1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda. (Video Time Stamp 0:00:00—0:00:25)

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

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Thaïsa Way. (0:01:25 -- 0:10:14) [Exhibit A]

Thaïsa Way, Chair of the Faculty Senate, began by delivering some prepared remarks [Exhibit B].

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions. (00:10:14—00:39:03)
   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit C]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit D]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. (00:10:14—00:32:00) [Exhibit E]

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, summarized her report. She also noted that the Governor’s supplemental budget should be sent out sometime in mid-to-late December. In addition, the State is undergoing a process of reinvestment in higher education. Additional faculty priorities going forward include financial aid and student diversity. Policy issues that might arise at the State and local level include free community college, protection for DACA students, revisions of the APA process, and financial aid/loan relief for specified programs. Finally, a new McCleary ruling says that the legislature must speed up K-12 salary increases.

Randy Hodgins, Vice President of External Affairs, addressed federal issues. The tax-reform debate remains front and center. Key issues of concern for higher education in the House bill include taxing tuition waivers and employer grants for continuing education, as well as imposing strict limits on student-loan interest deductions. It is not expected that these provisions will appear in the Senate bill, and there is some hope that the Senate version will be the basis of the House-Senate conference bill. Other items of concern that probably will survive include an increased standard deduction (that may have a chilling effect on charitable giving) and some provisions related to capital construction funding (that may affect our funding mechanisms). Research funding is in good shape under the current budget proposals. Work remains to be done on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and the children’s health insurance program.

In response to questions about state legislative issues, Taricani said that the majority change does not automatically mean our priorities will be heard more favorably. For one thing, we do not yet know the make-up of key committees. Moreover, there are elections next year and agendas will be set in the short term to preserve or flip the recent change. In this regard, Hodgins added that the Democrats will be focused on showing that they can make the trains run on time. We should not expect anything other than targeted efforts, such as on the state need grant. If the Democrats can hold the majority, then there may be more substantive change. In response to questions about regent involvement on the federal tax bill, Hodgins noted that corporate America has in general remained fairly silent on the current process. There has been much more said about DACA. The regents are kept informed about legislative efforts, and they do support the work done on the areas of concern outlined earlier.

d. Report of the Chair of the Advisory Council on Intellectual Property, Practice, and Policy (ACIP3). (00:32:00—00:39:03) [Exhibit F]

Robert Gomulkiewicz, Chair of ACIP3, began with a brief history of the formation of ACIP3 out of two previous intellectual property policy committees—Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (a presidential committee) and the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (a faculty senate committee). He then went on to summarize his written report, emphasizing the work done evaluating various implementation pathways for open access.

e. Council Activities Report. [Exhibit G]
4. **President’s Remarks—Ana Mari Cauce. (00:39:04—01:11:41)**

President Cauce began by reiterating concerns about the federal tax bill. In addition to the issues mentioned before, there are proposals down the road that would deregulate the for-profit colleges, that would make it more difficult for families to afford tuition, and that would provide disincentives for schools to take risk on low income students by making the schools partially responsible for loans if students don’t finish. She has been to Washington D.C. to talk with our representatives about higher education, and feels that we have had some influence on the final outcome. In addition, she has written a joint letter with the President of Washington State University (WSU) further outlining various concerns. Cauce noted that the Senate as a whole, as well as individual faculty members, can make their voices heard, and that such efforts do have an effect.

Cauce also noted that important parts of the public are losing confidence in higher education; Republicans focus on ideological concerns, and Democrats focus on affordability and economic diversity. Moreover, there is the feeling that higher education does not give students skills that help them get jobs. With respect to ideology, perceptions can be driven by a few media reports, but not everything gets reported. For example, the response to Milo Yiannopoulos speaking on campus gets heavy coverage but the non-response to Dinesh D’Souza gets little coverage. In any case, perceptions may well affect legislative policy going forward. Cauce feels that the public view of higher education in terms of tuition and student-body make-up is skewed by private universities, even though 80% of students get their degrees at public universities. We must think about how to turn around these perceptions.

Cauce cannot remember whether the regents as a whole have ever made a joint statement about policy, but individual regents have been active. She is not against making informal inquiries on whether they would be willing to take collective action that is narrowly focused on higher education. It would be powerful if the UW and WSU regents could weigh in together. Cauce will explore this. Taricani added that the regents have been very active at the State level.

Cauce also spoke about local efforts. The focus in Olympia is the fund-split formula. We are also looking at the capital budget. We are interested in talking with the Seattle mayor about the proposal for free-tuition for community colleges. Cauce would like to see the proposal expanded to include public universities. The University Master Plan is coming up for discussion; we want to make sure that we are not just an urban campus dominated by tall buildings.

Cauce spoke to several things at the UW. The open access policy is faculty-driven, but she hopes that some consensus can be reached before it is submitted to the faculty. Cauce also mentioned issues of campus climate, including concerns about sexual harassment and general student mental well-being. With respect to faculty salaries, Cauce said that we are looking to see whether salaries have lagged inflation since 2008. But faculty must also accept that faculty course loads have deflated and that the size of faculty is a factor too. In any case, Cauce is hopeful that the state legislature will begin to focus more on higher education.

In response to perceptions that complaints about sexual harassment are not being adequately addressed, Cauce made several points. The administration takes these issues very seriously. We need to strengthen the wording of our sexual harassment policies and make faculty more willing to discipline themselves.

In response to a question about the status of the evaluation of issues surrounding the faculty effort certification process, Cauce said that the results of the task force study are now being discussed at the Dean and unit level.

In response to a request for an update on the proposed health metrics evaluation department, the Senate was informed that the Provost, following the advice of the SCPB, has decided to pursue a limited reorganization, consolidation, and elimination procedure (RCEP). This decision is conditioned on the implementation of a continuing collaborative process to address issues of coordination between the Schools of Medicine and Public Health. Notices will be sent out to voting members of affected units, who will have the right to petition for a full RCEP. Finally, the RCEP deals with the establishment of the department; it does not provide for new degrees which is a separate issue that we must address carefully.
Cauce closed by saying that she hoped there would be an announcement about a new Provost in January.

5. Requests for Information about actions or discussions at the last Senate Executive Committee meeting. (01:11:42—01:12:02)

   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of October 2, 2017.
   a. Approval of minutes of the October 2, 2017, SEC and October 19, 2017, Faculty Senate meetings;
   b. Waiver requests for restricted contracts [Exhibit H]
   c. School/college/campus bylaw reviews [Exhibit I]

There were no requests for information.

6. Memorial Resolution. (01:12:03—01:14:05)

George Sandison, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented the motion on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee.

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 Frank H. Brownell of Mathematics who died on October 21, 2017, after having served the university since September 16, 1950.

Professor Emeritus Robert C. Butow of History who died on October 17, 2017, after having served the university since September 16, 1960.

Professor Emeritus Caspar Robert Curjel of Mathematics who died on October 15, 2017, after having served the university since September 16, 1964.

Professor Emeritus Sue-Ellen Jacobs of Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies who died on November 6, 2017, after having served the university since September 1, 1974.

Professor Emeritus Paul Eric Neiman of Medicine who died on October 11, 2017, after having served the university since July 1, 1968.

The motion was approved by a standing vote.


a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit J]

The consent agenda was approved.


There were no announcements.


There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business. (01:15:00—01:17:27)

a. Class B Legislation [Exhibit K]
   Title: Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations.
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
   Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

On behalf of the SEC Vice Chair Sandison presented a motion to approve the legislation proposing the addition of interdisciplinary concentrations. Immediately following another motion was made and seconded, at the request of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, to indefinitely postpone acting on the legislation. There was no discussion, the motion passed.
b. Class C Resolution [Exhibit L]
   Title: Resolution regarding tuition tax bill
   Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

A motion was made and seconded from the floor to approve the Class C resolution in Exhibit L for distribution to the faculty. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

11. Discussion Items: (01:17:40—01:59:03)
   a. Budget Collaboration. [Exhibit M]
      Provost and Board of Deans and Chancellors: Gerald Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President.
      Elected Faculty Councils (EFC) and Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB): Jacob Wobbrock, EFC, I-school, Sarah Elwood, EFC, Arts and Sciences, Zoe Barsness, Chair, SCPB.
      Update on Research Funding: Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research

Provost Baldasty spoke to his handout [Exhibit N] and summarized ongoing discussions with Deans, Elected Faculty Councils (EFC), and the SCPB. He noted that the current process focuses both on long-term unit planning as well as the specific use of unit adjustments (not retention raises) to address compression and inversion. Last year the units were asked to do salary planning. This year they are being asked to take a more detailed look at the fiscal priorities of units, as well as provide specific plans regarding unit adjustments. At the unit level, the Provost and SCPB envisions a collaborative effort involving the Deans, their EFC’s, and the respective unit faculties. This approach has grown out of lessons learned during the previous Faculty Senate efforts on a faculty salary policy.

Sarah Elwood, Chair of the College of Arts & Sciences EFC, related her experience. The Arts and Sciences EFC devotes 6-8 meetings a year on the budget. The Dean is usually present at these meetings. They discuss numbers, values and priorities, and the levers available to implement change. At least once a year, the Dean presents a detailed overview of the budget. The EFC works in an advisory capacity and ask hard questions, and the Dean takes shared-governance seriously.

Zoe Barsness, Chair of SCPB, spoke to SCPB’s role in the budget discussions. The SCPB is advisory to the Provost. It is there to ask hard questions and present the faculty perspective. With respect to the latter, the SCPB is working to make their views on academic and fiscal priorities and values more explicit. As the Provost indicated, the SCPB is working with the Provost to empower the EFC’s in their collaborative role in unit governance and to remind faculty to be engaged. Faculty is in control of many of the levers that affect fiscal and academic health. Senate Leadership holds regular EFC Chair meetings. The SCPB has helped develop various tools and information-sharing processes to aid EFC’s in their role, and the committee is working this year on reviewing unit adjustment plans. This entire enterprise is an iterative process, and sophistication is increasing as the process unfolds. Feedback, suggestions, and questions are welcome.

In response to questions, Barsness and Provost Baldasty emphasized that high-level terms like “collaboration” have real substance. Indeed, the Provost is making it clear to Deans that open and engaged discussions are expected. Having said that, there is still no general agreement on low-level terms such as “compression,” that are heavily dependent on the context at the unit level. Similarly, there is no overarching rubric for the use of unit adjustments. The use of unit adjustments must conform to well-articulated unit goals, values, and priorities. Finally, efforts will be made to publicize these new shared-governance initiatives. Faculty senators can help in this regard.

Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, summarized her slides and provided an update on research funding. [Exhibit M]

In response to questions, Lidstrom said that it has been difficult to collect longitudinal data on grant distributions as regards ranks and ages. Lidstrom also said that it is not necessarily helpful to provide an average cost to write a proposal because the range is so broad in terms of effort and the number of faculty involved. Having said that, her office can make available the data they have collected.

      Mary Lidstrom, Vice Provost for Research, and Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy.

Vikram Jandhyala, Vice President for Innovation Strategy, and Lidstrom gave an update on Global Innovation Exchange (GIX) summarized their slides [Exhibit O].
In response to questions, the following information was provided. The current tuition is $54,000 for the 15-month program and $70,000 for 21-month program (which includes six months in China). The UW part of the academic program is run through the Continuum College. The program is entirely self-sustaining; no state funds are involved.

12. Good of the Order. (02:10:48—02:11:05)

There was no good of the order.

13. Adjournment. (02:11:05—02:11:08)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Thaisa Way, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, December 7 at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102
The Faculty Senate along with our Councils are actively addressing our goals of strengthened shared governance; building fiscal stability; developing a UW Faculty 2050 framework; clarifying career trajectories for lecturers; and fostering a more diverse, equitable, and just community on our campuses. All of this work moves forward productively because we have a remarkable faculty including the many members who step up to do the hard work and builds on our close partnership with the UW leaders as well as the professional staff, and as always our students.

**Strengthening Shared Governance:** Strengthening the foundations and practices of shared governance is a primary goal of our Faculty Senate leadership. I have attached, again, the letter of shared values that we supported last year as a Faculty Senate, for those who have joined us this year and to remind those who supported the letter last year. It was a collective effort that resonates with our work, day in and day out, and we hope serves as a core statement of our work ahead. This grounds our work on the UW Faculty 2050 initiative, our discussions of budgets and strategic plans, and our efforts to address issues that are facing our faculty today and in the near term, from calls for open access to the standard of conduct and the process of addressing differences and disputes.

We continue to investigate the process by which UW can establish an open access (OA) policy for scholarship authored by our faculty members. These efforts reflect a consensus among many faculty members that public universities should provide open i.e. public access to the scholarship of their faculty; that universities should develop the repositories for the open scholarship rather than relying on outside industries to do so; and finally that faculty should not be limited by which journals they wish to publish in. Over 660 universities and research institutes currently have OA policies with at least 59 public and private universities in the U.S. that hold their own OA repository including the University of California, the University of Minnesota, Duke, University of Virginia, University of Pennsylvania, MIT, all of Harvard’s 9 schools — and more recently the University of Arizona and the University of Massachusetts – Amherst (See a list of additional universities and funding agencies with open access policies.) The question is not whether but how.

We are working with the new Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policies and Practices (ACIP3) to understand how best to move this forward. I encourage you to review the Open Access Policy FAQ here; [http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq). While this is based on an initial proposal for how OA would work, and we may amend that, it is a solid foundation for our discussion and consideration. The next steps will be a convening of chairs of FCFA, FCR, FCUL, ACIP3 and Faculty Senate leadership to determine the approach and corresponding legislation most appropriate and to present that for approval to the SEC and then to Faculty Senate, and finally should it be approved, to all faculty for a vote.

Another aspect of shared governance is understanding how we foster a standard of conduct among faculty that supports our shared UW vision and values grounded in our commitment to educate a diverse student body to become responsible global citizens and future leaders through a challenging learning environment informed by cutting-edge scholarship. This means assuring that our Faculty Codes related to the standard of conduct as well as the adjudicative and conciliatory proceedings for the resolution of differences is clear, timely, equitable, and just. As we have not fully reviewed these sections of the Faculty Code in over 25 years, we have established a review process this year that is being led by the Secretary of the Faculty, Michael Townsend and immediate past chair of the Faculty Senate Zoe Barsness with my support. This process will be led by faculty in partnership with administrative leaders and experts to assure that establish best practices as reflected in our Faculty Code. On this topic, we remind everyone of the UW Faculty Code, Section 25-71 Standard of Conduct:

**A.** The University is an institution having special public responsibility for providing instruction in higher education, for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research, and for providing related services to the community. As a center of learning, the University also has the obligation to maintain conditions which are conducive to freedom of inquiry and expression in the maximum degree compatible with the orderly conduct of its functions. For these purposes the University is governed by rules and regulations which safeguard its functions, and which, at the same time, protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. All members of the academic community, including members of
the faculty, have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments.

**Fiscal stability and faculty compensation:** We continue to foster collaborative approaches to unit strategic planning and budgets bringing our elected faculty councils to the table with their respective deans and chancellors. This is critical work that requires our faculty representatives understand budget processes and planning as well as how to best engage in the broader strategic planning. The effort is being facilitated by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting as well as by Faculty Senate leadership in partnership with our Provost. I also want to take this moment to acknowledge the hard work of our Elected Faculty Council members and chairs who are working hard to contribute to the critical conversations and planning processes. We will be a stronger university and institution for this hard work and deep focus, by faculty and leaders.

In a similar manner we are working to increase fiscal literacy of the Faculty Senators, as evident in the presentations on the UW budget at the last meeting (by Jeffrey Scott, Sarah Hall, and Provost Baldasty) and our next discussion on shared governance in regards to unit budgets as well as a report by Vice Provost for Research, Mary Lidstrom on research indirect costs and distribution. The SCPB is developing improved means of compiling and responding to the many questions and inquiries posed by faculty across the UW about budgets, compensation, and related fiscal initiatives. These are included in the SCPB chair reports that are available to all faculty as an attachment to the SEC and senate meeting agendas; these are available via the Faculty Senate Website in advance of each SEC and senate meeting: [http://www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/minutes-agendas/](http://www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/minutes-agendas/). We invite all faculty to read the SCPB chair reports and encourage them to submit questions to Zoe Barsness as Chair of SCPB at: senate@uw.edu

As classroom use is part of our stewardship of resources, it is important to remind faculty that in the Spring 2018 all faculty on the Seattle campus will need to adhere to the block scheduling for courses during the popular hours from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. This will assure that we are using our classrooms efficiently and as equitably as possible. Be sure to check in with colleagues to make sure everyone is planning appropriately. The fantastic staff that do the room scheduling have made great improvements already- but this will be a big change for a number of us (me included).

On a related note, UW IT is retiring a number of Catalyst apps- something that has been in the works for over 2 years as well as making the final transition away from deskmail to either Microsoft 365 or Google. If you have not made the transition yet- it is time to do so. Help is available online and through UW IT.

**UW/Faculty 2050:** As we educate graduate students and hire new faculty today, we know these are the very individuals who will serve as UW leaders, movers, and shakers by 2050. What do they need to be most successful? What emerging trends and forces do we need to identify and address to assure we are stewarding the next generation of faculty and leaders to realize the potential of this public research university? While we have begun to meet with small faculty groups, we will be engaging a broader community in the coming months through workshops, surveys, and focus group discussion. This is a critical project as we seek to affirm our roles as faculty, the importance of academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge and collective impact on the world around us in collaboration with our communities.

**Lecturer career paths:** The FCFA is addressing the need to strengthen and clarify career paths for lecturers. This is critical work across all units and campuses. It will include consideration of criteria and processes for hiring and promotion, as well as titles and responsibilities. As noted in the FCFA preliminary report for the year’s agenda, the following are the focus of their work:

- codifying the Provost's Lecturer Appointment Guidelines within the Faculty Code
- strengthening the career pathway for lecturing faculty, including promotion processes
- reconsidering the voting hierarchy for personnel actions, including merit review
- voting rights for part-time lecturers
- potential changes in titles

**Diversity and Equity:** We are honored to note that Faculty Senate leadership is partnering with the Race & Equity Initiative and the Office for Faculty Advancement to launch a new Diversity Leadership
Training (DLP) for over 20 new chairs and program directors. The program will be developed and stewarded by experienced UW faculty, staff, and administrators with expertise in issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. Chadwick Allen, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement, will lead the program with an advisory committee comprised of Ralina Joseph, Associate Professor, Communications, in the College of Arts & Sciences and Director of the Center for Communication, Difference, and Equity; Bruce Nelson, Chair of Earth & Space Sciences and Associate Dean for Research, College of the Environment; Joy Williamson Lott, Professor, History of Education and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies in the College of Education; and Robert Crutchfield, Professor emeritus and former Chair of Sociology, College of Arts & Sciences. Ed Taylor, Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs, and Thaisa Way, Chair of the Faculty Senate, will be supporting the program. This initiative builds on the efforts and lessons learned of the Leadership Excellence Program that is led in partnership with the Provost, Faculty Senate Leadership, and the BODC.
A Letter of the UW Faculty Affirming Our Shared Values

As faculty members of a public university with a local footprint, a regional impact, and a global reach, we serve society through our teaching, research, and public engagement. At a time when institutions of higher education are facing increased scrutiny, we reaffirm our commitment to academic research and teaching as an essential public good that transcends politics and strengthens democracy.

Democratic Tradition: Historically, universities exist as institutions for the creation and dispersion of knowledge. The US has been committed to higher education since its founding, with nine colleges established before the American Revolution. The emergence of the public university also has a long history beginning with the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided for a land grant university in every state. Public universities have made higher education more accessible and the recognition that higher education brings with it enormous benefits has led to an increased diversity of faculty, staff, and students, as well as broader areas of research and teaching. Today, students and faculty come from all backgrounds and from around the globe to study and pursue research at our university. We are stronger and we serve the public more fully because of that diversity and growth.

Public Good: As faculty at a public institution of higher education, we teach and do research to expand knowledge and improve human and environmental health around the world. As teachers and scholars, we are a valuable public source of knowledge, expertise, and innovation. University-led research and scholarship provide enormous social and economic benefits to our state, our country, and the world. Going forward, we commit to strengthening the presence and impact of public universities in our state and across the nation.

Access and Excellence: Universities help build the future and this is nowhere more evident than in our work with students, both inside and outside the classroom. As teachers and researchers, we foster the growth of leaders, thinkers, and innovative problem solvers who seek to improve and strengthen communities here in the Puget Sound region and around the world. We nurture students as they engage with new ideas and develop the foundations of new knowledge in the sciences, humanities, arts, and professions. We welcome students into our laboratories and libraries, guiding them along the deep river of research that moves the world forward. The future of democracy is in the hands of our students and we have the obligation of providing them with an excellent education.

Critical Thinking and Inquiry: As educators and learners we are dedicated to fostering bold inquiry and fearless debate based on strong foundations of critical thinking and analysis. We are responsible for creating learning environments that demand challenging explorations of ideas, concepts, and domains of knowledge. We are responsible for maintaining respectful communities. The value of honest, critical, and probing inquiry is essential in both our research and teaching, as we prepare the next generation of thoughtful leaders and lifelong learners. We embrace the formidable challenge of creating an environment that supports free and critical inquiry, recognizing that such inquiry is not always comfortable or easy for any of us.

Inclusion and Engagement: Creating and dispersing knowledge that serves the public good is only possible in an environment in which a broad range of perspectives can be voiced and explored. Diversity is essential to our success in innovation and creativity as researchers, teachers, and faculty members. Inclusion and full engagement are crucial to our mission as a public institution. Generating new knowledge to address the great challenges facing us all relies on a breadth and depth of engagement that reaches across all boundaries, including but not limited to those of geography, race, gender, class, sexual orientations, politics, disabilities, and religions.

Academic Freedom: As scholars, teachers, and members of the faculty community, we are committed to academic freedom as defined in "A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility" (UW Faculty Code Section 24-33, 2014). We re-affirm "the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in teaching, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to shared governance and the general welfare of the University." We support every one of our colleagues and students who face harassment of any form in their pursuit of knowledge and understanding. We also recognize that the privilege of academic freedom creates important responsibilities. As teachers, mentors, and scholars, our collective power to generate and share knowledge is formidable, and we pledge to hold ourselves to the highest standards of truth and justice.

Endorsed by the UW Faculty Senate on April 18, 2017
Thaïsa Way, Chair of the Faculty Senate, prepared remarks:

This fall we celebrate 80 years since 1938, when UW President Sieg called the first meeting of the first Faculty Senate at the University of Washington. President Sieg served as chair of the senate until 1947, when legislation was passed to require that senate chairs be elected from the voting members of the faculty to serve one-year terms. Joseph Harrison, from English served as the first elected Chair- 70 years of a true faculty senate leadership by and for faculty.

In 1956, the Faculty Senate emerged with a "constitution" in the form of the Faculty Code; the framework for shared governance that remains in effect to this day. The accord affirmed the ideals of shared governance at the University of Washington and was instrumental in restoring trust between the university faculty and the administration: "A university is a community of scholars contributing, each according to his own talents and interests, to the transmission and advancement of knowledge. ...A university administration must seek wisely and diligently to advance the common effort, and the strength of a university is greatest when its faculty and administration join for the advancement of common objectives."

While I assume you read the reports in the agenda, there are issues I want to highlight today. There are a number challenges facing our faculty and community today that are of concern. The first is sexual harassment- as many of you know, the #meetoo movement has become increasingly evident in the past several weeks. As noted by the MIT president in a recent letter: "When it comes to sexual harassment, assault and related misconduct, a community like ours presents a particular set of risks: a 24/7 environment that brings together people across a broad range of ages, incomes and backgrounds, many of whom have power over others – power to make being at this campus miserable, power enough to make or break a career."

As President Cauce wrote, "...Our commitment to preventing violence and to properly investigating and addressing allegations is unwavering." What can we do about sexual misconduct? As Dean Graumlich wrote to her community: "First, bring it out into the open. This opens the door to connect people with resources. "I will be posting her letter and the resources available at UW on the Faculty Senate blog-please take note and listen carefully to those around you.

On an equally concerning note, we know that one of our students was detained by ICE officials and yesterday was denied bond- at least for now. Yesterday faculty member Angelina Godoy, wrote the following after attending the hearing: "I was very proud of our community... The judge commented appreciatively on both the presence of faculty in the courtroom and on the fact that Bangally's file included letters of support from faculty, deans, and even the president of UW. It was clear that our presence was unusual and that it made a difference, at the very least to Bangally and his family, who expressed deep gratitude. I felt proud to be there alongside such a strong contingent of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff, and many colleagues expressed similar sentiments. It felt -- feels -- like the beginning of the network you and I have discussed, where members of our community come together as individuals to support those most vulnerable amongst us. The beginning of a beloved community at UW."

We have also heard that some of our faculty have been having troubles traveling- both internationally and domestically- and these are both US citizens and international faculty. There is concern that there has been a particular uptick of obstacles to travel for university faculty- we need to know more as international travel is a significant and critical part of research, scholarship, teaching, and service for UW faculty ...

We would like to ask for your help. If each of you as faculty senators could ask your faculty if any among them has had trouble with travel, immigration, homeland security, or other related issues in the past six to eight months, and what types of problems- whether it is visa or extra scrutiny or being denied global entry, if you could share that information with us, without names or dates, or other identifying information, by January 15, 2018, we would be greatly appreciative.

You may send that information to the faculty senate email or if you prefer, call me at the Faculty Senate office. Again, what we would like to learn is how faculty and student travel may be affected by homeland security, immigration and/or other travel rules, practices, or policies.
Please note, we don’t need names - we need to know if there is a pattern of any kind. If there are those who want to know about resources we can provide - I would recommend they contact the Office for Global Affairs.

It is important that the UW administration do what it can for our faculty, staff, and students when they face these challenges, but we as a community should not think that what the administration does should be the sum total of what we can or should do. There are some who fear that stepping up and taking action as individual faculty members in support of our colleagues or students is equivalent to engaging in prohibited political conduct. Let me be clear, faculty are free to support the human rights of all members of the university community, including immigrants, to assure that we remain a welcoming and inclusive community.

A third challenge is the proposed tax plan that includes changing the tax exemption for graduate student tuition waivers - there is a class C resolution that you should have received yesterday - we hope to partner with other universities in the PAC12 and to join forces with our leadership – including President Cauce- who have been working hard to oppose these changes. We hope you will join us in making a stand against the proposal.

We are a remarkable university - our faculty, staff, and students - and we do indeed have our moments to celebrate - recently one of our faculty members who comes from Zimbabwe wrote to colleagues last week after President Mugabe stepped down:

“And today we are free! To me, this is more liberating that even Obama being elected as US president. The irony is that people born after independence from the British (born after 1980) are considered “born-free” in Zimbabwe. But today is the first time I have felt free.

Thanks for reading. My point is to remind you to enjoy the American freedom of speech that many of you were born into.” May we each do all that we can to steward our right to free speech and academic freedom.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. **Vice-Chair Nominations:** The search for the 2018-19 Faculty Senate Vice Chair is beginning and currently seeking nominations. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the university and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact Jordan Smith in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. **Committee on Committees:** The Committee on Committees will soon be seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) or Jordan Smith (jjsmith4@uw.edu) for further information.

3. **Senate Executive Committee Vacancy:** One of the faculty council positions on the SEC has become vacant, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs. The Faculty Council on Women in Academia has been nominated to fill the council vacancy. A Faculty Senate election to vote on the replacement will be conducted via Catalyst in the near future.

4. **Changes to Student Governance and Policies Website:** A number of housekeeping changes were made to Chapters 209 and 210:
   (http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/SGP/SPCH209.html )

5. **Changes to Faculty Code and Scholastic Regulations:** A number of housekeeping changes relating to the current name and focus of the Continuum College were made to Faculty Code Sections 24-32.C and 42-49, as well as to Chapters 102,109,113, and 115 of the Scholastic Regulations:
   (FCG Section 24-32.C)
   (FCG Section 42-49)
   (SGP Chapter 102)
   (SGP Chapter 109)
   (SGP Chapter 113)
   (SGP Chapter 115)
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma

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 committee has met several times since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Committee members received an introduction to the sources of the now $7.25 billion annual budget of the UW. Nearly half of the core operating budget originates with UW Medicine Health Systems (48%). Grant and contract funds from both public and private sources account for about 18% of the budget and Designated Operating Funds (DOF, which includes allocations of indirect cost recovery from grants and contracts, summer quarter revenue, overhead revenue, fees, and discretionary investment income) account for 5%. State appropriations (5%) and Tuition (8%) components are in the single digits. Nevertheless, the State and Tuition components constitute a significant fraction of the “University Operating Resources” that support our core instructional mission. Annual Gift and Endowment funds account for 4% of the core operating budget. It is important to note, however, that these funds are generally “earmarked” and thus restricted in their use. University auxiliary activities round out the operating budget, and account for 12% of university operating resources.

Challenges that shape the UW’s budget were also identified, including limitations on enrollment growth and mix, per student funding levels, recent legislatively imposed constraints on our tuition-setting authority (which limit the UW to tuition increases of approximately 2% per year for the foreseeable future), rising compensation expenses, mandatory cost increases for utilities, property expenses and compliance, as well as federal funding and policy uncertainties. The committee will explore many of these specific challenges in greater depth over the course of the next few months. For additional information on FY18 budget development please explore the following links:

- [http://opb.washington.edu/content/annual-budgets](http://opb.washington.edu/content/annual-budgets)
- [https://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Budget/Adopted_FY18_Operating_Budget.pdf](https://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Budget/Adopted_FY18_Operating_Budget.pdf)

**FY18 Compensation and Merit**

The committee also explored in depth how the compensation pool for FY18 has been funded and allocated. The Provost authorized a 2% merit pool for eligible and meritorious faculty, librarians, and professional staff in FY18 (see [FY18 merit authorization letter](https://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Budget/Adopted_FY18_Operating_Budget.pdf) for details). In FY 18, UW Seattle will need $9.1 million to implement the 2% merit increases authorized by the Provost yet will receive only $8.5 million in new tuition and state revenue to support those increases. This discrepancy reflects inherited compensation costs incurred when we chose to make investments in UW merit pools in excess of state authorization and state funding levels during the FY14 – FY17 time period. As a consequence, the split between state and tuition funding of increases to our compensation base for UW faculty and professional staff has shifted such that the state funded portion decreased from approximately 50% in FY13 to 34% in FY18.

In addition to the challenges associated with shifts in the fund split, the UW has not been well served by the complex formulas that the legislative staff in Olympia used to calculate our state allocation for the current biennium. The UW will be requesting a revision of these formulas in the upcoming, supplemental legislative session.

Finally, availability of increased compensation dollars to fund FY18 regular merit has been impacted by the increase in promotion raises from 7.5% to 10% effected by changes made to Executive Order 64 last fall. Three hundred and two faculty received promotion raises this fall, accounting for $2.4 million of the overall FY18 incremental compensation pool.

Coincident with the aforementioned shift in funding split and compensation allocation, institutional flexibility has been further constrained by the imposition of new fees from the state which is now charging the UW $2.4 million to cover the costs of central state agency services to us. Other local financial needs have also intensified, namely increased utility and compliance costs.
In short, while the state's authorization for three 2% salary increases during the current biennium is a very positive development and appears to provide sufficient funding to cover the FY18 merit increase, in actuality new state dollars will cover only one-third of the costs associated with implementation of the 2% regular merit increase for faculty and professional staff. Thus the remaining two-thirds of the FY18 regular merit increase must be funded by the UW through tuition increases (which are constrained) and a redeployment of unit and central funds.

Even so, in addition to regular merit, the Provost has allocated extra unit adjustment funds to UW Seattle schools and colleges based on the number of senior faculty in the unit. He is providing $2 million in central funds (secured through central administrative cost savings) to match academic units’ self-funded unit adjustments in FY18. The SCPB seeks to assure that the academic units are strongly positioned to take advantage of the Provost’s matching funds in order to address the compression, equity and other strategic compensation needs they have prioritized locally. Thus, the committee is continuing its collaboration with the Provost, Board of Deans and Chancellors, and Elected Faculty Councils to support units’ budget analysis and compensation planning efforts. The first deadline for submission of unit adjustment proposals was November 1 for implementation in February 2018. The second deadline for submission of unit adjustment proposals is January 1, 2018, for implementation in April 2018. The committee will begin reviewing unit adjustment proposals received prior to the November 1 deadline later this month and will continue these reviews through the month of January.

It is important to note that all net operating fee revenue (i.e., tuition after waivers and other financial aid) from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma is distributed in full to each campus. Net operating fee revenue is distributed to Seattle schools and colleges in accordance with Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) formulas.

The formulaic portion of each unit’s ABB budget provides 35 percent of the indirect cost recovery funds generated by the unit and 70 percent of net tuition funds generated by the unit’s students, using a mix of student credit hours (80%) and degrees or majors (20%) as the measure of activity. Thus, academic units across the university (including UWT and UWB) are differentially enabled to fund the authorized 2% merit pool and unit adjustments. For more information on compensation, please see http://opb.washington.edu/content/compensation.

**Activity Based Budgeting**

In line with recommendations of the 2017 ABB Oversight Committee, the SCPB will review the impact that changes in the ABB formulas effected last year have on unit funding, as well as the purpose and calculation of the ABB supplements. Supplement funds provide support for activities that do not generate tuition revenue (e.g. research, service), and for tuition-generating instructional programs that generate insufficient tuition revenue to cover instructional costs. Despite the very simple calculation that generates supplement values, it has been described as the primary means by which schools and colleges have cross-subsidized each other, as well as the primary means by which state support was directly appropriated for unique and specific programs managed by schools and colleges. The 2017 ABB Oversight Committee suggested that supplement funding levels could be adjusted in response to various changes, including costs due to inflation or evolution of the scope or scale of unit programs. To facilitate its review of the role and calculation of ABB supplements, the committee has formed a small working group, which will report back to the larger committee with recommendations for general discussion in early 2018. For more information about ABB and how its implementation has evolved, see: http://opb.washington.edu/abb-committees-and-reports.

Other topics the committee has begun to address include several requests for consideration of a limited RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation or Elimination of Program). We have also begun our annual review of units in deficit. We heard on the good progress being made at the law school and were updated on the situation in Dentistry. SCPB will continue its review of deficits in the coming months, including an update on Intercollegiate Athletics and central units in deficit (e.g., UW Press, UW TV).
Updates on Requests for Information Regarding the University Budget and Finances

In this section of my report, I have compiled the requests for information that were made at the last Senate meeting or directed to me as chair of the SCPB via email in the interim. Responses are those provided by relevant staff at the Office of Planning and Budgeting with input from other administrative groups where relevant. If the topic was also addressed at SCPB, the responses below are reflective of what was learned during our SCPB discussion. I would like to thank Jeff Scott, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, Associate Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting Sarah Hall and their staffs for their timely and instructive responses to these questions.

Q: Are UW Bothell and UW Tacoma ineligible for unit adjustments because funds are taxed for central allocations, which are being used to fund senior faculty unit adjustments?

Any academic unit in the UW universe may leverage the unit adjustment tool, including UWT and UWB. The matching funds discussed earlier in my report, however, are allocated only to Seattle units because they pay the ABB tax (30%) on tuition dollars, which UWT and UWB do not. All tuition dollars, reflecting their enrollments, are passed through to UWT and UWB. UWT and UWB then pay overhead fees to the center for certain services (e.g., libraries). The matching funds being offered to Seattle units are in part funded from this tuition tax and other savings centrally achieved. The Provost allocated these matching funds to the Seattle units on the basis of senior faculty headcount in response to ongoing concerns about compression that remained to be addressed after the changes made to EO64 last fall which focused on increasing the rank raises and strengthening the unit adjustment tool to enable its proactive use in supporting unit compensation strategies. The Provost is retaining the portion of the matching fund pool designated to each of the 17 units in “escrow” to be released to them once they have made a formal unit adjustment proposal and it has been approved. All unit adjustment proposals (whatever their origin) come to SCPB for review and approval. While the matching funds are allocated proportionally based on senior faculty headcount, Seattle units are free to use the unit adjustment funds as they see fit to address self-determined compensation priorities as dictated by their unit compensation strategy. At the Provost’s behest, and with the support of the BODC, SCPB and Senate leadership, the Deans and unit Elected Faculty Councils have been working on developing these compensation strategies for the past year. They continue to refine them. Any monies required in excess of the unit’s portion of the “matching funds” to enact the proposed unit adjustment must be self-funded.

Q: What is the rate of growth for unrestricted net assets at the UW?

There is no predictable, reliable “growth rate” that can be attributed to Unrestricted Net Position. The components of activity in this category of net position typically include the following:

- Operating losses on unrestricted budgets
- State operating and capital appropriations
- Investment income on unrestricted operating funds
- Interest paid on external debt

These amounts can vary significantly from year to year. Unrestricted Net Position has also been impacted in recent years by Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) accounting changes regarding pension liabilities. These accounting changes have required the UW to reflect a reduction of Unrestricted Net Position equal to our current obligation to fund future pension-related payments (described below).

Q: Can these resources be deployed to something like faculty salaries?

While these funds could be used for salary increments, taking such an approach would not necessarily be fiscally prudent as in doing so the institution would create recurring, permanent liabilities on a funding base that is discrete and limited. Washington State University engaged in similar practices (i.e., using reserves for ongoing expenses) over the past few years and these past practices are now proving very problematic. Their recent announcement of significant, permanent budget cuts reflects such risks. They have largely overspent their reserves by using them not for one-time expenses or to capitalize one-time costs (such as buildings or equipment) at lower, internally financed rates, but by committing those limited funds to ongoing operational costs (e.g. salaries) and thus incurring permanent, ongoing liabilities.
More important, the Unrestricted Net Position will become a deficit by the end of FY18, due to required recognition of the UW’s obligation related to future pension benefits and funding of other post-employment benefits (OPEB) already earned by UW employees. As such, there will be no “surplus” resources at the center available for redeployment to faculty salaries.

Q: How much of the unrestricted net assets went to construction and future retirement liability? Was $800 Million was transferred out of unrestricted assets to cover pension liabilities, and if so, what was the motivating situation (e.g., bad forecasting, a shift in salary composition)?

In FY17 the University purchased or constructed $688 million of capitalized assets. Building & infrastructure additions were $494 million, and equipment additions were $152 million. The rest of the additions were for library materials and significant software solutions such as completion of HR/Payroll Modernization and for UW Medicine’s clinical departments.

The amounts that have been recognized to fund future retirement obligations are as follows:

- For unfunded statewide plans (PERS, TRS, etc.) -- $984 million as of FY17
- For UWSRP retiree benefits earned -- $439 million as of FY17
- For statewide OPEB -- $1,200 million (estimate) to be recognized FY18. Note that recognition of this obligation in FY18 will create a significant deficit in Unrestricted Net Position.

Importantly, the pension liability issue may appear as straightforward, but the University's supplemental retirement plan (closed to new members March, 2011) requires that we actively save funds to disburse payments to members. It is also important to note that many of the folks included in the plan continue to work and are thus remain eligible under the plan, even though the plan may be closed to new members. Currently, our plan has a healthy savings, but does not have all the cash needed to cover its liabilities.

Q: And why were those decisions made, if they were made?

As a governmental entity, the UW is required to comply with GASB accounting standards and as such, has no choice but to recognize our obligations for pension and OPEB liabilities.

From a practical and human perspective, the use of unrestricted assets to shore up future Pension commitments is to assure that we have adequately funded the pension pool and have sufficient funds available when required to meet our commitments in the future. If we deplete these resources by “double-dipping” so to speak to fund current faculty salaries we will be at serious risk of (1) overspending our reserves and (2) failing to meet our obligations to our colleagues when they retire in the future (e.g., a scenario perhaps not as extreme, but similar to those currently being experienced in Detroit and various other Illinois and Southern California municipalities that have consistently underfunded their pension pools over the years).

Q: Have any other major items been prioritized over the faculty salary compensation with respect to unrestricted assets?

Faculty compensation has been (and is currently) the top priority in all university budget decisions. Nothing takes higher priority. When the legislature was not able to provide incremental funding for compensation, the University used what reserves it had and cost savings achieved centrally to provide merit pools of 4% in FY14 and 4% in FY15 for UW faculty and professional staff when the state authorized 0% and funded 0% in both of those years. In FY 16 the UW implemented a 3% merit pool, which the state authorized at 3%, but state funds only covered 38% of the incremental compensation. In FY17 the UW implemented a 4% compensation increase, although the state authorized only a 1.8% increase and state funds covered only 34% of the incremental compensation. Certainly, there have been expenses that we have covered with temporary reserves recently (e.g., maintaining facilities services staff without a capital budget), but we have had to be extremely cautious about use of any funds, whether unrestricted and recurring or temporary, given broader concerns about our University’s long-term financial health.

As described in previous presentations to the Senate, the UW deployment of permanent reserves and new permanent budget authority to support the 4% percent merit pools in FY14 and FY15 for faculty and
staff when the legislature did not authorize or fund wage increases for state employees was the right thing to do after years of salary freezes, but it also meant that we dipped into our permanent reserves and now we must proceed with caution. As a result, OPB and the Provost are modeling and forecasting long-term compensation commitments against new, permanent budget authority. This ongoing and dynamic conversation is one to which SCPB remains closely attuned.

In closing, I encourage any SEC member, Senator or faculty who has questions about the budget or finances to submit his or her questions to me as Chair of SCPB at senate@uw.edu. The SCPB will compile these questions and answers so as to not overburden our OPB staff, who are working extremely hard to address the complexities of our budget. When analyses and materials in response to questions that are posed by Senators or faculty are shared with the SCPB, I will be sure to include a summary of the SCPB discussions and related materials in my regular reports. This will streamline information sharing while assuring faculty voice and that all faculty have access to the full breadth of responses and related materials.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor, Music History

**Majorities for 2018 supplemental session:** With the Democratic candidate winning the 45th District in the general election, the State Senate now has a Democratic majority. As I have noted several times last year, both the House and Senate have very slim majorities, meaning that just a few elections in November 2018 could change the majority of either chamber. This means that although the Legislature will have a clearer path to passing legislation, it will be careful not to pass legislation that would significantly endanger seats in the election coming in 11 months. This editorial provides a good sense of the balance that will be in play during the 2018 session: “Democrats may control the Legislature, but moderates will set the agenda” [https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/democrats-may-control-the-legislature-but-moderates-will-set-the-agenda/](https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/democrats-may-control-the-legislature-but-moderates-will-set-the-agenda/)

**Contacting legislators:** I strongly encourage you to contact your own district’s legislators; messages from constituents always gets the most attention. You can find your district and links to your legislators at [http://app.leg.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/](http://app.leg.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/) As always, we must use non-UW email accounts when contacting legislators about campaigns, fundraising, or lobbying.

**Priorities:** This is a “short session,” or supplemental session, of sixty days, which means that new budget requests are not a priority; but adjusting the current budget is the primary focus of budget committees in the Legislature. The main priority of the university and discussed in the UW Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) is the need to obtain full funding for the salary increases allocated for 2018-19 academic year: 4% total, provided as two 2% increases in July 2018 and January 2019. Our SCPB is discussing the timing of these raises internally. The main issue we take to the Legislature is what is called the “fund split,” or the amount of the salary increase funded by tuition versus state appropriation. We are requesting that the fund split be adjusted to 50%/50% (tuition ratio to appropriation; currently set in the budget law as 66%/34%). We need an additional $9.5 million appropriated to our budget to pay for the salary increases and other central expenses charged by the state. This request is outlined in our budget request to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) in this document: [http://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Budget/2018_Supplemental_Operating_Budget_Submission.pdf](http://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Budget/2018_Supplemental_Operating_Budget_Submission.pdf)

Other policy issues will reappear, such as the faculty regent legislation, measures intended to contain the cost of course materials, and probably legislation related to academic freedom and student conduct codes. Our UW policies on academic freedom and the student conduct code are well stated and were well supported in discussions last year in Olympia, and I expect to be able to make the case again for our ability to deal with these significant issues at the institutional level, without the need for state legislation.

The 2017-19 capital budget still needs a final vote; getting a two-thirds majority for bond issuance is still a challenge, but we hope the state will move forward expeditiously on finalizing the current capital budget. This is an unprecedented situation, to move into the second session of a biennium without an approved capital budget.
Report of the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy, and Practice
Robert Gomulkiewicz, Professor, Law

Pathways for Open Access to Scholarly Works

The ACIPPPP was established last academic year and in partnership with Thaïsa Way, Chair of the Faculty Senate, and Margaret Shepherd, our representative from the Executive Office, we developed a work plan for this academic year with four areas of focus: Pathways to Open Access; Co-Motion and issues of patent support; Global Innovation Exchange (GIX) and related IP issues; and Continuum College and online course materials. Additionally, we will review other Co-Motion policies and the status of the Outside Work Form.

In the fall we have focused on Open Access policies with a subcommittee and report below. We recently received an update on new directions for Co-Motion’s policies and practices regarding patent support. In future meetings we will be discussing the status of changes that had been made to the Outside Work Form during the waning days of IPMAC and SCIPC. Our attention will then turn to intellectual property policies and practices presented by the Global Information Exchange (GIX). During the winter quarter, we will delve further into GIX-related issues and also begin to focus on IP-issues related to online course materials and Continuum College.

ACIP3 Report on Open Access Policies

The Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy & Practice (ACIP3) met on October 27, 2017, to provide guidance to the President and Faculty Senate on pathways for implementing open access to UW faculty’s scholarly works. This guidance is the culmination of several meetings in which we discussed open access pathways. We considered various “opt out” pathways where faculty would provide an initial license to the university via faculty legislation that could only be waived on an article by article basis, and various “opt in” pathways where faculty would provide an initial license to the university via faculty legislation but that license would only become effective if faculty opted to apply it either on a blanket basis for all articles or on an article by article basis.

The committee, as in prior meetings where we discussed the subject, voiced strong and unanimous support for the principle of open access for scholarly works. In fact, several committee members emphasized that any disagreement about UW’s approach to implementing an open access policy should not be taken to signal, internally or externally, lack of support for open access in principle. Apart from that point of unanimity, however, the committee was split on the best implementation pathway. Three members (Gordon Aamot, Mike Rosenfeld, Jane Van Galen) supported recommending an “opt out” pathway where the initial license from faculty would be granted via Class A/B legislation but a faculty member could opt out of open access on an article by article basis. Five members (Jim Gregory, Nancy Hovis, Adam Moore, Fiona Wills, and Pierre Mourad via email) supported recommending an “opt in” pathway (either on a blanket or article by article basis) where the initial license from faculty would be granted via Class A/B legislation, with some members expressing a view that “opt-in” legislation would be more likely to pass and would allow the faculty an opportunity to learn more about the benefits of open access. Some favoring “opt in” suggested that the faculty re-visit the issue of the need for an “opt out” approach after a certain period (e.g., 5 years) of operating under a more robust “opt in” system (i.e., a system with enhanced nagging, nudging, and notice). Some members (Mike Townsend, Nancy Hovis) supported exploring an approach where units on campus could choose between an “opt out” and an “opt in” system on a pilot project basis (as Harvard has done, for example).

ACIP3 Subcommittee Report.

Background

Executive Order 36 is the University of Washington’s Patent, Invention and Copyright policy. Current policy, as well as historical practice, stipulates that university faculty, staff and students retain all rights in copyrightable material they create, including scholarly works, subject to specific exemption or condition.
In April 2015 the Faculty Senate approved a **Class C “Resolution Concerning the UW Open Access Repository & Request for Advice on an Open Access Policy.”** The resolution requested the Provost to direct the Vice Provost for Digital Initiatives and Dean of University Libraries to develop an open access publication policy for recommendation to the University.

**Proposed Open Access Policy**

The Faculty Senate discussed a **recommended policy** for the first time on March 2, 2017. During the discussion, there were several legal questions about the mechanism by which faculty would transfer ownership rights and the survivability of ownership over time. It was determined that these questions needed further discussion before the Senate could debate the merits of the policy. A sub-committee of the Advisory Council on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice (ACIP3) met to discuss the legal issues over the summer. The faculty will revisit the topic in Fall 2017. The information below is a summary of subcommittee work.

---

### OPEN ACCESS LICENSE – LEGAL PATHWAYS

(A) **“OPT IN”**

- Policy put in EO 36; Senate uses Class C resolution to indicate support.

(B) **“OPT OUT” (for quotes see *)**

- Policy described in EO 36; Senate Class A/B legislation. Disadvantage is that policy is spread across various places and authorities.

(C) Initial granting of license takes place pursuant to EO36; use Class C resolution to indicate support. Disadvantage is that all legal eggs in one basket.

(D) Initial granting of license takes place pursuant to a combination of EO 36 and Senate Class A/B legislation. Disadvantage is that “rule” is spread across various places and authorities.

- Confirmation step will be utilized on each article to ensure survivability of license vis-à-vis subsequent transfer of copyright.

---

- Can opt in going forward. But can opt out at later date.

- Opt out is article by article.

- Can opt out going forward. But can opt in at later date.

---

- Opt in grant is article by article.
SOME THEORETICAL/POLICY CONCERNS

In a sense, the choice at level (A) involves a trade-off between faculty rights and the benefits that an open access policy covering all faculty would bring to the public, authors, and University.

In a sense, the choice at level (B) pits strength of legal arguments supporting initial grant of license against simplicity of policy/rule statement.

In a sense, the choice at (C) would go to the burden on individual faculty members.

In a sense (D) is the linchpin. If Eric Priest is right, then (D) can be handled by (B) or (C) and essentially can be removed from the picture. If not, then (D) may argue in favor of (C)'s article-by-article choices.

Irrevocability of license? Scope of license?

SOME PRACTICAL CONCERNS

If the software implementation puts the onus on the faculty, then practically speaking is not everything article-by-article?

What about faculty liability vis-à-vis signing transfers of copyright that contain no-encumbrance warranties?

What about administrative expense associated with each defined pathway?

Open Access Policy FAQ.

In conclusion, I would be happy to answer any questions that you have about our deliberations.
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

- Developed and approved a new FCAS Policy during the summer, which states “residency status (WA State; Domestic Non-Resident; International) is not to be used as a criterion for admission to capacity-constrained majors or programs.”
- Successfully filled memberships on subcommittees for 2017-2018. Subcommittees include the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP), Subcommittee on Admissions and Graduations (SCAG), and the Honors Subcommittee.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

- Forwarded Class B legislation on proposed revisions to Faculty Code and Governance, Chapter 51, Faculty Leave and Vacations, including a revised leave policy for non-birth parents among UW Faculty. The SEC considered the legislation and ultimately requested the council work through substantive questions that arose during discussion, primarily concerning fiscal and human resources-related impacts.
- Evaluated the Seattle (and surrounding region) housing market with a guest from the Runstad Center for Real Estate Studies as a precursor to future discussions concerning supporting UW faculty in relation to housing needs and current trends.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Held their first meeting of 2017-2018 and identified activities of interest for the academic year.
- Reviewed its charge letter forwarded by Faculty Senate leadership and drafted a letter recommending revisions based on feedback from members and expected/feasible council activities.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- FCFA’s Class A legislation on clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles was approved by UW voting faculty and President Ana Mari Cauce late in spring quarter, 2017. The legislation adds a new passage to Faculty Code Chapter 24.34 stating: “individuals appointed to one of the instructional titles in Section 1-3 above may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of specific ways (Section 24-32). While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.”
- The council is continuing its robust investigation into lecturer issues at the UW with the goal of finalizing a “package” of related legislation during the 2017-2018 academic year.

Faculty Council on Research

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

- Prompted development of the Shared Research Resources Task Force (SRTF) during the summer of 2017, which is currently operating to improve, facilitate, and increase use of shared research-related resources at the UW.
- Considered legally-sufficient institutional pathways for implementation of a draft university-wide Open Access Policy.
- Received an update and provided feedback on the status of federal research regulatory reform.
Faculty Council on Student Affairs

- Held their first meeting of 2017-2018 and identified activities of interest for the academic year.
- Successfully integrated ASUW Bothell and ASUW Tacoma students into its membership using a new video-conferencing-based meeting space.
- Developed plans to evaluate housing needs for UW students through various mechanisms during 2017-2018.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

Individual subcommittees were established in the council’s first and second meetings, and the FCTL is now working to address issues/topics associated with UW pedagogy in the following areas:

- Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments
- Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges
- Diversity- and Equity-Informed Pedagogies & Teaching Effectiveness
- Faculty 2050
- Learning Analytics Principles

In addition, the council has:

- Provided feedback on development of policies relating to use of student data in learning analytics during late spring quarter, 2017, and was cemented as the university’s primary resource for governing development and implementation of those policies on an ad hoc basis.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

- Approved revisions to the university-wide undergraduate curriculum approval mechanism of “Tri-Campus Review” (full approval process not yet completed).
- Held their first meeting of 2017-2018 and identified activities of interest for the academic year and a plan for achieving defined goals.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

- FCUFS has reviewed the following topics so far during 2017-2018 and provided feedback/oversight to administrative guests: A pending campus UAV (unmanned aerial vehicles; aka. drones) policy, which will be a revision to Executive Order 22 (presently deals with helicopter operations on campus)
- One Capital Plan
- Burke Museum
- Population Health Facility
- Transportation Services change

Faculty Council on University Libraries

- Considered legally-sufficient institutional pathways for implementation of a draft university-wide Open Access Policy.
- Received a report and provided feedback on the new Scholarly Communication and Publishing Department of the UW Libraries.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

- Reviewed and ultimately voted to endorse a legislative proposal from the Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement relating to UW faculty parental leave policy.
- Held their first meeting of 2017-2018 and identified activities of interest for the academic year.
To: Senate Executive Committee

Re: Support of a request by the Faculty Council on Research (FCR) to the UW President’s Office to amend Executive Order #8 in order to delegate responsibility to the Office of Sponsored Programs to make decisions on a limited number of routine requests for restricted contract waivers.

According to Executive Order #8, it is the responsibility of the Faculty Council on Research to “review every proposal for a research grant or contract that carries a provision expressed or implied that seeks to limit participation, access to facilities, or the freedom of the investigators to publish or not to publish the results of such research in full.”

In my experience both as a member and chair of the FCR over the past several years, many of the restricted contracts forwarded to the FCR for review are routine in the types of restrictions included in the contract. During my tenure on the FCR we have never denied these types of waiver requests. These types of restricted contracts include:

- contracts with confidentiality agreements (e.g. clinical trials),
- right of first review (corporate contracts with 30-60 days restrictions),
- consortium agreements (e.g. multi-center clinical trials where all parties must agree to publication of pooled data).

To review requested waivers for restricted contracts, the FCR has a standing sub-committee that does an initial review of each contract and makes a recommendation to the full voting membership of the FCR. At each FCR meeting where the waiver requests are pending, the full FCR has a discussion that takes into consideration the recommendation of the sub-committee followed by a vote. Approval is granted if more than half of the voting members approve the request.

Over the past few years, the FCR has received 10-15 waiver requests annually. Pre-review plus discussion by the full FCR takes a considerable amount of time and effort by the FCR and often delays approval of the contracts for months. This will be a much bigger problem this coming year as the APL has a new basic agreement with the Office of Naval Research where every task order will have a restriction that requires the Project Officer’s prior approval. According to EO 8, the FCR will have to review each task order.

The FCR would like to delegate responsibility for approval of these routine contracts to OSP so that every contract with restrictive clauses do not have to be reviewed by the FCR. These would include:

- Contracts with confidentiality agreements (e.g. clinical trials),
- right of first review for corporate contracts with nor more than 60 days restrictions,
- consortium agreements per standard trails regarding publication restrictions,
- Office of Naval Research task orders.

However, in order to delegate responsibility to Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), we need to have the President’s office give their approval and amend EO 8. The Secretary of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate have recommended that the FCR seek support from the SEC before contacting the President’s office. I believe that the mandate for having the FCR do these contract reviews originated with the Faculty Senate in the late 60s as a means for having the faculty play a role in approving military contracts during the Vietnam War.

The FCR proposes to meet with representatives from the President’s Office and OSP to develop the final list of routine restricted contracts that can be approved by OSP without prior approval by the FCR. All other restricted contracts will continue to be reviewed by the FCR. A list with additional examples of restricted is below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Restriction Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration in which joint publication is envisioned; however,</td>
<td>The parties (sponsor and UW) are collaborators and intend to jointly publish. UW does not have the ability to independently publish results of the collaboration effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW cannot independently publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication decisions by committee; no ability for UW to</td>
<td>Multi-site clinical study/trial in which the consortia or committee makes publication decisions; no ability to independently publish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independently publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents publication of information restricted by privacy</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent PHI, PII or other personal, student, or other privacy information protected by statute/regulation from being shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents publication of information restricted by export control</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent export-controlled information from being shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents publication of classified work</td>
<td>The purpose of the publication restriction is to prevent classified information from being distributed outside the intended clearance limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended period of restriction for sponsor review</td>
<td>The publication restriction is to allow sponsor to review the intended manuscript/publication draft for possible patent protection or to strike its confidential information from the publication, and this restriction exceeds 90 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor approves all publications</td>
<td>Sponsor has the final approval over all publications or other dissemination of the research results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-for-hire</td>
<td>Sponsor owns the results therefore we do not have right to publish/disseminate results (typical in services or other procurement agreement, not typically handled by OSP but rather under the auspices of APS 59.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal to Request that the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations Review School, College, and Campus Bylaws and EFC Composition

Rationale:

As we strengthen shared governance, it is important to assure that school, college, and campus bylaws are consistent with the UW Faculty Code. In addition, it is critical that the composition of Elected Faculty Councils (EFCs) are elected faculty only. This is outlined in Section 23-45 of the Faculty Code.

In the past decade, there have been significant variances from these policies and practices. In some instances, units have included chairs, directors, and other administrators on EFC’s. Moreover, there are units in which the dean appoints members of the EFC or where chairs self-appoint. Such practices are not in accordance with the spirit or letter of the Code. This is of particular concern at this time as the Faculty Senate, with support from the Provost, has charged EFC members, as part of their advisory role, to collaborate with deans and chancellors in discussions of budget, compensation, and strategic planning.

It should be noted that Faculty Code Section 23-45.D states: “The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each campus’s, college’s, or school’s procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.”

Request:

That the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations engage in a thorough review of each school’s, college’s and campus’s bylaws and procedures to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the requirements of Section 23-45.

Section 23-45 Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure

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

B. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty council or councils that shall advise their respective chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses, matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each campus shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.

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

D. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each campus’s, college’s, or school's procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.

E. The Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure. It may directly control its affairs or may delegate to a council, executive committee, or other committees any of its powers, provided that such council or committees shall be representative of the various fields of graduate study.
2017 – 2018 Appointments to University and Senate Committees

Faculty Council on Academic Standards
- Jennifer Payne, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Connor Casey, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
- Erick Winger, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Laura Lillard, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Charles Chamberlin, University of Washington Retirement Association, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
- Bryan Crockett, Professional Staff Organization, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Judith Henchy, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Miceal Vaughan, retired faculty member, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
- Karyn Crow, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Ann Madhavan, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Research
- Larry Pierce, Professional Staff Organization, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Jake Busche, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Ann Glusker, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Charles Hirschman, retired faculty member, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs
- Aileen Trilles, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Sumire Nakamura, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Carolyn Martin, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)
- Laurianne Mullinax, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Maria Zontine, Professional Staff Organization, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Meixi Ng, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Amanda Hornby, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Judith Howard, retired faculty member, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy
- Annette Anderson, Professional Staff Organization, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Lauren Pressley, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Gowri Shankar, UW Bothell, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, UW Tacoma, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Claudia Gorbman, retired faculty member, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00)
- John Carroll, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Chris Byrne, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Steve Goldblatt, retired faculty member, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on University Libraries
- Tim Zastrow, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending on September 15, 2018.
- Alanna McAuley, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Susan Redalje, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.
- Kate O’Neill, retired faculty member, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)
- Jennifer Payne, Professional Staff Organization, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending on September 15, 2018.
- Anya Bartelmann, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as a voting member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2018.

Student Conduct Review Officers
- Eliza Sutton, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Scott Hauck, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Nancy Kool, UW Bothell, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2020.
- Britta Ricker, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning immediately, and ending September 15, 2020.
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies, Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 114, Section 2.H.
Proposed addition of interdisciplinary concentrations

Rationale:

Many undergraduate students take a set of courses outside their major(s) to expand their opportunities for post-baccalaureate pursuits. Current examples of this are the courses commonly referred to as “pre-med,” study abroad opportunities partnered with on-campus courses, and independent research projects. Currently, there is no way for these focused academic experiences to be acknowledged on the student’s transcript. This proposal would create a new transcriptable credential, the “Interdisciplinary Concentration” (IC), which will facilitate and formalize these student-focused experiences.

The IC will be focused not on unified topics (thus differentiating it from majors, minors, and options) but rather on unified experiences. Depending upon the nature and scope of the IC, this experience could be formed by a collection of courses across disciplines or programs, or by combinations of such courses on-campus and related opportunities—such as faculty-directed service work off-campus. All ICs will entail interdisciplinary coursework and / or experience.

Student benefit is the impetus for this change, as an IC will provide a transcripted recognition of the additional, focused, and interdisciplinary experiences the student has chosen. As with minors, students should not take additional time to complete the IC; rather, the IC will simplify planning for students who wish to pursue such experiences by providing them a formalized and yet flexible curricular structure that can overlap with their undergraduate degree.

ICs will be created, approved, modified, and administered by the appropriate campus-based faculty bodies that already oversee the creation, approval, modification, and administration of majors, minors, and options (i.e., via the existing ‘1503’ process).

Tri-campus and online ICs will be permitted, as long as the pertinent procedures for approval are followed. ICs will be “open” academic programs, awarded to any student who completes the requirements.

This legislation will allow the responsible faculty bodies to create guidelines for the development of IC proposals that can then be evaluated by the appropriate faculty approval processes noted in the paragraph above. If this Class B legislation is enacted, we anticipate that two ICs would move forward fairly quickly (tentatively named “pre-Health Studies” and “Leadership”) and that several others would be developed in the near future.

H. Degrees with Minor and/or Interdisciplinary Concentration

Departments, schools, and colleges are authorized to provide a course of study leading to an undergraduate academic minors and/or interdisciplinary concentrations. Requirements are within the purview of the department, school, or college.

1. The A minor shall consist of not less than 25 credits that have a topical focus. Interdisciplinary minors are encouraged. Courses taken to fulfill the minor may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the minor will appear on the permanent record.

2. An interdisciplinary concentration shall consist of not less than 30 credits that are organized around a set of skills, prerequisites for post-baccalaureate education, or other experiences. Courses taken to fulfill the interdisciplinary concentration may also apply as appropriate to the general education, writing, diversity, and reasoning requirements. Completion of the interdisciplinary concentration will appear on the permanent record.

23 Distance-learning minors or interdisciplinary concentrations (whether entirely new, or a distance-learning version of an existing minor or interdisciplinary concentration) must be approved by the same process as non-distance-learning minors versions. Modes of content delivery must be described and approved at all levels, including unit, college, and Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
Class C Resolution regarding tuition tax bill.

Whereas section 117(d) of the Internal Revenue Code currently exempts qualified tuition waivers from taxation; and

Whereas there is a Congressional bill that proposes to change that exemption and make tuition waivers taxable income; and

Whereas many graduate students work as teaching or research assistants while completing their studies; and

Whereas universities often waive their tuition and provide a small living stipend as compensation; and

Whereas the proposed plan would no longer allow people repaying their student loans to reduce their tax burden; and

Whereas the House plan would treat these tuition waivers as taxable income; and

Whereas graduate students fear this change could lead to annual tax burdens that would impact their ability to afford graduate school; and

Whereas section 117(a) of the Internal Revenue Code exempts scholarships from taxation; and

Whereas universities which provide scholarships cannot stipulate that students work as teaching or research assistants as a condition of receiving them; and

Whereas at the University of Washington our graduate students depend on tuition waivers; therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington, stands strongly in opposition to this legislation that proposes to alter the tax exemption status of tuition waivers.

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
November 30, 2017
Update on Research Funding
Fall 2017

Mary Lidstrom
Vice Provost for Research

How Do We Stay Competitive in the Future in Research?

What will the future look like?
- More competitive, collaborative, technology-reliant, nimble, and diversified.

What is our core competitive edge?
- Quality
- Breadth
- Focus on balance between basic research and providing solutions to society’s most pressing issues.

How do we achieve competitiveness?
- Focus on recruiting and retaining top faculty
  - Colleagues
  - Students
  - Facilities
  - Startup/compensation
- Enabling high risk/high return research
- Working to improve the research environment
Trends in Current Research Funding

- UW has a strong research funding profile tripling our research funding over the last 20 years
- We are one of the few universities in the U.S. with total research funding over $1B
- Research supports the academic mission: about $200M/yr of external research funding supports undergraduate and graduate student experiential learning

Recent World Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Jiao Tong World University</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters Most Innovative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Times Higher Education World Rankings</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US News &amp; World Report Global Rankings</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UpShot College Rankings Index</td>
<td>18 (in US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Update

State FY13 awards were artificially low due to federal sequestration, and as a result FY14 awards were artificially high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State FY</td>
<td>$1.12B</td>
<td>$1.39B</td>
<td>$1.30B</td>
<td>$1.37B</td>
<td>$1.63B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal FY</td>
<td>$1.31B</td>
<td>$1.34B</td>
<td>$1.31B</td>
<td>$1.32B</td>
<td>$1.68B* ($1.4B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: A ten-year, $280M Foundation award accounts for the higher level of funding in FY 2017

Funding Update: FY 13-17 (State FY)

Note: FY13 was artificially low due to delays, FY14 was artificially high.

* Note: A ten-year, $280M Foundation award accounts for the higher level of funding in FY 2017
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Exhibit M

Trends in Federal R&D, FY1976-2017

In billions of constant FY 2016 dollars, excluding mandatory proposals in FY 2017

Source: AAAS analyses of historical budget and agency data and the FY 2017 request. R&D includes conduct and facilities. © AAAS | 2016

How Competitive are we for Federal Research Funding, Compared to Other Non-profits?


Originating sponsor funds
Adjusted to exclude financial aid awards
Collaborations

- 22% of our total FY17 funding is in incoming + outgoing subcontracts
- A testament to the strength of our faculty
- Part of our competitiveness
UW Measures to Ensure Competitiveness

- Focus on recruiting and retaining top faculty, post-docs, students and staff
- Continue Bridge Funding and RRF grant programs
- Targeted investment in development of modern research facilities
- Targeted investment in Research Innovation (Donor Funds)
  - Innovation Awards
  - Washington Research Foundation Innovation Postdoctoral Fellowships
- Decrease administrative burden on researchers

Giving Time Back to Researchers: How Much?

2012 FDP Survey on Faculty Workload

- 42% = 10 hr/week
- Actual burden = 5 hr/week
- Target: give back 1 hr/week

1 Hour/week not much! But, if it is the most annoying hour each week, then it is worthwhile.
Challenges

- Ongoing uncertainty at the federal level
  - Funding, especially for some areas
  - Regulations
  - Science-based decision-making
- Never-ending onslaught of new regulations
  - Focus on data sharing
  - Focus on protections for sensitive data
  - New rules for human subjects research
Strengths

• Well-informed and highly supportive congressional delegation
• Competitiveness
• Collaborative culture
• Great recruitments—keep building to the future!

Summary

• Research is foundational for the future of the UW, contributes to the educational mission
• We are investing in our future by enabling research advances that maintain our competitiveness
• Our competitiveness remains strong; research funding continues to grow in the face of a restricted federal funding climate
• We will continue to work in partnership with campus on increasing competitiveness and meeting upcoming challenges
Late November/early December meetings.

Right after Thanksgiving, I will be meeting with each dean and chancellor, and the chair of their Elected Faculty Council (EFC).

Below is a description of how you can prepare for the meeting.

You do not need to create a written report for these meetings, other than the report you are submitting November 1 on gap analysis/unit adjustment, but please plan to talk about the Nov 1 report and related issues (see below) when we meet. Please share this document with your elected faculty councils.

1. **EFC/Dean or Chancellor meetings**: How often does the elected faculty council meet with the dean/chancellor? What are some of the topics/issues you've discussed so far this autumn?

2. **Your Nov 1 report**: We will spend some time on your November 1 report. You may well have answered all of these questions in the report, but if not, it would be good to get a sense of
   a. How you arrived both at the gap you identify, and
   b. How you decided on your first step to address the gap.

3. **How are you thinking about costs in general?** As you may remember, the document we created last year at the start of this work, identified faculty salary discussions as a key goal for the elected faculty councils and the deans/chancellors. The document also outlined a case for thinking more broadly about our costs. From that document:

   "Ultimately, the discussions and solutions are not just about salary. They are about the quality of the faculty, meritorious work and market pressures. These issues also concern human capital needs, such as: Program/curriculum design; faculty workload; staffing mix and salary policy goals/objectives are all inextricably linked together; create a dynamic system and reflect our values. Sustaining long term institutional success requires us to thoughtfully manage all and appreciate better the dynamic linkages between many contributing factors."

4. **We also specified some key assumptions:**
   - No new, major internal funds available from Provost to address your needs/goals
   - State dollars essentially flat
   - Modest tuition increases (2% per year)
   - Necessity of collaboration between administration (deans, chancellors) and elected faculty councils.

5. **And we identified a series of things** (policies, programs requirements, etc.) that drove costs, and thus affected how much money would be available for salaries. I’d like to hear about your discussions on these issues.

**Overall issues:**

- How do you make curriculum decisions? How do these decisions impact budgets?
- How do you decide curricular and fiscal priorities?

**Needs/Costs assessment**

a. **What is the cost of your curriculum?**
   i. Program offerings (how many degrees? Certificates? Undergrad, grad?)
   ii. Program curriculum design (how many courses?)
   iii. Delivery modes (Face to face? Other formats?)
   iv. Enrollments (total number of majors, minors, SCH)
   v. Class size (small classes, large? A mix?).
vi. Faculty workload, Teaching loads (how many classes do faculty teach? Mix of faculty teaching loads, contributions of lecturers), course reductions?

vii. Administrative stipends.

b. Current Staffing mix in your unit (TT/NIT/Teaching assistants/clinical staff, etc.)

Resources assessment

c. What resources are available to your unit to fund the work done in the unit (teaching, research, etc.)?
   i. Current state $$$
   ii. Program tuition (current? Flexibility to adjust?)
   iii. Enrollments (current, anticipated demand, trends?)
   iv. Buyouts
   v. ICR
   vi. Endowments
   vii. Other

Constraints on your funds

d. Compliance, risk

  e. Regulatory and legal requirements

  f. Accreditation standards and requirements (e.g., accreditation rules about class size, curriculum, use of full-time faculty, library staffing and access, etc.)

  g. Curriculum

  h. Space

  i. Current tuition levels vs peers/regional competitors

  j. Etc.

Gap Analysis

k. What is the best mix of faculty to enhance your ability to achieve your unit's goals and objectives for teaching, research/scholarship, and service?

l. What's your current mix of faculty?

m. What gaps exist and how do they need to be closed in order to better align mix of faculty with ability to achieve your goals and objectives?

n. Who are your market peers given your mission (may differ by programs/departments within unit)?

  o. Salary needs to sustain ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty, in desired mix to support mission related activities, goals and objectives?

  p. What things can you quit doing? Are there any things in your program that are not key to your unit's mission and that can be eliminated?

Need/goal prioritization

q. Revisit unit strategic plan.

  r. Prioritize, rank gaps

  s. Create a timeline for and develop a plan to address gaps.
Global Innovation Exchange (GIX) update

Presented at: UW Faculty Senate
Nov 30, 2017

Presented by:
Vikram Jandhyala and Mary Lidstrom
GIX co-executive directors
cgixuw.edu

GIX: A global innovation education model
## GIX Has Strong Global Industry Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Partner</th>
<th>Microsoft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valued Partner</td>
<td>海南航空 （HAINAN AIRLINES）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Members</td>
<td>arm, Baidu, Boeing, T-Mobile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GIX Has Strong Global Academic Partners

[Map showing various universities and institutions around the world]

GLOBAL INNOVATION EXCHANGE
THE BUILDING OFFICIALLY OPENS

AN EMOTIONAL DEDICATION
LEADERS AND DIGNITARIES IN ATTENDANCE

GIX ELEMENTS

GLOBAL INNOVATION EXCHANGE
GIX OUTPUTS

GIX PROGRAM STYLE

GLOBAL INNOVATION EXCHANGE

Entrepreneurial Thinking

Interdisciplinary

Just-In-Time Learning

Curricular Innovation

TeamWork

Design Thinking
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION

- Interdisciplinary M.S. Degree through the Graduate School, Continuum College
- All approvals granted last year
- Academic units involved:
  - College of Engineering
    - Computer Science & Engr
    - Electrical Engineering
    - Human Centered Design and Engineering
  - Foster School
  - Law School

PREPARE. PRACTICE. LAUNCH.
STATE OF THE ART TECHNOLOGY ABOUNDS

COLLABORATION

- Financial Incentives
  - Tenure-track Faculty positions
  - Professors of Practice

- MSTI degree
  - Teaching and Projects
  - Strong international exposure

- Consortium
  - Industry partners do MS projects at GIX
    - Pipeline to long term research as well as UG projects

- Future degree programs
  - Co-design cross-disciplinary, global, industry-connected programs
  - CSE, EE, HCDE, Law, Foster
  - CoMotion partners on incubation, mentor networks,
GIX COURSE CRITERIA

novel & cross-dept: should be a program that is not redundant with an existing degree offered by any UW department and is not just a repackaging of an existing program or degree

interdisciplinary: something that no department is fully positioned in terms of expertise to offer on their own - requires the collaboration of other departments and/or industry

project-based: a core part of the program learning comes from students/teams working on real-world, relevant projects

global: requires or benefits from international industry/ academic/cultural collaboration

CURRENT STATUS

42 Graduate Students from 11 countries

Curriculum led by Shwetak Patel (CSE/EE) and Linda Wagner (HCDE)