Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, May 19, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Beauchamp called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. The agenda was amended to move item 10 e, the resolution concerning an alternative faculty salary policy proposal to unfinished business. Agenda was approved.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Norm Beauchamp. [Exhibit A]

Chair Beauchamp reminded the Senators that this is the last meeting of the year. He believes it is imperative that there is a full discussion on the proposed salary policy so that there is an informed vote. Senators need to be the ones who help the rest of the faculty understand the Class A legislation.

Chair Beauchamp recognized the service of the Secretary of the Faculty, Marcia Killien, who is retiring on June 30, 2016. The announcement was met with applause from those present.

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

There were no questions.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce acknowledged the student activism that has happened recently, commenting that it is good to have engagement from the students. She further commented on some of the issues raised by student groups. UW is not invested in private prisons so cannot divest from them. In terms of buying prison goods, 0.11% of furniture purchased has been from prisons in the last 6 years, representing $6 million out of $6 billion spent on furniture. The State requires UW to purchase from the lowest bid from a responsible bidder. There is a process to lodge a complaint against a vendor and say the vendor is not responsible. Regarding scholarship aid for undocumented students, UW has provided $4.2 million in financial aid and scholarships this year of which $1.2 million is from the State Need Grant. This is more than what the UC system is doing. She also announced that as of this morning, Gerald Baldasty has been named Provost (no longer Interim Provost), for up to 3 years; the announcement was met with applause from the Senate. She is working to implement more rigorous performance reviews of high ranking administrators.

If the salary policy legislation passes the Senate today, no communication from the President’s office is planned. She is 100% committed to making work whatever the faculty supports. There is no policy that is perfect, especially if there is not enough money. Work will need to be done to implement the policy. If the legislation does not pass, she is 100% committed to working on ways to assure improvements in compensation for the faculty.

There were no questions.

5. Requests for Information.

   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of May 2, 2016.
   a. Approve the April 4, 2016, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the April 21, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. 2016-17 Schedule of Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate meetings. [Exhibit E]
   d. Faculty council activities. [Exhibit F]
   e. Faculty Demographic Tableau Dashboard. [Exhibit G]

There were no questions.
6. Memorial Resolution.

Zoe Barsness presented the memorial resolution.

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Professor Emeritus James A. Donaldson of Otolaryngology who died on March 20, 2016, after having served the University since 1965.

Clinical Associate Professor Robert Vernon Erickson of Pharmacy who died on March 25, 2016, after having served the University since 1990.

Clinical Associate Professor Ray Harrison Fenner of Orthopedics who died on April 30, 2016, after having served the University since 1990.

Professor Emeritus Earl Busby Hunt of Psychology who died on April 12, 2016, after having served the University since 1967.

Professor Emeritus Gladys Engel Lang of Sociology who died on March 23, 2016, after having served the University since 1984.

Professor Emeritus Ed Miles of Aquatic and Fisheries and The Daniel J Evans School of Public Affairs who died on May 7, 2016, after serving the university since 1974.

The Senate approved the resolution with a standing vote.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for 2016-17 Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit H]
   b. Approve nominations for 2016-17 Senate Executive Committee Positions. [Exhibit I]

The consent agenda was approved.

8. Announcements.

Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, asked the Senate to help consider potential Secretary of the Faculty nominees. She also acknowledged the service that Norm Beauchamp has done for the Faculty Senate as Chair for the past year and presented him with plaque in recognition of his work.

Susan Astley thanked President Cauce and Provost Baldasty for releasing the tableau information on faculty demographics for access by all faculty.


There was one item of unfinished business, the Class C resolution relating to an alternative faculty salary policy proposal in Exhibit N, which was postponed to this meeting. Discussion will resume at the point we were at when the motion was postponed. Chair Beauchamp made a motion to postpone the resolution to the end of new business. Motion passed. The resolution was postponed.

   a. Class A legislation – Second Consideration. [Exhibit J]
      Title: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code regarding faculty salary policy.
      **Action:** Conduct final review of legislation to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection.

Chair Beauchamp discussed the process for approving legislation on second consideration. There were changes suggested by the SEC based on reviews by the President and the Advisory Committee on Faculty
Code and Regulations and the legislation was approved by the Senate Executive Committee at its last meeting. This alternative proposal will be considered first by the Senate.

The alternate proposal (Exhibit J) approved by the SEC was presented to the Senate for consideration by Vice-chair Zoe Barsness.

Rolf Johnson, Chief of Staff to the President, and Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, spoke to the changes from the President’s office, shown in Exhibit J.

Chair Beauchamp urged a full discussion of the legislation. Senators made arguments in favor and in opposition to passing the legislation.

Christina Fong asked what would happen to schools in the waiting period between requesting to be exempt from the tier system and deciding on an alternative system. President Cauce said there would be a timeline for the process that will be ready when the new policy is actually implemented.

Kate O’Neill, Law, spoke against the proposed legislation. She commented that she had moved from a position of support to opposition during the lengthy consideration and change of the original idea. She indicated she is not opposed to a policy that tries to address compression for long-term faculty. The original plan seemed to do that, but it became clear that it wouldn’t work across the entire university. Her concerns include the consequences of choices that need to be made to move funds to support policy. Flexible options (opt outs & customization) means passing to the faculty binding legislation where they won’t really know what their own unit will implement. The intent is to increase power to faculty; this policy is focused on alleviating compression without addressing other problems. She has submitted a statement of concerns, posted on the Senate website. She spoke to concerns about the vague criteria related to tier-advancement through collegial performance reviews. She believes that most of the problems can be fixed within the current policy without the complexity and risks she has spoken to related to the proposed policy. She urged voting no.

Paul Hopkins, Chemistry, spoke in support of the Class A legislation. He indicated that while there have been changes, much of those changes have not been substantive. He reviewed the history of funding the regular and additional merit raises and suggested strongly that the tier system will provide more assurance of salary increases. He acknowledged that senior faculty will not benefit as much as faculty at earlier career stages from this policy but that the legislation should be supported for those faculty. He hopes the Senate will pass it and let the whole faculty decide. Tier raises build on the promotion raises that we know work. Tier raises will be like they are at the University of California (UC), sacrosanct. In time, Deans may even come around to the benefits of the new policy. Groups who choose to be exempt from the tier system would still be better off than in our current policy. We are doing this for the next generation.

Gautham Reddy, Radiology, spoke against the legislation. He does not think the policy will work for faculty in the professional schools. When he was a faculty member at the University of California, the tier system was very cumbersome for faculty in Medicine. He indicated he respected the good intentions of the working group but believed that it would not work well with all academic units, especially the School of Medicine due to their salary structure where salaries come from non-state sources. Such a big change should have a broader consensus. He would prefer an opt-in system rather than an opt-out/exemption.

Brad Holt, Engineering, emphasized that this is our employment contract and it is a legal document. Deans may limit tier advancements for any reason. Why would we say that in our contract? Deans or Chairs may ask for merit review at any time. Why would we do that? He emphasized the words are important. It is possible to delay the whole system if it imposes a severe financial stress on a department or program. Why would we write that? We provide no guidance for placement in tiers in this legislation. Tier raises can be delayed and the amount determined later. There are no guarantees of 8% raises. UW is different from the UC system. We are state employees and the state determines tuition, but the UC system is not that way. We live and die with the State and any salary system has to reflect that environment. Tiers do not qualify as promotions, so the State will not give you the tier raise. For opting-out, the Dean can choose to opt-out and consult with the faculty. The Provost will then decide the feasibility. That’s not very promising. He urged voting no because he believes we can do better.
Gail Stygall, English, spoke in support of the proposed legislation. She believes that more funds will go to faculty than in the current policy where deans have the control through retention raises. She wants to have a vote now rather than wait years for an alternative. She believes the proposed system will stand up in the legislature because the tier system is similar to steps in other employee groups. She believes the UC system is the type of mature salary system we should have at UW, for the future generation of faculty. She urged a yes vote.

Janelle Taylor, Anthropology, commented that reviewing a lot of faculty may be cumbersome, but it is not new. It is also in the current policy. The criteria must remain vague so that people can properly judge faculty based on what is important in their unit.

Steve Buck, Psychology, indicated this proposal provides the only clear, well-developed course to keep faculty salaries on track. He is not confident that an alternative would be better or less complex in its implementation. We will never reach wording that pleases everyone, so it is time to act and let all faculty vote on it.

Duane Storti, Engineering, shared Holt’s concerns. The Faculty Senate needs to get a lawyer so that we can understand the implications of the language. We have come to the time where faculty should be able to vote.

Max Lieblich, Mathematics, said this is a wonderful university. However, the current policy is not working. When he was hired, colleagues at Princeton told him the salary system at UW was terrible. It gives UW a bad reputation. The policy causes compression. The new policy will address that. Models have been made for this policy and it is affordable. It enshrines in the Code that the faculty are important.

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke to the language and intention in the proposed salary policy, making observations for future reference: The biennial budget appropriates what is called a "general wage increase" to employees. It should be clear for future interpretations of the state budget language that the faculty understands that it is agreeing that the general wage increase will not go to all faculty each year as it has in the past in the form of 2% and merit increases, but will be assigned to the pool that will be used to create the larger four-year-cycle increases of the new budget policy. The state mechanism is set up to provide the annual general wage increase, but we can decide, by this new salary policy, to award the overall amount in a different way. The general wage increase does fluctuate each year; for example, in 2015-16 it was 3.0%, and in 2016-17 it will be 1.8% from the state (increased to 4.0% by internal funding and legislative language that allows the UW to add internal funds to the state salary increase).

Brad Holt reiterated that he understands the frustrations with salaries, but this proposed policy does not make money. We operate on boom and bust. He is worried that if we operate on tiers, someone will get their tier increase and then we will have a recession so people up for their tier increase will not get it. They will not be happy.

Gordon Watts, Physics and Chair of FCFA, commented that in order to fix salary compression we need a large infusion of money. This policy will allocate the funds in, hopefully, a more transparent or equitable way.

Robin Angotti, UW Bothell, spoke to the UWB as the fastest growing campus in the state of Washington. We will not be able to fund this policy at UWB. This campus does not have faculty who are retiring to help fund this system. She feels powerless and voiceless voting on a policy she knows that UWB will want to be exempted from.

Another Senator from Arts and Sciences spoke to the need to make sure tier advancements are funded by the State. If a lot of schools opt-out, what will be the impact on the system? President Cauce said the legislature is open to UW funding promotion raises so if they view tier raises that way they may be permissive of that. There is no obligation from the state for promotion or tier raises. It is more important to consider if the UW can afford it than if the State will be permissive.

Mark Wurfel, Medicine, expressed the need for flexibility and this is about as good as we can do.

Janelle Taylor called the question and it was seconded. There was opposition to calling the question; the vote to call the question passed.
The motion to approve the Class A legislation to be sent to the faculty for vote passed, with a vote of 47 yes, 29 no, and 4 abstaining.

Chair Beauchamp urged Senators to encourage their colleagues to vote on the legislation. The Secretary of the Faculty read the voting rules from the Faculty Code.

b. Class B Legislation – Chapter 110: Grade, Honors, and Scholarship. [Exhibit K]
   Title: Changes to Chapter 110.1.A, Satisfactory/non-satisfactory grade requirements.
   Action: Approve for distribution and approval by the faculty.

Patricia Kramer spoke to the Class B legislation. This legislation is proposed because of student abuse of the current policy in how many satisfactory/non-satisfactory credits they register for. This policy applies to undergraduate students and not professional or graduate students.

The motion to approved the Class B legislation passed.

c. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit L]
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
   Title: Resolution concerning holistic review for competitive admissions majors.
   Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.

Patricia Kramer spoke to the Class C resolution. The Council hopes that this legislation will begin conversations about competitive admission majors and will guide FCAS in considering new proposals.

The Resolution passed.

d. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit M]
   Title: Resolution concerning Student Collective to host Tent City 3.
   Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

President Cauce spoke in favor of the Class C resolution. A student present at the meeting offered to answer any questions. Organizers are trying to gather a group of faculty together who may be interested in teaching at the tent city. Kate O’Neill said that she hopes this will allow UW faculty to provide clinical services to the residents.

The Resolution passed.

e. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit N]
   Title: Resolution concerning an alternative salary policy proposal.
   Action: Postponed at April 21 to next meeting, May 19, to approve for distribution to faculty.

There was no discussion.

The motion failed.

11. Good of the Order.

There was no good of the order.


The meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien
Approved by: Norm Beauchamp, Chair
Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, May 26 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Norm Beauchamp, Professor, Radiology

Dear Friends,

Our last senate meeting of the academic year! It is fitting that the year-end meeting will call on us to apply our shared governance skills to their fullest. We will be undertaking the second consideration of the Class A Salary Policy legislation. A university salary policy is central to the goals of excellence, inclusiveness and sustainability.

We must have two goals for our Senate Meeting.

1. It is imperative that we have a full discussion. We want to make sure that the senate vote is optimally informed. We have constructed the agenda to enable a conversation. Let us hold each other accountable to this goal.

2. We must spend adequate time in discussion so that we, the representatives of the faculty, have the depth of understanding needed to educate the faculty (if the policy does go to a faculty vote).

I am pleased to share that a great deal of effort is going into informing the Senate and the Faculty. We are creating materials that include a table comparing the current and proposed new salary policy, a 300 – 500 word editorial describing the pros of the policy as well as a 300-500 word editorial that describes the cons. We will provide these editorial statements to the senate prior to the meeting. These materials may be updated, based on the Senate discussions and vote.

I leave you with a quote from Sharon Salzberg.

“Voting is the expression of our commitment to ourselves, one another, this country and this world.”

Let’s get it right.

Best,
Norm
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty  
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. **SEC Elections.** Senate Executive Committee elections will begin after the May Faculty Senate meeting.

2. **University Faculty Council membership.** Nominations are continuing to be accepted for appointments to university faculty committees and councils for the academic year 2016-17. If you are interested in serving on a faculty council, or would like to nominate a colleague, please contact me at secfac@uw.edu.

3. **University Faculty Lecturer.** Eight outstanding nominations were received for the 41st University Faculty Lecturer and a recommendation was sent by the selection committee to the President. Ray W. Hilborn, Professor of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences in the College of Environment, has been selected as this year’s University Faculty Lecturer. Thanks to the selection committee for their work: Zoe Barsness, Michael Rosenfeld, Rachel Chapman, Charles Hirschman, Robin McCabe, Cherry Banks, and Marjorie Olmstead.

4. **Result of Class A vote on Eligibility for Election to the Senate.** Class A legislation 138, on eligibility for election to the Senate, was sent to the faculty for a vote on April 22, 2016, and voting will end on May 13, 2016.

5. **Thank you for your service.** Thanks to everyone who has participated in faculty governance activities during this past academic year. Your service is essential for the wellbeing of our university.

6. This is my last Senate meeting as I am retiring from the University on June 30, 2016. It has been an honor and privilege to serve as your Secretary of the Faculty since 2008. I’ve enjoyed meeting and working with so many committed and talented faculty, staff, students, and administrators across the three campuses of the UW. I especially wish to thank the staff of the office of the Senate and University Committees who have supported me and all of you these past years: Nancy Bradshaw, Susan Folk, Alex Bolton, Jed Bradley, Jordan Smith, Craig Bosman, Grayson Court, and Joey Burgess. Keep up the good work!
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Kate O’Neil, Professor, Law

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.

There are two pieces of good news. First, the state supplemental budget includes money that fully "backfills" tuition revenues lost due to a combination of the tuition freeze and increased student enrollment. Second, the interim provost announced that the UW will authorize faculty raises of 4% for the coming year – 2% for basic merit and 2% for additional merit. This is an increase from an earlier estimate and was made possible through a combination of the tuition backfill and savings due to the “Transforming Administrative Process” (TAP) initiative.

We have completed reviews of unit budget requests and are now consulting with the Office of Planning and Budgeting (OPB) and the provost’s office on formation of the UW’s budget proposal for FY 17 that will be forwarded to the Regents for approval in June. The committee also discussed the criteria for including budget proposals to the state Office of Financial Management (OFM). That submission is due in September before the first SCPB meeting next year. Therefore, SCPB is working with OPB and the provost to define criteria now. Those include a hierarchy based on internal priorities – compensation, essential operation and maintenance, compliance, and diversity efforts – assessed in light of likely legislative priorities.

The committee received an update on the HR/Payroll project from Vice President for UW-IT and CIO Kelli Trosvig. The new system is not ready for launch and the start date is uncertain. In addition to the cost overruns, the committee discussed lessons to be learned as the UW moves toward implementing a new financial management system. The committee also decided that it will invite the project managers back to report on a number of topics. We would like to see an “as is” workflow model of 3-4 significant use cases for 3-4 diverse units. We’d like a model of the “to-be standardized” workflows that correspond to each of these use cases along with an articulation of predicted benefits. We would also like them to articulate where they anticipate any constraints to be in terms of implementing the proposed Class A Faculty Salary Policy, particularly with respect to customization. We have also asked whether the new system will be capable of tracking and analyzing faculty demographic data in snapshots and over time.

Since my report to the Senate Executive Committee, SCPB has received drafts of the UW’s operating and capital budgets for FY 2017. The budgets are subject to Regent approval. In the operating budget, the priorities remain increasing compensation, transforming administrative practices (TAP), critical compliance issues, and investing in student experience.

For this year, the Provost has authorized 4% raises, 2% for regular merit and 2% for additional merit. As part of the TAP initiative, the provost has required administrative units to reduce compensation costs by about 10%. That, together with an increase in the state supplemental budget to provide a backfill for the tuition cuts, has modestly increased resources available for compensation and other needs.

Undergraduate tuition will not increase next year, and fee increases for undergraduates are modest. Because of the legislatively-mandated tuition cuts two years ago, the estimated total cost of attendance for resident undergraduates at all three campuses has declined slightly. The cost for non-residents has risen slightly. We have also received information on tuition and fee increases in graduate programs. With a few exceptions, those were modest.

We have also received information about a relatively new project (begun in FY ’16) to upgrade the UW’s financial management system – which is 40 years old. The committee has urged the managers of that effort to learn from the challenges the UW has encountered in the effort to upgrade the HR Payroll system. (The latter’s launch has been postponed and will not occur this June 2016). It appears that they are doing so. The committee has also urged the managers to ensure that the two systems are integrated, and has recommended that the managers consult with faculty who are expert in designing complex systems. A fundamental challenge is to maximize standardization for efficiency while ensuring that systems realistically meet the varied needs of units. Members of SCPB will be following up this quarter.
with the managers of both efforts to secure a detailed report on the implementation process in an effort to help ensure that these needed changes are implemented as efficiently and effectively as possible. I expect that a fuller report will be made to SCPB by the managers of both efforts early next autumn.

We have received a draft of a new Campus Master Plan for Seattle. The existing one, agreed to with the city in 2003, will be built out by 2018. The new plan seeks approval for an additional 6 million square feet of building capacity. There will be increased height and density, especially on west and south campuses. There will also be a new park area on the waterfront near the existing waterfront activities center. Committee members expressed some concerns about parking, accessibility, and travel times from one end of campus to another. The master plan does not in itself dictate exactly what types of buildings or services (such as shuttles) the UW may build or provide. The Master Plan proposal will be published in the second half of September and there will be open houses to discuss it and a 45-day public comment period.

We also received a draft report on the Capital Plan, which reflects that UW’s near-term goals for partial implementation of the Master Plan. The UW is anticipating about a 30% decrease in capital spending since the past five years, in part because of limited state funding and limitations on using more debt funding for capital projects. An urgent need – which is reflected in the request to the legislature, is for maintenance of existing buildings, where UW has a significant backlog.

The UW now moves into planning for the ’17-19 biennial budget proposals to the state legislature. The UW anticipates a difficult environment in Olympia. State revenue forecasts are trending down, and the legislature will likely have to deal with the McCleary decision and K-12 funding in this next budget. At this stage, the UW draft operating fund proposals to the state emphasize compensation, and funding for WWAMI and RIDE. The UW also plans to request funds to support clean energy research, and some dedicated funds will likely be available to support marijuana research. There is also pending a request for funds for a new law school in Tacoma, pending feasibility assessments.

This is my final report to the Senate as outgoing chair of SCPB. I have thoroughly enjoyed my three years in Senate leadership. It’s been a great education and a great opportunity to work with wonderful colleagues across all our campuses. Thank you all!
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor and Chair, Music History
olympia@uw.edu

Preparation for 2017-19: SCPB Chair Kate O’Neill is leading the SCPB in discussions of the budgetary priorities for the 2017-19 legislative request, a budget-building process that has been taking place over the past half-year, starting with proposed priorities from deans, which are now being assessed by the UW Office of Planning and Budgeting (part of the Office of the Provost), in weekly discussions with SCPB. The revenue projections have been lowered, but there are several more official projections before the 2017 legislative session. The main budgetary shadow looming over the 2017-19 budget is the requirement to begin to fund the K-12 restructuring imposed by the McCleary decision, which requires the state to take over a large amount of funding from local districts. While we have been hearing for years that the McCleary decision would impose large charges on the past biennial budgets, the Legislature has found ways to avoid that, but must actually deal with it in the 2017-19 budget. I provide an update on the final enacted supplemental budget at the end of this report.

Advocacy: I can report on increased and new interest from legislators about creating channels of communication and advocacy during the legislative session, with outreach to faculty; I maintain an external account for communications about grassroots advocacy, and comply with all the provisions of state ethics law regarding advocacy; please send me the address of your own external account at uwadvocate@gmail.com if you want to receive more information on these efforts. Updates on legislative issues can continue to be found at http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia

Agenda building: Understanding the intended agendas of legislators is key to preparing for the 2017 session. In addition to the UW request, the Legislature will have its own higher education agenda for the session, and where we can align with those priorities, we will do so. The Legislature always has a focus on student access and affordability, ranging from tuition cost to textbook cost in individual courses. The tuition reduction for resident undergraduates (and the backfill for the universities) is very popular in the home districts of legislators, who are making support of higher education a key piece of their re-election campaigns. Access is another critical issue – will the overall capacity of Washington universities, community/technical colleges, and private colleges be able to increase enrollment to allow a continuation of the historical upward trend of college-educated populace in our state? Legislators get considerable pressure regarding access to STEM fields and medical education; the Legislature will provide funding for increasing student seats in those fields, and the UW will make the case for sending that funding to the UW; in the current session, we have gained in both of those areas. Other issues that have emerged in the past two sessions in the Legislature will return again: the need to fully fund the students’ State Need Grants (underfunded significantly for qualified students); attention to issues of transfer students; the need to make applications and potential financial aid more understandable to future students, especially those who will be the first in their families to attend college. For these issues, I am providing information to legislators for their general background and in response to questions that come from their constituents.

Faculty issues: Of particular interest to faculty are several recurring issues that have been introduced in legislation in the past two sessions, and are likely to return again. Fortunately, we have been addressing many of these issues through our Faculty Senate over the past few years, so we have strong policies in place that allow us to respond clearly to bills on issues such as textbook costs for individual courses (we already have policies in place regarding attention to that issue), academic freedom (our recently approved statement on academic responsibilities and freedom was very useful in the past session), and a variety of other faculty-centric concerns that our Faculty Code and various Class C resolutions address. A proposal for a faculty regent bill has failed five times in the past decade, but I am working with legislators and the other four-year institutions to be as well positioned as possible to introduce legislation proposing the addition of a faculty regent, which the Faculty Senate will have an opportunity to review before it is submitted to the Legislature. There are many parties who want to be consulted on this legislation, including the other potential partner institutions and the potential sponsors on the House and Senate side; the universities began the preparation for this a full year in advance, in Autumn 2015, as I noted earlier this year. Whether the majority parties remain the same or change will have a significant bearing on the viability of this legislation; Democrats have always been the primary sponsors of past faculty regent legislation proposals, but currently do not hold the majority in both of the chambers. As I noted in the April
Faculty Senate meeting, I have been reaching out to legislators of both parties in the House and Senate on issues that interest them, as bipartisan support is essential to our interests.

Legislative majorities: The election season provides many opportunities to get to know your legislators. The November election will be highly competitive in districts where it might be possible for a seat in the House or Senate to switch from Democrat to Republican hands, as the majority in both the House and Senate is extremely narrow, and the change of party for one or two seats will change the majority of the House and Senate. In the March Faculty Senate meeting, I provided a slide of the trend of the shift over the past ten years: in 2007, the House had 62 Democrats and 36 Republicans; now there are 50 Democrats and 48 Republicans, so the shift of one more seat could create a tied House (last occurred in 1999-2001, with co-majorities). The Senate has gone from 32 Democrats and 17 Republicans in 2007 to a Republican majority in 2013 of 25 Republicans and 24 Democrats. The changes have been gradual over the past decade, and each party has make reclaiming (or retaining) the majority a high priority.

Update on the final enacted supplemental budget: When the Governor signed the final supplemental budget, the university received a surprise restoration. He made a veto that is very useful to the UW, deleting the requirement that the UW pay around $2 million to central services at the Office of Financial Management, so the backfill amount of tuition dollars really is closer to a true backfill now, upholding the promise made when the original 2015-17 budget was enacted (to add enough state appropriation dollars to offset the tuition reductions, with an adjustment in the supplemental budget). (Where we still disagree is in the calculation of the backfill, an ongoing disagreement.) My previous comments on this issue had stated:

"A new charge to the UW, other public universities, and various state agencies is an obligation to fund some of the central services of the Office of Financial Management. While this is new to higher education, other state agencies have been providing contributions to pay for these services in the past. The charge to the UW for the biennium will be $2 million."

So, this charge (which would have become a permanent biennial obligation) is no longer in the budget. The supplemental budget is now law.
## Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>April 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senate** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.

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

**Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
Report of Faculty Council Activities
Senate Executive Committee
May 2, 2016

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

A report addressing the effects of ABB (Activity-Based Budgeting) on educational collaboration was completed at the beginning of Winter Quarter. This report was requested by the ABB review committee and the SCPB and is currently under review. In order to develop the report, three surveys that targeted Deans, departmental chairs, and departmental advisors were administered by the council.

The review of preliminary proposals from the College of Engineering regarding admission of freshman applicants to the University directly to the college is underway.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

Developing a comprehensive comparison of benefits between UW and other major research universities via a digestible infographic

Investigating retirement incentives: VRI/VEBA

Investigating three additional open issues:

- 10% contribution opt in/out
- Long term care insurance
- Tuition waivers

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs / Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs is holding joint meetings with the Faculty Council on Women in Academia to address specific issues that impact faculty demographics, including:

FCWA/MA was granted access to the Faculty Demographic Tableau dashboard in November 2015 for review and consideration. FCWA/MA approved submission of the following statement to the SEC:

“FCWA/MA has reviewed the Faculty Demographic Tableau Dashboard and recommends all faculty and relevant administrative staff and academic personnel receive access to the dashboard via their UW NetID starting January 2016.”

Drafted and forwarded a Class C resolution on Black Lives Matter, approved in the faculty senate’s January 2016 meeting

Developed a Class C resolution on Living Wages, currently awaiting consideration by the faculty senate

Worked with Gordon Watts (chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs) on revising language of new salary policy to avoid recreating social and economic hierarchies produced in old salary policy

Helped develop a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) source of information on the potential implications of unionization on women and faculty of color at UW

Reviewed the draft “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices” from the Center for Teaching and Learning

Voted to endorse a Class C resolution brought for co-sponsorship Patricia Kramer (chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards)

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

FCFA has forwarded three pieces of Class A legislation through to the SEC and faculty senate in the 2015-2016 academic year, including:

Changes to Chapter 28 of the Faculty Code on “Adjudicative Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences” (approved)
Changes to Chapter 26 of the Faculty Code on “Financial Emergency and Procedures for Elimination of an Academic Program” (approved)

Changes to Chapter 24 of the Faculty code on “Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members” (currently within its second consideration)

The council is continuing its investigation of lecturer issues at the UW with an aim to consider changes to the faculty code, once completed.

**Faculty Council on Research**

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the FCR has developed and imported data from a survey on the effects of ABB (Activity-based Budgeting) on collaborative research at the UW. The survey received approximately 800 responses, and a report was drafted thereafter and sent to the ABB Review Committee and the SCPB. The council also vetted the new Executive Order No. 61 procedures for investigation of research misconduct, and continues to investigate ways to widely disseminate information to the faculty on research compliance regulations.

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

The FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students. The major issues that have come before the council so far this year are:

Review and forwarding of Class B legislation recommending revisions to the UW Student Conduct Code during fall quarter 2015 to the faculty senate (approved).

Continued participation in the drafting of a revised Student Conduct Code and the clarification of the role and operation of the Faculty Appeal Board.

Student Financing & Debt, including: the increasing cost of a college education (and the impact of the state tuition reduction action); transfer of the burden to students; the compatibility or rather incompatibility of students needing to balance the increasing demand that they work (part or full time), with their studies and family life; and, the impact of debt upon student graduating the university or even their ability to continue their education.

Student Mental Health issues, including examining the apparent increase in the number and scope of services requested;

Quality of Student Life including consideration of better integrating student athletes and international students into life of the university

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

The FCTL has completed and forwarded its report/recommendations on the feasibility and pedagogical impacts of regularizing UW’s summer quarter under the ABB (Activity-based Budgeting) funding model, and provided its recommendation to the SCPB and the ABB Review Committee

FCTL has investigated the pros and cons of allowing the UW logo and brand to be associated with MOOCs offered by UW faculty and forwarded its recommendation to faculty senate leadership

The FCTL continues to investigate and become informed on possible ways to improve or recommend additional web instructional tools for UW faculty to use in their courses

**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

In addition to its normal business of reviewing curriculum proposals for the purpose of conducting Tri-campus Review, the FCTCP is working on:

Optimizing its charge and membership by way of a council survey identifying top priorities

Investigating methods to better synthesize various initiatives between the three UW campuses
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

The council has reviewed and offered feedback on the North Campus Student Housing Phase IV-A, revisions to the Burke Museum, classroom updates from Classroom Technology & Events (UW-IT), Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) Building II, updates on the UW’s classroom scheduling issues and possible shifts in related policies, and a Transportation Services update.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

The FCUL continues to monitor and receive updates from members of the UW libraries in their efforts to respond to the Class C resolution on Open Access (approved spring 2015), which includes assessing the university’s current open access repository (ResearchWorks), development of a university-wide open access policy, and investigation of potential new repository software for utilization at the university. Finally, in support of the Libraries’ ongoing review and planning process, the council recently visited the UW-Bothell campus to receive a tour of its library’s facilities and services.

Approved council minutes are available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/.
Date: January 11, 2016

To: SEC

From: FCWA/MA, Susan Astley, PhD, Rachel Chapman, PhD, Co-Chairs

RE: FCWA/MA Statement of support to release Faculty Demographic Tableau dashboard to Faculty and Administrators

FCWA/MA was granted access to the Faculty Demographic Tableau dashboard in November 2015 for review and consideration.

Background: Faculty have been requesting access to the Faculty Demographic Tableau dashboard since May 2014 when it was first introduced and formally presented to the Senate (see attached documents presented to the SEC in April 2015: FacultyDemogRequestApr2015.pdf; SECdemographicData040615.pdf).

On January 11, 2016, FCWA/MA approved the following statement for submission to the SEC:

“FCWA/MA has reviewed the Faculty Demographic Tableau Dashboard and recommends all faculty and relevant administrative staff and academic personnel receive access to the dashboard via their UW NetID starting January 2016.”

Attachments: FacultyDemogRequestApr2015.pdf
SECdemographicData040615.pdf
Questions:

1. When will the faculty receive access to their demographic data via Tableau (as piloted by OPB in 2014: See Figs 2 and 3)?

2. Why is the demographic data (gender and race) missing from the Academic Personnel Appointments with Demographics report (Fig 1) posted on the University’s B.I. Portal? [https://biportal.uw.edu/Report](https://biportal.uw.edu/Report)

Background

Data presented to the Senate in May 2014 demonstrated lack of racial/ethnic diversity among faculty and gender inequity in Rank, tenure, salary, and leadership at the University of Washington. These diversity/equity issues vary markedly by School and Department. Senate Resolutions call for efforts to advance racial and ethnic diversity and achieve gender equity.

Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Equity, Access, and Inclusion in Hiring, Jan 2015

Class C Resolution 525: Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographic Concerns, Nov 2012

Access to Data

To address these Resolutions, faculty need access to faculty demographic data in two formats:

1. Annual salary and demographic data on individual faculty members in excel format for statistical analysis.

The Academic Personnel Appointments with Demographics report posted on the B.I. Portal is a good example (Fig 1). It is interactive (e.g. faculty can select Year back to 2007, Unit, and Job Class Code). Within seconds the report is presented (with one row of data for each identified faculty member) and can be downloaded as an excel file with the push of a button. (Unfortunately, the demographic data is currently missing from the report: Fig 1)

Fig 1. [https://biportal.uw.edu/Report](https://biportal.uw.edu/Report)
2. **Interactive visualization of annual salary and demographic data via the Tableau platform.**

Tableau allows the User to select parameters (race, age, gender, dept, rank, etc) via dropdown menus. Within seconds the data requested is presented graphically (Figs 2, 3).

**April 2014**: OPB piloted a faculty demographic Tableau platform (Figs 2, 3).

**May, 2014**: Astley and Gregory presented the pilot faculty demographic Tableau platform to the Faculty Senate. Only Astley and Gregory had access to the pilot website. When asked when the rest of the faculty would receive access to this Tableau website, Ana Mari reported she hoped by September 2014.

**Feb 2015**: Astley was informed the OPB pilot Tableau website was discontinued.
Faculty demographic data is posted in aggregate, tabular, pdf format (Academic Personnel Data) (Fig 4). This format prevents most forms of empirical statistical analysis and would require tremendous time and effort to transform the data into a format that could be summarized descriptively or graphically.

The UW has made tremendous progress providing faculty and students with access to UW data.

- Visit the UW Business Intelligence Portal for UW Enterprise Data Warehouse Reports and Analytics.
  https://biportal.uw.edu/Its impressive.

Note: Student demographics (gender, race) are posted via Tableau from 2006-2014 (Fig 5).
https://bitools.uw.edu/views/06-DiversityProfileandTrends/06-DiversityProfileTrends#1

It’s time to post the faculty demographics via Tableau.
Fig 1A. Workforce Profile: 2013 Affirmative Action Plan: Psychiatry.
Academic Personnel posts these PDFs on the UW website http://www.washington.edu/diversity/faculty-advancement/academic-personnel-data/ annually. The PDFs date back to 1997 (Fig 1B). Regardless of the size of a department, n’s of 1 are reflected throughout these documents. Faculty identifiers are not provided in these documents. The fact that the UW has posted these Workforce Analysis PDFs every year back to 1997 confirms that posting faculty gender and race by School, Department, Job Code, and Year meets federal regulations. As reported in the posted PDFs “…this report is designed to meet federal regulations…”

The faculty request that the exact data used to generate these posted, annual Workforce Analysis reports be imported into Tableau so ALL faculty (and students) have interactive, visual access to ALL faculty data, as demonstrated by the pilot project conducted by OPB in 2014. Screen shots of the Faculty Demographic Tableau pilot are presented below in Figs 2 and 3.
Fig 2. **Tableau presentation of the Psychiatry faculty (2007-2013): Number of tenured positions held by women and men.** This is the exact same data presented in Fig 1. The benefits of Tableau are clear. Within seconds the User can easily generate this graphic that clearly shows the gender inequity among tenured Psychiatry faculty in 2013. More importantly, the User can see that this inequity dates back to at least 2007 and is showing no signs of improvement. To generate this exact same graphic using the data from the Workforce Analysis annual pdf reports (Fig 1) would require several hours. It would also require access to and skill using database and graphic software. In contrast, generation of this graphic in Tableau took less than 15 seconds and requires no expertise or special software on the part of the User. Note that Tableau has no more ability to reveal the identity of an individual faculty member than does the currently posted Workforce Analysis reports (Fig 1). The 1 female with tenure is represented as a number in the Workforce report (Fig 1) and as a bar of height 1 in this Tableau graphic (Fig 2). All Tableau is doing is providing the User with easy, interactive, visual access to the exact same data posted in the Workforce Analysis pdf reports.
Fig 3. Tableau presentation of the Psychiatry faculty (2007-2013): Race/ethnicity profile. Again, this is the exact same data presented in Fig 1. Within seconds the User can generate this graphic illustrating the racial profile of the Psychiatry faculty over time. The User can request the bars represent the number or percent of faculty. Note, the 1 American Indian faculty member is represented as a number in the Workforce report (Fig 1, circled in blue) and as a bar of height 1 in this Tableau graphic (Fig 3). This demonstrates that Tableau is not revealing any information that is not already revealed in the posted Workforce reports. Tableau is simply posted tabular data in graphic format.
2016-2017 Appointments to University Committees and Faculty Councils

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30)
- Sarah Stroup, College of Arts and Sciences, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Phil Brock, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Lynn Dietrich, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- John Sahr, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Matthew Taylor, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)
- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Russell Fernandes, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Mary O’Neil, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 11:00)
- Margaret Adam, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Eric Bugyis, UW Tacoma School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Purnima Dhavan, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Kamran Nemati, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Jacob Vigdor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Mondays at 12:30)
- Joseph Babigumira, School of Public Health, as a member for a term beginning September 15, 2016, and ending September 16, 2019.
- Yoriko Kozuki, School of Nursing, as a member for a term beginning September 15, 2016, and ending September 16, 2019.
- Thomas Lee, Foster School of Business, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Pietro Paparella, UW Bothell School of STEM, as a member for a term beginning September 15, 2016, and ending September 16, 2019.

Faculty Council on Research (Meets Wednesdays at 9:00)
- Michael Rosenfeld, School of Public Health, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Paul Fishman, School of Public Health, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Nicole Gibran, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Todd Herrenkohl, School of Social Work, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

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

- Chris Laws, College of Arts and Sciences, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Doug Brock, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)**

- Dan Turner, Foster School of Business, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Amy Howells, School of Nursing, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- David Masuda, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Ellen McGough, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

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

- Ehson Feroz, UW Tacoma Milgard School of Business, as a member beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

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

- Bruce Balick, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Ann Marie Borys, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Ann Mescher, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

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

- Laurianne Mullinax, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
Nominations for 2016-17 Senate Executive Committee Positions

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Medicine – 2 positions | Kelly Edwards, Bioethics  
| | Nicole Gibran, Surgery  
| | Kurt Johnson, Rehabilitation Medicine  
| | Paul Manner, Orthopaedics  
| | Sherene Shalhub, Surgery  
| Arts and Sciences – 2 positions | Paul Hopkins, Chemistry  
| | Max Lieblich, Mathematics  
| | Chandan Reddy, English  
| | Janelle Taylor, Anthropology  
| Engineering – 1 position | Duane Storti, Mechanical Engineering  
| | Steve Tanimoto, Computer Science and Engineering  
| Other health science colleges¹ – 1 position | Susan Astley, Public Health  
| | O. Ross Beirne, Dentistry  
| | Tom Hazlet, Pharmacy  
| | Mary Hebert, Pharmacy  
| | Aaron Katz, Public Health  
| Environment and Built Environments – 1 position | Jan Whittington, Urban Design & Planning  
| Professional Schools² – 1 position | Michael Townsend, Law  

Faculty Council Nominations
1. Faculty Council on Academic Standards
2. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
3. Faculty Council on Student Affairs

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

Charge

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

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

How Nominees were selected

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

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

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

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

Members of the nominating committee:
JoAnn Taricani, College of Arts and Sciences and committee chair
Steve Buck, College of Arts and Sciences
Mark Haselkorn, College of Engineering
Paul Sutton, School of Medicine
Class A Legislation – Second consideration.
Proposed amendments to the Faculty Code faculty salary policy sent under separate cover.

Rationale for proposed changes in the alternative proposal.

In general, the major concerns are related to providing adequate protection to faculty from units who elect to opt-out of the tier adjustments, including providing more flexibility in timelines and requiring additional information in the proposals for opting out. Other concerns are related to insufficient clarity in the proposed legislation that might lead to confusion or misinterpretation and possible future adjudications or lawsuits. The rationale for specific required changes are summarized below along with changes suggested by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations made by a subsequent amendment, referencing line numbers in Exhibit J. The president’s proposed changes are in red and blue; the advisory committee’s changes are noted in green.

Please note, the changes in blue and red in Exhibit J are changes the president would require to be able to sign the legislation if approved by the faculty.

Line 142-------- Replace the word merit with performance because merit has special meaning in the current salary policy. This change has been uniformly made throughout the document in an attempt to be as clear and consistent as possible.

Line 629-------- Administrator exemption from the tier system when the administrator participates in the evaluation of faculty and has a conflict of interest needs to be consistent.

Line 644-669--- Exemption from the tier system. Additional guidance needs to be added as to information needed in the proposed plan for the protection of the faculty. Enough specificity needs to be provided to guide the faculty in knowing what they can expect. Changes are needed to provide additional clarity and consistency that includes options both to opt out and opt in. The effective date will need to be specified for each proposal. Additions are needed to clarify procedures when a faculty member has a joint appointment.

Line 660-------- Change 45 days to ‘as soon as practicable’ in response to information that there may be multiple requests for exemptions. If that occurs, more time will be needed to review them all.

Line 1409------- Conditional phrase added to avoid conflict with other provisions in the Faculty Code.

Line 1443------- Move text to Section 24-62, lines 1507 – 1512, on performance reviews for clarity.

Line 1499------- Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommendation, should explicitly state that faculty exempt from the tier system (i.e. administrators who are also faculty) are exempt from collegial performance reviews.

Line 1520------- Reword to focus on outcome of performance reviews instead of distribution of variable adjustments.

Line 1569------- Clarification of requirements.

Line 1625------- Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations recommendation, remove ‘early tier advancements’ and delete the parentheses, to improve clarity.

Line 1755------- Necessary to add specific provision to provide for salary increases for faculty who are not tier-eligible

Line 1799------- Necessary to provide more flexibility to the timeline.

Line 1809------- Need to address units where all adjustments are variable.

Line 1857------- Necessary to add specific provision to provide for salary increases for faculty who are not tier-eligible

Line 1903------- Necessary to require additional detail related to variable adjustment proposals and performance reviews for the protection of faculty

Line 1922-1930 Clarifies text related to variable adjustment procedures and performance reviews.

Line 1945-1951Parallels current salary policy provisions to attend to equity considerations.

Line 1998------- Timeline flexibility is needed, due to the complexity for transitions and pre-transitions.

Line 2418------- SEC amended to make proposal conform with the organization and style of the Code.
Class B Legislation – Changes to University of Washington, Student Governance and Policies –
Chapter 110: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship

Background and Rationale

Currently, students at the University of Washington are allowed to register for credits under the satisfactory/non-satisfactory designation. When this option is selected, students are assigned a numeric grade by the instructor and if that grade is equal to or greater than 2.0, the Office of the University Registrar assigns an S for the course. If the grade assigned by the instructor is less than 2.0, then the Office of the University Registrar assigns an NS for the course.

Satisfactory/non-satisfactory courses are not included in the calculation of a student’s cumulative GPA. Two main motivations for students to select a satisfactory/non-satisfactory option are: to explore an area outside their main focus without the pressure of receiving a numeric grade and to be able to respond to personal circumstances that hinder their ability to do their best in a course.

Recently, it has come to the attention of the Office of the University Registrar and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) that students are choosing to register for courses using the satisfactory/non-satisfactory option and then rarely, if ever, attending the course or completing any assignments. These students receive a non-satisfactory grade in the course, but because the course grade is not used in the calculation of the cumulative GPA, the student’s academic standing is not affected. In some cases, the number of courses that students have received a non-satisfactory in exceeds 9.

Consequently, FCAS proposes that the Student Regulations be amended to include a maximum of 20 credits that can be registered using the satisfactory/unsatisfactory option. This allows for students both to be able to explore topics outside of their main area of interest and to salvage credits in the case of a difficult quarter.

Chapter 110: 1.A.

6) S/NS

a) An undergraduate may earn up to 25 elective credits of the 180 minimum credits required for graduation on a satisfactory/non-satisfactory (S/NS) basis. Each instructor shall report numeric grades to the Registrar, who shall convert satisfactory grades (2.0 or greater) to S, and nonsatisfactory grades (less than 2.0) to NS for the student’s transcript. S/NS shall not be considered in computation of the grade-point average.

b) An undergraduate student may register for up to a maximum of 20 credits under the satisfactory/non-satisfactory basis, with exceptions possible by approval of the campus Registrar.

b) Subject to the maximum credit limitation above, the student may indicate at the time of registration if she or he elects to take a course on an S/NS basis. The student can change to and from an S/NS option through the seventh week of the quarter through electronic registration. There is no limit to the number of S/NS credits that a student can register for in a given quarter. Withdrawal from an S/NS course is subject to the same regulations as for any other course.

e) An instructor may not submit an S or NS in a course. S/NS grades shall appear on the transcript only in the event that the student is registered on an S/NS basis.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 2, 2016
Class C Resolution concerning holistic review of applicants to competitive admissions majors

Background and Rationale

Applicants for admission to the University of Washington are assessed for admission based on two categories of information: academic accomplishment and personal factors. Academic accomplishment includes such things as courses undertaken and grades obtained. Personal factors context the academic accomplishments of the applicant and include such things as familial socio-economics and the applicant’s responses to essay prompts. This process is referred to as “holistic review,” is based in the Student Regulations Chapter 101, and is overseen by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) for the Seattle campus and the appropriate bodies for the Bothell and the Tacoma campuses.

Students at the University of Washington must declare a major by the time that they have completed 105 credits (Student Regulations Chapter 116). Three methods for admission to majors exist at UW: open, minimum requirements, and competitive admission. Open admission to major means that students may declare the major at any time. Two units that have open majors at this time are Anthropology and Oceanography. Minimum requirements admission to major is a situation where students must meet criteria, such as completion of a course with a specified course GPA, before they are admitted to the major. All students who meet these minimum requirements are admitted to the major. Dance and Philosophy are currently minimum requirement majors.

Competitive admission to major exists when units have more qualified students, i.e., students who are admissible, than ability to educate them. These capacity constrained units must select students, who will be allowed to declare the major, from a group of qualified students. Business and Engineering majors are competitive.

The number of competitive majors has increased in the last few years at the University of Washington and currently approximately 70% of the majors on the Seattle campus are competitive admissions.

While the admission process to the University of Washington requires holistic review, admission to majors does not.

Recommendation for holistic review of applicants to competitive admissions majors

WHEREAS, the University of Washington admits “…those students deemed best able to contribute to and benefit from the educational programs and opportunities offered at the University;”¹ and

WHEREAS, some units are capacity constrained in that they receive more applications from qualified students than the unit can accommodate in their major course(s) of study; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington recognizes that an “…important and essential component of any educational program is the exchange of information and life experiences though a diverse student body, with representatives from all cultural backgrounds given opportunity at participation;”² therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that units that are capacity constrained use a holistic review process that includes “…personal factors such as school and community service, leadership, overcoming adversity, and family educational and socioeconomic background”² and academic qualifications in the selection of students who are to be admitted to study in the unit.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 2, 2016

¹ Board of Regents Governance, Policy No. 4, Policy on Admission.
² University of Washington Scholastic Regulations Chapter 101.2.A.
Class C Resolution concerning student collective to host Tent City 3.

WHEREAS, Tent City 3 is an authorized temporary tent encampment that provides life-saving shelter and safety to up to 100 men, women, and children experiencing homelessness year-round; and

WHEREAS, Tent City 3 moves to a new host site every 90 days, and previous hosts have included churches, parks, and two universities in Seattle; and

WHEREAS, hosting Tent City 3 is an innovative pathway to transformative, bi-directional learning experiences for all members of the University of Washington community; and

WHEREAS, hosting Tent City 3 offers the University an opportunity to take a bold, action-oriented stand against inequity; and

WHEREAS, students, faculty, and Seattle-area community members have advocated for the University of Washington to host Tent City 3 since 2009; and

WHEREAS, GPSS passed Resolution 11.08-09: Resolution in Support of Hosting Tent City III, in April 2009; and

WHEREAS, ASUW and GPSS have approved resolutions in support of hosting TC3 at UW in Winter 2017; and

WHEREAS, the University has gone on public record about their current consideration of hosting TC3, and we are now in critical window for bringing in voices of support; and

WHEREAS, the student organizers of the Tent City Collective have already formed partnerships with faculty in departments across campus, including medicine, nursing, law, geogoraphy, dentistry, social work, build environments, and public health; and

WHEREAS, faculty are vital stakeholders in this and all campus affairs, who are essential to fulfilling the educational goals in which the initiative takes root; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON:

THAT in an effort to support the University’s mission to provide experiential-learning based education and serve the public of Washington State, the faculty of the University of Washington support the University in hosting Tent City 3 during the Winter of 2017, for 90 days; and

THAT faculty, Tent City 3 residents, students, administrators, and community members will be involved in the planning and implementation of University activities related to hosting; and

THAT this be forwarded to UW President Ana Mari Cauce, Director of Regional and Community Relations Sally Clark, GPSS President Alex Bolton, ASUW President Tyler Wu, and Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs Ed Taylor.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 2, 2016
Background and rationale:

Our region is facing an unprecedented state of emergency with over 4,505 people without any kind of shelter. By hosting a tent city during the Winter Quarter of 2017, we hope initiate a campus wide conversation on homelessness in our community. We hope this conversation will begin to break down stereotypes, provide students with pragmatic knowledge around the issue, and inspire Washington’s current and future leaders to take an active role in ensuring everyone has a safe, affordable place to live.

ASUW, GPSS, AAUP, President Cauce, and a number of elected officials have publicly affirmed that the bi-directional educational opportunities which would accompany hosting tent city align with the University’s mission to take a leading role in solving the challenges facing our world. We seek the support of Faculty Senate because we view faculty as essential stakeholders in creating these transformative learning opportunities.”
Resolution concerning an alternative salary policy proposal.

WHEREAS, throughout the long and dedicated efforts of the Salary Policy Task Force and the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to develop, negotiate, draft, and revise the elements of the proposed and newly amended faculty salary policy, a general consensus has persisted about the following goals:

The UW must:

- pay its faculty competitively upon hire and throughout a productive career;
- remove inequities in compensation for continuing, productive faculty;
- remedy compression for long-serving, productive faculty,
- motivate continuing productivity for mid- to senior-level faculty,
- limit the incentives for faculty to pursue retention raises and reward loyalty; and
- provide units with more salary policy flexibility, including at the departmental and individual level; and

WHEREAS, for over two years, it has proved difficult to achieve consensus among the faculty and administrators of UW’s diverse schools, colleges, and campuses (“units”), about the specific elements of an effective and administrable new faculty salary policy that would achieve the goals above; and

WHEREAS, it has been difficult to draft a new policy that achieves the goals outlined in the attached rationale for all UW faculty in large part because the units have different faculty demographics, different funding models, and different competitive challenges in hiring and retention; and

WHEREAS, in order to garner support from the senators and faculty from these diverse units, the newly amended proposed Class A legislation for a new faculty salary policy permits every unit to adopt local formulas for market adjustment and flexible adjustment raises, and to opt out of tier advancement raises altogether; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility permits any unit to opt out of the central feature of the new salary policy’s design – tier advancement raises for long-serving, meritorious faculty; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility also permits any unit to adjust the default formulas for market adjustment and flexible adjustment raises; and

WHEREAS, this local ability to adjust the default formula for market adjustment raises may reduce raise predictability for basic merit, and

WHEREAS, local flexibility means that UW faculty in different units may be subject to different timing and criteria for various kinds of merit-based raises, and to different expectations about career salary progressions; and

WHEREAS, the opportunity for local flexibility has the potential to add complexity and reduce transparency about the bases for merit-based raises, given the diversity of formulas and categories that may be adopted; and

WHEREAS, this local flexibility requires administrative procedures and associated costs at the unit level to opt out of the proposed default formulas and tier-advancement review processes, and central and unit administrative procedures and costs to monitor and implement the opt-outs; and

WHEREAS, the proposal makes extensive and complex amendments to the faculty code to transition to and implement the default processes and formulas, including especially the tier advancement processes and raises, while simultaneously requiring other code amendments to permit units to opt out of the default processes and formulas; and

WHEREAS, the proposal is likely to generate significant administrative costs to effect the transition and ongoing administrative costs to monitor implementation of the default policy as well as the opt outs; and
WHEREAS, it appears likely that many units will indeed choose to opt out of the default processes and formulas; and

WHEREAS, the potential of local flexibility in regards to raise formulas and types means that faculty are now asked to approve Class A legislation to approve a new faculty salary policy without having adequate information about how it would apply in their units; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the consensus goals above should be achieved without the numerous, substantial changes to the faculty code proposed by the proposed Class A legislation, presented to the Senate Executive Committee on April 4, 2016, and the new administrative processes and costs associated with those changes; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the faculty senate leadership shall work with the UW administration to present proposed Class A legislation to the Senate Executive Committee for forwarding to the Faculty Senate in time for the SEC’s first meeting in Autumn 2016; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a duly constituted committee shall consider proposed Class A legislation to implement substantive elements of a faculty salary policy:

I. The key elements of an Alternative Salary Policy Proposal

1. **Coverage.** All persons with faculty appointments are covered. Inclusion of Librarians is an administrative option.

2. **Promotion Raises shall be 12%.**

3. **Annual Market Adjustment Raises for Meritorious Faculty**

   3.1. Market Adjustment Raises in any given year shall equal the CPI-U for the previous year, or 2% of salary, whichever is more, provided that the Market Adjustment Raises may not exceed 4% of salary. The Provost will determine the percentage each year after consultation with the SCPB.

   [There will be an off-ramp, as in existing policy, if matching the rate of inflation for basic merit raises would cause severe financial distress and damage essential UW teaching, research, or administrative missions.]

   3.2. The Market Adjustment percentage raise shall be uniform across all units.

   [No change from the current salary policy].

   3.3. All meritorious faculty shall be eligible for a Market Adjustment Raise. Each faculty member’s eligibility for a Market Adjustment Raise shall be based on the most recent regular performance review.

   [The processes and criteria for merit determinations are unchanged from the current salary policy.]

4. **Additional Merit Raises**

   4.1 The Provost shall determine the percentage raise for Additional Merit for the succeeding academic year after consultation with the SCPB. The percentage shall be determined based on the maximum amount of funds reasonably available to the University to provide, or make sustained and substantial progress toward providing, competitive salaries to all eligible faculty.
4.2. The percentage raise for Additional Merit shall be distributed uniformly to all units. After consultation with elected faculty councils, deans may distribute different percentage raises to individuals.

[The process for determining “Additional Merit” under the current code is not altered.]

4.3. To be eligible for any Additional Merit raise, a faculty member’s performance must have been deemed at least meritorious in the last regular performance review. In determining the degree of Additional Merit and the appropriate percentage raise for individual faculty, units should engage in a holistic review of the faculty member’s cumulative career performance relative to peers, including exemplary teaching or service, or both, in addition to scholarship. In accord with the University’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

[This is not changed from the existing criteria except to make more explicit that teaching and service and diversity goals and efforts count.]

4.4. In determining the total amount of funds to be distributed for Additional Merit by a unit, and after consultation with and approval by a vote of the unit’s Elected Faculty Council, a dean may retain a portion of the additional merit pool [not to exceed ___ % of the pool in any given year?] to fund Unit Adjustment Raises under ¶5 below or Tier Advancements under ¶6 below.

[This is a bit different than the present code. It’s designed to give units flexibility, promote transparency, and also give faculty a say in setting priorities. It’s also designed to encourage units to build up a reserve, at least if there’s any money to do so. Perhaps the Provost should have power to intervene here and order certain deans to withhold a % or to contribute additional funds to enable units to build reserves for these purposes.]

4.5. As unit resources allow, after consultation with and approval by a vote of the Elected Faculty Council, a Dean may make additional funds available for Additional Merit raises, Unit Adjustments, or Tier Advancements, in addition to those provided by ¶ 4.4.

4.6. In the dean’s annual budget request to the Provost, the dean shall detail the unit’s plan and rationale for funding Raises for Additional Merit, Unit Adjustments, and Tier Advancement Raises, confirm consultation with and vote of the unit’s Elected Faculty Council on the plan, and describe the past year’s actual allocation, if any, under ¶¶4.4 and 4.5 to fund Unit Adjustment raises or Tier Advancement Raises, or both, and explain any deviation from the prior year’s plan. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting shall review and advise the Provost about unit’s annual budget requests.

5. Unit Adjustments

5.1 To the extent funds are available to a unit, and after consultation with and approval by a vote of the Elected Faculty Council and by the Provost, the dean shall give meritorious individual faculty members, groups of meritorious faculty, or all meritorious faculty in the unit, Unit Adjustment raises for the purpose of removing salary inequities, compression or inversion, or other phenomena that render a salary or salaries uncompetitive or unfair.
6. Tier Advancements for Full and Associate Professors (TT, WOT, and Research), Principal and Senior Lecturers, Senior Artist in Residence.

6.1 A faculty member who is initially promoted to, or holds the rank of, Professor, Associate Professor, Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Senior Artist in Residence, on or after the date that this policy takes effect, will be assigned to Tier 1 in that appointment title. Lateral hires may be assigned to the tier the unit faculty and dean deem appropriate, subject to approval by President and Regents.

[This is very different from the amended Class A – which has rules for determining initial tiers and when advancement reviews are mandatory.]

6.2 Each Professor (TT, WOT and Research), Principal Lecturer and Senior Artist in Residence has the right to be considered for up to three Tier Advancements Raises. Associate Professors and Senior Lecturers have the right to be considered for up to three Tier Advancement Raises. No person may receive a Tier Advancement raise unless at least five years have passed since the effective date of that person’s last promotion or tier advancement.

[This is a big change from present code and also very different from the proposed Class A legislation. This provides a right and an opt-in by an individual, rather than a mandatory requirement with a unit opt-out. It provides a mechanism by which long-serving faculty can trigger a unique review of their accomplishments and secure a substantial raise.]

This right is designed to reduce the incentives to shop for outside offers and thus reduce the use of preemptive, or actual, retention raises. At the same time, it reduces the burden on units to review approximately 25% of continuing faculty every year. Unlike the proposed Class A legislation, tier advancement raises, as described here, are not designed to be the principal mechanism for providing adequate compensation to loyal, meritorious faculty. They are designed to increase the tools and transparency with which a unit may provide competitive salaries to long-serving, very productive faculty.

6.3. Eligibility for Tier Advancement Raises – Eligibility for a tier advancement requires an extraordinary record of accomplishment during the period since the last promotion or tier advancement in teaching, research or service, combined with at least meritorious performance in both other categories. An extraordinary record of research requires evidence of significant national recognition, accomplishments that surpass the average of peers in the unit; an extraordinary record of teaching or service requires substantial evidence of significant recognition by the appointing unit. A recommendation for a tier advancement shall be approved by the voting faculty superior in rank of the unit, or in the case of full professors by the voting faculty equal in rank of the unit, by the Elected Faculty Council of the unit, by the Dean, and by the Provost.

[The point here is to give truly meritorious faculty, who due to compression or other factors may not be paid competitively, a right to trigger a review. In addition, this tries to make a tier advancement truly distinct from and more rigorous than the criteria for additional merit.]

6.4 A faculty member whose tier advancement is approved under ¶ 6.3 is entitled to a tier advancement raise. A tier advancement raise for an Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer,
or Senior Artist in Residence equals 8%. A tier advancement raise for a Full Professor or
Principal Lecturer equals 10%.

6.5. Unit faculty may adopt by-laws requiring periodic reviews of faculty every five years up to
without regard to whether the faculty member wishes to apply for a tier advancement.

[This is designed to make it clear that units can still do post-tenure reviews regardless of
whether a faculty member applies for a tier advancement. These reviews could provide a
basis for Additional Merit Raises. They are also an accreditation requirement, I believe.]

7. Retention Raises

7.1. Retention Raises will remain available as market conditions warrant, but they will require
credible evidence of an actual or credible impending offer and a genuine intention by the
faculty member to accept the offer unless the UW provides an acceptable retention raise.
Retention raises in excess of ___% must be approved by the Provost.

[No change, except that more evidence of a likely offer is required. The goal is to make it
easier to retain highly meritorious faculty through flexible, but transparent, use of Additional
Merit Raises, Tier Advancement Raises, and Unit Adjustments, rather than through
retentions]

Submitted by:
Kate O’Neill, Faculty Senate Past Chair
Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 4, 2016

Postponed to May 19, 2016, meeting by:
Faculty Senate
April 21, 2016