

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 31 January 2008
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The agenda was approved. The Chair reminded Senators to identify themselves by name and departmental affiliation when speaking.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate.

“Welcome. We have an interesting agenda with at least 2 items that may generate comments and questions, that is, the Legislative Report and the Senate Restructuring proposal. I would like to make a few remarks about an issue that arose after the agenda was sent out, that is, the series of articles, *Victory and Ruins*, published this week in the Seattle Times about the UW football program or more specifically, the Husky Rose Bowl team of the 2000 season. President Emmert will also have something to say about this in his report.

“I respect the role journalism plays in the writing of the public record, but the Times series seemed to have a particularly singular and harsh point of view. It did describe a sorry chapter in the history of the UW, a chapter characterized by brutish and criminal behavior by some players on the 2000 football team. The university’s response was not sufficiently corrective or of a standard worthy of this institution. The aggressive legal pursuit of a rape victim who sued the University was particularly unfortunate. It would have been far better for the university to settle the lawsuit uncontested along with a letter of apology.

“Given that these articles described what happened 5 to 8 years ago, I think the question we should now ask is, “Do the same problems still exist today?” The answer is largely “no”. We have entirely new leadership at the top—a new president, Mark Emmert; a new football coach, Tyrone Willingham; and a new athletic director, Todd Turner. Their combined leadership and their demands for accountability have turned the situation around and they deserve credit for doing so. While all three would surely like to see more wins on the football field, they respect the integrity of the university and recognize the importance of academic values. I think it was the correct decision to allow Coach Willingham to complete the terms of his contract. On the other hand, I find it regrettable that today is Todd Turner’s last day as Athletic Director. The scandalous state of affairs described in the Times’ articles dramatically highlights the difficulties faced by Emmert, Willingham and Turner when they came here.

“Part of the improvements in oversight of the athletic program has involved the Faculty Senate. Closer ties between the athletic program and faculty governance were established in 2004 when the Faculty Athletic Representative, who is Pat Dobel, and the Faculty Senate signed an agreement stipulating that a quarterly report will be given to the Senate Executive Committee by the Faculty Athletic Representative and together with the Athletic Director, they will address the Faculty Senate at least annually on the state of the Intercollegiate Athletic Department. This agreement includes a requirement that both of them be open to questions about issues of concern to the faculty. They have fulfilled these obligations over the past 3 years.

“Also, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality have formed an *ad hoc Committee on Academic Quality and Rigor* to review the academic rigor of selected courses, including some of those popular with the athletes.

“Shortly after Todd Turner was hired in 2004, The Seattle Times published an article entitled *Turner is the right man for Huskies right now*. As stated in the article, his clear message then was that rules would not be compromised for the sake of winning. He did not deviate from that message. The hiring of a new Athletic Director with a proven commitment to academics and integrity is once again critical for the university. Or, as Todd Turner expressed it, it is important for an Athletic Director to have values that are in line with what the institution is about.

“Please hold your comments and questions until after the next agenda item, that is, the Report of the President. President Mark Emmert will give this report.”

3. Report of the President / Opportunity for Questions – President Mark A. Emmert.

President Emmert opened his remarks by saying that he was in agreement with the Chair's remarks. He augmented those remarks by stating that one of the primary purposes of the athletic program is to reflect who we are as an academic institution in terms of values and comportment. He reminded the Senators that there are millions of people in the country who know nothing of the UW except what they see in intercollegiate sports arenas across the country. Unfortunately this country pays a disproportionate amount of time to sports. Rankings of intercollegiate teams are far better known than academic rankings for the same institutions. Given that reality it's important that those watching UW teams see not only good athletes but students and coaches that represent the UW as an academic institution and reflect the expectations of all UW students and faculty. In fact, UW athletes are doing very well academically. Their academic work is above average and their graduation rate is better than that of the student body. Despite the deplorable chain of events reported by the *Times* articles (which covered a period of time six and more years ago), there is much to be pleased with at present. He acknowledged the Faculty Senate's role in oversight of the Athletic Program, including the work of the current Faculty Athletic Representative, Patrick Dobel, and the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

With regard to funding of repairs to Husky Stadium **{Exhibit G}**, the President reminded Senators that the Department of Athletics is an entirely self-sustaining unit. In fact it gives back to the University by making the Stadium available for many events and purposes outside the realm of its Department. The original bowl is 80 years old. It is literally falling down and it needs to be repaired very soon. The question is how to fund these repairs which fall outside the Department's annual budget. One option is to request funding from specific tax revenues. These are taxes paid largely by non-residents for hotels, motels and rental cars – and at least some of those tax-payers are attending events at Husky Stadium.

In response to a question from Professor Sivarajan Murali (Anesthesiology) about whether the University had issued a formal apology to the rape victim mentioned in the *Times* articles, the President thanked him for the thoughtful suggestion and said he would look into the matter.

4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor Gail Stygall, Committee Chair.

The Search for the Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting is nearing completion. Stygall and JW Harrington are on the Search Committee and are currently in the midst of interview scheduling. She will report again on the status of the search at the next Senate meeting.

Budget discussions **{Exhibit E}** are underway in Olympia, and the Governor has proposed a budget with very limited new spending. This is due, at least in part, to a more rapid drop in housing starts and employment than the economic forecasters had expected. This is especially true with starts of single-family housing that had a drop of 30% with a corresponding drop in employment. The hope is that expected increases in employment in software and aerospace will balance these drops. She asked the Senate to keep in mind that even though state funds represent only about 10% of the total UW budget, they constitute almost all of the instructional budget and set the level for grant-funded items.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) continues to meet nearly weekly. The Committee is deliberating the list of possible budget items – including fiscal impacts that may be associated with two Class C resolutions that were approved by the Senate at the end of the last academic year – one concerning tuition benefits, and the other addressing the “opt-out” provision for retirement contributions at age 50.

The University is in the process of preparing both a fiscal year 2009 budget and a biennial 2009-2011 budget. The handout (provided by Gary Quarfoth) distributed **{Exhibit F}** shows the process in Olympia as it relates to fiscal year 2009 and the proposed biennial budget.

She directed Senators' attention to the final page of the handout and discussed some of the constraints on preparing the budget:

- The 2009-2011 proposed budget goes before the Regents on July 17 as an action item; that means it must appear on the agenda at the previous Regents meeting as an information item;

- The Fiscal 2009 budget is adopted by the Regents on June 12th, which means that it will be an information item at the May 15th meeting;
- The rest of the timeline in the handout shows ramifications back to January.

She continued by pointing out that the importance of this information is twofold:

- Large, new items are not likely to appear in the fiscal 09 budget. Apart from the fact that the economic forecast is not cheerful, this is a supplemental budget – designed for new, one-time items. The Provost remains committed to trying to fund raises of 4.5% for FY 2009 (including 2% ordinary merit and 2+% of additional merit, with some flexibility to go to the Deans this year. She is also committed to a second year of unit adjustments, although not beyond that. She should be applauded for trying to keep this commitment for a second year, allowing some stability in the growth of faculty salaries.
- Serious requests for new money in the 2009-2011 biennial budget for any number of items must be made between now and April. The SCPB will be discussing the 2009-2011 proposals in April and May.

Stygall also reported that she had made a request to the College Councils Chairs that they begin discussions with their Deans now about possible budget requests. She then urged Senators to begin discussions with their colleagues and departments so that they, too, might be in a position to participate in discussions with the Deans about the 2009-2011 budget proposals, recognizing that the budget request will go to the Regents at their July meeting and then back to Olympia in September.

5. Legislative Report – Professor James “J.W.” Harrington, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty on Boards: Hearings have been held in each house’s Higher Education Committee. After discussions with our administrations, Presidents of all six Washington institutions of higher education are neutral. Given the sensitive nature of this kind of change, it’s unlikely to be approved in this legislative session, but on-going discussion and exposure this year will prove valuable in future attempts.

The State Budget will be under consideration for the next few weeks. The Governor’s call for fiscal restraint is gaining momentum, especially considering sobering economic forecasts. Revenue and case-load forecasts are expected in a couple weeks – and in the coming weeks, Harrington will be pushing for reinstatement of the nonresident graduate tuition cut last year.

Plans for the UW-North campus are still up in the air. More legislators are questioning the commitment of so much capital funding. However, regardless of fiscal doubts, there is a great deal of important political backing and momentum behind this proposal. The House Appropriations Subcommittee put the Governor’s \$1.1 million, FY 2009, request for start-up courses in Everett, into area community colleges and outreach. Harrington feels that this was more a “question mark” than a signal to halt the proposal for a new campus. In general, Harrington’s tack is to stay out of public debates. This is a highly charged political issue that will be decided based on who can bring more political power to bear. He has, however, been trying to ensure legislators know that although the faculty of the UW are behind providing more access to higher education, they are concerned about starting a new campus that will either be starved for physical resources or will starve the rest of the state’s university campuses of physical resources.

Other bills currently under consideration include:

- Articulation & transfer (HB 2783)
- Data dashboard (HB 3210)
- Pilot performance contracts (SHB 2641)
- Grants to institutions for student childcare subsidy, to match students’ self-imposed fees, approved by House Appropriations Subcommittee.

Harrington encouraged Senators to contact him for more information on these bills or anything else he had reported on.

Finally, Harrington raised the question of Husky Stadium. He said he had little to add to what the President had already reported. The proposal has received some legislative support, but certainly not overwhelming support.

6. Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of January 14, 2008.

Chair Luchtel explained that item six on the agenda lists actions taken by the Executive Committee during its meeting of January 14, 2008. These include:

- a. Minutes of the November 19, 2007 SEC meeting and November 29, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting were approved;
- b. Unfinished Business: Discussion regarding alternative Faculty Senate structures **{Exhibit B}**;
- c. New Business: Discussion on the Dispute Resolution Process **{Exhibit A}**.

7. Announcements. There were none.

8. Requests for Information.

In response to a request for information, Secretary of the Faculty Gerry Philipsen initiated a discussion about the idea of restructuring the Faculty Senate. This idea had been presented and discussed at the most recent meeting of the Senate Executive Committee and at a recent meeting of chairs of elected College, School and Campus Councils. Each of these bodies had a distinctive take on the questions raised from initial discussions and on the discussion draft of a proposal that came out of those initial discussions with past Senate Chairs last summer **{Exhibit B}**. He emphasized that this is a discussion draft, not a legislative proposal, at this point.

Chair Luchtel added that a review of faculty senates in other institutions revealed that other institutions had Faculty Senates of 100 members at most – and some with many fewer. Our Faculty Senate is elected more on the model of the US House of Representatives than the US Senate. The proposal in the handout moves in the direction of the US Senate. He also said he favored the idea of including representatives from College and School Councils in the Senate – feeling that it would strengthen the work of the Senate and Colleges to have that connection.

Stephen Hauschka, Senator from Biochemistry, stated his concern that whatever the model, some provision should be made to include a healthy representation of younger faculty members.

Michael Forman, Senator from the Tacoma Campus, emphasized the need to ensure that the Senate represents faculty, first and foremost.

Susan Astley, Senator from Epidemiology, suggested that the issue with the Senate is one of format. She argued that the real work of the faculty is done in Faculty Councils and that she herself had found her experience in Faculty Councils to be much more satisfying than her experience in the Senate.

Philipsen asked for a straw poll by show of hands on reducing the size of the Senate to 100 or less. The response was fairly evenly divided among those for, against and unsure.

William Pola, Senator from Military Sciences, expressed concern about being in a smaller unit that would probably not have a direct representative if the Senate were reduced in size. If so, he would be interested in provisions for input on representation for those in smaller units.

Senate Vice Chair David Lovell remarked that this proposal is a good starting point in ensuring that each college and school is represented and includes strategic individuals from each school, college and campus on the Faculty Senate. This would provide an opportunity for the Senate to integrate more closely with issues that arise in schools, colleges and campuses. All of these are represented. The remaining question is how to deal with the inequity among the very large and very small schools and colleges.

Luchtel concluded the discussion by suggesting that at the very least, there's a need to alter the current ratio of 1 senator per 15 faculty members. That alteration, in addition to the integration of college, school and campus representatives, would be well worth considering.

Philipsen encouraged Senators to continue thinking about these ideas and to e-mail him with any further comments or suggestions.

9. Nominations and Appointments.

Nominations for Faculty Councils and Committees were approved as listed in **{Exhibit C}**.

10. Memorial Resolution.

Senate Vice Chair David Lovell read the resolution:

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

Assistant Professor Willard Bill of Education who died December 26, 2007 after having served the University since 1971.

Lecturer Raymond T. Cole of Business, Government, & Society who died on December 19, 2007 after having served the University since 1961.

Professor Emeritus William F. Irmscher of English who died December 20, 2007 after having served the University since 1949.

Professor Emeritus Robert Jones of Surgery who died December 12, 2007 after having served the University since 1974.

Lecturer Herbert Kagi of Political Science who died November 14, 2007 after having served the University since 1966.

Professor Emeritus Adah Miner of Speech who died January 5, 2008 after having served the University since 1948.

Professor Merle Sande of Medicine who died November 14, 2007 after having served the University since 2005.

Professor Emeritus Daris Swindler of Anthropology who died December 6, 2007 after having served the University since 1968.

Clinical Associate Professor Jeffrey Werner of Medicine who died December 29, 2007 after having served the University since 1972.

Associate Professor Stanton Wheeler of Sociology who died December 7, 2007 after having served the University since 1955.

Professor Emeritus Jan Wolak of Mechanical Engineering who died June 1, 2002 after having served the University since 1965.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the senate chair be directed to communicate to the immediate survivors the action taken, together with the condolences and sympathy of the faculty.

The resolution was approved by a standing vote of the Faculty Senate.

11. Unfinished Business. There was none.

12. New Business. Class C Resolution regarding Student Lobby Day

The resolution was approved as attached **{Exhibit D}**.

13. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate

A Faculty Guide to Dispute Resolution at the University of Washington

Originally produced as a brochure by the [Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs](#) in cooperation with the Secretary of the Faculty.

Draft Revision: January 2008

Please direct questions and/or requests for copies of the brochure to:

Secretary of the Faculty
Box: 351271
Phone: 685-2703
E-mail: secfac@u.washington.edu

What would you do if you found yourself entangled in a conflict with a colleague that seemed to defy resolution?
Where would you go if you felt you'd been treated unfairly in a tenure or promotion decision?

When the prospect of resolving conflicts directly with your colleagues seems unlikely, you are encouraged to consult with any of several offices on campus that provide a variety of problem-solving and dispute-resolution services.

Policies and procedures that pertain to many of the situations described here are addressed in the [Faculty Code](#) (Volume Two, Part II of the [UW Handbook](#), available at <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/Volume2.html>). Chapters 27 and 28 define the available Conciliatory and Adjudicative Procedures for the Resolution of Differences. Access to these formal procedures is in no way compromised by seeking alternative resolution of differences -- in fact, it is encouraged.

Concerns that may arise during the course of your employment as a faculty member at the U.W. (acronyms deciphered below):

- Salary/contract/merit review¹ issues (see EOO, OO)
- Promotion/tenure² issues (see OO)
- Laboratory and/or office space expectations/agreements (see OO, LSMC)
- Interpersonal conflict and workplace mistreatment (see OO, EOO, LSMC)
- Professional rights and responsibilities (see OO)
- Allegations of scholarly or scientific misconduct³ (see OSI)
- Questions regarding discriminatory actions (see EOO, UCIRO)
- Retaliatory treatment (see UCIRO, OSI)
- Issues related to disability accommodations (see EOO)

University of Washington Handbook references:

- UW Handbook, Volume Two, Chapter 24
 - UW Handbook, Volume Two, Chapters 24 & 25
 - UW Handbook, Volume Four, Part X
-

Descriptions of U.W. Offices that provide problem-solving and dispute-resolution services to faculty:

- **Ombudsman's Office (OO)** -- is a readily available resource for faculty and other members of the University community for information, education, and confidential consultation regarding conduct or conflict in the University environment. A designated neutral, the Ombudsman provides options for conflict prevention, management, and resolution. Conciliation, mediation, and referral services are provided.
 - **University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO)** -- conducts neutral, internal investigations of complaints that University policies prohibiting discrimination, sexual harassment, and retaliation have been violated. UCIRO guides, participates in, or refers parties to a variety of resolution activities, including mediation and other alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms. These activities are often undertaken in conjunction with Personnel Services, the Provost's Office, the Ombudsman's Office, and other appropriate University units.
 - **Office of Scholarly Integrity (OSI)** -- is responsible for coordinating, in consultation and cooperation with the Deans of Schools and Colleges, all inquiries into and investigations of allegations of scholarly misconduct. The OSI is also responsible for ensuring compliance with Federal reporting requirements in matters of scientific or scholarly misconduct and for maintaining all records resulting from inquiries and investigations of such allegations.
 - **Equal Opportunity Office (EOO)** -- oversees provision of disability accommodations for faculty. EOO provides informal consultation on matters related to discrimination and offers training programs regarding sexual harassment, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and disability issues.
 - **Law School Mediation Clinic (LSMC)** -- mediates all types of disputes except family matters. Typical cases include co-workers in conflict, student-staff-faculty, consumer, and landlord-tenant matters.
-

These (among other) colleagues may be able to offer individual assistance facilitating a mutually satisfactory resolution of differences -- or be able to direct faculty members to other available mediation services:

- **The Secretary of the Faculty** -- helps colleagues determine their rights as faculty members at the U.W. and should be contacted if a faculty member anticipates filing a formal conciliation or adjudication.
- **The Vice Provost** -- discusses questions about the nature of a faculty member's appointment and procedures governing appointments.
- **The Office of the Vice Provost for Student Life** is where conflicts involving students might be reported. [543-4972]
- **Human Resources** is where conflicts involving staff might be reported. [685-4711]
- **The Office of the Assistant Attorney General** might assign an attorney to defend an employee who has been named in a lawsuit, provided that employee is found to have acted in good faith within the course and scope of his or her University employment. [543-4150]

NOTE: Faculty members with supervisory responsibilities have an obligation to uphold University policy, particularly in regard to establishing and maintaining work environments free from discriminatory or illegal conduct. Faculty members should report complaints of discriminatory or illegal conduct to their supervisors, who in turn will consult, as necessary, with the appropriate offices referenced in this brochure. A faculty member's complaint regarding the conduct of a supervisor may be taken to the individual who oversees that supervisor.

Directory:

Equal Opportunity Office (EOO)
Prudence Miles
Director, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action
Box 351237
543-1830; e-mail: milesp@u.washington.edu

School of Law Mediation Clinic
Julia Gold
Director
Box 353020
543-3434; e-mail: julgold@u.washington.edu

Ombudsman's Office (OO)
Box 352238
685-6816; e-mail: ombuds@u.washington.edu

Secretary of the Faculty
Box 351271
685-2702; e-mail: secfac@u.washington.edu

University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO)
Box 354996
616-7110; e-mail: uciro@u.washington.edu

Office of Scholarly Integrity (OSI)
Office of the Vice Provost
543-6617

Office of Academic Personnel
Cheryl Cameron
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Box 351237
543-6616; e-mail: ccameron@u.washington.edu

Modified: January 10, 2008

Original document October 8, 2007/Revised January 10, 2008

The Structure of the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington

The beginning of a conversation to address such questions as:

- Is the apportionment scheme of the Senate workable? At present, the ratio of 1 Senator for every 15 voting members of the faculty would yield a Senate of approximately 268 members.
- Is the size of the Senate conducive to high quality legislative deliberation?
- Are there people who should be included in the Senate who are not now there?
- Who should serve on the Senate's Executive Committee?
- How often should the Senate and its Executive Committee meet?
- Can a smaller Senate adequately represent the breadth and complexity of the faculty at the University?
- Would a smaller Senate weaken Faculty/Senate communication?
- Would a smaller Senate diminish its moral force?

As a way to open the conversation, we can consider some alternative structures, such as:

Senate (55 members)

Chair of the Faculty Senate
Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate
Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Faculty Legislative Representative
Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative
President of the University
The Provost
Chairs of Faculty Councils (14)
Chairs of College, School, and Campus Councils (18)
At-large members elected by the University Faculty (16)

Senate Executive Committee (22 members)

Chair of the Faculty Senate
Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate
Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Faculty Legislative Representative
Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative
President of the University
The Provost
Chairs of Faculty Councils (14)
Secretary of the Faculty

Committee: Dan Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate; Ross Heath, Past Chair, Faculty Senate; Jan Sjavik, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs; Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty; Gerry Philipsen, Secretary of the Faculty.

Nominations and Appointments.

Nominate, for Senate appointment, effective immediately, representative members of Faculty Councils and Committees for terms ending September 15, 2008, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the Faculty Councils:

A. Representatives of the Associated Students of the University of Washington:

Academic Standards ----- Doug McManaway

B. Representatives of the Graduate and Professional Student Senate:

Educational Outreach ----- Leslie Ann Caromile

Tri-campus Policy ----- Danielle Magnuson

Nominate for Faculty Senate appointment, effective immediately, Sarah Stroup, Group 1, Classics, Faculty Council on Academic Standards, for a term ending September 15, 2010.

Nominate for Faculty Senate appointment, effective immediately, Gunner Almgren, Group 8, Social Work, Faculty Council on Academic Standards, for a term ending September 15, 2010.

Nominate for Faculty Senate appointment, effective immediately, James Antony, Group 5, Education, Faculty Council on Academic Standards, for a term ending September 15, 2010.

Nominate for Faculty Senate appointment, effective immediately, Linda Martin-Morris, Group 3, Biology, Faculty Council on Educational Technology, for a term ending September 15, 2010.

Resolution In Support Of Student Involvement In Lobby Day

WHEREAS, Lobby Day will be held Tuesday, February 12, 2008; and

WHEREAS, this is an opportunity for all University of Washington students to present their opinions regarding higher education to their legislators; and

WHEREAS, Tuesday, February 12, 2008 is a scheduled class day; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the proposal of the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate that the faculty of the University of Washington make every effort to facilitate student involvement in Lobby Day by excusing them from class on Tuesday, February 12, 2008.

*Submitted by:
Tyler Dockins, ASUW President*

FY 2009 UW Core Education and Indirect Cost Recovery Budget Issues
Initial List — 1/28/08
Office of Planning and Budgeting

The Revenue Side of Things

Core Education Budget

Issue	FY 2009 Estimated Dollars	Comments
General increases in tuition	\$ 10-15 million in incremental revenue	
New enrollment funding — both State General Fund and tuition from new enrollment	\$7,573,000 in additional State General Fund for new enrollments	875 new student FTEs — 355 at UW Seattle, 250 at UW Bothell and 270 at UW Tacoma; some flexibility to reallocate among campuses.
Other Core Education Budget revenues	??????	Probably a small increase in Summer Quarter tuition revenue estimate. No really material changes in other revenues.

Indirect Cost Recovery Budget

Indirect cost recovery revenue	At least a few million in incremental indirect cost recovery revenue.	Based on year-to-date FY 2008 data, Planning and Budgeting is currently projecting that actual revenue will exceed budgeted revenue by a few million dollars. Through November 2007, grant awards are strong — up about 13% over the same period of the previous year. Forecast for FY 2009 strongly influenced by next three months of data on both grant awards and actual indirect cost recovery revenue collections.
--------------------------------	---	---

The Expenditure Side of Things

Core Education Budget

Issue	FY 2009 Estimated Dollars	Comments
Debt service on UW Tower surface parking lots	Approximately \$900,000	Approximately \$13 million of the total UW Tower acquisition cost is attributed to the two surface parking lots acquired as part of the purchase. The debt service costs associated with the surface parking lots has not been included in the UW Tower lease rate as the UW has not yet made a final decision on

Issue	FY 2009 Estimated Dollars	Comments
		disposition of the surface parking lots.
FY 2009 UW Tower building operations shortfall	Number still being calculated	At the start of FY 2009, UW Tower will be approximately 50% occupied; the building should be about 75% occupied by the end of December 2008; the building should be 100% occupied by the end of June 2009.
Mailing services for UW Tower	\$30,000 (need to verify number)	Estimated cost of expanding UW mailing services to UW Tower.
Internal Audit staffing	\$200,000	Second year of Board of Regents requested ramp-up of Internal Audit staffing.
Combined Fund Drive operations cost	\$100,000	Half of total annual cost; other half paid for by State Department of Personnel.
Tuition waiver for children of faculty and professional staff	Approximately \$2,000,000	FCRIB and SCPB proposal to implement a tuition waiver benefit for the children of faculty and professional staff.
Change UWRP rules to make 10% contribution rate at age 50 an "opt-out" procedure rather than an "opt-in" procedure	Cost appears to be minimal.	As of a recent payroll, there were 256 UWRP participants who are over 50 and at the 7.5% contribution rate. Probably 100 of those 256 people are "transitional" — i.e., they just turned 50 and will probably file their paper work to change to the 10% contribution rate soon.
Information Management Advisory Committee project implementation recommendations	????	For comparison, \$1,400,000 allocated in FY 2008
Academic Technology Advisory Committee investment recommendations	\$1,400,000 requested for FY 2009	\$700,000 allocated in FY 2008
Funding for various salary and benefits survey/comparison analysis	\$100,000 - \$200,000	The UW conducts salary and benefit surveys for both classified staff and professional staff on a regular basis (at least every other year for a number of years). In addition, the UW has incurred expenses for obtaining executive level position salary and benefit information. While at least some level of annual expenditure is predictable, all of these expenses have been temporarily funded.
Human Resources costs associated with implementation of the campus safety initiative	Approximately \$400,000	Costs associated with staffing the 685-SAFE telephone number

Indirect Cost Recovery Budget

Issue	FY 2000 Estimated Dollars	Comments
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

Issue	FY 2000 Estimated Dollars	Comments
Data Center debt service	\$826,000	The UW Tower data center project is supported by a combination of State capital funding and \$12 million in indirect cost recovery supported debt.
Animal facilities upgrades debt service	It depends — on final costing, decisions yet to be made on structure of the debt, and pending decisions about how much debt to issue. As an approximation, \$1.4 million for debt service on \$20 million in debt.	The UW is doing a number of upgrades to animal facilities in order to get off of AAALAC accreditation probationary status. Analysis and costing is still going on - but the UW will likely need to issue \$20-30 million in indirect cost recovery supported debt to fund these facilities upgrades.
South Lake Union 2 dedicated indirect cost recovery	It depends — need to analyze which facilities South Lake Union 2 tenants are coming from. For grants moving from UW Seattle campus, need to assess likelihood of new grants backfilling in the space vacated. As a guess, \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 budget allocation in FY 2009.	The UW Medicine South Lake Union 2 building will be occupied as of the start of FY 2009. Per agreement with the School of Medicine, they pay all of the operating costs for this facility and as a result they receive the facilities indirect cost recovery generated to help pay for those costs.
Indirect cost recovery rate study preparation costs	\$200,000 - \$300,000	The UW needs to use both temporary staff and selected consulting services in the preparation of its new indirect cost recovery rate study.
IMAC recommendation — continuation of implementation of Faculty Effort Certification System project	????— need to check with Office of Information Management on FY 2009 funding need.	\$500,000 allocated to FEC system project in FY 2008
Faculty grants management training	\$30,000	Training is required. Funding has been on a temporary basis for a number of years.
Support for global research activities	???????	

**Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Development Schedule
And
2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Request Preparation Schedule
(Second Draft – January 7, 2008)**

Month	Events in Olympia	UW FY 2009 Budget Process	2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Request Process
January 2008	<p>**Approximately January 11, 2008 – January State General Fund Revenue Collections Report</p> <p>**January 14, 2008 – Legislative Session Begins</p> <p>**Last two weeks of January, 2008 – UW responses to fiscal note requests and legislative questions</p> <p>**Legislature starts grappling with the “what to do about Initiative 960” question</p>	<p>**Develop initial estimates of cost changes for utility, property rentals, risk management, debt service and other “institutional” budgets</p> <p>**Summarize previous commitments to deans, vice presidents and vice provosts</p> <p>**Develop first draft of issues/topics for discussion in FY 2009 budget development process</p> <p>**Update background information for FY 2009 tuition discussions</p> <p>**Prepare initial revenue estimates for indirect cost recovery, investment income, Summer Quarter tuition, etc.</p> <p>**Discuss FY 2009 budget priorities with SCPB and BODC</p> <p>**Discuss early assessment of financial context for FY 2009 budget with SCPB and BODC</p> <p>**Prepare early version of FY 2009 Straw budget for discussion with provost</p> <p>**Review/update FY 2009 budget request list from deans, vice presidents, vice provosts</p>	<p>**Begin discussions with other 4-year institutions regarding the 2009-11 coordinated capital project list for the six four year institutions. For UW, the primary focus of this discussion will be on capital projects already in the state funding pipeline: Restore the Core construction (Denny Hall, Lewis Hall and Balmer Hall); Restore the Core pre-design/design (Miller Hall and Anderson Hall); Molecular Engineering construction; UW Tacoma Phase 3 construction; UW Bothell Phase 3 design; Gould Hall expansion. Those projects would require approximately \$230 million in capital funding in the 2009-11 biennium; for comparison, the UW received \$144 million for capital projects in the 2007-09 biennium.</p> <p>**Discussions with BODC and SCPB regarding any revisions to the draft 2009-11 project list for the coordinated capital project list discussion.</p>

Month	Events in Olympia	UW FY 2009 Budget Process	2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Request Process
		<p>**Provost begins annual meetings with deans, vice presidents and vice provosts</p>	
February 2008	<p>**All of February, 2008 – UW responses to fiscal note requests and legislative questions</p> <p>**All of February – legislature continues to grapple with the “what to do about Initiative 960” question</p> <p>**February 7, 2008 – Caseload Forecast Council meeting; final K-12 enrollment, Medicaid, prison population, etc. numbers for 2008 Supplemental Budget</p> <p>**Approximately February 11, 2008 – February State General Fund Revenue Collections Report</p> <p>**February 14, 2008 – Economic and Revenue Forecast Council meeting; final State General Fund revenue forecast before 2008 Supplemental Budget adopted</p> <p>**Third week of February, 2008 (an estimate) – House version of 2008 Supplemental budget published</p> <p>**Fourth week of February, 2008 (an estimate) – Senate version of 2008 Supplemental Budget published</p>	<p>**Provost continues annual meetings with deans, vice presidents and vice provosts</p> <p>** Review/update FY 2009 budget request list from deans, vice presidents, vice provosts</p> <p>**Discuss first draft of “institutional” budget figures and previous commitments with SCPB and BODC</p> <p>**Discuss initial list of FY 2009 issues/topics with SCPB and BODC – add items to list based on discussion</p> <p>** Update all of the preliminary budget estimates for “institutional” budgets and previous commitments</p> <p>**Discuss potential FY 2009 tuition increases with BODC and SCPB</p>	<p>**Discussions with BODC and SCPB regarding any revisions to the draft 2009-11 project list for the coordinated capital project list discussion.</p> <p>**Continuation of 2009-11 coordinated capital project list with the other 4 year institutions.</p>
March 2008	<p>**Early March, 2008 – House/Senate conference committee negotiations on 2008 Supplemental budget</p> <p>**Approximately March 10, 2008 –</p>	<p>** Update all of the preliminary budget estimates for “institutional” budgets and previous commitments</p> <p>**Further discussion of FY 2009 tuition</p>	<p>**Continuation of 2009-11 coordinated capital project list with the other 4 year institutions. The UW’s ability to change its own project list starts being fairly limited.</p>

Month	Events in Olympia	UW FY 2009 Budget Process	2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Request Process
	<p>conference version of 2008 Supplemental budget published</p> <p>**As part of final budget work, legislature takes actions required by Initiative 960 related to tuition and fee increases</p> <p>**March 11 – 13, 2008 – Final 2008 Supplemental budget adopted by the legislature</p> <p>**March 13, 2008 – End of legislative session</p> <p>**Late March, 2008 – Governor reviews 2008 Supplemental budget passed by legislature</p> <p>**Late March, 2008 – Governor solicits state agency input on potential vetoes of sections of 2008 Supplemental budget passed by the legislature</p>	<p>increases with BODC and SCPB</p> <p>**Continued discussion of FY 2009 issues/topics with SCPB and BODC</p> <p>**Mid-March – prepare first public version of FY 2009 Straw Budget (after conference version of legislative budget is available)</p>	<p>**March 20, 2008 – discussion of status of 2009-11 coordinated capital project list with Board of Regents.</p> <p>**Begin discussions with BODC and SCPB on potential 2009-11 state operating budget requests.</p>
April 2008	<p>**By April 2, 2008 – Governor publishes veto actions and signs 2008 Supplemental budget.</p>	<p>** Update all of the preliminary budget estimates for “institutional” budgets and previous commitments</p> <p>**Preliminary FY 2009 tuition increase recommendations formalized</p> <p>**Discussions of FY 2009 Straw Budget with SCPB and BODC</p> <p>**Late April – finalize draft FY 2009 budget recommendations that will be presented to Board of Regents</p>	<p>**Continue discussions with BODC and SCPB on potential 2009-11 state operating budget requests.</p>
May 2008		<p>**May 5, 2008 – Information Item on draft 2009 UW budget and proposed tuition</p>	

Month	Events in Olympia	UW FY 2009 Budget Process	2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Request Process
		<p>increases to Regents Office</p> <p>**May 15, 2008 – Draft 2009 UW budget and proposed tuition increases discussed at Board of Regents meeting</p>	
June 2008		<p>**June 2, 2008 – Action Item on 2009 UW budget to Regents Office</p> <p>**June 12, 2008 – 2009 UW budget and tuition increases adopted at Board of Regents meeting</p>	<p>**June 2, 2008 – Information Item on Proposed 2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Requests due to Board of Regents Office.</p> <p>**June 12, 2008 – Proposed 2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Requests discussed at Board of Regents.</p>
July 2008			<p>**Revise Proposed 2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Requests based on Board of Regents feedback at June meeting.</p> <p>**July 7, 2008 – Action Item on Proposed 2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Requests due to Board of Regents Office.</p> <p>**July 17, 2008 – 2009-11 State Operating and Capital Budget Requests adopted at Board of Regents meeting.</p>
August 2008			<p>**The Office of Planning and Budgeting prepares detailed decision packages (for operating budget requests), C-2 and C-100 forms (for capital budget requests), and a variety of other background data that the Office of Financial Management requires as part of the biennial budget submittal.</p>
September 2008			<p>**Mid-September – the Office of Planning and Budgeting submits the UW's 2009-11 operating and capital budget requests to the Office of Financial Management.</p>