1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – George Sandison [Exhibit A]

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
   d. Council Activities Report. [Exhibit E]

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the October 1, 2018, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the October 18, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]

6. Announcements.
   a. Update on enrollment management work groups.

7. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty council attendance – first consideration. [Exhibit G]
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration
   b. Class A Legislation – Proposed update to titles of voting membership on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – first consideration. [Exhibit H]
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration
   c. Approval of the December 9, 2018, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit I]
      Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

9. Discussion Items.
   a. Housekeeping and the Faculty Code. [Exhibit J]
   b. UW faculty 2050 update. [Exhibit K]
      a. Thaisa Way, project lead
   c. Title IX update on steering committee recommendations. [Exhibit L]
      a. Valery Richardson, Title IX coordinator

10. Adjournment.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
    Approved by: George Sandison, Chair

Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, November 26 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
George Sandison, Professor, School of Medicine

Report will be sent under separate cover.
1. Vice-Chair Nominations: The search for the 2019-20 Faculty Senate Vice Chair is beginning and currently seeking nominations. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the university and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. Committee on Committees: The Committee on Committees will soon be seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) or Lauren Hatchett (lehatch@uw.edu) for further information.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Thaïsa Way, Professor, College of Built Environments

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

SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions. The SCPB is advisory to Provost Mark Richards with a reporting obligation to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and to the Senate. To assure that we have the capacity to provide robust, thoughtful, and timely advice, I work closely with the Office of the Provost as well as with Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, Sarah Hall, and with George Sandison, Chair of the Faculty Senate. For those who share our interest in the budget and fiscal data, I highly recommend you explore the Institutional Data Resources found at: http://opb.washington.edu/uw-profiles-information.

In the coming year, the SCPB will attend to addressing our ongoing fiscal challenges as we strive to support the critical contributions we make as a public university through teaching, research, and service. This engages a focus on understanding the current structure of the budget and how we allocate it (Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) is a significant part), including the resource challenges impacting us (e.g., reduced state support, flat tuition and enrollment growth), exploring where and how we allocate our fiscal resources, and developing a better understanding of the significant budget challenges facing us (e.g., unit deficits and deferred maintenance on systems and buildings). We will engage in scoping the next ABB review, the impacts of enrollment management, and in reviewing the plans for the Finance Transformation that we are currently planning.

In the past month we have focused on review of units with budget challenges, deficits, and debts. Provost Richards has continued to build on efforts to assure that unit budgets are both realistic and adhered to in a responsible manner. This has required some units to make significant changes to their operating expenses and revenue budgets. We are focused on both the budgets and future planning as well as how faculty is being engaged in relevant unit-level discussions and decisions, in particular in partnership with the Elected Faculty Councils (EFCs).

An example of this is the School of Law where faculty came together to re-align teaching assignments to more equitably distribute the school-wide course load and increase fiscal efficiencies. The College of Arts & Sciences has been working hard to address the implications of changes in college enrollment (which actually increased in the past year), as well as tackle fiscal planning for the future. Productive results are emerging. The School of Medicine is implementing the Financial Stability Plan (Project FIT) across the hospital system. The School of Dentistry is now under the leadership of Dean Chiodo who is establishing important guidelines for improving its fiscal health. Dentistry is not out of the woods yet but progress is being made. We are pleased to see the work being done and believe that deans and chancellors in partnership with their elected faculty councils are addressing the fiscal health of the schools, colleges and campuses in a responsible and rigorous manner.

SCPB will continue its support of Elected Faculty Councils (EFC) in collaboration with the Provost and Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC) to enhance the breadth and depth of faculty input into the annual budget and compensation planning efforts ongoing within each of the schools, colleges and campuses. This year we increased that engagement as the Provost recommended that deans and chancellors engage with the EFCs on their hiring/ FTE plans for the next academic year. The Provost in consultation with the BODC has altered the budget process calendar to schedule the unit budget proposal and hiring plan so that they are submitted together in February, 2019. This will allow budgets to be reviewed in the context of hiring plans and hiring plans in the context of operational budgets. We met with the chairs of Elected Faculty Councils and they are pleased to take on this discussion.

Last week the Office of the Vice President for UW Facilities shared the progress on the UW Seattle Master Plan (we hope it is approved by end of Winter Quarter 2019), capital planning and budgets, and the U-PASS / transportation challenges.
The Master plan allows the UW Seattle campus to expand by up to 6 million square feet at the same time as we are being asked to address our impact on the community. For more information, see: https://cpd.uw.edu/campus-master-plan The UW is responsible for addressing expected growth and its impact on the community and city. UW leaders have agreed to construct 450 additional housing units in Seattle's U-district for faculty and staff earning less than the area’s median income. UW leaders want to sustain a higher parking-space cap and the taller zoning heights currently zoned. An area of disagreement is the UW’s proposed goal of 15 percent of commuters traveling by single occupancy vehicles by 2028, as opposed to the city’s proposal of 12 percent. The Seattle campus is already at 17%, which is remarkably low. SCPB emphasized concern that we must both address our impact on the community and we must allocate our limited financial resources to our educational mission first and foremost.

As for the U-PASS, the current system is being supported through a variety of resources and it was clear it is not fiscally sustainable over the long run. Encouraging public transportation is important, and with the new light rail stations it is a reasonable expectation that U-PASS use will increase as the additional stations come online and provide an attractive commuting option to a greater number of UW community members. However, it is not free, no matter how you spin it. UW pays for every trip on a U-PASS, and the cost of each of those trips is the same as it is for anyone traveling on an ORCA card. Currently 97 cents on every dollar for the cost of the U-PASS is transit. The UW doesn't get any volume discount, rather we pay a fixed cost per ride. To cover these costs, the UW draws on parking fees among other sources. However, this has its challenges. For example, if fewer people use and pay for UW parking, then we have fewer dollars for the U-PASS. The different models to ensure fiscal sustainability of the program are under consideration and SCPB will actively engaged with reviewing these proposals as they emerge.

Finally, and crucial, is the upcoming legislative discussions for the next biennium. JoAnn Taricani, our Faculty Legislative Representative, has sent out a survey to determine priorities for her agenda in Olympia. Chris Laws, Deputy Legislative Representative will also be helping to realize these priorities. Please read the legislative report. This is a critical year.

And if you have not yet - take a look at the data that President Cauce provided in her report last month. We are third from the bottom in state support for major public universities AND in the bottom third for tuition. As President Cauce noted, “we’ve all been hearing about how California will be providing the UC system with a much needed infusion of dollars because they’re concerned that years of underfunding are leading to their universities losing competitive ground.” Yet UCLA already receives more than $11,000 per student. Compare that to our $5,200 per student state support. Our current funding model is unsustainable and undermines the essential contributions we make as a public university to our students, their families, and the state and nation. Again in her words: “The UW is ALL ALONE amongst our country's top public universities in being at the very bottom in terms of state funding AND in the lowest third of in-state undergraduate tuition – Compared to our peers, we’ve been stretching our resources further and further, and that’s not all bad. But you can only go so far. Parts of our university are already stretched far beyond any reasonable comfort zone.”

I look forward to hearing from you. Send me your questions and concerns. We will work to do our best to respond.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor, Music History

The state legislative races, as expected, left the State House and Senate with slightly higher Democratic majorities; several races were decided by only a few hundred votes, and one Senate race appears to be won with less than a 100-vote margin.

Our priorities of institutional funding and faculty/professional staff salaries will be a faculty priority as well as the top concern of the administration and Regents. The next budget news will be in mid-December, when the Governor releases his budget proposal for 2019-21.

I have prepared a survey for faculty senators to complete to indicate faculty priorities; the survey link can be found at (Catalyst; requires UW NET ID):

https://catalyst.uw.edu/webq/survey/taricani/354993

(20 items included on the survey, along with space for additions)

Please take the time to complete this survey; I will provide an interim report at the meeting of the Senate Executive Committee on November 19 and the Faculty Senate meeting of December 6. Thank you!
Council Activities Report

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

- Revised and approved the “FCAS Policy on the Use of Residency Status for Admission of UW Matriculated Students to Majors or Programs” in order to account for an appropriation given to UW Computer Science & Engineering (CSE) by the Washington State Legislature (approved May 2018).
- Reviewed and approved a substantive proposal from the Paul G. Allen School to change to an admissions model in which approximately 50% of its annual Computer Science cohort is admitted directly to the Computer Science major as incoming freshmen (approved April 2018).

Additionally, FCAS is charged with addressing the following topics during the 2018-19 academic year in addition to conducting its regular business:

- Monitor student course evaluations initiative being undertaken by Office of Educational Assessment
- Finalize development of UW Areas of Knowledge definitions
- Finalize development of FCAS Best Practices for Syllabi

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

- Reviewed and continues to address recommendations made within the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Pre-Retirement Planning. The Committee was appointed by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) at the request of the FCBR and charged to look at ways to improve pre-retirement planning by faculty and to encourage continuing participation by retired faculty in contributing to the University of Washington community.
- Continues to investigate needs associated with parental leave (and associated policies) for faculty at the UW, especially relating to the new Washington Family Leave Act.
- Recommunicated to university administration its longstanding recommendation for an opt-out model for the increased (10%) contribution to the UW Retirement Plan (UWRP) at age 50 and above for UW employees.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

FCMA forwarded Class A legislation that amended Faculty Code Chapter 24.32 stating: “any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.” The legislation is not intended to mandate that units may only hire/promote faculty with those credentials (service that addresses diversity and equal opportunity), but simply provides that where this service exists, it shall be considered. The Faculty Senate approved the legislation on May 17, 2018, and the legislation received final approval from President Cauce and became effective on June 22, 2018.

Additionally, FCMA is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

- Continue to evaluate the Faculty Code through the lens of multicultural affairs, diversity, and difference, with the potential use of Class A legislation to strengthen equity and fairness.
- Edit the charge/title of the FCMA to include intersections (religion, gender, LGBTQ+, etc.) so that it names what the council is actually doing.
- Diversity in Faculty Hiring: Consider drafting Class A legislation, requiring a diversity contribution statement for faculty hiring. This proposal stems from a discussion regarding a similar policy at UC San Diego that requires all candidates applying for faculty appointments submit a personal statement detailing their contributions to diversity.
- Explore the topic of trainings (implicit biased, etc.) for search committees.

**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

FCFA forwarded Class A legislation concerning Faculty Lecturer Issues during spring quarter, 2018, which amended the UW Faculty Code qualifications for appointment to Principal Lecturer by clarifying the nature and level of expectations for that title. The legislation also amended the UW Faculty Code procedures for promotion by removing assistant professors from the promotion process for faculty with instructional titles (legislation approved June 22, 2018).

Additionally, FCFA is charged with addressing the following topics/goals in the 2018-19 academic year:

- Continue exploring the status, working conditions, and career paths for instructional faculty.
- Explore ways to ensure consistency between Academic Human Resources policies and Faculty Code around Tenure & Promotion.
- Code provisions regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process.
- Review Faculty Code language around Elected Faculty Councils to bring greater clarity around membership and function.
- Faculty policies around writing recommendation letters.
- Retired faculty participation in Faculty Senate.

**Faculty Council on Research**

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the following are other topics/goals that the FCR is charged with addressing during the 2018-19 academic year:

- Discover which types of research restrictions are still subject to FCR review, in consultation with the Office of Sponsored Programs, given recent revisions to Executive Order No. 8. Review and approve the list of common restrictions placed on contracts submitted to the Office of Sponsored Programs that they can approve without the need to submit to FCR for review and approval.
- Develop protocols with the Office of Sponsored Programs for review and approval of Clinical Research funded by industry.
- In conjunction with the Office of Sponsored Programs, develop a task force to make recommendation on University of Washington Shared Research Resources.

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

FCSA is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

- Development of Medical Excuse Note Policy.
- Continue to monitor various Student Life-related ongoing initiatives and provide feedback.

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

Individual subcommittees of the FCTL were constituted in the council’s first meeting and are working to address areas of interest relating to pedagogy in the following areas:

- Goals and Principles of Learning Analytics at the UW
- Diversity and Equity Informed Pedagogies
- Evaluation of Instruction for Improvement of Teaching: Course Evaluations
- Educational Policies/Procedures around Teaching and Learning

Additionally, FCTL is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

- Evaluate if more can be done to facilitate religious accommodations for students, as requested by the ASUW Student Senate.
• Continue to oversee development of Goals for the use of Learning Analytics at the UW.
• Evaluate if the “Saturday Finals” issue can be can be remedied or its severity reduced.
• Continue work from last year investigating what diversity and equity-informed pedagogy is already being practiced at UW campuses, how these efforts support the student learning experience, and how they further the teaching and learning components of the UW Diversity Blueprint.
• Continue the exploration of the use of course evaluations as a formative feedback mechanism of teaching performance and student learning. This work should support the newly formed task force studying course evaluations at the UW.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

FCTCP is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

• Analyze the extent to which University Faculty Councils take tri-campus matters into account while conducting their business.
• Work with the University Registrar to implement changes designed for tri-campus review process.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

FCUFS is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

• Work with new organizations and processes by which capital projects and other campus improvements are being approved and managed.
• Review issues facing classroom management and innovation in learning environments (currently in use and/or needed).
• Receive the annual transport services review with a broad context of campus mobility and commuter perspectives.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

FCUL was instrumental in submitting Class B legislation to create Chapter 54 in Faculty Code and Governance outlining an Open Access Policy. The legislation was approved on June 1, 2018.

Additionally, the council is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

• Monitor the implementation of the new UW Open Access Policy.
• Evaluate the state of the ALUW “Faculty Status” proposal.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

FCWA forwarded a Class C resolution regarding wellness rooms, which was approved by the Faculty Senate on March 1, 2018. Among other things, the resolution requests that the, “Faculty Senate of the University of Washington strongly recommends that at least one wellness room is included as a requirement for all new buildings (or more based on population capacity of the building), and that functioning wellness rooms be provided close enough to existing buildings on campus so as not to cause undue hardship for those individuals who require access.”

Additionally, the council is charged with addressing the following topics/goals for the 2018-19 academic year:

• Provide feedback on ongoing student course evaluation initiative.
• Monitor the development of new capital projects with emphasis on addressing campus wellness rooms.
• Collate faculty promotion data in regards to gender.
2018-2019 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Conciliation Board
Per Section 27-41:C of the Faculty Code, “Conciliation officers shall be selected by the President from a list of names exceeding the number of positions to be filled, prepared, and approved by the Senate Executive Committee. Vacancies for the remainder of unexpired terms shall be filled according to this same procedure. Conciliation officers may be reappointed to successive terms by mutual consent of the President and the Senate Executive Committee.”

Harris Baden, School of Medicine, for re-appointment as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Mariela Klawitter, Evans School, for re-appointment as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Linda Watts, UW Bothell, for re-appointment as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Daniel Feetham, Central Advising Units, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Angelia Miranda, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Andrew Flannery, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Padmaja Vrudhula, Graduate & Professional Student Senate, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Bryan Crockett, Professional Staff Organization, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Leyla Salmassi, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Research
Larry Pierce, Professional Staff Organization, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs
Afua Tiwaa, Associated Students of the University of Washington - Bothell, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Aileen Trilles, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Angelia Miranda, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.
Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy

Wes Lloyd, UW Tacoma Institute of Technology, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

David Socha, University of Washington Bothell General Faculty Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Marian Harris, University of Washington Tacoma Faculty Assembly, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Naga Palepu, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Ferdinand Khalid, Graduate & Professional Student Senate, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

Wendy Star, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.
Legislation proposing changes to Faculty Code, Chapter 42 Faculty Councils (The Standing Committees of the University Faculty) and Their Duties

Section 42-32 Appointment of Faculty Councils

A. Because the faculty councils will be concerned with broad problems of policy relating to matters of University government, the basic qualifications of appointees should include a broad familiarity with the problems of University government, an understanding of the particular problems of the faculty within the framework of the University, and a familiarity with the substance of the particular areas of council responsibility.

B. The Executive Committee shall nominate and the Senate shall approve the appointment of the chairs and members of faculty councils.

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall consist of two members from the University of Washington, Seattle; two members, designated by the General Faculty Organization, from the University of Washington, Bothell; two members, designated by the Faculty Assembly, from the University of Washington, Tacoma; and as ex officio with vote: the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Vice Chair of the General Faculty Organization, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty Assembly; and as ex officio without vote: the Faculty Legislative Representative and the Deputy Legislative Representative.

C. At the beginning of each academic year the roster of each faculty council shall be published in the Class C Bulletin. Subsequent changes during the academic year shall be published in the Class C Bulletin.

D. The Executive Committee may determine the size of faculty councils from year to year, provided only that it make every effort to confine the size of each council to the size required for the effective discharge of its responsibilities.

E. Council members shall serve three-year terms and may be appointed to serve a second consecutive term. Appointments become effective at the beginning of the academic year. When an appointment is made to fill a position vacated during the academic year, the appointed shall be made as specified in Chapter 41, Section 41-33.

F. Faculty Council members shall be deemed to have vacated their seats when they have been absent from three council meetings in an academic year. Council members are considered absent only if they fail, prior to a meeting, to inform the chair of the faculty council or the faculty council analyst of their inability to attend.
Legislation proposing change to Faculty Code, Chapter 22 Constitution of the Faculty Senate

Section 22-91 Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

A. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting shall advise the administration and shall inform the Faculty Senate on long-range planning and on preparation of budgets and distribution of funds with particular reference to faculty concerns. The committee shall be guided by the advice of the Senate Executive Committee and/or the Senate on matters of policy.

B. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to report committee activities on a regular basis to, and to seek advice from, the Executive Committee and the Senate. The Chair shall be a member of the Senate Executive Committee.

C. The committee membership shall consist of:

1. Twelve faculty members, including:
   a. The immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate, who also chairs the committee effective August 1 through July 31;
   b. The Senate Chair;
   c. The Faculty Legislative Representative and Deputy Legislative Representative;
   d. Six at-large faculty members, nomination, election, and replacement of whom shall be governed by procedures set forth in Chapter 42, Section 42-32 of the Faculty Code, and who shall serve three-year terms; in nominating such members, the Senate Executive Committee shall maintain representation from the colleges, schools, and campuses;
   e. The Senate Vice Chair;
   f. The Secretary of the Faculty

2. The Provost, the Senior Vice President for Planning and Management, Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, and a representative of the Board of Deans;

3. One student member nominated jointly by the ASUW and GPSS, and who shall serve a one-year term;

4. The Presidents of the ASUW and GPSS, who shall serve ex officio without vote.

D. Terms of members shall begin on September 16, unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment.
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 6, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
Johnson Hall 102

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor George Sandison.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of November 19, 2018.
   a. Approval of the October 1, 2018 Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of October 18, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.


    a. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty council attendance.
        Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
    b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to voting membership of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
        Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

11. Discussion Items.

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: ________________  Approved by: ________________
Mike Townsend  George Sandison, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty  Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, October 25 at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102.
Housekeeping and the Faculty Code

At the October 1, 2018 SEC meeting, a discussion took place pursuant to an agenda item entitled “Housekeeping and the Faculty Code. The discussion showed that before Code can be written, the following four questions need to be addressed:

1. Should the scope of housekeeping be restricted to correcting typographical, name, section numbers, and the like, or should it include changes made for clarification and/or compliance purposes?

2. In a two-step procedure of (a) initial approval and (b) faculty weigh-in, how shall the first step be formally carried out?

3. With respect to the second step, shall the initial approval be seen as (a) temporary subject to approval or (b) presumptively valid subject to veto?

4. Related to (3), how shall the second step be formally carried out?
UW faculty 2050 update

As you may recall, last year Faculty Senate leadership facilitated the project we called UW Faculty 2050. This was meant to advance a framework for faculty careers in the coming decades, with an eye toward our younger faculty and their development as academic leaders. This report outlines a breadth of aspirational strategies that might guide faculty careers while building toward a more diverse and inclusive community across the academy that enhances our ability to serve the public good while sustaining and strengthening our research and teaching missions. Additionally we have shared a summary of the faculty survey that was completed last spring.

How did we develop this report? Faculty Senate leadership partnered with then Provost Baldasty and members of the Board of Deans and Chancellors to consider what the UW might be in 2050. Our work focused on the role of faculty as we drive the academic vision and mission of the institution. Our approach was to identify trends that will likely shape careers and leadership prowess. While we know that we will fail to imagine just how much change there might be or fully appreciate the directions it will take, our intention is to be strategic in our approach to the future to assure that we continue to build upon our core mission to engage in public education and the generation of knowledge for the public good.

Together we sought to build on the strength of a shared vision grounded in the values of a public university as a public good, the essential contributions of diversity, equity, and inclusion to our excellence, and the remarkable ways in which our careers are engaging new and alternative forms of scholarship, teaching, and service. We want a university that stewards these ideals in its cultures, both local and institution-wide, in its policies and practices, and its leadership and communities.

These core values of a commitment to the public good, equity and inclusion, and the potential we can realize by actively stewarding future careers, are reflected in our already strong commitment to excellence in research and teaching, the Race & Equity Initiative, the Population Health Initiative, and finally in President Cauce’s vision for a university that excels in our impact as described in her conversations with our community in the past three years.

This summary report was provided to our new Provost, Mark Richards, by the Faculty Senate Leadership as a means for him to learn more about UW faculty views, how we describe ourselves as an academic community, and how we wish to steward the university into the future. We share this with you now as it is in our collective hands to determine how best to implement the intentions and the strategies outlined within.

As for next steps, we are developing our priorities as a faculty. We will share these with the Faculty Senate in January, 2019 to get your feedback. In the meantime, we are sharing this document with the Provost, BODC, and Faculty Senate. We hope the following steps will be taken:

- The UW should consider embarking on a university-wide strategic plan that would use this document as a foundational contribution from the faculty;
- Members of the BODC should work with their EFC’s to use this document to develop/refine their action plans, diversity, and improving tenure/promotion and hiring guidelines;
- The Faculty Senate should develop an action plan based on this document and then assign the appropriate councils with implementation and evaluation;
- Elected Faculty Councils should review the document and determine what actions they would like to work on and collaborate with their respective Deans to realize the aspirations here described;
- All faculty should review the document and should be recognized and rewarded for contributing to the efforts here described and more importantly to the broad vision that emerges from this work.

Please let us know what you think - and how you might suggest we move forward.

Thaisa Way, on behalf of Faculty Senate leadership and the many faculty engaged in this project (see report for the full list)
SUMMARY ONLY
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Steering Committee:
Thaisa Way, Chair, Faculty Senate, Professor, College of Built Environments
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Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Milgard School of Business, UWT
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Lead Faculty Participants:
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Gunnar Almgren, Professor, School of Social Work
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Additionally faculty participated by:
- attending discussion groups (2 ½ day retreats and 3 open meetings)
- participating in focus groups (themed across three foci of the report)
- providing comments on drafts of reports (EFC chairs, Faculty Council Chairs, etc.)
- responding to faculty survey (945 respondents)
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Executive Summary

As noted by A. Bartlett Giametti (former president at Yale University) it is essential that university faculty and administration seek to “reforge common aims, to establish again a common set of goals and values, to lay aside the mistrust that corrodes the capacity to educate the young and to discover and share new knowledge, and to speak to the public of the nature and purpose of an education (“The Academic Mission” 1987, in A Free and Ordered Space, p. 46). Drawing on the responses to a faculty survey (20% response rate), a series of focus groups, and several workshops with a variety of constituencies, this 2050 report reflects the efforts of the UW faculty in collaboration with our academic leadership to describe our common aims, reaffirm our shared values, and speak to the purpose of education. In so doing we lay out what we believe are emergent and aspirational strategies built on our aims and values so as to realize the potential of research, teaching and service to impact our communities and beyond.

A. THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY AS A PUBLIC GOOD

As a public research and teaching university, the University of Washington is a remarkable institution in the breadth of our public outreach, mission, and impact. Through our roles in research, teaching and service, we address vital issues that touch lives, locally and internationally. Through these efforts, we serve the Puget Sound region, Washington State, the Pacific Northwest, and the nation, as well as global communities. We are a form of the public commons, serving multiple communities. We support our students and their families and engage with our local communities including business, non-profits, and governmental agencies among others. As a state university we serve our state and as a public institution we serve our nation and the world.

Emergent and Aspirational Strategies:

- Expand and strengthen recognition of education in the public good and democracy, drawing on faculty as public scholars;
- Foster faculty engagement with those in public higher education across the state to build a more robust community of public educators;
- Strengthen recognition of service to the institution, disciplines, and to our communities as valuable professional contributions of faculty;
- Implement the Connected-U plan to recognize the contributions of each of the three campuses;
- Strengthen recognition and sharing of distinct perspectives to co-exist within the academy, specifically among faculty and students;
- Facilitate and value broad inquiries across political, economic, social, and cultural domains and boundaries;
- Review general curriculum requirements to ensure they robustly reflect the breadth and depth of the UW’s educational mission;
- Establish robust support for faculty-led community engaged, collaborative, interdisciplinary, and/or public scholarship, research, and teaching;
- Formally recognize, value and reward commitment to community impact within research, scholarship, teaching, and service; and
- Expand recognition of the value of a deeply pluralistic institution and faculty community that reflects the perspectives of the city, region, state, and world.

B. BUILDING AND STEWARDING AN INCLUSIVE, EQUITABLE, AND DIVERSE COMMUNITY

We believe the most important strategy for UW leaders and faculty is to establish a shared understanding of why diversity is essential for our success as a public university, for access and for excellence. We need shared narratives about the big D of Diversity - that is about race as well as gender and low-income or socio-economically disadvantaged populations. We need to talk about these issues in intersectional ways making it challenging in its complexity, as that is the only way we will change the structures that have fostered historical and current disparities based on differences, Diversity, equity, and inclusion are grounding values that determine whether we are successful as a public institution of higher education in the pursuit of truth and knowledge.
Emergent and Aspirational Strategies:

- Implement recommendations in the Diversity Blueprint
- Describe diversity and inclusion in ways that lead to a more widely-shared understanding of the challenges and opportunities across academic communities, particularly among faculty;
- Develop a space/place for grace and reconciliation for faculty, staff, and students;
- Develop a community of Equity Advisors for faculty;
- Increase advancement funds for stewarding diversity (hiring, retention, and support);
- Develop metrics to assess how leadership stewards diversity and inclusion (incl. deans & chairs);
- Develop metrics and structures to support accountability of faculty in support of diversity and inclusion (hiring, promotion, merit, and tenure decisions);
- Expand our technology/digital toolboxes for recruitment of faculty, students, staff;
- Expand resources to support diversity scholarship, teaching, and service (for faculty and graduate students);
- Increase access and support for students from diverse backgrounds to include all manners of diversity (social, cultural, economic, abilities, and racial etc.);
- Expand program of diversity seed grants for faculty;
- Develop places for fostering inclusive community activities and engagements for faculty, staff, and students;
- Consider recognition of faculty affiliations and how the university can support alternative and diverse communities within the academy;
- Review and improve support for families, parents, and other non-salaried benefits for faculty as a means to support a broad range of faculty needs; and
- Develop measures of success and best practices in faculty diversity, equity, and inclusion to include a Diversity Dashboard.

C. FACULTY CAREERS

As a public university we face the challenges and opportunities of pursuing knowledge and truth through the robust practices of research, scholarship, and teaching including emerging approaches including but not limited to community engagement, public scholarship, and service learning for students. Faculty careers and how we do our work define the mission of discovery at the University of Washington.

Emergent and Aspirational Strategies (Faculty Careers):

- Strengthen stewardship of Academic Freedom and Tenure as equally important to the University as an academic and educational institution;
- Strengthen acknowledgment of contributions of lecturers to our teaching mission through appropriate policies, practices and procedures;
- More robustly steward the professional growth of lecturers through improved policies, practices and procedures;
- Improve stewardship of professional growth of research faculty through appropriate policies, practices and procedures;
- Establish more robust policies to support hybrid careers for faculty as they choose different roles throughout their careers;
- Improve recognition for roles faculty undertake in support of the institution to include faculty mentoring, pipeline development, shared governance, and leadership; and
- Improve non-salaried benefits including parental leave, childcare services, and retirement planning resources for all faculty, staff, and students.

Emergent and Aspirational Strategies (Teaching):

- Continue to build focus on high quality teaching including strengthening the value we place on teaching at all levels and in all forms;
- Develop more productive and accurate assessments for teaching building on peer/colleague evaluations (noting implicit biases and other questions of current evaluations);
- Improve access and use to technological tools for teaching, learning, and disseminating of knowledge;
- More fully describe the value of diversity focused teaching and determine that such work shall be recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty;
• Improve recognition and rewards for alternative forms of teaching including collaborative, interdisciplinary, and community engaged; and
• Increase pedagogy that more fully supports students from diverse backgrounds to include all manners of diversity (social, cultural, economic, abilities, and racial etc.).

**Emergent and Aspirational Strategies (Service):**

- Increase recognition of institution building as valid contribution and recognize in promotion and tenure criteria;
- Recognize shared governance as an essential contribution and value as leadership development;
- Address significant disparities of service, with particular attention to disparities that correlate to gender, race, and rank; and
- Clarify service expectations and recognition of a broad range of activities that might be service, in addition to contributing to teaching and/or scholarship

**Emergent and Aspirational Strategies (Research):**

- Improve how we describe and promote the pursuit of truth through research across disciplines, fields, and domains in ways that are legible to our public communities;
- Better define, assess, and value community engaged scholarship and determine that such work shall be recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty;
- Better define, assess, and value collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship and determine that such work shall be recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty;
- Better define, assess, and value public scholarship and determine that such work shall be recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty;
- Strengthen recognition and value of diversity scholarship and determine that such work shall be recognized and considered in hiring, merit, promotion, and tenure of all applicable faculty; and
- Establish a university-wide resource or office for strengthening support of collaborative, community-engaged, and interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service.

**Next Steps:**

We present this document with the aspiration to partner with the Provost, BODC, and leadership to realize the greater potential of our faculty, community, and university. Our next step would be to determine the highest priority strategies for attaining short-term and long-term objectives as outlined in the document. We will need to establish work groups and timelines as well as develop the capacity to accommodate uncertainties. It is important work. We look forward to the collaboration, and are excited by the potential outcomes of our partnership.
UW Faculty 2050 Summary of Survey Results
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Survey Goals, Structure, Demographics
Goals of the UW Faculty 2050 Survey

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

Survey Structure

- 10 closed response questions (1 question included 6 sub-prompts)
  - Questions about: UW Core Values; Types of Teaching, Service, Research; Influence of MPT Criteria on Teaching, Service, Research; Demographics (Rank, Campus included)
  - Response Rate: 99.37% was the highest response rate, 92.70% was the lowest response rate

- 9 open response questions (*short* answer)
  - Questions about: Views on the UW; How to Improve MPT Criteria for Teaching, Service, Research; Ways to Strengthen DE; UW’s Contributions to the Public; Faculty Policies; Looking Ahead for New Faculty; the Next Decade
  - Response Rate: 77.88% was the highest response rate, 33.76% was the lowest response rate

Survey Demographics

- 945 Unique Responses
- 807 Seattle, 53 Tacoma, 36 Bothell
- 346 Professors, 230 Associate Professors, 128 Assistant Professors, 98 lecturers, 50 or less in all other categories.
- 447 Females, 422 Males, 7 Other, 71 Unclassified
- 117 underrepresented in their discipline
- 16 self-identified LGBTQIA+
- 10 self-identified racial/ethnic minorities
- Other self-identified social categories: first generation college student, first generation immigrant to the US, parents.
How Faculty See the UW

How faculty view the UW

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

From your perspective and experience as a faculty member at the UW, please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements currently captures a core UW value:

Our Role as a Public Institution of Higher Education is Key to our Research, Teaching, and Service

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well
From your perspective and experience as a faculty member at the UW, please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements currently captures a core UW value:

**The Ability to Inspire and Innovate are Core to our Mission and Vision**

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well

**Academic Freedom in our Research, Teaching, and Service**

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well

**Diversity, Equity, and Building an Inclusive Community is Essential for our Success**

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well
From your perspective and experience as a faculty member at the UW, please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements currently captures a core UW value:

**Human Centered Learning and Teaching for all Students**

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well

From your perspective and experience as a faculty member at the UW, please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements currently captures a core UW value:

**Strong and Sustained Shared Governance is Essential for our Success**

- Not at all
- Not very much
- Neutral
- Well
- Very well

In addition to university education, UW’s greatest contribution to the public is...

- Research
- Community Resource
- Teaching
- Medical Care
In addition to university education, UW’s greatest contribution to the public is...

**Research:** “Research that creates new knowledge and innovation to improve our understanding of the world and improve our lives.”

**Community:** “Stimulate the broader public’s knowledge and passion about key issues in the world—new scientific breakthroughs, international relations, environmental challenges, etc., and provide them with access to talks by top experts on these issues.”

**Education:** “Education of our sons and daughters has to remain our primary mandate, the reason we exist. If we prepare them for the world as good citizens, the thinkers, makers and shakers, we will have succeeded.”

**Medical Care:** “We’re known for medical research and care, for good reason.”

---

**How Faculty Experience Merit, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria**

Do current criteria for merit, promotion, and/or tenure reflect the ways in which you engage in teaching?
Teaching:

Types of teaching most represented in the survey:
- Small Lecture (N = 673)
- Seminars (N = 581)
- Large Lecture Class (N = 369)

Types of teaching less represented but significant in the survey:
- Community Engaged Teaching (N = 131)
- Online (N = 74)
- Studios (N = 41)
- Other (N = 69; mentoring students, independent study, study abroad/experiential learning)

If not, how would you improve or expand the criteria?

- Unclear and Unrealistic Expectations and Evaluation Criteria
- Disparities Based on Time, Effort, Type of Teaching
- Institutional Biases
- Teaching is Undervalued

"There need to be additional ways of representing strong teaching beyond student evaluations. The criteria needs to be made explicit. [We] Need more credit for mentoring/teaching."

"Provide additional credit for interdisciplinary, inter-departmental teaching."

"I still think teaching is largely an afterthought at the UW, its obligatory for tenure-line folks, and something that is often overlooked if a person is a promising/imp scholar, or brings in a ton of grant money."

Do current criteria for merit, promotion, and/or tenure reflect the ways in which you engage in research and/or scholarship?
Top 5 Types of Research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single PI/Head of Lab</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Health/ Clinical</th>
<th>Applied Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single PI/Head of Lab</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/ Clinical</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research:

Types of research represented in the survey (as defined on the survey):
- Single PI or Head of Lab (N = 274)
- Social Sciences (N = 270)
- Interdisciplinary (N = 253):
- Humanities (N = 117)
- Technology Developments and Patents (N = 104)
- Arts (N = 34)

Science Breakdown:

**Social Science** (N = 270)
- Community Engagement (N = 98)
- Engaged Scholarship (N = 95)
- Interdisciplinary (N = 87)

**Basic Science** (N = 221)
- Single PI or Head of Lab (N = 103)
- Physical or Natural Sciences (N = 83)
- Interdisciplinary (N = 33)

**Physical or Natural Science** (N = 123)
- Basic Science (N = 83)
- Single PI or Head of Lab (N = 57)
- Applied Research (N = 42)
If not, how would you improve or expand the criteria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Value for Types of Work Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“As a junior faculty, I was told often by others that (not my department) to <em>not collaborate</em> and to write sole PI grant.”</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching, Mentorship Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“I have very few hard core research papers. Yet I have changed the way people teach and learn my subject. There should be some way to account for that.”</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Scholarship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>“I would like to see <em>support for public scholarship</em> providing expertise to public advisory boards or writing internal reports at the university that require research and data analysis.”</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unclear and Unrealistic Expectations and Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>It’s unclear what is meant by the work “criteria”. The faculty code is (purposefully) vague. Departmental guidelines may or may not be very explicit. Merit criteria are not well defined in my home unit and we have no transparency in this process, so this question is difficult to answer.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Engagement &amp; Public Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaborative Work at UW:**

*“[F]uture colleagues will have a different career path being more involved in collaborations (interdisciplinary) as well as engage more with public (crowd funding)”*

*“Widespread research collaborations, both national and international, are now the norm, and the trend will likely continue.”*

*“We should encourage more interdisciplinary events so departments can learn to work together better. A good example is with the engineering department promoting collaboration with Children’s to innovate and bring ideas to market.”*

*“Interdisciplinary research where collaboration is critical to success still faces challenges as being viewed with the same level of integrity and quality as sole-PI research.”*
Community Engagement & Public Scholarship

“Service includes much that is unacknowledged by the institution. As an underrepresented faculty member with deep ties to the community I am often (implicitly and explicitly) tasked with bi-directional representation. In community settings I represent the University; while in the University I am often a proxy for or a bridge to or a liaison with the community. None of my white nor my over-represented international colleagues carry such responsibility. Additionally, underrepresented faculty are often a life-line for counsel and support underrepresented students; meaning we carry enormous formal and informal advising loads. While also serving as teacher/mentor/counselor to faculty colleagues seeking cultural insight. It’s exhausting work, but unrecognized and unrewarded. In the literature it is referred to as a cultural taxation.”

Invisible Labor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>URM in Discipline</th>
<th>Well Represented in Discipline</th>
<th>Full Professor*</th>
<th>Associate Professor*</th>
<th>Assistant Professor*</th>
<th>Lecturer (includes principal and senior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Community Engagement</td>
<td>27.36%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Engaged Scholarship</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Public Scholarship</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All ranks shown here refer to tenure track faculty. Data on faculty WOT, clinical faculty, and research faculty were not broken down by ranks in this same way. You can request data on these groups if you would like.

Do current criteria for merit, promotion, and/or tenure reflect the ways in which you engage in service (professional, institutional, or otherwise)?
Service:

In general, respondents are VERY active in service.

Types of service represented in the survey:

- Department or Program Level (N = 817)
- Mentoring of Students (N = 810)
- Campus or University Leadership (N = 349)
- Public Scholarship (N = 205)
- Other (N = 61; Journal Editor/Reviewer, National/International Service, Clinical Practice)

If not, how would you improve or expand the criteria?

Inequalities in Service Labor, Recognition, and Reward

Unclear and Unrealistic Expectations and Evaluation Criteria

Devalued Non-UW Community Service

Racial Inequalities | Gender Inequalities | Campus Inequalities | Rank Inequalities | Department Inequalities

Most mentions → Least mentions

If not, how would you improve or expand the criteria?

"I find that while I am encouraged to do [service], I am not rewarded for it, am often penalized for it (with warnings that I am insufficiently productive and taking on too much service work); while the institution benefits from my "hidden", uncompensated, and unacknowledged labor."

"[A] wide range of expectations and activity in service makes assessment difficult."

"Explicitly calling out broader community engagement & public scholarship as service - I didn't realize those “counted” [because] what’s normed is just stuff people do in support of the university/department. Also acknowledging mentoring of both students and faculty beyond formal structures."

"Allow women, people of color, and people of different backgrounds/levels to be represented on decision-making committees."
Invisible Labor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>URM in Discipline</th>
<th>Well Represented in Discipline</th>
<th>Full Professor*</th>
<th>Associate Professor*</th>
<th>Assistant Professor**</th>
<th>Lecturer (including principal and senior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Mentoring Students</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Mentoring Colleagues</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All ranks shown here refer to tenure track faculty. Data on faculty WOT, clinical faculty, and research faculty were not broken down by ranks in this same way. You can request data on these groups if you would like.

---

Common Themes for Research, Service, Teaching:

**PMT criteria exist in a “black box”:** “Criteria are too vague. It’s difficult to gauge whether you are on track, highly dependent on quality and availability of mentoring by dept chair and senior faculty.”

**Disparities in recognition and reward:** “It’s not so much about expanding the criteria as it is about making sure that everyone is actually doing their part. [The] heavy lifting tends to get done by women and scholars of color, many/most of whom are not yet tenured.”

**Interest in interdisciplinary, community work and public engagement:** “Consider public engagement or community engagement as an additional criterion for effective teaching.”

---

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
What one activity or initiative might you suggest to strengthen diversity, equity, and inclusion at the UW? ...

**Overarching Theme: Strengthen the Pipeline**

"Stop talking about "diversity, equity and inclusion" and start having real conversations about power, privilege and race, gender, class, sexual identity, disability, and so on."

"We likely need a sustained effort at multiple levels (individual, curricular, institutional, etc.) to foreground historical and present contributions of under-represented groups across campus. For instance, providing grants for equity-related undergraduate/grad research projects, offering pedagogical scaffolding and encouragement for addressing under-represented intellectual lineages and issues of representation within courses, bringing regular speakers to campus that contribute to these areas (supported through lecture series, exhibitions, or even year-long themed pedagogical programs), and hiring more diverse campus leaders."

"Actually hire faculty of color and white faculty who have an established research/practice agenda rooted in equity."

"I’ve been participating in President Cure’s inclusivity training this year. I think every faculty member should participate in it, especially our newest faculty."

---

**The Look Ahead to 2050**
If you consider the newest faculty colleagues in your discipline or area, how do you think their careers might be different from yours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Different</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support from mentors</td>
<td>Technologically advanced, novel methods</td>
<td>Coat of living is higher, less place-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better salaries</td>
<td>More interdisciplinary, collaborative research</td>
<td>More competition for funding, grants, publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearer criteria for success</td>
<td>More community engagement</td>
<td>MPT criteria too demanding; faculty are stretched too thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More diverse and/or more DEI-aware</td>
<td>Changes in teaching style and structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Faculty Careers are Better

“I have an optimistic view that they will be mentored better and so the average standard of early accomplishment may improve.”

“Probably higher salary, but more restricted resources and increased demands.”

“I believe there is a generational difference in that newer faculty seems to be more open-minded about racial/ethnic diversity/equity/inclusion compared to more senior faculty.”

“The expectations for tenure and promotion are clearer and the feedback process between the Dean and junior faculty members is consistent.”

New Faculty Careers are Different

“They will have more engagement with an online world, in teaching, in research, in disseminating knowledge.”

“Widespread research collaborations, both national and international, are now the norm, and the trend will likely continue.”

“My young colleagues are hungry for impact. They will be more engaged with entrepreneurial approaches to impact, not just publish or perish.”

“They may also have to navigate more emphasis on teaching bigger classes and perhaps learning how to conduct hybrid or online courses.”
New Faculty Careers are Worse

“Limited and competitive funding to sustain research career.”

“I think that Seattle is getting to be a harder place to live. So I wonder if they have to be thinking about moving more than I did.”

“I feel so sorry for them. They come in with good salaries- but they won’t keep up with inflation. They have less control over what they teach because we no longer can replace all the people we use - so they lose young colleagues and have to do a lot of service teaching because there is no one else to do it. I would not choose a University career if it had been like this when I went to graduate school - and I worry for them.”

If you could change one faculty-related policy at UW- what would it be?

Changes to Merit, Promotion, Tenure Criteria

- Better Salaries
- Support for Families
- Institutionalize & Support Faculty on Different Tracks

Changes in Hiring

Changes in Teaching

If you could change one faculty-related policy at UW- what would it be?

“Require all units (departments, schools, and colleges) to produce, post, and regularly update written promotion and tenure guidelines.”

“Pay, job security, and opportunities for lecturers at all ranks (part time, non-competitively hired, competitively hired).”

“It is disappointing and appalling that a public institution of this caliber does not provide parental leave to its faculty members.”

“Make our hiring aligned with our stated values, explicitly considering expanding the diversity (racial, ethnic, approach to scholarship) of UW faculty, community as hiring criteria.”

“Allow well-planned co-teaching to be part of a faculty’s teaching load and have it count towards their full load.”
What do you think is most important for faculty to be thinking about in the next decade?

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

**Shifting Technology:** “The same things we have always needed to think about; delivering quality education, doing good research, taking on important problems, but doing all of this while understanding that technology is changing how we do our work, and how tech is changing the social world around us, especially for our students.”

---

**Next Steps – Data Collection and Analysis**

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

Surveys were a good start, but we can do more:
- Focus groups
- Semi-structured interviews
- Further analysis of survey data
Thank you!
Title IX update on steering committee recommendations

Title IX Coordinated System of Initiatives, Programs and Services

Title IX Steering Committee
- Tri-campus committee of senior leaders appointed by President Cauce to provide ongoing strategic oversight to the University’s work on Title IX

Title IX Working Committee
- Tri-campus committee of campus partners who meet regularly to monitor, identify, elevate issues, and create and implement strategies to foster cultural change and positive compliance with Title IX

Service provider offices
- Have operational and subject matter expertise in a variety of prevention and response areas

Title IX Coordinator
- Provide leadership and consultation for a broad network of campus partners who collectively provide resources, support, services, outreach and education

Confidential Advocates
- Counseling
- Medical care

Private & Discreet
- SafeCampus
- Title IX Coordinator

Prohibits discrimination
- All UW people
- All UW locations

Policies
- Education & Outreach
- Support Resources

Complaint & Investigation Office
- UCRO
- Human Resources
- Title IX Investigation Office

Title IX COORDINATOR
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

TitleIX@uw.edu
206-616-9713
Title IX
Strategic Priorities

Campus Climate
Facilitate a regularized assessment of all students, faculty, and staff on all three campuses regarding sexual violence, harassment, and other sexual misconduct.

Education and Outreach
Develop increased, coordinated, and evidence-based institution-wide strategy to build upon current education and outreach aimed at the prevention of and response to sexual violence, harassment, and other forms of sexual misconduct.

Employee Responsibilities
Clarify employee responsibilities and protocol for providing support, resources, and reporting options to students and employees who disclose that they have been impacted by sexual assault, sexual harassment, or other forms of sexual misconduct.
SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WOMEN
Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine

OVERVIEW
System-wide changes to the culture and climate in higher education are needed to prevent and effectively respond to sexual harassment. There is no evidence that current policies, procedures, and approaches—which often focus on symbolic compliance with the law and on avoiding liability—have resulted in a significant reduction in sexual harassment. Colleges and universities and federal agencies should move beyond basic legal compliance to adopt holistic, evidence-based policies and practices to address and prevent all forms of sexual harassment and to promote a culture of civility and respect. The cumulative result of sexual harassment in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine is significant damage to research integrity and a costly loss of talent in these fields. Institutions should thus consider sexual harassment equally important as research misconduct in terms of its effect on the integrity of research. These key findings are explored in the National Academies report, Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

PREVENTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WOMEN IN ACADEMIC SCIENCES, ENGINEERING, AND MEDICINE
Addressing and preventing sexual harassment requires attending to all three forms of sexual harassment: 1) gender harassment (sexist hostility and crude behavior), 2) unwanted sexual attention (unwelcome verbal or physical sexual advances), and 3) sexual coercion (when favorable professional or educational treatment is conditioned on sexual activity). Gender harassment is by far the most common form of sexual harassment, and when severe or frequent, it can result in the same level of negative outcomes as one instance of sexual coercion. Leaders in academic institutions and research and training sites must pay increased attention to and enact policies that cover gender harassment as a means of addressing the most common form of sexual harassment and of preventing other types of sexually harassing behavior.

Attending to an organization’s climate is crucial to preventing and addressing harassment because organizational climate is the greatest predictor of sexual harassment. Organizations with tolerant, or even perceived tolerant, climates show higher rates of sexual harassment than those seen as intolerant. Unfortunately, academic institutions are often perceived as tolerant, and based on the best available studies to date, more than 50 percent of women faculty and staff report having been harassed. Student surveys of university systems show disturbingly similar high rates, with 20–50 percent of women
students experiencing sexually harassing behavior perpetrated by faculty/staff, and women students in academic medicine experience more frequent sexual harassment than those in science and engineering.

The persistent sexual harassment in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine, and its adverse impacts on women's careers, is jeopardizing more rapid and sustained progress in closing the gender gap in these fields. Across all industry sectors, occupations, races, ethnicities, and social classes, sexual harassment undermines women's professional and educational attainment and their mental and physical health. For women faculty in science, engineering, and medicine, the professional outcomes from being sexually harassed include stepping down from leadership opportunities to avoid the perpetrator, leaving their institution, and leaving their field altogether. Additionally, when sexual harassment occurs in research environments it can undermine core values of research integrity. The cumulative effect of sexual harassment is significant damage to research integrity and a costly loss of talent in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine.

Four factors increase the likelihood that women in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine will be targeted with sexual harassment: male-dominated work settings; hierarchies that concentrate power in individuals and make students, junior faculty, and others dependent on them for funding, research direction, mentorship, and career advancement; symbolic legal compliance policies and procedures that are ineffective at preventing harassment; and uninformed leadership at all levels lacking the tools, intention, and/or focus needed to undertake the key actions necessary to reduce and prevent sexual harassment.

The challenges and opportunities are significant. Preventing sexual harassment against women is critical to avoiding further loss of talent in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine, and thus to advancing the nation's economic and social well-being and its overall public health. Making the necessary changes to prevent harassment will require diverse and visionary leadership at all levels as well as the support and participation of every member of the academic and research communities.
However, when academic institutions demonstrate the will to do so, the research shows what will work to prevent sexual harassment, and thus we can protect the next generation of women entering science, engineering, and medicine.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO BRING ABOUT NECESSARY CHANGE**

Seven recommendations focus on what academic institutions need to do to address and prevent all forms of sexual harassment.

**RECOMMENDATION: Address the most common form of sexual harassment: gender harassment.**

Institutional leaders should pay increased attention to and enact policies that cover gender harassment. Because it is the most common form of sexual harassment, it usually accompanies other forms of harassment, and thus addressing it will have a large impact on preventing the other types of harassment as well.

**RECOMMENDATION: Move beyond legal compliance to address culture and climate.**

Academic institutions, research and training sites, and federal agencies should move beyond interventions or policies that represent basic legal compliance and that rely solely on formal reports made by targets. Sexual harassment needs to be addressed as a significant culture and climate issue. The following five recommendations offer specific ways to progress toward this goal.

**RECOMMENDATION: Create diverse, inclusive, and respectful environments.**

Academic institutions should work to create a diverse, inclusive, and respectful environment where these values are aligned with and embedded into the systems, structures, policies, and procedures of the institution. Their leaders should prioritize taking actions that will result in greater gender and racial equity in hiring and promotions, thus improving the representation of women at every level. They should also foster greater cooperation, respectful work behavior, and professionalism at the faculty, staff, and student/trainee levels, and should evaluate faculty and staff on these criteria in hiring and promotion. Institutions should combine anti-harassment and civility-promotion programs. They should ensure that training on preventing and addressing sexual harassment is tailored for specific populations, provides skills needed by all members of the academic community, teaches how to interrupt and intervene when harassment occurs, and focuses on changing behavior, not just changing beliefs. Critically, institutions must evaluate training programs for efficacy and to determine what aspects most effectively change climate, and reduce and prevent harassment.

**RECOMMENDATION: Improve transparency and accountability.**

Academic institutions should develop and readily share clear, accessible, and consistent policies on sexual harassment and standards of behavior. They should include a range of clearly stated, appropriate, and escalating disciplinary consequences for perpetrators found to have violated policy and/or law. Such consequences should be punitive, not something often considered a benefit, such as a reduction in teaching load or time away from campus service responsibilities. Policies should also include an investigative and decision making process that is fair to all involved and that is undertaken and completed in a timely manner.

Academic institutions should strive for greater transparency in how they are handling reports of sexual harassment while balancing a need for confidentiality. They should issue annual reports that provide information on (1) how many and what type of policy violations have been reported (both informally and
formally), (2) how many reports are currently under investigation, and (3) how many have been adjudicated, along with general descriptions of any disciplinary actions taken.

Academic institutions should be accountable for their organizational climate, and utilize climate surveys to further investigate and address systemic sexual harassment, particularly when surveys indicate specific schools or facilities have high rates of harassment or chronically fail to reduce rates of sexual harassment.

Academic institutions should consider sexual harassment equally important as research misconduct in terms of its effect on the integrity of research, and thus should increase collaboration among offices that oversee the integrity of research (i.e., those that cover ethics, research misconduct, diversity, and harassment issues) and centralize resources, information, and expertise.

RECOMMENDATION: Diffuse the hierarchical and dependent relationship between trainees and faculty.

Academic institutions should identify and enact mechanisms to diffuse concentrated power and dependencies in relationships between trainees and faculty/advisors, such as using mentoring networks and committee-based advising, and providing independent funding.

RECOMMENDATION: Provide support for the target.

Academic institutions should convey that reporting sexual harassment is an honorable and courageous action and provide (1) access to support services (social services, health care, legal, career/professional) regardless of if a formal report is filed, (2) alternative and less formal ways to record information about an incident, and (3) approaches that prevent the target from experiencing or fearing retaliation.

RECOMMENDATION: Strive for strong and diverse leadership.

Strong and diverse leadership is essential to creating and maintaining a culture and climate that prevents harassment. It is crucial that all levels of leadership, from principal investigator and lab director to university president, are held responsible for creating the needed changes described above. Institutional leaders at all levels should make publicly known the goal of reducing and preventing sexual harassment is one of their highest priorities, and they should engage students, faculty, and staff in efforts to achieve that goal during their tenure. And because leaders without effective tools cannot implement the kind of institutional change required to address a problem as widespread and longstanding as sexual harassment in the academy, institutions should support their leaders at every level by providing skill-development training customized to each level of leadership.

COMMITTEE ON IMPACTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN ACADEMIA
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