Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, October 1, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall


Absent: JoAnn Taricani, Gowri Shankar, Scott Barnhart

Guests: Cheryl Cameron, Angelia Miranda, Miceal Vaughan, Stephan Siegel

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:32. The agenda was approved.

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

George Sandison, Chair of the Faculty Senate, summarized the remarks attached in the Exhibit.

Provost Richards and President Cauce noted that the exact funding mix for the new financial software is under discussion and that every effort will be made to keep the cost down, but that implementation will involve some financial pain.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.  [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.  [Exhibit C]

A question was raised about progress in filling the remaining seat on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB). Thaïsa Way, Chair of the SCPB, responded that she expected the seat to be filled shortly. She went on to say that every effort was being made to ensure that the SCPB is truly representative of the faculty as a whole. Another question was raised about whether all SCPB materials are generally available. Way responded that some materials are not available for public distribution. In response to a third question, Way said that the SCPB continues to look at the fiscal health of individual units.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce said she and Provost Richards are looking forward to working with the faculty during the coming academic year. She noted Provost Richards’ commitment to a strong partnership in shared governance.

President Cauce outlined several issues of importance in the near future, including transformation of the financial system and the implications of faculty turnover in terms of diversity, housing costs, compensation, and day care. She agreed that Sandison’s list of priorities are important.

President Cauce said she will be focusing on Olympia. She noted that legislators say they will look at higher education this year, but one problem the University faces is a general feeling that the state funding allocation lacks importance because of its size relative to the overall budget. Cauce said the University must explain that much of this budget involves the operation of the medical campus as a health-care provider, so that the overall budget numbers are not an accurate reflection of the funds available to support the operation of the UW as an academic institution. In addition, Cauce noted that donors do not, as a general matter, want to supplant state dollars. It follows that state support remains critical to help the UW continue its mission as a public institution of higher learning. Cauce said that the UW will be pursuing the fund-split formula, which currently overestimates the UW’s ability to use tuition dollars to replace direct state appropriations and puts an undue burden on UW students vis-a-vis students at other state institutions.
President Cauce said that the administration and faculty leadership are working together to roll back the 2016 housekeeping changes. Cauce said that she hopes this can be done without having to substantially rework existing, or issue new, Executive Orders. The roll back will allow work on the dispute-resolution parts of the Faculty Code to proceed unencumbered. Cauce emphasized that it should in no way be seen as a lessening of our commitment to the values underlying the University’s policies on discrimination and harassment.

President Cauce made some general comments on the use of Executive Orders. She said that EO’s are not the appropriate way to change policy as a general matter, but there must be a mechanism for making sure that the UW complies with federal and state regulations. Cauce noted that such a use of EO’s would only take place with close consultation with faculty leadership, and that the EO process has a built in sixty-day procedure for faculty input, which input always is taken very seriously.

Provost Richards made some general comments. Richards said that the UW is on a good trajectory in many ways, but there is a lot of work to be done. Richards said he has found something of a loose and unstructured set of internal processes in a number of areas. They need to be clarified and communicated to deans, chairs, and faculty. Richards argued that this is important because universities get themselves in the most trouble when they violate their own policies and procedures. The issue of discrimination and harassment is a case in point. Members of the community don’t know what to do in terms of identifying, reporting, and responding. Richards said that the administration will be working with the senate to provide appropriate and effective training, as well as providing avenues for communication and discussion.

With respect to the federal regulations, President Cauce said that we will be looking to Washington, especially the Department of Education. Her expectation is that the new approach will be more permissive than prescriptive, but with some particular attention to the rights of the accused. If this is the case, then the UW will proceed along the approach started under the Obama administration guidelines. Provost Richards agreed, but added that there is some worry there will be new regulations creating disincentives for victims to report in the first instance.

Some members questioned whether online discrimination and harassment training is enough. Provost Richards agreed and said his own experience is that online training is more effective in detailing the reporting process than it is in providing definitions of discrimination and harassment per se. President Cauce noted that there is a task force looking into training, including bystander training. Cauce said that bystander training is critical because research shows that gender-based discrimination and harassment is an environmental starting place for workplace discrimination and harassment generally. Moreover, gender-based discrimination begins with a climate in which inappropriate comments go unchallenged. Members said that it would be important that uniform training be given to all members of the community.

Provost Richards said that the university has an environment that is hyper-protective of the accused. Townsend agreed that, as a substantive matter, universities tend to downplay behavior that would be considered actionable in a corporate setting, but he said it must be remembered that, as a procedural matter, a public university is legally limited in how summarily it may act.

Provost Richards raised the possibility of providing the senate with access to legal advice. President Cauce said that this could be explored, but it is a complicated issue.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Announce electronic approval of the May 7, 2018, Senate Executive Committee, and May 17, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.
   b. Summer approved nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit D]
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.
7. Unfinished Business.

There was no new business.


   a. Approval of the October 18, 2018, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit F]
      Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.

9. Discussion Items.

   a. Housekeeping and the Faculty Code. [Exhibit G]
   b. Requiring Faculty Council attendance for continued council membership.
   c. Report and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Pre-Retirement Planning.
      Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement. [Exhibit H]

Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, introduced the housekeeping discussion. He pointed out that the current housekeeping section is not in the Code itself. The section was written by the Records Office as part of the move from the older faculty-handbook. The underlying idea is that the two-consideration-Class-A approach might not be appropriate for certain types of changes. He noted that there is some agreement that the Code needs clarity, but there is some discussion about the appropriate scope and process for housekeeping. With respect to scope, one extreme would be to say that no housekeeping is allowed. At the other extreme, housekeeping could cover everything from typographical errors to clarifying language to changes required by compliance with state and federal regulations. With respect to process, at one extreme one could require something like the rather cumbersome two-consideration Class-A-legislation model. At the other extreme, one could stay with the current system which leaves it to the Secretary of the Faculty.

During the ensuing discussion, several points were made. On the process side, there was support for an approach that allows for immediate changes to be made by a smaller body, such as the SEC, but that changes would be subject to a later ratification process involving the faculty. This would be similar to the emergency-rule making authority used in the administrative-law setting. On the scope side, there was argument about whether housekeeping should cover clarification and compliance. Townsend pointed out that the Code has an interpretation process that might overlap with clarification; care should be taken so no conflict arises. The point was made that without some sort of expedited process to deal with compliance issues, the President might be compelled to use intermediate Executive Orders to supplant the Code, a prospect that bothered several members who were concerned about the implications for shared governance.

Townsend introduced the discussion on council attendance by making the following points. A number of chairs have raised concerns about attendance problems and the effects on obtaining a quorum, getting work done efficiently, etc. The Code has no specific provision on council attendance. The only means of addressing it formally now is by seeking a member’s removal in front of the Senate. Then questions that are raised are the following. Should we have a specific attendance policy for council members? If so, what should it be? And if so, how should it be administered?

A discussion followed. There was general agreement that a policy on unexcused absences was needed. There was general agreement that there be a mechanism ensuring that council members in jeopardy be given adequate notice. There was some support for the idea that the council Chairs determine whether the absence was excused. There was some discussion about how many unexcused absences would trigger a response and whether the response would be automatic removal. Provost Richards argued that it might not be possible to determine the best answers to these questions ex ante, and that it would be worth picking a policy and seeing how it worked, modifying it later if it did not have the desired effect.

Stephan Siegel, Chair of the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement, began the discussion of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Pre-Retirement Planning by summarizing the material in the Exhibit. The report and its recommendations focus on faculty generically and do not single out tenure-track faculty. Several members said that, given fiscal challenges and competing demands for funding, it
would be important to have more information on the monetary implications of the recommendations, especially the recommendation to make the VRI permanent. Moreover, it was suggested that other stakeholders, including junior faculty, should take part in the policy discussions. Finally, President Cauce noted that it was not unusual to have retirement incentives, such as VRI, that come and go depending on extant workforce and funding realities. There was a general recognition of the benefits of providing faculty members with a forum for discussing retirement issues, but concerns were raised about having an official presidential/senate imprimatur attached to a panel giving faculty members substantive, as opposed to procedural, advice. There was general agreement to investigate how the rights and responsibilities of emeritus faculty could be more explicitly spelled out in the Faculty Code. There was some discussion about whether any more tangible information about the supplemental retirement income could be made available to faculty before retirement. Some members felt that the website could be a little clearer on what classes of income are included in the twenty-four-month base period. But there was general recognition of the practical and legal problems with providing specifics on formula inputs before their numerical values are fixed by conditions at the time of retirement. The discussion ended with an acknowledgement of the need to balance the contributions retired faculty can still make and the need to let junior faculty take their place in shaping the university.

10. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 P.M.

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

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, October 8 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
George Sandison, Professor, School of Medicine

This is my first report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC). I want to emphasize my pleasure in receiving an opportunity to serve our faculty body and the SEC in the senate leadership role of Chair. I am imbued with confidence to succeed in my senate chair role because of the strong support of the members of this committee, other senate leaders, and the chairs and members of the senate faculty councils that have been nominated to serve during my tenure. But it is not only the support of arms extending from the faculty senate that will define leadership success and good progress over the next year. It is also the fact that as faculty leaders we have the great fortune of partnering with two outstanding academic leaders at the helm of the University of Washington, President Cauce and Provost Richards, both of whom are committed to shared governance and to assist faculty to achieve value-driven improvement in all spheres of their work; education, discovery, and service to our communities. As we all appreciate, this faculty work is the core raison d’être for the university. Excellence in the practice and delivery of our work and our service to students and each other is paramount.

We cannot be good stewards of this university in harmony with the Board of Regents and our university administration without openness to new ideas, trust in each other and collaboration to achieve our shared goals. There is no doubt that unexpected obstacles that stand in the way of our goals will become apparent. Progress may be slower than we want. Long term, or even short term, we may face unintended consequences of the decisions we make along the way. Openness, collaboration and trust is critical to our progress but so is tenacity of purpose, corrective action when appropriate, and the patient acknowledgement that slow improvement is better than no improvement at all.

The major priorities we have identified for the year are:

1. Development of an improved system governing faculty dispute resolution
   A concerted effort to develop a value-based system for the faculty conduct and disciplinary process has been underway for a year. This effort, led by Drs. Zoe Barsness (2017-18 Faculty Senate past-Chair) and Michael Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty), will continue throughout this academic year and it is anticipated that faculty code changes will be proposed to the Faculty Senate in 2019. More options for mediation and reconciliation will be made available in under the proposed new system. Consequently, a reduction in full adjudication panel proceedings are expected as an outcome.

2. Improved working conditions for lecturing faculty
   Efforts to improve lecturer working conditions will continue. This enterprise has made successful changes to policy and the faculty code over the past few years but is not considered complete. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) will consider further changes addressing remaining issues that may include a title change, more timely promotion consideration, and greater employment security.

3. Affordable housing for new faculty
   An increasing problem confronting new faculty and staff recruitment is the cost of accommodation and housing, especially in the Seattle region. This problem is well recognized by President Cauce and Provost Richards as a detriment to new faculty recruitment. Initial steps by our administration have been taken to investigate possible solutions to this increasingly serious problem. In addition a feasibility study led by three faculty (Drs. Gundula Proksch, Theo Myhre and Gowri Shankar) participating in a leadership excellence program (LEP3) project aims to develop financial and legal models, attractive architectural and landscape designs, identification of sites, and land acquisition options. This study will draw on the professional expertise of university senior staff and administrators. Senate leadership will be facilitating these interactions and supporting progress toward a workable solution.
4. Further clarifying and strengthening the role of Elected Faculty Councils (EFCs)

The role of school and college elected faculty councils is to provide advice to deans on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, academic policy, budgets and priorities for resource and salary allocation. Following the May 7th 2018 report to the SEC by the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Code and Regulations that summarized the EFC bylaw review report, the FCFA was charged with reviewing the report and making recommendations. It is anticipated that the changes to the faculty code to improve its clarity on EFC membership composition and member voting status will be recommended. In addition, faculty senate leadership will continue regular meetings with EFC chairs for the purpose of mutual education and cooperation to improve the quality of advice provided to their deans.

5. Improvement of UW faculty diversity profile

A survey for the Faculty 2050 initiative indicated faculty had strong concerns that efforts on faculty diversity have been slow to make meaningful change to the overall faculty diversity profile. Faculty senate leadership will continue to pursue engagement with senate faculty councils, school/college/campus EFCs and all levels of university governance to build upon and implement strategies to bring a rapid change in the diversity profile of faculty. Ultimately recruitment of excellent faculty candidates who also improve faculty diversity is a responsibility of faculty themselves.

6. Faculty input and monitoring of the new financial software design and implementation

The Board of Regents has approved funding for a new financial software platform. The large cost associated with the purchase and workflow changes required to successfully implement this software platform is expected to impact the majority of faculty and staff at the university. Based on the recent implementation of the Workday software, pre and post implementation difficulties will be considerable. It is important that faculty leadership is proactive by being regularly apprised and consulted by IT leadership and IT operations on the design and plans for implementation of this software. A quarterly meeting between IT leadership and faculty senate leadership has been arranged. (The medical school EFCs will be encouraged to do similarly for the clinical transformation implementation of a new single electronic health record platform across the UW medical system).

Each faculty council chair and the faculty senate leadership have collaborated on specifying at least three council goals for the year. These goals will be listed on the Faculty Senate website. Please contact me by email using the address sandison@uw.edu if you would like to provide input or additional suggestions on the above senate leadership priorities or goals of the faculty councils posted. Thank you for allowing me to serve in the senate chair role. I thank you for the important service you are providing to the faculty senate and university.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Faculty Councils have full membership and Chairs appointed. Welcome to all returning and new members! The list of members, along with meeting minutes and schedules can be found on our website at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html.

2. The Senate Leadership will be meeting regularly throughout the year with Faculty Council Chairs and Chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils of Schools, Colleges, and Campuses (i.e. “college councils”) for coordination and information sharing. Specific invitations to these meetings will be forthcoming.

3. Our long-time office manager and Assistant to the Chair, Nancy Bradshaw, retired at the end of the last academic year. Replacing her is Jordan Smith, who has previously served two and one-half years as Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty. Replacing Jordan Smith is Joey Burgess, who has previously served four years as Faculty Council Support Analyst. Replacing Joey Burgess is Lauren Hatchett. Ms. Hatchett holds a Master’s in Education Policy from the University of Washington, and she has extensive background and experience in the non-profit, legislative, and higher education settings. Most recently, she has been working in the University’s Office of Planning and Budgeting. We are thrilled to have her joining our team.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Thaișa Way, Professor, College of Built Environments

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

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting advises the administration and informs the Faculty Senate on long-range planning, preparation of budgets, and distribution of funds, with a particular focus on faculty concerns. The committee consults with the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate on matters of policy. (Faculty Code 22-91).

SCPB OVERVIEW

SCPB provides strategic advice and counsel to the Provost regarding areas of faculty interest and oversight. SCPB focuses on high-level views of strategic and fiscal issues, levers and impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Voting Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thaisa Way</td>
<td>Committee chair</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Sandison</td>
<td>Faculty Senate chair</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Janes</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Vice Chair</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnn Taricani</td>
<td>Fac leg rep</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Laws</td>
<td>Dep Fac. Leg reg</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Townsend</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Brown</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Grossman</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hebert</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Greengrove</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Olmstead</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Richards</td>
<td>Provost, EVP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Norris Hall</td>
<td>AVP, OPB</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Sullivan</td>
<td>Dean, BODC rep</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUW Rep</td>
<td>Ritika Jain</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPSS Rep</td>
<td>Giuliana Conti</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Student Rep</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCPB meets three times per month for two hours each session. Twice quarterly, SCPB meets for one hour, and the Provost and AVP, OPB, cover emergent issues and budget allocations. Otherwise, meetings are planned by SCPB chair and the Associate Vice Provost, Planning & Budgeting.

The Chair of the SCPB will meet monthly with the Provost to facilitate SCPB agenda planning and assure issues of faculty and administrative concern are addressed by the committee.

BODC, SCPB and PACS chairs will meet with the Provost regularly and line up critical issues for each group to discuss in concert.

**VALUES**

Executive Summary (see Attachment 1):
Any decision for the allocation of fiscal resources should:
- Support UW’s Academic Vision and Mission
- Respond to Critical Needs
- Support Faculty, Staff, and Student health and wellbeing
- Preserve our commitment to diversity, inclusion, and academic freedom
- Steward public mission of the UW
- Strengthen Fiscal Health
- Strengthen Long term Resilience

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. **University Priorities, Compensation & Unit Adjustment**

Executive Order 64 requires that the Provost consult with SCPB and BODC to formulate an approach for salary distribution plans, including merit allocation procedures and other compensation adjustments, including unit adjustment within the context of the university budget. Any merit pool allocation set at less than 2 percent must be justified to BODC and SCPB.

In 2016, the Provost required that Deans and Chancellors partner with their respective Elected Faculty Councils to develop compensation plans, unit adjustment requests, and to review unit budgets as a whole. The Dean/Chancellor invites the EFC Chair to accompany him/her to present to the SCPB as invited by the Provost. Unit adjustment is a mechanism used either outside or during the merit process to address foreseeable or emerging differentials in the academic labor markets and to reflect assessments of the quality, standing and contributions of units to the academic mission and quality of our university (Executive Order 64). SCPB must be consulted on unit adjustment proposals before the Provost approves or denies requests for unit adjustment.

2. **Deficit Monitoring**

During the 2017-18 academic year, SCPB heard quarterly updates to all university deficits, and by the end of the year, received briefings on forecast deficits, by unit, and year. In many cases, subject matter experts outside OPB brought updates to SCPB, including UW Medicine, National Primate Center, School of Dentistry, and the School of Law.

While SCPB reviewed reports provided, it is increasingly focused on developing advice and strategic guidance for resolving deficits consistent with faculty priorities.

3. **Tuition/Fee Approvals**

The Regents maintain authority to approve tuition rates. As part of the Annual Review process, Deans consult with students and faculty, and then submit to OPB requests for new or changing tuition rates.
OPB posts preliminary tuition proposals online and finalizes the new rates after Regents’ approval in June/July. The review process includes SCPB consultation for increases in excess of 5 percent.

4. Re-organization, Consolidation, Elimination of Academic Programs (RCEP)

In order to achieve a budget reduction, reallocate resources, implement educational policies, or realign academic priorities, a dean or chancellor may consult with his or her elected faculty council and proposal the elimination or reorganization of one or more programs.

Having consulted with the unit’s elected faculty council, the dean or chancellor would advance a proposal to the provost, who consults with SCPB on the proposed changes. In addition, SCPB would resolve disagreements around what constitutes a “program” and assess whether the proposal meets the criteria for a limited or full RCEP procedure (Faculty Code 26-41). In the event a petition is filed, SCPB works with the Provost to resolve the petition; its decision is binding.

5. Annual Review and Budget Development

In light of the aforementioned responsibilities, which include major drivers of revenue, expense, and reserve use, SCPB reviews unit-level financial forecasts and budget plans annually. SCPB provides strategic advice to the Provost in regards to budget requests, and considers both short- and long-term financial issues to best position the university to allocate its resources in mission-driven and strategic ways.

Attachment 1: SCPB Values for Decision-Making

SCPB Values to Frame Decision Making:

Values
Any decision for the allocation of fiscal resources should:
- Support UW’s Academic Vision and Mission
- Respond to Critical Needs
- Support Faculty, Staff, and Student health and wellbeing
- Preserve our commitment to diversity, inclusion, and academic freedom
- Steward public mission of the UW
- Strengthen Fiscal Health
- Strengthen Long term Resilience

Does the decision .... yes because it ....
Support UW’s Academic Vision and Mission
- Supports research, scholarship, and inquiry
- Supports teaching, pedagogy, and student learning
- Supports service, community engagement, and outreach

Respond to Critical Needs
- Ensures health and safety
- Sustains current activities deemed essential
- Offers a one time opportunity that fits mission/ vision/ objective

Support Faculty, Staff, and Student health and wellbeing
- Supports inclusive, safe, and welcoming culture that values equity and diversity
- Supports access to appropriate resources for faculty, staff, and/or students (affordable housing, childcare, benefits, etc.)
- Supports access for students from diverse backgrounds and experiences within the state and beyond

Preserve our commitment to diversity, inclusion, and academic freedom
- Supports increased diversity in recruitment, hiring, and mentoring of faculty and staff
- Supports increased diversity in recruitment, admissions, and mentoring of students and learners
- Supports academic freedom for our faculty, staff, and students
Steward the public mission of the UW
- Supports engagement with communities in research, teaching, and/or service
- Supports public service by faculty, staff, and students
- Supports programs that serve our communities as a reflection of our UW vision and mission

Strengthen Fiscal Health
- Supports short-term budget balance of unit budgets?
- Supports long term fiscal health of academic, student, and administrative units and activities
- Allocates funds per academic mission and objectives

Strengthen Long term Resilience
- Addresses long term challenges/ opportunities
- Repairs ongoing area of weakness/ area of neglect/ disparate allocations in times previous / avoids continuation of previous biases?
- Allows directed growth / expansion in opportune manner
Summer approved nominees for Faculty Councils and creation of an FCBR ad hoc committee on faculty pre-retirement planning.

Faculty Code Section 22-60.B.12: The Executive Committee of the Senate: (12.) Shall act for the Senate during the period from the last Senate meeting in the Spring Quarter until the first meeting in the Autumn Quarter, and shall report such actions at the first Senate meeting in the Autumn Quarter.

2018-2019 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

Adjudication Panel

Ehsan Feroz, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2021.

Lisa Kelly, School of Law, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

Sarah Stroup, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending on September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

Jack Lee, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Jack Lee, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Lauren Montgomery, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending on September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Research

Charles Frevert, School of Medicine, as chair for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Cheryl Greengrove, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 15, 2018, and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Chris Laws, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Dean Heerwagen, 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

Tom Halverson, College of Education, as chair for a term beginning on September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

AnnMarie Borys, College of Built Environments, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

Douglas MacLachlan, Foster School of Business, as a voting member for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

Robin Angotti, UW Bothell, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2018, and ending September 15, 2019.

Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative

Chris Laws, College of Arts & Sciences, as Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative for a term beginning immediately and ending August 1, 2019.
2018 – 2019 Appointments to University and Senate Committees

Conciliation Board

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

Marieka Klawitter, Evans School, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

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

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

Conor Casey, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

James Gregory, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Miceal Vaughan, College of Arts and Sciences, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Judith Henchy, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

Charles Hirschman, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Laura Lillard, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Ann Madhavan, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Research

Francis Kim, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Stewart Tolnay, College of Arts & Sciences, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Ann Glusker, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Erin Conor, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Fred Bookstein, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Judith Howard, College of Arts & Sciences, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Amanda Hornby, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

**Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy**

Claudia Gorbman, UW Tacoma, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Lauren Pressley, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a non-voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

Bruce Balick, College of Arts & Sciences, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Alena Wolotria, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

**Faculty Council on University Libraries**

Kate O’Neill, School of Law, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

Jackie Belanger, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

**Faculty Council on Women in Academia**

Lynly Beard, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.

**Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting**

Marjorie Olmstead, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Student Conduct Review Officers**

Jeffrey Schwartz, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2019.
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, October 18, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
Johnson Hall 102

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

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

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

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of October 1, 2018.
   a. Announce electronic approval of the May 7, 2018, Senate Executive Committee, and May 17, 2018, Faculty Senate minutes.
   b. Summer approved nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

8. Announcements.


11. Discussion Items.
   a. Academic Integrity Research Project.
      Elizabeth Lewis, Director, Wellness & Development.
      Ashlei Tobin-Robertson, Assistant Director, Community Standards & Conduct.

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: George Sandison, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, October 25 at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102.
Housekeeping and the Faculty Code.
Section 3 of the Introduction to the Faculty Code.

3. History of Revisions, Source Abbreviations Used, and Information Related to these Materials

The revision history of materials in the Faculty Code and Governance resource is located at the end of each section, if known. Sections within the Faculty Code and Governance resource can be initiated, amended, and repealed independent of the chapter in which they appear, and so contain separate revision histories.

Source abbreviations identify the authority or means by which these policies have been adopted and revised. In addition to some specific historical references, source abbreviations used in the Faculty Code and Governance history of revisions are as follows:

**AI**—Administrative Information: An informational statement prepared by a relevant University office or official of the administration.

**BR**—Board of Regents: An action or ruling of the Board of Regents.

**RC**—Rules Coordination: The Rules Coordination Office publishes simple housekeeping amendments to the Faculty Code and Governance that correct typographical errors; make address, name, or contact information changes; or clarify language without changing its effect. All housekeeping amendments to the Faculty Code and Governance are first reviewed and approved by the Secretary of the Faculty.

**S-A #**—Faculty Class A Legislative Action: Faculty Senate Class A legislative referendum action with Presidential approval is limited to amendment of the Faculty Code (Chapters 21-29), together with the number and date of the relevant Class A Bulletin.

**S-B #**—Faculty Class B Legislative Action: Faculty Senate Class B legislative action with Presidential approval, normally effective without referendum, together with the number and date of the relevant Class B Bulletin.

**S-C #**—Faculty Class C Non-Legislative Action: Non-legislative Faculty Senate Class C actions become effective upon adoption by the Senate, together with the number and date of the relevant Class C Bulletin in which the action is announced.

**Section 13-31**—The Enacting Clause: The April 16, 1956 enacting clause by which, under state statutes and with approval of the Board of Regents and of the President, provisions of the 1952 Faculty Handbook were revised and brought into their present numbering format by faculty referendum.

Other relevant information related to these chapters may also be cited at the end of the chapter.
Report and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Faculty Retirement.
Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement.

May 12, 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 benefitted from the participation of and input from Cheryl Cameron, Pat Dougherty, Tanya Eadie, Amy Hawkins, Mindy Kornberg, and Mike Townsend. I would summarize FCBR’s position as supportive of the following recommendations made by the Subcommittee:

- **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 VRI) 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 de[a]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 VEBAn 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 has 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 hesitant 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 be 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.