I'll use the Faculty Senate Blog (<https://depts.washington.edu/senatblg>) to provide updates, opinionate, or even just blow off some steam. I will also be using very short and targeted catalyst polls to get your feedback when specific policy or budget questions warrant it. The information I gather in this way helps gives me the opportunity to have meaningful participation in the legislative process so please be responsive if you hear from me, and remember Olympia time runs at least 10 times faster than campus time so don't delay! Lastly please use your personal (hopefully non-UW) email account to send me an email (jim.fridley@fridleys.net) as soon as you get a chance. I will assemble an email list to contact you if/when I need your help.

Lastly but importantly, remember that our colleagues in the Office of State Relations (<http://www.washington.edu/staterelations/>) and the Office of Planning and Budgeting (<http://opb.washington.edu/>) provide lots of useful information for you, through for example their briefing papers and blogs, throughout the entire legislative session. They generally have as up to date information as anybody you will find. Remember, too, to thank these folks when you see them. Their work on our behalf during the legislative session is substantial, the hours they devote to it become endless, and although it might not be readily apparent to all of us they are generally very successful in helping guide state budget and policy proposals toward the best possible outcomes. Unfortunately, their work isn't usually very apparent to us faculty so in many ways it becomes pretty thankless for them.

Respectfully submitted by:

Jim Fridley

Professor of Environmental and Forest Science

Professor of Mechanical Engineering

UW Faculty Legislative Representative

Faculty Member Appointments to University and Senate Committees**Adjudication Panel**

Joe Janes, Information School, as a new member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Steve Buck, Psychology, College of Arts & Sciences, as a new member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

Faculty Council on Research

Mike Rosenfeld, Environment and Occupation Health Sciences, School of Public Health, as a new member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.

Vice Chair Candidate Remarks

Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Science and Mechanical Engineering

I am your University of Washington Faculty Legislative Representative (your guy in Olympia). As such I was asked, and have agreed, to make myself available as a candidate for vice chair and subsequently chair of our faculty senate.

I am also a Professor of Environmental and Forest Science and Professor of Mechanical Engineering; and I am part of the UW Botanic Gardens faculty so I often work and teach in and around Merrill Hall. I started here at UW twenty-something years ago as an Associate Professor in Forest Resources. I've taught UW classes at all levels, to students from all three campuses, with 10 or so different prefixes and alongside colleagues from a wide range of disciplines. My favorite classes and research projects are the ones where students and faculty from many different backgrounds work together on a design or problem solving project.

Over the years I have served on or chaired some different senate councils/committees (SCPB, SCLM, FCUR, FCSA, SEC, and the SEC's nominating committee for senate vice chair) and due to my FLR role I currently serve on more than I will list here. Like all of you I have at various times served on many, many ad hoc committees and standing departmental and college committees.

In my current role as your Faculty Legislative Representative I work daily to represent our university faculty work and values to our state legislature, governor, and other aspects of state government. One very important part of the job I do on your behalf is to educate the people who are involved in state higher education policy making and budget setting about how and why our work matters and about how and why their many ideas and proposals would affect our ability to be successful in accomplishing our work. My aim is make sure they not only see the potential consequences of their proposals on us but also *how those consequences ultimately affect the things most important to them*. To do that effectively in Olympia requires building and nurturing relationships that are ultimately based on respect and trust. Therefore I balance my time in Olympia every day meeting with members of the legislature and their staff, education and higher education policy professionals, advocates, lobbyists, students, and faculty from other institutions; I attend and often have opportunity to speak at legislative committee meetings and other meetings involving the legislature, watch floor debates, and attend meetings of other entities such as the Higher Education Coordinating Board (I served on the HECB Advisory Committee as the state's Faculty representative). Equally important, I invest considerably in being informed about the ideas and motivations behind the policy and budget proposals and also their potential impact on us.

On campus I attend faculty senate and senate executive committee meetings, regular meetings of the faculty's shared governance leadership, and meetings of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. I also meet occasionally with administrative leaders and staff. Here and in Olympia I communicate regularly with our university's external relations and planning and budgeting staff. These too-many meetings allow me to be informed about the issues related policy and budget here at the university. They also allow me the opportunity to do the second very important part of the job that an FLR must do on your behalf – educate and inform faculty (and staff and students when appropriate) about the legislature and its activity.

Through activities like the ones above and also things like serving on boards for some non-profit organizations (e.g., I was a founding board member of the League of Education Voters) I have learned that leading means working for your staff and volunteers (as opposed to them working for you) and that effective governance happens when you work with, not against, other people to get things done. I fully subscribe to the concept of servant leadership. For those of you who were lucky enough to know him, my friend the late State Senator Scott White will always remain my role model in that regard. I bring these values to all of my work and I will bring them to the faculty senate if you have me to serve as your senate vice chair (and subsequently chair).

If you have read my FLR reports to the senate over the past couple of years, or my occasional posts to the senate blog, then you know that I believe the external pressures threatening our university and our ability to do our work are numerous and strong right now. They frequently appear as discussion in the state legislature but they are topical in higher education nationally. The time devoted to higher education

in the President's very recent State of the Union Address is evidence of this. My belief is that we are in a period right now where we in higher education stand to be "done to" if we don't choose to "do." The concept of "a public university" is being redefined right now and we should choose to be leaders in that redefining. We all also know that our own university policies around things like faculty salary and promotion, adjudication processes, procedures for considering program change or elimination, and the model and process used for university budgeting are all very topical and likely in need of faculty attention.

We shouldn't embark to do anything that we do not believe to be right but it is a time when we should ask ourselves if the faculty senate could serve the faculty and its mission best by actively looking for solutions to the problems that are creating the external demands for change, instead of waiting to react to the actions of others seeking to address those same problems.

You are selecting a vice chair to work next year alongside our incoming chair, Jim Gregory, then become the chair that serves you a year later. These are very small increment in the life of our university and 2013-14 is quite a ways away. Suggesting now what we will need to work on then would be guessing and also presumptuous. But what I will suggest now is that there are a large number of drivers, the issues will keep appearing, and we should address them. The senator will ultimately decide what the senate works on. And if you have me involved as chair I will work for you and with you to make our faculty senate productive and our work successful.

Jim Fridley

Vice Chair Candidate Remarks
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

This is a pivotal time for the University of Washington. We're pivoting into a new administration, with a new president and a new provost; we're pivoting into a new method for budgeting and accounting; and most importantly, we're pivoting into a new reality of how the university is funded, and perhaps even a new understanding of the very nature of what it means to be a public university.

I can't help thinking of Frank Herbert's novel *Dune*, in which the character Paul Atreides has the gift of seeing the future. What he sees is time flowing like a river, with branches representing potential paths the future might take. Mostly, time flows through a great wide channel, with all the branches going more or less in the same direction. But occasionally there's a "nexus" or "pivot point," where the branches become so divergent and twisted that he can't see around the corner, and small actions can have earth-shaking effects. The trick is to keep his eye on the branches, and take the right action at the right time to ensure that society doesn't go down a path that leads to disaster.

I don't think it's an exaggeration to suggest that we're living through one of those perilous pivot points in the history of this university, and of public research universities in general. Throughout our history, this country has built an overwhelming consensus that public support for higher education is a good thing for our society, not just for those who benefit individually from it. The result is an educational system that's the envy of the world. Now, in the wake of economic collapse, that consensus is under attack. We've seen appalling budget cuts -- State funding for the UW has been cut in half over the past three years, and it may be cut further during the current budget cycle. These cuts threaten our mission at its core.

I have to say, though, that when I look around at what's happening at the UW right now, it's a little hard to tell that we're in the midst of this kind of crisis. The faculty and students here continue to rack up dazzling achievements, with many departments receiving top ratings, a regular procession of MacArthur fellows, two Rhodes scholars and four Goldwater scholars last year, just to name a few. Students still really want to come here -- almost as many freshmen applied here last year as applied to all four other state universities combined. I'm awed by the success of everyone here in keeping the boat on course so far.

But the current course is not sustainable. We've survived these cuts with a combination of temporary money, funding from private citizens and corporations, and large tuition increases. I've supported the tuition increases so far, as the least damaging stopgap in view of the fact that our tuition was so much lower than that of our peers to begin with. But we cannot continue raising tuition 10 or 20% a year, without wrecking the "public" nature of this university. There's also grave danger in increasing our reliance on corporate funding sources. While it's wonderful to see the fruits of our research having an impact in the "real world," partnerships with corporations sometimes come with expectations and strings that are at odds with the ideals of a university, especially a public one. One thing we've learned from the Occupy movement is the danger of accepting the idea that those with all the money get to call all the shots.

So what's the role of the Faculty Senate in all this? I'm not crazy enough to think that the Faculty Senate alone can reverse the decline of the social consensus in support of public higher education. But we have to remember that the faculty and students are the heart and soul of the university -- and students come and go, administrators come and go, but by and large we're here to stay. It's up to us to stand and loudly proclaim why we believe in what we do here. I'm not just talking about protecting our turf -- although this is a wonderful job that we have, I daresay most of us, with our talents and training, could have found more lucrative careers in the private sector. It might sound quaint, but I'd guess that most of us are here because we really do believe in the search for truth and beauty and innovation in service of humankind, and in the nobility of immersing students in that search. Our role is to make sure that every decision that affects the university gets made in the light of the long-term societal and cultural importance of what we do here. In some universities (such as Harvard, where I had my first academic job), the faculty sets the policy and the administration carries it out. In others (such as Utah, or so I hear), university governance is a truly shared responsibility. Here, although shared governance occasionally works well, it's a precarious thing, and sometimes deteriorates into window dressing. To the extent that we can strengthen and make more meaningful the voice of the faculty in University policy decisions, we will have strengthened our University, our state, and our society as a whole.

Let me tell you a little about myself. I've been in the Math Department almost a quarter century, two-thirds of that time as a full professor. I have to confess, Faculty Senate leadership is not a position that I've always aspired to. I truly love writing math books, teaching students about differential geometry, and proving the occasional theorem; and when this is all over (whether that happens a week from now, or three and a half years from now), I'll happily go back to doing those things.

But despite my protestations of wanting to be left alone, I've managed to put in a fair number of years in administration and faculty governance. In my department, I served three and a half years as Graduate Program Coordinator, overseeing 45 graduate courses, 80-odd grad students, and 80-odd TA jobs every quarter, and running graduate admissions; and then I served four more years after that just as Graduate Admissions Director. I served four years on the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, two as its chair. I served a couple of years on the College Writing Council, the University Grievance Committee, and a couple of other committees. For the past year and a half, I've been on the Executive Board of our local AAUP chapter. This is my fifth term on the Faculty Senate, including a stint on the Senate Executive Committee. Back in 2000, I served on the ad hoc committee that was responsible for the final wording of the new salary policy, so I've had some chance to see how shared governance can work when it's really working.

I'm extremely lucky to have been nominated for this position at this particular time, when I'll have a truly amazing team to work with – it'll be an honor to serve as vice-chair under Jim Gregory, and to work with Ana Mari Cauce, with Marcia Killien and the fantastic Senate Office staff, and with Jim Fridley as Legislative Rep (if it should work out that he gets to stay in that role). And although I haven't had a chance to get to know President Young yet, and he and we got off to a bit of an awkward start with the provost search and the fallout from the previous administration's actions, everything we've heard from faculty members at Utah suggests that he's someone who deeply respects and values the role of faculty in running a university, so I have high hopes that this will be a productive time.

There's a long list of specific pressing issues that the Senate will have to face in the next few years. You know what the biggest ones are:

1. Repairing our broken salary policy. The policy hammered out in 2000 served us well for almost a decade, and went a long way toward reversing the gross inequities and sinking morale that had developed in the preceding decade, when continuing loyal faculty received little or no salary increase while those who played the "outside offer game" got plenty. Now we're sliding perilously close to that situation again, and it has to be fixed.
2. Repairing our adjudication procedures, so as to protect the integrity of the processes established in the *Faculty Code*.
3. Monitoring the rollout of Activity-Based Budgeting, to ensure that the university's long-term priorities aren't overridden by the exigencies of the budgeting model.
4. Meeting the challenges of technology, distance learning, and alternative means of delivery of higher education such as the Western Governor's University. We've been hearing some opinions that suggest that professors and lectures and tenure will be made obsolete by these technologies. While new technologies present exciting opportunities for enriching the educational experience, I submit that the reason students are still streaming here is that our lectures, seminars, and individual face-to-face interactions with students add something indispensable to the educational experience. We need to document that and speak up for it.

Of course, by the time I become Senate chair (if I do), Jim, Susan, Ana Mari, and President Young will probably have solved all these problems. But there will be others.

By my reckoning, it's been 37 years since someone from the Math Department was Senate Chair (the last one was Ed Hewitt in 1975), so I guess maybe it's our turn. As a differential geometer who spends most of my time thinking about 4 and 5 dimensions and more, I sometimes think I ought to be able to step back and look over the panorama of space-time, like Paul Atreides in *Dune*; but I haven't figured out how to do that yet. So what I have to offer is my passion for the value of what we do, and my steadfastness about the importance of the faculty role in guiding the university. If you decide I'm the person you want in this job, I'll be honored to serve.

**Class A Legislation, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Revisions to Chapters 24-31 and 24-32: Code revisions related to appointment and promotion of
faculty members**

Rationale: Proposed changes to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions. [Faculty Code Chapter 24.31 and 24.32]

For several decades, the University of Washington has committed itself to increasing the diversity of its students, faculty, and staff. On the University's main website at www.washington.edu/diversity, it states, "At the University of Washington, diversity is integral to excellence. The University values and honors diverse experiences and perspectives, strives to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promotes access, opportunity, and justice for all. *Valuing and honoring diversity. It's the Washington way.*"

The proposed changes in the *Faculty Code* in Section 24-32, unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, are designed to allow that the work done by faculty in research, teaching, and service that enriches diversity at the UW be recognized in the processes of appointment and promotion. We recommend that language be added to the existing *Faculty Code* that will allow departments, review committees, chairs, deans, and the provost to consider this work in reviewing faculty. At least one set of peer institutions, the University of California system, adopted language similar to the one contained in this proposal.

Nothing in this proposed language requires that any member of the faculty demonstrate accomplishments in this area to be appointed or promoted. However, it does formally allow a faculty member's success in this area to be part of the file that is reviewed at all appropriate levels of the University. As the University continues to build excellence for the 21st century, a continued focus on diversity integrates the changing demographics of the country with the expansion of intellectual boundaries in many disciplines. A faculty with more of its members committed to diversity in research, teaching, and service will make the University of Washington better positioned to meet its stated goals in the 21st century.

In reviewing Chapter 24 of the *Faculty Code*, it was determined that Sections 24-31, General Appointment Policy, and 24-32, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members, each can be amended to include language that allows faculty work that promotes diversity and equal opportunity to be recognized in appointments and promotion. All proposed language appears in the attachment to this statement.

Faculty Code Chapter 24

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24–31 General Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.

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, of 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 conjunction with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, faculty contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the faculty member's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities, efforts to advance equitable access to education, or public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations.

- 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, contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education can 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.

- 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 educational outreach. 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.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 58, May 16, 1978; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 71, February 5, 1985; S-A 75, April 6, 1987; S-A 86, December 8, 1992; S-A 99, July 9, 1999: all with Presidential approval.

Slide 1

UWRP & VIP

Regents are the fiduciaries

- Plan Document is the legal basis of all plan rules
- Plan is Internal Revenue Code § 403(b)

UWRP Eligibility:

- Faculty & Academic Staff
- Librarians
- Professional Staff

UW Administration: decision makers

- Input from key participant stakeholder committees

We're all in the plan



Slide 2

Why Make Changes?

New IRS Rules

- IRS regulations issued in 2007 made 403(b) plans more similar to 401(k)
- Before the regulations, significant differences existed:

403(b) Plans	401(k) Plans
Multiple recordkeepers	Single recordkeeper
100+ investment options	10 – 30 investment options
Plan sponsor has limited oversight of investments	Plan sponsor selects and monitors investments

- Regulations require:
 - Complex data consolidation across all recordkeepers
 - Fiduciary oversight
- Department of Labor direction to 403(b) employers: Monitor your funds



Slide 3

Fund Review Committee (FRC)

UWRP/VIP Plan Document language authorizing FRC developed by FCBR & Benefits

- ALUW & PSO also on FCBR subcommittee
- FCBR subcommittee reviewed peers & private industry
- FRC model proven effective with UW peers

FRC language and membership updated: October 2010

- Endorsed by FCBR May 27, 2010; SEC October 11, 2010
- 1 additional faculty member; 1 UW Treasury rep
- Regents approved October 21, 2010



Slide 4

FRC - cont'd

- FRC has fiduciary status
- UW is not subject to federal ERISA law, but ERISA provides best fiduciary practices
- Two key fiduciary duties:

1. Exclusive Purpose Rule	Selection must be made by focusing exclusively on how best to provide benefits to participants and their beneficiaries while ensuring that administrative expenses are reasonable
2. Prudent Expert Rule	Selection must be made with the skill, prudence, and diligence of a prudent expert The focus is on a prudent process



Slide 5

FRC Process

- 2009 – Placed RFP for Investment Consultant
- Investment Consultant role:
 - Track and analyze funds and investment managers
 - Provide reporting to FRC
 - Provide peer and best-practice information
 - *NO* decision-making authority – FRC must generate recommendations
- Hewitt EnnisKnupp (Hewitt) selected



Slide 6

FRC Process - cont'd

- Hewitt EnnisKnupp, an Aon Company
 - Hewitt was founded in 1940
 - Leader in investment consulting and retirement administration services
 - Hewitt has over 160 higher education clients
 - Recognized for their expertise and leadership in the 403(b) area of retirement plan consulting



Slide 7

FRC Process – cont’d

- **March 2010 – work begins**
 - Review fiduciary role
 - Update Investment Policy Statement (Guides the FRC evaluation of funds and Fund Sponsors Review existing UWRP funds)
 - Hewitt reviews current UWRP funds (67)
- **June 2010 FRC receives Hewitt findings**
 - Significant redundancy (Currently 26 Large Cap Equity Funds)
 - Poor performers
 - Fees too high
 - FRC identifies need for review of alternate funds
 - Benefits receives approval to authorize Hewitt to conduct a search



Slide 8

FRC Process – cont’d

- **September 2010**
 - FRC reviews results of fund search
 - Makes three initial recommendations to Provost:
 1. Four-tier structure
 2. Reduction in “core” funds
 3. Conduct a recordkeeper search utilizing proposed funds



Slide 9

Recommendation 1: A Tiered Approach

Target Date Retirement Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple packaged solution requires less time and expertise • Built-in asset allocation that gets more conservative as a person gets closer to retirement • Target date funds are default if participant doesn’t act
Core Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of mutual fund options covering key asset classes • Includes active and indexed fund options • Can include mutual funds and annuities • Requires asset allocation decision
Annuity Window	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assets in the TIAA-CREF annuities are not eligible for default mapping to new funds • Annuities have an important role in the plans • Fees for annuities are fixed, but rebate to participants can be negotiated
Self-Directed Brokerage Window	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes all mutual funds available through recordkeeper’s brokerage account • Participant has greater flexibility, but also full responsibility for whether specific funds are appropriate



Slide 10

Why Tiers?

Provides broad range of options for diverse participant community

Provides structure and simplification to the investment decision process for plan participants

All current funds can be accessed through brokerage window

Sophisticated investors can access thousands of investment options, but must take personal responsibility and cost

- Brokerage window carries no annual fees
- Many funds have no trading fees
- Participant will pay trading fees if applicable



Slide 11

Recommendation 2: Core Funds

Consolidation of funds reduces fund fees

- Increased buying power: access to lower cost share classes
- *Lowering fees puts more money into the participants' pockets*

Individual funds require burdensome/costly FRC oversight under DOL rules

Current fund choices (67) overwhelming to many participants



Slide 12

Recommendation 3: Recordkeeper Search

Can't determine real costs of the plan until a search is performed

Recordkeeping function is distinct set of services

- Employer financial transactions and participant trades
- Web platform for participants and administrator
 - Consolidated recordkeeper means one-stop shopping
- Communications & education
- Compliance & required reporting



Slide 13

Recommendation 3: Recordkeeper Search – cont’d

Most participants unaware of fees they pay to current vendors for recordkeeping services

Simplifying recordkeeping overhead creates economy of scale

The RFP process gives the recordkeepers an opportunity to reduce their fees to be as competitive as possible

Single portal simplifies participant experience

UW can tap into full spectrum of funds in the marketplace



Slide 14

Participant Fees

Current

- Participants pay all plan costs – but don’t recognize it
 - Fund Investment management costs
 - Recordkeeping costs
- Current plan fees are much higher than future plan fees

Future

- Full fee transparency
- Recordkeeping fee – either flat or as % of account balance
- Investment Consultant fee
 - Current cost for AON Hewitt: \$125,000 per year
 - UW picked up AON Hewitt costs during transition only

Plan rebates will be arranged for any funds charging excess fees (TIAA-CREF)



Slide 15

Participant Fund Fee Savings

Asset Class	Fund Name	Expense Ratio		Annual Fee on \$50,000	
		Current	Future	Current	Future
Money Market	Vanguard Prime Money Market	0.23%	0.09%	\$115	\$45
Bond Market	Vanguard Total Bond Market Index	0.22%	0.07%	\$110	\$35
Large Cap Equity	Vanguard 500 Index	0.17%	0.04%	\$85	\$20
Small/Mid Cap Equity	Vanguard Extended Market Index	0.30%	0.12%	\$150	\$60



Slide 16

Participant Fund Fee Savings (cont'd)

Fees are very important:
 compound interest is exponential and nonlinear
fee reduction = a quarter of a million dollars!
 (\$20K/year contributed for 35 years at 10% appreciation)



Slide 17

FRC & FCBR Discussions

2009
January- April: FRC works with UW Treasury Office Investment Officers – they confirm UW lacks key data & expertise; recommends use of a consultant.
May: Authorized to place an RFP for Investment Consulting assistance
May: Update to FCBR; support for request for FRC consultant assistance.
November: Update to FCBR;
 Note: FCBR rep included in Consultant RFP review and selection process

2010
February: Hewitt EnnisKnupp selected and recommended for contract
March: Work begins with Hewitt
May: FCBR update on FRC work to date
 2009-2010 FCBR Chair was also FRC rep (Bob)
September: FRC makes first recommendations to Provost
September: Provost directs that key stakeholder committees be updated for input



Slide 18

FRC & FCBR Discussions

2010 Cont'd
November 1: FCBR discussion of FRC recommendations
 – FCBR requests additional FRC data & joint meeting with FRC
December 13: FCBR meets to continue deliberations
December 14: Joint FRC & FCBR meeting with Hewitt
 – All FRC data from Hewitt provided to FCBR for joint meeting

2011
January 3: FCBR meets to discuss joint FRC/FCBR meeting; no resulting recommendations
January 24: FCBR meets to discuss joint FRC/FCBR meeting; no resulting recommendations
 – determination is that chairs should meet to further discuss FRC recommendations
February 17: FRC & FCBR chairs meet



Slide 19

FRC & FCBR Discussions – cont'd

2011 Cont'd

February 28: FRC meets; concludes that notice to all key stakeholders is completed

March 1: FRC recommends to Interim Provost to move ahead with September 2010 recommendations

March 11: FCBR provides input to Interim Provost

April 19: Interim Provost approves those areas of agreement: 4-tier structure and to proceed with RFP for recordkeeper

- Requests that FRC provide opportunity for FCBR to review final draft of RFP

May 24: Draft RFP is presented at FCBR meeting

- FCBR requests additional scenarios be costed
 - FRC incorporates 12 additional costing scenarios into RFP
- FRC requests additional FCBR faculty member to participate in RFP review



Slide 20

FRC & FCBR Discussions – cont'd

2011 Cont'd

August 9, September 26, October 24 & 25 – FRC meetings

- Includes RFP review preparation
- Finalist interviews
- On-site visits to top 2 finalists – November

December 9: FRC recommendations to Interim Provost based on RFP results

- Reconfirm 4-tier approach
- Plan Funds
- Fund mapping
- Recordkeeper selection
- That VIP be moved to the new platform at the same time
- That a Roth 403(b) feature be added to the VIP

December 14 & 19: FCBR meets to discuss FRC recommendations

December 28: FCBR submits comments to Interim Provost



Slide 21

Spectrum of Opinion

Goal: input to the process

- Utilize expertise of FRC, FCBR, Benefits, Hewitt
- Develop knowledgeable committee members able to represent constituents
 - consider spectrum of participant needs
- Committees brought diverse opinions
 - Consensus on most, but not all, recommendations
- Ultimately administration decision
- Prompt decision benefits participants



Slide 22

Spectrum of Opinion – cont'd

Recordkeeper – balancing service and cost

- What is good service worth?

Number of funds – fewer choices at lower cost or maximum freedom?

- Brokerage window fee removed

Importance of faculty input to help reach decision

- Most important changes to retirement in decades
- Representation through FCBR and FRC
- Faculty Senate



Slide 23

Spectrum of Opinion – cont'd

The process has been extensive and thorough

The discussion has been broad

- Informed feedback
- Vendor information is confidential at this time
- Many hours to climb the full learning curve
- Fiduciary responsibility

Importance of moving ahead quickly

- Each month costs participants in higher fees
- Poor-performing funds identified: liability to keep them



Slide 24

Consensus

Vendor consolidation:

- Less faculty and staff confusion
- Lower fees due to economy of scale
- Provides total plan perspective; consolidated statement
- Improved plan compliance

Carefully selected investment choices with lower fees means **more retirement income for faculty and staff**

Simplify the plan to make selection of appropriate investments easier for a diverse population

Makes monitoring more manageable and less disruptive for faculty and staff



Slide 25

Peers Consolidating\Changing Recordkeepers

- Arizona University systems
- Caltech
- George Washington University
- Harvard
- Johns Hopkins
- Minnesota State Colleges & Universities
- MIT
- Northwestern
- Oregon University system
- Pepperdine University
- Purdue
- Stanford
- University of California system
- University of Colorado
- University of Louisville
- University of Miami
- University of Missouri
- University of Oklahoma
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of Utah
- Yale



Slide 26

Next Steps

- Presentations to campus January 31 & February 1
- Decision about recommendations is imminent
- Purchasing notifies apparent successful bidder
- Communication Plan begins immediately:
 - Recordkeeper manages rollout
 - UW Announcement & Vendor Website
 - Communications materials from recordkeeper
 - Large group meetings
 - Departmental and one-on-one participant meetings



Slide 27

Questions?



Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Recommendations to Provost

December 28, 2011

Dear Provost Wadden:

Last week the Faculty Council on Benefits & Retirement met to complete its discussion of the draft proposal of the Fund Review Committee re changes in the record-keeper and investments structures of the University of Washington Retirement Plan.

Following several hours of discussion, across two meetings of the Council this quarter, and in consideration of the scope and significance of the proposed changes, we recommend and request that the Office of the Provost elicit from faculty and professional staff comments re the major different options and the choices of those options recommended by the fund review committee before approving it and sending a recommendation to the Board of Regents. Katy Dwyer has agreed to coordinate a campus-wide process of feedback and suggestions and the Council is prepared to assist this process in any it can. We believe that such a process can be crucial to possible improvements in the ultimate proposal and to the eventual widespread understanding and acceptance of the changes by plan participants. We believe that such groups as the Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Organization should be invited to sponsor forums for participants that will help to educate the campus but also provide for constructive feedback re the plan, prior to its ultimate recommendation and implementation.

In addition to affirming, by unanimous Council vote, such a process of communication, feedback, and possible revision of the ultimate proposal, the Council also affirmed, by vote, the following suggestions made by the FRC:

1. We endorse the four-tier structure of the new plan
2. We endorse the use and prominence of a target-retirement series of funds as the default option for many participants
3. We endorse a tier with core funds that covers a variety of approaches and asset classes, with low fees, but recommend that this tier be populated with a selection of funds from all of the fund families to allow participants to choose among them and to have the option to concentrate their resources within a fund family to take advantage of the benefits from doing so. Providing choice and flexibility to participants should remain a key feature of the plan.
4. We endorse the provision of a brokerage tier that will make available a wide range of options for investors with particular and specialized objectives
5. We strongly encourage consideration of a record-keeper arrangement that would maximize potential expense savings to the University and to plan participants.

We believe that a University-wide conversation could be crucial to the success of the anticipated changes and we encourage consideration of such a process as well as of the specific concerns we raise above.

For the Council,

Gerry Philipsen, Chair
Professor of Communication