

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement**

April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018  
2:30 pm – 4:00 pm  
Gerberding 26

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Review of the minutes from February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018
  3. Letter: Charles Chamberlin
  4. Report and Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Retirement (Miceal Vaughan)
  5. Update: Supplemental retirement income (Stephan Siegel)
  6. Update: Parental Leave (Stephan Siegel)
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

**2) Review of the minutes from February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

The minutes from February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018 were approved as amended.

**3) Letter: Charles Chamberlin**

Siegel explained a letter of appreciation/condolences has been drafted to be sent on behalf of the FCBR to the family of long-standing council member, Charles Chamberlin, who passed away on April 4. The letter was shown and signed by council members. Some comments were made concerning Charles' many contributions to the work of the council since his first year of service in 1995.

**4) Report and Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Retirement (Miceal Vaughan)**

Siegel explained the Ad Hoc Committee on Pre-Retirement Planning – a body appointed by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) at the request of the FCBR – has completed its final report and related recommendations, which will be presented and detailed by emeritus faculty member, Miceal Vaughan (Professor Emeritus, English) (Exhibit 1). Siegel explained the FCBR will review the report and refer its own related brief on to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). FCBR formerly supported the notion to convene an ad hoc committee to evaluate the current state of UW's facilitating preparation for retirement of UW faculty members.

Vaughan explained the report's numerous recommendations are categorized by type from "A-C." He explained these recommendations were envisioned to be primarily considered and/or addressed by the FCBR. Vaughan explained the A series of recommendations generally relate to the idea that details about faculty retirement plans should be readily available to faculty at all points of their career.

*“A” series of recommendations (Exhibit 1)*

Recommendation A.1 was highlighted. Vaughan noted distribution of an annual letter from the Provost is an opportunity for the Provost’s Office and Academic Human Resources to coordinate the options and stages available for retiring faculty/faculty planning to retire. He explained such a letter sent 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 (Exhibit 1).

Recommendation A.7 was highlighted. Vaughan noted Faculty Code Section 24-57.C and D emphasize the importance of documenting multi-year plans and goals for both individual faculty and their units, and that such regular conferences will likely open space for discussions of retirement options and possible timelines. He noted this is one of the elements already included within the Faculty Code that should be invoked and developed to help make it more immediately apparent when a faculty member is in a late stage of their faculty career what their late-career options might be.

Cheryl Cameron (Vice Provost for Academic Personnel) and Tanya Eadie (Associate Vice Provost, Academic Personnel) were present to reflect on the recommendations within the report from the perspective of Academic Human Resources. Cameron was asked to comment on the A series of recommendations.

Cameron clarified that not all faculty have the same options available to them at the time of retirement, citing the Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) and vested right to 40% reemployment of which only tenured faculty are eligible. It was noted communicating all faculty retirement options to all faculty will mean that some faculty receive information on potential retirement options they do not necessarily have access to.

It was noted in relation to communicating retirement options to faculty over email, separate emails would need to be broken out based on what potential benefits apply to a target group. It was noted the goal of this letter would be communicating those options to all faculty, specifically those near retirement.

Recommendation A.2 was discussed. Vaughan explained it was envisioned that “the panel of experienced retired colleagues” would exist under the umbrella of the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Recommendation A.5 was raised. Siegel explained the idea was formerly explored earlier in the academic year and it was found Academic HR did not have the availability to appoint a representative to attend each meeting of the council. A resolution to that issue was that a member of Academic HR would attend FCBR meetings an ad hoc basis when items of special relevance were on the agenda.

In relation to recommendation A.6, Cameron explained the option for individualized retirement agreements was formerly terminated and the VRI substituted as a vehicle to incentivize retirement at certain times. Siegel explained the currently unknown timeline for the availability of VRI makes retirement planning difficult for relevant faculty. There was some discussion of the availability timeline for the VRI benefit. The current window for faculty begins in June of 2018 and extends to June of 2019, which allows eligible faculty to consider retirement (with the knowledge the benefit is available) for two separate academic years.

*“B” series of recommendations (Exhibit 1)*

Vaughan clarified that the three recommendations included in B are partially dependent on the adopting of some of the recommendations listed in A.

In relation to recommendation B.2, Vaughan explained the vested right to 40% reemployment for up to five years after retirement, as well the Voluntary Retirement Incentive (VRI) and information on individualized retirement transition arrangements are currently not included/referenced anywhere within the Faculty Code. He explained the Ad Hoc Committee urges that retirement options should be written into the Faculty Code, rather than exist solely under the auspices of the UW administration.

In relation to codifying the VRI and 40% reemployment right, it was noted the UW Board of Regents (BoR) initially approved/established the VRI program, which begs questions concerning the viability of writing these benefits into the Faculty Code. A guest explained Class A legislation might be utilized in attempt to codify those benefits, which would be deliberated by both faculty and administration during the legislative approval process.

It was also explained there is significant control and influence retained at the local level concerning how the reemployment option works for specific faculty members. Considerations can relate to course offerings, decision approvals, funding sources, and others, and for this reason, there is great variation between areas of the university related to the offering of the benefit. It was noted this was done purposely to allow for flexibility in use of the benefit. It was noted it is difficult to articulate one size fits all approach to that benefit given the significant variation that occurs at the local level. Vaughan explained under Activity-based Budgeting (ABB), 40% rehire is less feasible than it was for some faculty, as funding is no longer derived from the Provost’s Office, but instead is generated by Student Credit Hours (SCH) (in some cases). According to one member, the tying of the reemployment benefit to ABB has simply made the benefit unstable.

Recommendation B.3 was discussed. Siegel asked the council for feedback on the recommendation to establish the VRI as a more permanent benefit, or to determine if its timeline could be extended. A guest noted the uncertain availability of the VRI incentive each year is what makes it a retirement incentive for faculty, as they do not know the next time the benefit will be offered and so may opt to take it as soon as it becomes available. It was clarified the VRI benefit has been offered by the university six times over the course of the last eight years.

Dougherty (Director, UW Retiree Relations) commented that without regularity in these options (VRI and 40% reemployment), it has made it very difficult for faculty to make retirement decisions or engage in planning. Another member noted that given that these retirement options are controlled at the local level, the viability of them being offered has become dependent on local unit contexts.

After some more discussion, Shankar suggested the FCBR make a recommendation that the VRI be an ongoing, permanent retirement option.

*“C” series of recommendations (Exhibit 1)*

Vaughan explained the first two recommendations in C. relate to clearly and publically defining benefits for faculty with emeritus status, as well as the President sending formal notices of appointment to

faculty who have been granted emeritus status. After a question, Cameron explained she would look find out if the practice has already been ongoing, as there was a belief letters are already being sent to emeritus faculty.

It was noted recommendation C.3 references the Secretary of the Faculty in recruiting retired faculty for service on councils and senate committees. Vaughan explained some units do well in facilitating that retired faculty have knowledge of these types of service opportunities while others do so to a lesser degree. Mike Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty) explained that the recently-implemented Committee on Committees is responsible for selecting nominees to sit on university-level faculty councils, and the UWRA might connect with that body. Dougherty explained over 25% of UW's retired faculty have volunteered to reengage with the university in some fashion.

### *Conclusion*

Siegel noted it is evident that the VRI option might be improved by way of becoming a more permanent benefit rather than offered intermittently, and the council may choose to recommend this. He explained in relation to the idea to codify some retirement options into the Faculty Code – for some benefits, that codification might make sense while for others the task may prove to be difficult. It was noted the council would reevaluate the idea in a future meeting.

After some discussion of FCBR's reception of the retirement report, a member suggested a short summary be developed and sent to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on the council's opinions on recommendations listed within the report. Siegel noted he would draft the short document and forward it on to the SEC.

### **5) Update: Supplemental retirement income (Stephan Siegel)**

Siegel explained the notion that a simple approximation might be carried out in-house relating to UW supplemental retirement income will be further evaluated by himself and Shankar, and subsequently discussed in the council's May meeting.

### **6) Update: Parental Leave (Stephan Siegel)**

Siegel explained the issue of the FCA interpretation detailed in the previous FCBR meeting will be discussed today by the Senate Chair, Thaisa Way, with members of Academic HR and the Provost. He noted he would report on the outcome of that meeting in FCBR's next meeting.

### **7) Good of the order**

Nothing was stated.

### **8) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst*

**Present:**                   **Faculty:** Russel Fernandes, Gowri Shankar, Stephan Siegel (chair), Mary O’Neil, Jason Wright  
**Ex-officio reps:** Laura Lillard, Jacob Ziegler, Andrew Flannery  
**President’s designee:** Mindy Kornberg  
**Guests:** Patricia Dougherty, Amy Hawkins, Cheryl Cameron, Tanya Eadie, Mike Townsend, Miceal Vaughan

**Absent:**                   **Faculty:** John Mittler, Julia Metzner, Nicole Hoover  
**Ex-officio reps:** N/A

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – Report and Recommendations 20180314