

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
May 9th, 2017
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from April 25th, 2017
 3. Jason Wright – Parental leave for faculty
 4. Continued discussion of promotion issues for lecturers
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

Johnson called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from April 25th, 2017

The minutes from April 25th, 2017 were approved as amended.

3) Jason Wright – Parental leave for faculty

Jason Wright (member, Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement) explained Faculty Senate leadership charged the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (FCBR) to investigate faculty parental leave during the 2016-2017 academic year. The FCBR has solicited input from various stakeholders and administrators while considering potential amendments to language in the Faculty Code & Governance, and now seeks feedback from the FCFA.

Wright spoke to the history of faculty parental leave policy at the UW using an outline, and explained the options faculty currently have to take leave under existing policies (Exhibit 1). He commented that if a faculty member becomes a parent through surrogacy or adoption, they currently have no formal avenue for paid leave. In response, the FCBR has charged a subcommittee to develop new policy options.

Wright spoke to parental leave practices/policy of UW peer institutions using a different handout (Exhibit 2). The majority of listed institutions offer a more generous paid faculty leave policy than the UW. The most generous policy is held at University of Colorado (UC) Boulder and UC Denver, which includes “18 weeks (paid) leave to care for the faculty member's child within twelve months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of the child, using accrued sick leave” (see Exhibit 2 for holistic discussion of all the benefits at several institutions).

Policy options identified by the FCBR Parental Leave Subcommittee were highlighted (Exhibit 1). He explained the subcommittee believes extending the sick leave benefit to include newborn care may be

the simplest, most impactful improvement for UW parental leave policy. He asked council members to offer any thoughts, comments, or other feedback, which he will pass on to the Subcommittee.

There was some discussion of a new proposal from Seattle City Council councilwoman Lorena Gonzales concerning City of Seattle policy for parental leave. It was noted the topic is trending in the region, and elsewhere in the country.

A member recommended that whatever policy option is chosen does not define gender as binary.

A member asked if there is any known downside to extending the sick leave benefit as recommended. Another member commented that if a faculty member's sick leave is depleted for another reason, then the exclusive option to use sick leave for paid parental leave may be problematic. Wright noted exhausting sick leave is a point of issue which has been previously identified.

There was some discussion associated with costs of implementing the recommended policy change. Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty, Faculty Senate & Governance) questioned if it is known or being discussed where additional funding will come from for the change if there is found to be an increased cost. Wright explained the FCBR had utilized the UW office of Planning and Budgeting for a cost-analysis of a separate issue in the past, and may so do again for parental leave. A member commented that if you know the age structure and gender of UW faculty, it should be possible to develop an approximate cost-analysis.

Vaughan asked if there is any administrative pressure from UW deans or chairs in support of the change. He explained it would be a useful to have that information, in order to show that the change would be to the institution's benefit relating to recruitment and retention. Cameron (president's designee) commented that there is some interest in the topic from that perspective. Wright explained there is an idea to survey UW chairs via the FCBR, to identify reasons why prospective faculty members chose not to work at the UW after having been offered a position.

There was brief discussion of the university on-the-whole "self-insuring" in order to pay for the cost of backfilling faculty member's positions while out on parental leave (rather than the cost being applied individually to departments).

Cameron provided a list of topics that should be considered while revising parental leave policy:

- ❖ Vehicles other institutions have used
- ❖ Identifying exactly who is eligible for the defined policy
- ❖ Administrative mechanisms influence the cost of providing leave as well as the administrative cost related to implementation

Johnson noted the council is interested in the matter, and asked Wright to continue soliciting feedback from the FCFA as discussions evolve. Wright thanked members for their comments.

4) Continued discussion of promotion issues for lecturers

Meeting with School of Nursing EFC

Johnson explained he attended a meeting of the elected faculty council (EFC) in the School of Nursing to discuss the FCFA's draft Class A legislation on voting rights for part-time lecturers. EFC members raised three concerns related to the draft Class A legislation: extending the vote specifically to *annual* part-time lecturers, using the threshold of 50% or greater time to determine franchising, and that voting lecturers should somehow be limited to no more than 49% of the total voting faculty. Johnson explained he was able to quell each of the concerns by explaining nuances relating to the legislation which were otherwise unknown to the EFC. After misunderstandings were resolved, support for the proposal was substantially increased.

Johnson reported the School of Nursing EFC expressed an interest in implementing increased usage of "acting" faculty titles at the UW. The EFC was also interested in the idea of an alternative title altogether for UW's lecturers, which is being driven by several lecturers in the unit. It was clarified that the EFC expressed a desire to first alter voting rights for lecturers before taking on the work of substituting faculty titles. The School feels strongly that the issue is important for their recruitment efforts.

It was noted Janes or Watts plans to attend a Foster School of Business EFC meeting to gather feedback in the coming months, and after that, the FCFA may begin contacting individual EFCs with requests to join meetings.

Discussion of changes to the Faculty Code

Janes explained he recently reviewed different areas of the Faculty Code wherein language interacts with the currently-held interests of the FCFA and place marked those. As part of the discussion, the council also reviewed draft Class A legislation altering Chapter 24.41, which was amended in the last FCFA meeting (Exhibit 3).

Janes noted another way to achieve the objective of the draft Class A legislation would be to define the career track of lecturers as beginning with three annual contracts, which may then become a multiyear contract (3-5 years), at the end of which a mandatory promotion consideration will take place (for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer). He explained this is an alternate approach to encode or encourage the processes/practices surrounding a defined career path for lecturers. It was clarified this process relates to full-time lecturers.

A member noted the council previously held some discussion of lecturers who do not want to be promoted, and how they may opt out of this review. After discussion, several members noted that semantically the issue is hard to incorporate into code without inadvertently altering the proposal. One member noted this model would not be in his favor (given his entrance into his unit). A member noted under the proposed system, once a lecturer has hit the eligibility mark, they will be considered for promotion each time their multiyear contract nears its end (and potentially denied). Janes clarified this was the intention.

Other discussions of varying areas of the Faculty Code followed relating to the below sections:

24.34.B.13 – Janes noted if you added "lecturer" to the list of faculty in the passage, the university could employ "acting" lecturers. He explained doing this could mean non-competitively hired lecturers could be hired under the "acting" title, and thus a distinction could be made between competitively and non-competitively hired lecturers within the code. A member raised the point that this change was already

recommended by a previous lecturer issues taskforce, and she recommended the position of that group be levied politically if that route is chosen.

24.34.B.6 – The UW could differentiate between full-time lecturers and part-time quarter-to-quarter lecturers by using the title of “instructor” for the latter. Janes noted this change would come from the desire to separate out lecturer titles, potentially to enact policy changes for a specific population of lecturers without conflation.

24.52.B – The section could be altered to delineate “competitive hiring” in the code, as the section addresses what an appointment/search committee does. The section does not explicitly state that the defined process is a “competitive” process, but it also does not explicitly disqualify that interpretation.

24.51.B – The language could be inserted or modified to delineate competitive hires.

FCFA’s direction concerning new legislation

A member asked that the council decide on topics to address and prioritize given the influx of new and overlapping topics. There was some discussion.

One member noted the council should address promotion eligibility/career track (of lecturers) and no longer focus on voting rights (for the time being). Another member agreed and noted the topic of lecturer promotion/career track seems to be the path of least resistance politically. It was agreed that the FCFA’s current objectives relate to lecturer “citizenship,” as a broad term. Promotion/career track and non-fulltime lecturers gaining the right to vote are both associated topics.

Another member asked the council focus on promotion eligibility/career track for the time being, and not provoke disfavor for legislation related to voting prematurely. A member noted the inclusion of annual lecturers in the voting legislation seems to have the greatest resistance. It was noted this aspect of the legislation could be better clarified for external (to the FCFA) stakeholders.

A member requested that feedback from EFC meetings relating to FCFA initiatives be tracked formally in a document and stored in the council’s records.

There was brief discussion of folding together lecturer franchising and promotion legislation into one combined legislative initiative, as associated Faculty Code changes may be more comprehensively understood by external groups by doing this.

Discussion was halted due to time constraints. Janes noted the discussion can continue in the next meeting.

5) Good of the order

Vaughan noted he has been in the process of enhancing faculty “pre-planning for retirement,” and a proposal will soon go to the FCBR to charge an ad hoc group to address the topic.

6) Adjourn

Janes adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemati, Miceal Vaughan
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Julius Doyle, George Sandison
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend, Jason Wright

Absent: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Chandan Reddy, Gordon Watts (chair), Eric Bugyis
Ex-officio reps: Freddy Mora, JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits

- Exhibit 1 – Faculty Committee on Benefits and Retirement v3
- Exhibit 2 – Parental Leave Comparison for GCS Peer Institutions
- Exhibit 3 – DRAFT revisions of 24-41 24-54 041817_revised042517byfcfa

Faculty Parental Leave Policies

Problem Statement

The University of Washington lacks a coherent and equitable Faculty Parental Leave Policy. The lack of a clear policy creates a situation where leave benefits may be applied inconsistently across the University Faculty, with resultant equity and legal implications.

History of UW Parental Leave Policy

- Prior to 1972:
 - No parental leave policy.
- April 1972, SB-121:
 - Established "Faculty Maternity Leave" as an unpaid leave.
 - Specifically excluded sick leave use for maternity leave.
- May 1973, SB-122:
 - Directed that pregnancy-related disability be covered by paid sick leave of up to 2 months.
 - Brought UW sick and disability leave policies in line with US Department of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) guidelines, put forth in response to passage of the Education Amendments of 1972.
 - Replaced unpaid "Faculty Maternity Leave" with unpaid "Infant Care Leave".
- Dec 1980, SC-254:
 - Changed term of sick leave benefits to 90 calendar days.
- Dec 1995, SB-161:
 - Expanded sick leave benefits to include care of a child with a health condition requiring treatment or supervision.
 - Replaced unpaid "Infant Care Leave" with unpaid "Family Leave," and directed that leave for care of a newborn child qualify for paid medical benefits for up to 12 weeks.
 - Brought UW sick and family leave policies in line with The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993.

- Amended sick leave policy satisfies the requirements of Washington State Family Care Act (FCA) of 2002.
- Amended “family Leave” policy satisfies requirements of Washington State Family Leave Act (FLA) of 2006.

Current UW Parental Leave Policy

- No specific parental leave policy. Leave benefits around birth or adoption of a child are applied piecemeal through a variety of leave mechanisms:
 - For female faculty who give birth, up to 90 calendar days of paid medical leave can be used, with physician approval. Per UW sick leave policy.
 - For faculty who are the spouse or registered domestic partner of a female who has given birth, up to 90 calendar days of paid medical leave can be used during the period of pregnancy-related disability, presumably with physician attestation. Per WSFCA.
 - For all faculty, up to 90 calendar days of paid medical leave can be used to care for an infant with a health condition requiring treatment or supervision, with physician approval. Per UW sick leave policy and WSFCA.
 - For all faculty, unpaid leave is available for up to 6 calendar months or 2 quarters for care of an infant child, with paid medical benefits for up to 12 weeks. Meets FMLA and FLA requirements.

Policy Options

1. Status quo

- Pros: cost neutral, no administrative burden
- Cons: inequitable, contrary to UW equity values, vulnerable to litigation, hampers recruitment and retention

2. Expand sick leave coverage to include newborn infant care

- Pros: equitable, in line with UW equity values, in line with GCS peer institutions, minimal administrative burden, fosters diversity in recruitment and retention

- Cons: cost burden depending on coverage and utilization rate, barriers to implementation and enforcement in small units

3. Establish separate paid parental leave for primary caregivers

- Pros: equitable, in line with UW equity values, in line with GCS peer institutions, fosters diversity in recruitment and retention
- Cons: cost burden depending on coverage and utilization rate, greater administrative burden, barriers to implementation and enforcement in small units

4. Establish separate paid parental leave for all parents

- Pros: equitable, progressive, in line with UW equity values, in line with many GCS peer institutions, fosters diversity in recruitment and retention
- Cons: cost burden depending on coverage and utilization rate, greater administrative burden, barriers to implementation and enforcement in small units

Policy Recommendation

Expanding sick leave coverage to include care of a newborn (policy option 2) would seem like a reasonable balance of equity and cost concerns. It would represent the most expedient and least administratively burdensome approach to furnishing equitable leave around the birth or adoption of a child. It is potentially cost neutral, as this is an existing benefit provided to UW Faculty, although to the degree that positions must be backfilled or departmental work assignments would change, there may be a cost to coverage of work duties during the leave period. In addition, there may be difficulties with application and enforcement across a variety of departmental structures, as it would rely on faculty colleagues to take up the burden of additional work.

Possible Future Directions

1. Class C Resolution calling on administration to formulate an official parental leave policy in consultation with the faculty
2. Class B Resolution articulating a specific parental leave policy out of FCBR with additional committee and council sponsors
3. Call on faculty senate to convene an ad hoc committee to develop a Class B Resolution

Parental Leave Comparison for GCS Peer Institutions			
Peer Institutions	Birth Mother	Non-birthing Parent	Comparison to UW
UW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90 days paid disability leave for childbirth pregnancy or recovery. Additional Unpaid Family Leave up to 6 months or 2 quarters to care for newborn or newly adopted or foster child 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90 days paid sick leave only to care for minor child <u>with health condition needing treatment or supervision</u> Unpaid Family Leave up to 6 months or 2 quarters to care for new child 	N/A
UC Boulder UC Denver	<p>9 month Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 weeks (paid) leave to care for the faculty member's child within twelve months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of the child, using accrued sick leave. If the faculty member exhausts all accrued sick leave before the end of the eighteen-week period, then they may continue the leave for the remainder of the period at half pay with full benefits. <p>12 month Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 months of parental leave, during which time they may use accrued sick leave, accrued vacation leave, and/or leave without pay to care for member's child within 12 months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement 	<p>9 month Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 weeks of (paid) leave to care for the faculty member's child within twelve months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of the child, using accrued sick leave. If the faculty member exhausts all accrued sick leave before the end of the eighteen-week period, then they may continue the leave for the remainder of the period at half pay with full benefits. <p>12 month Faculty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 months of parental leave, during which time they may use accrued sick leave, accrued vacation leave, and/or leave without pay to care for the member's child within 12 months of the birth, adoption, or foster care placement 	Substantively more generous for both, birth mother and non-birthing parent

UMd, College Park UMd, Baltimore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 weeks paid Parental Leave, creditable first to sick and personal leave, with balance supplemented as needed to reach 8 weeks • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA, can use accrued sick leave to cover 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 weeks paid Parental Leave, creditable first to sick and personal leave, with balance supplemented as needed to reach 8 weeks • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA, can use accrued sick leave to cover 	Substantively more generous for non-birthing parent
UMass Amherst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 semester paid leave, must use sick leave and then sick leave bank to cover • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 semester paid leave, must use sick leave and then sick leave bank to cover • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	Substantively more generous for both
UC, Davis UC, Irvine UCLA UCSD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid Childbearing Leave, 6 weeks or greater with medical approval • Unpaid Pregnancy Disability Leave up to total of 4 months • Runs concurrently with unpaid FMLA 12 weeks • Remainder quarter ASMD • 1 additional quarter ASMD • Unpaid Parental Leave up to 1 year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unpaid FMLA 12 weeks • 1 quarter ASMD (if 50% parental responsibility) • Unpaid Parental Leave up to 1 year 	Slightly <i>more</i> generous for both
Rutgers, New Brunswick Rutgers Camden Rutgers Newark RNJMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 weeks paid Recuperative Leave • 8 weeks paid Release Time • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 weeks paid Release Time • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	Substantively more generous for non-birthing parent

University of Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid disability 6+ weeks with medical authorization • Unpaid Parental Leave 6 months (continued eligibility for health insurance) • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 weeks unpaid FMLA • Unpaid CT State Statute 5-248a 24 weeks, runs concurrently • Unpaid Parental Leave 6 months (continued eligibility for health insurance) 	<p>Similar to UW</p>
University of Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid short term disability up to 6 months, with medical authorization • 3 weeks paid Parental Leave • 9 weeks unpaid Parental Leave • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 weeks paid Parental Leave • 9 weeks unpaid Parental Leave • Runs concurrently with 12 weeks unpaid FMLA 	<p>Substantively more generous for both</p>

Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a full-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

2. Appointment as a full-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24-53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

C. 1. A full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

2. Upon the completion of six or more annual appointments in any eight year period, or two or more consecutive multi-year appointments, a full-time lecturer or artist in residence shall, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for promotion to senior lecturer or senior artist in residence, respectively, following the procedures detailed in Section 24-54.

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. 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. 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 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 faculty 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 voting faculty 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.

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

An unfavorable promotion decision regarding a faculty member with an instructional title does not preclude renewal of appointment as described in Section 24-41, Subsection B.3.

E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]