Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, May 7, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Absent: Sarah Stroup, Scott Barnhart, Angelisa Paladin, Linda Watts
Guests: Cheryl Cameron, Rich Christie, Gordon Aamot, Margaret Stuart

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Way called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Thaïsa Way [Exhibit A]

Chair Way spoke to her written report.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.
   d. Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement: ad hoc Committee on Faculty Pre-retirement Planning Report. [Exhibit C]
   e. Faculty Council Activities Report. [Exhibit D]

Zoe Barsness, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, summarized the work of the SCPB so far this year.

The Committee has been involved in the annual reviews of the main academic and administrative units across the University, doing “deep dives” on a representative sampling to look at individual issues as well as common trends. A summary will be provided to the Faculty Senate.

A subgroup of the SCPB worked as part of a larger task force on the Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) supplements. The supplements served initially to mitigate the ABB rollout through a “hold-harmless” principle. But it was understood that such an approach was not permanent, and the supplements eventually would become a strategic tool used to support academic initiatives and priorities. The task force is looking at how the supplement process might be managed to implement this more general purpose.

Finally, the SCPB has been advising the Provost on issues related to this biennium’s merit raises. The legislature authorized a 4% raise over the course of the biennium at 2% per year. However, the University contends that the legislature did not fully fund this amount. Provost Baldasty outlined the current plan, which is to offer 2% as a regular merit raise for all meritorious faculty and professional staff. This will be self-financed by individual units. Administrative cuts will make an additional 1% available for faculty, distributed only to those deemed extra-meritorious. Moreover, the additional 1% cannot be given across the board, but must be based on individual determinations. Barsness remarked that these tradeoffs represent a balancing of issues relating to access and compensation.

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, gave an oral report. She is working on the survey of specific faculty priorities for the upcoming session, but she believes that faculty must also address the legislature about the overarching issue of higher education funding. She also noted that issues of academic freedom and freedom of speech are bubbling up around the country. It’s been dealt with successfully here, but she said that faculty must be vigilant about potential legislative inroads on traditional faculty freedoms.
In response to questions, several points were made. The legislature authorized two 2% raises for the next biennium. The word “authorize” means we are allowed to give such raises. Although the University controls the number of people we admit, there is a minimum number of in-state undergraduate students that the UW is expected to take, and the ability to raise in-state undergraduate tuition is controlled by a state formula that has limited increases to roughly 2% a year. This does not provide enough tuition dollars to cover the shortfall in state appropriations made for the raises.

Chair Way said that the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Pre-retirement Planning Report distributed in Exhibit C has been sent back to the Council for further vetting. Provost Baldasty said that thought must be given to the costs associated with some of the recommendations, particularly the recommendation making the Voluntary Retirement Initiative (VRI) permanent. President Cauce noted that VRI’s were intended to be sporadic so that they serve as an incentive. Way suggested more generally that all Councils proposing legislative changes include fiscal-impact notes. The chair of the ad hoc committee is a retired faculty member. Baldasty questioned the wisdom and propriety of having retired faculty involved in writing rules that do not apply to them.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce spoke on a number of topics.

She expressed some concerns about the state legislature. Although there is a lot of talk about how “this is the year for higher education,” Cauce feels it remains to be seen how the legislature will define higher-education priorities. For example, proposals to enact “free community college” raise questions about funding as well as whether the community college degree is the best place for emphasis. In addition, community college presidents fear that such a program will constrain their ability to raise tuition. In any case, the program does not address non-tuition costs.

Admissions numbers look good at this point in time. Unlike universities in the South and East, the UW is not seeing a decline in international students.

With respect to the Pre-Retirement Committee Planning Report, Cauce said retirements will be taking place at an unprecedented pace. The UW must be careful about putting the needs of retirees ahead of future members of the community. For example, child care is an ongoing issue that will require increased resources. In fact, the UW may have to rethink some of the current retiree entitlements, such as parking. She said that extra care must be taken when considering new entitlements.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the April 2, 2018, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the April 19, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]
   d. Approve nominations for 2018-19 Senate Executive Committee Positions. [Exhibit F]
   e. Approve 2018-19 Schedule of Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate 2018-19 Meetings. [Exhibit G]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

Chair Way announced that May 18th is the 80th anniversary of the Faculty Senate and shared governance.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

8. Discussion items.
   a. Interfolio Information: Margaret Stuart, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. [Exhibit H]
Margaret Stuart, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, gave a presentation on Interfolio, an electronic system that will be the required tool for initial faculty hiring at the University of Washington. The rollout date is set for July 1.

During discussion several issues arose.

Several members expressed concern that requiring the use of Interfolio would interfere with established hiring portals and processes in departments, such as mathematics, or schools, such as law. President Cauce said that there are other universities with such units that use Interfolio, and perhaps they could be consulted. Vice-Provost Cheryl Cameron noted that the relevant deans here, who have been consulted on Interfolio, did not express any such reservations. Stuart said she would investigate this issue.

Other members wondered about Interfolio’s process for recording the reasons that applicants are dropped from consideration. The concern was expressed that Interfolio’s reliance on fixed categories would not provide enough flexibility for individual searches. Moreover, these categories, which are traditional in conception, may not support our university-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion goals that envision thinking outside the box with respect to such criteria. For example, Interfolio’s “professionalism” category can become a box for “people who are not like us.” Stuart replied that these categories were derived after consultation with relevant stakeholder groups, they provide a basis for a consistent framework for discussion and data collection, and that units are allowed to develop rubrics that elaborate on the individual categories. In response, it was noted that the third assertion undermines the second. Moreover, adopting traditional terminology tends to result in traditional rubrics, or, in the alternative, requires units to spend time retranslating and thus creating a discontinuity between the category descriptor and the rubric. Stuart said that the wording of the list of categories could be discussed but it must be kept in mind that the goal is a common set of university-wide categories.

Some members wondered whether, to the extent that the Interfolio documentation is subject to public records requests, the preceding issue would increase the University’s potential for liability. Stuart responded that the failure to provide reasons why people are dropped from consideration creates liability risks under federal requirements.

Way highlighted these three issues as appropriate for further discussion. In particular, she wondered whether there could be a delay in, or a modification of, the implementation of the process by which applicants are dropped from consideration, but Stuart responded by again noting the requirements of federal law. Several members wondered whether the July 1 rollout date was compatible with a full investigation of these issues, and, moreover, how any such investigation would be coordinated with the faculty side of shared governance.

The discussion concluded with Stuart agreeing to get more information about the issues raised, and Way agreeing to work on ways of coordinating with the faculty side of shared governance.

b. Summary of the review of school/college/campus bylaws – Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit I]

Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, introduced Rich Christie, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Code and Regulations. Christie summarized the material in the Bylaw Review Report in Exhibit I, which Christie pointed out represented the views of the full committee.

During the discussion, several points were made. Members were concerned that one implication of the report is that a majority of the faculty can disenfranchise the rest with respect to electing the Elected Faculty Council’s (EFC), thus running against the idea that the EFC’s are to represent all of the faculty. Other members were concerned about the possibility of senior administrators serving on EFC’s, thus undercutting its role as providing another avenue of input to the administration. On the other hand, some members pointed out that small units might find it difficult to staff EFC’s to the extent that administrators are excluded. Moreover, they pointed out that there are other advisory committees on which senior administrators sit, such as the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. In addition, there was some uncertainty about how senior administrative status would be defined. Finally, some members suggested that the issue might be less about who is on the EFC and more about which EFC members can vote. Members differed on which of these two concerns were greater. There also was some difference about the extent to which these issues should be left up to individual units as opposed to providing more specific mandates at the Code level.
A motion was made and seconded to accept the report and refer the report to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs for further study and recommendation. The motion passed.

   a. Class B Legislation – Open Access Proposal.  [Exhibit J]
      Joe Janes, Vice Chair Elect
      **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate. Joe Janes, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, gave a brief review of the history of the proposal and described it in general terms as representing a collective effort making faculty work available to the public. Gordon Aamot, Director of Scholarly Communication and Publishing with the Libraries, went over some of the details of the policy and how it would work in practice.

Discussion of the motion followed. A motion was made and seconded to amend the legislation by replacing the phrase “ResearchWorks Archive” in line 28 with the word “institutional,” and replacing the phrase “ResearchWorks Archive” in line 30 with the phrase “institutional repository.” The motion to amend passed.

Discussion ensued on the motion as amended. Aamot made clear that the policy allows for faculty members to submit works with an attached embargo period. Provost Baldasty noted that this proposal will result in startup and ongoing annual costs in the hundreds of thousands of dollars and that these funds will have to come from somewhere in the administrative budget. It was noted that the open-access implementation relies on the existence of journals, so it is not intended to replace them. Baldasty accepted such an intention, but argued in response that funding open access could result in less money being available for journal subscription. Baldasty noted that the annual costs are comparable to Interfolio, but he pointed out that Interfolio is being adopted in part because of compliance issues.

The motion as amended passed.

   b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty lecturer issues - second consideration.  [Exhibit K]
      **Action:** Final review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

A motion was made to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration.

There was no discussion and the motion passed.

   c. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to promotion and tenure diversity requirements - second consideration.  [Exhibit L]
      **Action:** Final review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

A motion was made to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration.

There was no discussion and the motion passed.

   d. Approval of the May 17, 2018, Faculty Senate Agenda.  [Exhibit M]
      **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda.

There was no discussion and the motion passed.
10. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday May 14 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Thaïsa Way, Professor, College of Built Environments

As an opening, I want to begin this report by bringing attention to a critically important project to develop an Open Access policy proposal which has been in the making for over three years and will come to Faculty Senate for approval on May 17, with implementation planned for next year. We have developed the policy proposal and an implementation framework that maximizes access while establishing the ability for each faculty member to participate, to ignore, to obtain a waiver, or to delay participation. Please encourage your senators to read and review with faculty prior to this May meeting.

**Strengthening Shared Governance:** I met this month with faculty council chairs to hear about their work. Threads that were evident was a focus on student and pedagogical challenges as reflected in the work to establish a policy for students who need accommodations in their coursework / class attendance for religious reasons, the challenges of open source / online textbooks, and direct admission. The challenges of diversity and equity were evident in efforts to establish equitable benefits for adoptive parents, wellness rooms for nursing mothers and those needed a private space for medical purposes, and to increase the value of diversity scholarship. In each of these areas the chairs noted a need for better and more comprehensive data from the UW.

Elected Faculty Councils (EFC) have been working with deans to develop compensation plans and to review fiscal plans for the next year. This has required a new level of fiscal literacy by our EFC members and we appreciate their efforts. Additionally many EFCs have been working on merit, promotion, and tenure guidelines to address the forms of scholarship, teaching, and service that are increasingly a part of faculty careers, including community-engaged, public, collaborative, and interdisciplinary scholarship, research, and teaching. The Carnegie application for community engaged university designation is supporting this work as they collect evidence and document our ongoing efforts.

As noted in the fall, we are currently engaged in the process of a faculty governance review of our disciplinary and dispute resolution system as outlined by the faculty code. We have established a framework of guiding principles and values to inform the review process of the current system which is the accreted product of 30 years of incremental changes. The process is being led by co-chairs Zoe Barsness and the Secretary of the Faculty Mike Townsend and facilitated by three teams: a steering committee, a values and principals work group, and a drafting / rules and regulations work group. Our intent is to develop a system that facilitates access while assuring greater fairness, accuracy, and efficiency. Our goal is to have a draft ready for review in the fall in partnership with the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and other appropriate councils.

**Diversity and Equity:** The 2050 project as noted below highlights that we have work to do in this arena. There is significant concern that diversity, equity, and inclusion are not as strongly shared values as many believe they should be. In particular this is evident in the call for increased value for diversity scholarship. Addressing this issue, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs has proposed legislation to alter our code so that scholarship and teaching on diversity "shall" be considered by promotion committees when requested and submitted by the faculty member. This does not require that we engage in diversity scholarship, teaching, or service, but requires that when we do we have the right to expect it to be acknowledged and considered in a review of our work as faculty. Others pointed to the need to improve our stewardship of an inclusive community including expanding access to trainings, support resources, and establishing a place for grace for those times when things go awry. Finally, it should be noted that there is a significant call for better data and easier access to the data. With Workday established the UW can and must collect more comprehensive data on our faculty and staff so that we can accurately and productively assess our efforts to build a diverse and inclusive community. In turn, many noted that such data should be available for review when assessing our leaders from chairs to our top administration.

**UW/Faculty 2050:** In March, 2018 we shared a faculty survey with all voting faculty (all tenure track faculty at 50% or higher and all full time lecturers and WOT faculty). The ten closed responses asked about UW Core Values; Types of Teaching, Service, Research; Influences of MPT Criteria on Teaching, Service, Research; Demographics (Rank, Campus included). The nine open response questions asked about views on the UW including, How to Improve merit, promotion, and tenure criteria for Teaching,
Service, Research; Ways to Strengthen Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; UW’s Contributions to the Public; Faculty Policies; and how the careers of new faculty might be changing. We received 598 responses (a rate of over 10% of total voting faculty), with the majority from the Seattle campus (515 Seattle, 37 Tacoma, 15 Bothell). Faculty rank was across all levels including tenure track and lecturers and research faculty.

As a whole respondents believed academic freedom is essential and we have an important role as a public good. Faculty suggested that MPT criteria are adequate but need to be significantly improved to better and more fully reflect the ways that we teach, research, and perform service. It is clear from the survey responses that diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts should be strengthened across the academy. The focus on human-centered teaching was questioned as was the role of shared governance, thus we should address these values if we are to make them core to our future. Emergent and aspirational strategies have been developed and are being shared with members of the Board of Deans and Chancellors, faculty council chairs, and elected faculty council chairs. I will review these as well at the Faculty Senate meeting on May 17.

**Fiscal stability and faculty compensation:** As noted in the SCPB report by Zoe Barsness, faculty senators and leaders are focused on efforts to understand the challenges of the UW’s budgets from the scale of the units to the broader university as a whole. While some units appear to be doing well, and others are recovering appropriately, there remain those who are struggling. If we are going to sustain the broad university that we have built, it will be important to understand how best to steward the comprehensive nature of the academy. Developing priorities and strategies is increasingly essential and we will be looking to Elected Faculty Councils to continue to partner with the SCPB and Faculty Senate along with their deans and chancellors in this challenging work. And more to the point, faculty will need to continue to think creatively and deeply about how we do what we do- and how we steward the investments in this work well. Our decisions make a difference.

Additionally, JoAnn Taricani and I have sought to strengthen the voice of the faculty at the table with our state legislators. Over a number of months, I have met with those legislators representing UW and my district (I live in the UW district) including Representative Nicole Macri, Speaker Frank Chopp, and Senator Jamie Pedersen to understand their perceptions of the university and our potential to be strong partners. In turn, as JoAnn does on a regular basis, I have advocated for our faculty and our university. Our leaders have tough choices before them and it is important that we are viewed as partners. This is particularly important now as these choices are increasingly critical to our fiscal health and to the success of our state’s future. I very much appreciate JoAnn’s hard work to be a productive partner and encourage you to reach out to your representatives to share with them the ways the UW can be a partner in our community.

**Lecturer career paths:** The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has submitted two pieces of legislation this year for voting rights and for clarifying promotion criteria. A task force is compiling a handbook for lecturers to assure that everyone has access to the information needed, and to correct the misperceptions that remain. This will be shared with FCFA for review and then with our lecturers across all schools and colleges and each of our three campuses.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   In my twenty-five years at the University of Washington, I have met no one more deserving of recognition and praise than Nancy Bradshaw. Congratulations and thanks for your service. You will be greatly missed!
Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
Ad hoc Committee on Retirement Report
April 29, 2018

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

Dear Thaisa—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * *

Background

The members of the ad hoc subcommittee were:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. by generating more robust and consistent resources and general information for faculty about the UW retirement plan (UWRP) and about other aspects of retirement planning;
B. by improving access to informed, personal assistance for individual faculty while they are in the process of transitioning to retirement (or considering doing so in the near-term); and
C. by identifying some additional ways the UW might continue to draw upon and engage the active participation of retired faculty in service to our larger community.
A. Information and Resources for Retirement Planning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Request that a representative of the Provost’s Office/AHR participate as a regular member of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR).

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

RECOMMENDATION (A.6)

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

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

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

Providing clear guidelines about when and to whom these arrangements would be available is essential. (A useful model may be found in the negotiated contracts in the UCLA “Pathways to Retirement” program: https://apo.ucla.edu/faculty-retirement-resources/pathways-to-retirement.) That said, it may be that simply “daylighting” this option would mitigate against charges of favoritism as it becomes more generally known and discussed among faculty. Similarly, it is unclear who has the authority to approve these agreements, though presumably a dean (and probably the Provost) would need to approve such an arrangement before it could be effected. In any case, such details need to be clarified and publicly articulated as well.
RECOMMENDATION (A.7)
Request that the Provost draw the attention of administrators and senior faculty to the existing requirements of Faculty Code Section 24-57.C and D and emphasize the importance of documenting multi-year plans and goals for both individual faculty and their units. Such regular conferences will, quite naturally, open space for discussions of retirement options and possible timelines.

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

RECOMMENDATION (A.8)
Ask HR/AHR to provide on their Retirement web pages the Supplementation Plan formula, so that faculty may have access to this information for planning prior to their retirement.

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

B. Transitioning to retirement

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION (B.1)

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

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

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

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

Lower down in this same section appears the following:

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

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

RECOMMENDATION (B.2)

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

Rationale: There is nothing in the Faculty Code that mentions the retirement options for faculty, including what is acknowledged to be the “vested” right to reemployment. And there is no statement of the underlying “policy”—indeed there is virtually no mention of faculty reemployment aside from the notice (in Section 21-32.A) that “retired faculty” are accorded voting rights while “serving on a part-time basis.” A search of the UW Policy Directory (including AHR Policies) produces no clearer articulation of the underlying “policy.” The Faculty Code would appear to be a prime location for such statutory matters.
As far as state law is concerned, we have found little relevant beyond RCW 28B.10.420.2(d), which does state that part-time reemployment “shall not exceed forty percent of full time employment during any year.” However, since it says this applies to faculty who retired “not later than the end of the academic year next following their seventieth birthday” (420.1), we might question whether this is still in force, since the federal statute against mandatory retirement became effective for tenured faculty in 1994. Nevertheless, this RCW section remains, it would appear, unrevised, since it remains in the RCW with its 1979 language.

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

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

**RECOMMENDATION (B.3)**

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

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

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

The Regents’ action established the following procedure:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION (C.1)
Define more clearly in the Faculty Code and publicize what the benefits and privileges are of emeritus faculty as continuing members of the University Faculty.

Rationale: Emeritus faculty remain, officially, members of the University faculty (FCG Section 21-31) and while they no longer are given voting rights (or UW paycheck) they do retain certain benefits and privileges as members of the faculty. As reported in the Academic Personnel web page regarding “Emeritus and Retired Faculty Titles” (https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/retirement/designations/)
“Retired/Emeritus status provides substantial privileges to the University faculty member, including continuation of Library borrowing privileges, access to University email accounts, discount prices on University productions and museums, among others.” While the practical benefits to retirees are specifically enumerated, the vagueness of “among others” deserves attention, especially those that accrue to those with an emeritus appointment. It is not clear exactly what those privileges are and some clarification (perhaps in the Faculty Code) should be articulated. And, at least, it should be made clearer what roles these members of the faculty may play as continuing members of the University faculty, and (in that regard) what services and recognition they might expect from the Provost’s (or Dean’s) office. A useful model for a web page delineating the privileges and benefits of being emeritus can be seen in this example from the University of California, Berkeley: https://ofew.berkeley.edu/welfare/retirement/privileges-and-benefits-conferred-upon-all-emeriti.

RECOMMENDATION (C.2)
Ensure that formal notice of appointment as emeritus is sent to faculty members when it is approved by the President. This should be accompanied by a document articulating the benefits and privileges discussed in the preceding recommendation.

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

RECOMMENDATION (C.3)
Encourage the Secretary of the Faculty to publicize more broadly the opportunities for retired faculty to serve on Faculty Councils and on other committees of the University and its constituent units; and advise retired faculty of other opportunities as they become available.

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

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

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

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

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

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

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

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

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Developed and advanced Class A legislation amending Faculty Code Chapter 24 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members) to encourage the recognition of faculty members who contribute significant amounts of time to the University in areas that promote a more diverse campus and that improve the experiences of and opportunities for non-traditional students. The legislation passed its first reading in the Faculty Senate on April 19.
- Gathered and analyzed UW faculty demographic data and sorted findings by campus and college via the Faculty Demographic Trends Tool.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Advanced Class A legislation on lecturer voting eligibility amending Faculty Code Chapter 21-32 (Voting Membership in the Faculty) to allow Senior and Principal Lecturers and Senior Artists-in-Residence to have voting privileges at 50% or greater effort and to be included as retired faculty during quarters that they work part-time. The legislation is currently out for faculty vote as part of the Class A legislative process.
- Advanced Class A legislation on faculty lecturer issues amending Faculty Code Chapter 24-34 (Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles) and Chapter 24-54 (Procedure for Promotions) to clarify the nature and level of expectations for the Principal Lecturer title in a more general way than the current more specific list of potential methods of recognition, and to reorient voting procedures for promotion of faculty in instructional titles and restructure language for clarity. The legislation’s second reading in the Faculty Senate will occur on May 17.
Faculty Council on Research

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

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

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

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

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

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

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

In addition, the council has:

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

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

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

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

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

Faculty Council on University Libraries

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

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

• Developed and forwarded Class C resolution concerning wellness rooms to the Faculty Senate (approved March 1), which recommends that “at least one wellness room be included as a requirement for all new buildings (or more based on population capacity of the building), and that functioning wellness rooms be provided close enough to existing buildings on campus so as not to cause undue hardship for those individuals who require access.” The council followed up outcomes related to the resolution with administrative guest, Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) in its most recent (April) meeting.
2018-2019 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adjudication Panel

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

**Open Seat Nominations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td>Scott Barnhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gautham Reddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td>Janelle Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terri DeYoung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Rich Christie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other health science colleges ¹ – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Doug Ramsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Built Environments – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Lorenz Hauser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Schools² – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Shailendra Jain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theo Myhre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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

Charge

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

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

How Nominees were selected

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

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

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

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

Members of the nominating committee:
Mike Townsend, School of Law and committee chair
Bill Erdly, Representing UW Bothell
Lauren Montgomery, Representing UW Tacoma
Paul Sutton, Representing the School of Medicine
Ken Yocom, Representing College of the Environment and College of Built Environments
Joey Burgess, Council Support Analyst
George Sandison, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
# 2018-2019

Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn Quarter 2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter 2019</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>December 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>January 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Quarter 2019</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>April 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
Interfolio Update
May 2018

Activities and Engagement

- Extensive, recurring engagement from diverse groups over 12 mos
  - Enterprise Committee—40+ hrs to date
  - Faculty Focus Group—8 hrs to date
  - Staff Focus Group—8 hrs to date
  - Procurement Committee—30 hrs
- On track for July 1 launch
- Currently, moving through configuration
Anticipated Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar/Apr</td>
<td>Complete system configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Update BoDC, unit administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Update Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Unit representative training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Cascade training, sandbox experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAUNCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug/Sept</td>
<td>Refresher training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Recruitment Process

- Clear message coming from engagement groups that standardization is desired and welcome

- Desired outcomes in defining a standard:
  - Understanding of requirements and roles
  - Clear, sustainable expectations for process participants (all levels)
  - Support reporting requirements
  - Continuity in how and to whom information is presented
  - More efficient review and approval
Key Opportunities for Standardization

- Position, application, and applicant statuses
- Search plan
- Assessment rubric
- Interfolio institutional settings

Position/Application/Applicant Statuses

- Standardizing statuses supports UW in meeting reporting requirements
  - Position statuses identify the active phase of the search
  - Application statuses identify the different phases of review
  - Applicant statuses identify the reason an applicant falls out of consideration

- Recommended statuses were drafted by Enterprise Committee with feedback and overwhelming support of focus groups
### DRAFT - Position/Application/Applicant Disposition Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Status</th>
<th>Application Status</th>
<th>Disposition Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Receiving Applications</td>
<td>- Never Submitted</td>
<td>- Never Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reviewing Applications</td>
<td>5. Minimum Qualifications</td>
<td>- Does Not Meet Minimum Qualifications — Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Does Not Meet Minimum Qualifications — Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Does Not Meet Minimum Qualifications — Other Credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. First Review</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Education</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Specialty/Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Publication/Scholarly Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Other Credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Professional/Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Long List</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Education</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Specialty/Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Publication/Scholarly Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Other Credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Professional/Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Short List</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Education</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Selected — Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- - Not Selected — Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAFT - Position/Application/Applicant Disposition Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Status</th>
<th>Application Status</th>
<th>Disposition Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interviewing Applicants</td>
<td>- Not Interviewed</td>
<td>- Not Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed — Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed — Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed — Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed — References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not Interviewed — Professional/Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offer</td>
<td>- Not Selected — Offer Declined</td>
<td>- Not Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hires</td>
<td>- Not Hired</td>
<td>- Not Hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Top ranked interviewee (placeholder who make it to the top contender)</td>
<td>- Not Selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAFT - Position/Application/Applicant Disposition Status

- Not Selected — Service
- Not Selected — Specialty/Discipline
- Not Selected — Publication/Scholarly Record
- Not Selected — References
- Not Selected — Other Credentials
- Not Selected — Professional/Collegiality
- Not Selected — Education
- Not Selected — Experience
- Not Selected — Teaching
- Not Selected — Research
- Not Selected — Service
- Not Selected — Specialty/Discipline
- Not Selected — Publication/Scholarly Record
- Not Selected — References
- Not Selected — Other Credentials
- Not Selected — Professional/Collegiality
- Not Selected — Interview
Search Plan

• A standardized search plan helps units focus on:
  ✓ Identifying key recruitment details and goals
  ✓ Attracting a diverse applicant pool
  ✓ Developing a screening rubric

• Engagement groups recommend embedding a search plan into Interfolio as a required step before the ad could be posted

DRAFT Search Plan – Faculty, Librarians, & Academic Staff

SECTION I: Search Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring Plan Number (if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Task Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial deadline for receipt of applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set deadline for screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised start date for screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION II: Essential Functions and Qualifications

Essential functions are those job duties that an employee must be able to perform with or without reasonable accommodation. For example, an employee task faculty members might have teaching, advising, curriculum development, scholarly research, and service to the community as essential functions. Essential functions may vary from one position to another. In this document, these essential functions are included in the positions.

Please describe the essential job functions:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 

Qualifications are unique characteristics the search committee will use to screen the applicant pool. They can include minimum qualifications (i.e., required qualifications and desired “preferred” qualifications). All minimum qualifications should be listed in the advertisement. Applicants may meet minimum qualifications as an initial step in their application process. In addition, the advertisement should include preferred qualifications or as expected job titles/responsibilities. All qualifications should be clear for the applicant. Applicants must review job descriptions related to minimum and desired qualifications prior to submitting. (Click for PDF disclaimer)

Minimum Qualifications:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 

Detailed Qualifications and/or anticipated job duties & responsibilities:

1. 
2. 
6.
### DRAFT Search Plan – Faculty, Librarians, & Academic Staff

**SECTION III: Affirmative Action Plan Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative Action Plan Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REHABILITATION ACT (3): cover discrimination on the basis of disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Underrepresentation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION IV: Advertising Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Advertising Sources</th>
<th>Local newspapers, job boards, and practice outreach efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional associations/members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job search sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List all targeted publications, websites, job boards, and practice outreach efforts / professional letters, new institution announcements, recruiting efforts, you wish to reach underrepresented demographics. For more information on potential advertising sources, visit [https://www.eddiebellaadvert.com/2016/12/30/marrev](https://www.eddiebellaadvert.com/2016/12/30/marrev).

---

**Assessment Rubric**

- An assessment rubric helps units define and adhere consistently to screening metrics.

- Engagement groups recommend requiring that units define screening metrics in Interfolio; no standardization beyond requiring a rubric.

- Engagement groups recommend that rubric information be required before the search can be closed and/or the hire processed in Workday.

- When the hiring packet comes over in Workday, the assumption is that the chair and/or dean have reviewed the rubric and support it.
Interfolio Settings

- Interfolio allows the institution to set various controls on how units use the tool. Engagement groups recommend the following institutional settings for all academic personnel searched in Interfolio:
  - ✓ Auto-populated EEO statement and Diversity Statement
  - ✓ Not allow commenting in the system, just rating
  - ✓ Approval routing

Questions?

Margaret (Peg) Stuart, Assistant Vice Provost
mjsstuart@uw.edu / 206.685.7110
Bylaw Review Report
March 6, 2018

Rich Christie, Chair, Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

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

Summary

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

The ACFCR therefore reviewed the bylaws of the 27 campuses, colleges and schools listed in Executive Order IX as having been established by the Board of Regents against the provisions of Faculty Code Section 23-45 (FC 23-45). Executive Order IX is found at

http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EOIX.html

The bylaws reviewed were those posted on the Faculty Governance web site at

http://www.washington.edu/faculty/schools-colleges-campus/

The Faculty Code section 23 is found at

http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCGTOC.html

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

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

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

Issues

The Faculty Code Does Not Bar Administrators From EFC Membership

FC 23-45C provides that “Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advise the dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord
with Subsection A, the faculty of each school or college shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ex-Officio EFC Membership

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

Standing Committees

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

The ACFCR considers that if the EFC is authorized to advise the Dean on, e.g., P&T in the bylaws, the existence of a parallel advice path is not prohibited by the Faculty Code. Best practice would be for the EFC to have some interaction with the standing committee, such as an annual report, but this is not required.
Similarly, while the P&T committee composition and election is prescribed elsewhere in the Faculty Code, the ACFCR considers that other standing committees may be appointed or elected, and may include non-faculty voting members such as advisors and students. While there is an expectation that these committees would be elected by the voting faculty or appointed by the EFC without administrative involvement, appointment by the Dean (one case exists) is not prohibited by FC 23-45. ACFCR considers that the latter practice should be discouraged, but that amending the Faculty Code to deal with standing committees would become too complicated.

**Individual Review Comments**

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

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

**College of Built Environments**
No issues.

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

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

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

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

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

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

It appears that the actual work of curricular review and P&T review is performed by committees of faculty appointed by the Faculty Council. The committees are described as reporting to the Faculty Council, which is described as advising the Dean.

In the Curriculum and Student Affairs Committee, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Director of Student Services (the latter a staff position) are described as ex officio members, but with or without vote is not specified. This should be specified. (In fact no Director of Student Services is listed on the Evans School Web site. The top listing on the Student Services web page is Carrie Evans, Assistant Dean of Students, who is not faculty.)
Foster School of Business
The Dean is an ex officio member of the Faculty Council. With or without vote is not specified. Without vote should be specified.

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

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

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

Information School
The iSchool Bylaws posted on the faculty governance web site at

http://www.washington.edu/faculty/schools-colleges-campuses/

are not current. Joe Janes provided a current copy dated May 19, 2017. The comments below apply to the current version.

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

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

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

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

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

ROTC
Bylaws not required, according to the web site. ROTC faculty are not tenure track and do not do P&T. The faculty are militarily subordinate to administration of the Department, which ill-accords with the notion of an elected group of them advising senior officers.

Dentistry
No explicit exclusion of administrators (Associate Deans, Department Chairs) from elected Faculty Council positions.

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

The discussion of mail ballots is out of date.

School of Law
No explicit exclusion of administrators from Council and standing committee voting positions.
The elected faculty council (the Executive Council, or EC) delegates the appointment of standing committee members to the Dean or Dean’s designee in the bylaws. While permitted under the Faculty Code this is inappropriate. The EC should retain the power to appoint committee members. Perhaps the EC should consider the Dean’s recommendations when making appointments. That way when a conflict between EC and Dean arises, the EC would prevail. (Note that the P&T Council is elected, but see below.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

School of Social Work
There is a reference to FC 23-45 in the preamble, but the specific duties of the Faculty Council do not include advising the Dean on P&T or academic policy.

The Section 1 preamble states that the Faculty Council (the EFC) is responsible for the election of the chairs of the standing committees, but Section 1.d.(1) states that the Faculty Council proposes a slate of candidates for the (complete membership of the) standing committees. Probably the preamble is incorrect.

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

There is no explicit exclusion of administrators from the Faculty Council or standing committee positions, except that the Dean is specifically excluded from election to the Faculty Council, implying that Associate Deans and Chairs can be so elected.
UW Bothell
The explicit bar on administrators being GFO chair or vice chair is a best practice.

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

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

UW Bothell – School of Business
No bylaws posted.

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

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

UW Bothell – School of Educational Studies
No bylaws posted.

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

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

The presence of standing committee chairs as voting members of the Executive Council (the EFC) is mildly concerning. The standing committee chairs are elected to that position by standing committee members who have in turn been elected to their positions by the faculty. Thus the standing committee chairs are not directly elected to the EFC by the faculty. However, Faculty Code section 23-45B permits Tacoma to determine the “procedure by which the (EFC) members are elected.”

UW Tacoma – Milgard School of Business
The Faculty Council is the EFC of the Milgard School of Business. In Section III.1.A the Faculty Council “advises the Dean on pending matters.” The complete list of topics from FC 23.45C should be listed, perhaps concluding with “and other pending matters.”

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

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

UW Tacoma – School of Education
No bylaws posted.
Appendix: Bylaw Review Rubric
School or College ____________________________________

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

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

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

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

Remark on any No answers:

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

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

Remark on any Yes answers:

Make any additional general comments on back.
Class B Legislation regarding an open access policy

Background and Rationale

Adoption of a New Open Access Publication Policy by the Faculty of the University of Washington

On April 23, 2015, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved a Class C “Resolution Concerning the UW Open Access Repository and Request for Advice on an Open Access Policy” that was submitted jointly by the Faculty Council on Research and the Faculty Council on University Libraries. In that resolution, the Senate requested that the Provost direct Betsy Wilson, Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives and Dean of University Libraries to "develop an open access publication policy for recommendation to the University and conduct a needs and integration assessment to determine what resources are necessary to enhance the University's institutional repository, ResearchWorks Archive, to the level of a world-class repository". This resulted in a report to the Provost dated June 13, 2016 that included a new Open Access Policy for faculty at the UW with recommendations for the purchase of the citation harvesting software tool, Symplectic Elements and creation of an additional FTE position for the oversight of the repository.

The class C resolution passed by the Senate in 2015 followed similar resolutions passed by the ASUW and GPSS in 2014 and the establishment of open access policies and repositories at peer institutions including Harvard, the University of California System, the University of Minnesota, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and the University of Arizona. The recommended new policy for the UW is modeled on the guidelines established at Harvard and the recommended software is currently being used by the University of California System. Further justification for the resulting open access policy and for purchase of the citation harvesting software is included in the June 2016 report.

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

Recommended University of Washington Open Access Policy

Faculty Code and Governance
Chapter 54 Open Access Policy

Section 54-31 Purpose

As a public university, the University of Washington is dedicated to making its research and scholarship freely and widely available to the people of Washington and the broader research community. In addition to the public benefit, the following policy is intended to serve faculty interests by: promoting the visibility and accessibility of their work, resulting in greater impact and recognition; helping them retain distribution rights; and aiding preservation of the scholarly record.

Section 54-41 Policy and Grant of Rights

Faculty grant to the University a non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise, and to allow others to exercise, any and all rights under copyright relating to his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, for the purpose of making their articles freely and widely available in an open access repository. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership to the University.

Section 54-51 Scope and Waiver

This policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while a person is a member of the Faculty except for articles completed before the adoption of this policy. The Provost or Provost’s designate will waive this requirement or delay access for a specified period of time for a particular article upon express direction by the Faculty member. Grant of such a waiver or delay is mandatory, not at the discretion of any person or group.
Section 54-61 Deposit of Articles

To assist the University in archiving and disseminating scholarly articles, the Faculty commit to helping the University obtain copies of their articles. Specifically, each Faculty member who does not obtain a waiver to deposit in the Institutional repository will endeavor to provide an electronic copy of the final accepted (post-peer review) manuscripts of his or her articles to the University for inclusion in the institutional repository or notify the University that the article will be available elsewhere on an open access basis.

Section 54-71 Implementation and Oversight of Policy

The Provost or Provost’s designate will be responsible for implementing and interpreting this policy and recommending changes to the Faculty from time to time. In implementing this policy the Provost or Provost’s designate will strive to maximize Faculty participation by providing appropriate technology and other support to facilitate article deposit.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2018
Legislation proposing changes to Faculty Code, Chapter 24 Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Rationale

Section 24-34.B.3
The revision to the qualifications for the Principal Lecturer title (24-34.B.3) is intended to clarify the nature and level of expectations for that title, in a more general way than the current more specific list of potential methods of recognition. It is also intended to assist units to more effectively mentor and guide lecturing faculty in promotion to Principal Lecturers.

Section 24-54
Revisions to the section on promotion (24-54) are intended to restructure the language for clarity, and also to reorient voting procedures for promotion of faculty in instructional titles. This follows the recommendation of, among others, the Bothell Lecturers Working Group report from June of 2014, suggesting that “an asymmetry exists within the Code when it comes to personnel matters. Currently tenure track faculty have responsibility to review lecturers, but lecturers do not review tenure track faculty.” Having senior faculty vote is more respectful of the status and experience of the lecturer faculty. It should be noted that this does not affect the voting procedure for merit described in Section 24-55.

Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability that evidences promise of a successful career.

2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

3. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field, recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.
A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above) senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.
If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair’s recommendations with the candidate.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 2, 2018

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 19, 2018

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2018
Legislation proposing changes to Faculty Code, Chapter 24 Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Introduction

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs voted on February 8, 2018, to forward proposed Class A legislation to the Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion was approved by a majority of voting members.

Reasons for Proposed Changes

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs seeks to encourage the recognition of faculty members who contribute significant amounts of time to the University in areas that promote a more diverse campus and that improve the experiences of and opportunities for non-traditional students.

Over the course of this Academic year, the FCMA reviewed and ultimately selected Faculty Code Chapter 24.32 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members) for proposed revision in order to further promote the goal of diversity and equity. Where the chapter as a whole was modified in 2012 to allow that a faculty member’s “service that addresses diversity and equal opportunity” may be considered among the professional/scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion, the FCMA observed that under the current language (“may”), units may choose to discount a faculty member’s contributions to diversity in relation to appointment and promotion, but where the term “shall” is utilized, faculty members with relevant contributions shall have those contributions considered as part of their scholarly and professional qualifications. The proposed legislation is a mechanism to put value on an aspect of faculty work that is traditionally difficult to recognize. The legislation is not intended to mandate that units may only hire/promote faculty with those credentials (service that addresses diversity and equal opportunity), but simply provides that where this service exists, it shall be considered.

Background

At the initial meeting of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs in October 2017, the council reviewed goals provided by Senate Chair Thaïsa Way. Among the goals was a mandate to evaluate relevant sections of the Faculty Code and associated practices through the lens of multicultural affairs, diversity, and difference, with the objectives of strengthening equity and fairness.

During the course of the fall and winter quarter meetings, the Council reviewed various sections of the Faculty Code, paying particular attention to topics that would impact issues relevant to the goal provided by Senate Chair Thaïsa Way. Ultimately, the FCMA honed in on specific sections of the code within chapter 24. Specifically, section 24.32 of the faculty code, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members and the discretionary language utilized for the consideration of contributions “in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity” in appointment and promotion decisions. The Council recommends this Class A legislation modifying the discretionary language from “may be included” to “shall be” included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion.

Section 24-32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. In accord with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity may shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.
A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. For each of these realms, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member’s published or other creative work.

Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees. In all these, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included.

C. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;

- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;

- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;

- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;

- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;

- The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and

- The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor’s participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students’ long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University’s educational
function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.
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Agenda  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Thursday, May 17, 2018, 2:30 p.m.  
Johnson Hall 102

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Thaïsa Way.

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.  
e. Faculty Council Activities Report.  
g. Report of the Faculty Council on University Libraries.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.  
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of May 7, 2018.  
   a. Approval of the April 2, 2018, Senate Executive Committee minutes.  
   b. Approval of the April 19, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes; c. FCBR retirement report; d. 2018-19 SEC and Faculty Senate meeting schedule.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.  
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.  
   b. Approve nominees for 2018-19 Senate Executive Committee.

8. Announcements.


      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.  
   b. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to faculty lecturer issues – second consideration.  
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.  
   c. Class A Legislation – Proposed changes to promotion and tenure diversity requirements - second consideration.  
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.  
   d. Class C Resolution regarding Faculty Effort Certification.  
      Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.

11. Discussion Items:  
   a. Population Health  
      Derek Fulwiler, Director, Project Strategy and Communications, Population Health.  
   b. UW 2050 Faculty Survey Results

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend  
Approved by: Thaïsa Way, Chair  
Secretary of the Faculty  
Faculty Senate