Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from December 8th, 2017
3. Class C resolution on nursing stations and data in Tableau
4. Faculty 2050 update
5. Good of the order
6. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. Introductions were given and members remarked on something memorable from their holiday break.

2) Review of the minutes from December 8th, 2017

The minutes from December 8th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Class C resolution on nursing stations and data in Tableau

The council reviewed a first draft of the Class C Resolution on wellness rooms (Exhibit 1). The document was read aloud and there was some discussion.

A member noted the “n = 14” reference within the resolution is not accurate; Angotti noted she would try to locate the correct value.

It was noted the council previously discussed renovating existing buildings to add wellness rooms, and there is no related recommendation within the resolution. It was noted the cost of retrofitting buildings for this purpose is very high. Members considered adding new language.

Discussion then centered on locating best practices for offering wellness rooms at large institutions. Specifically, how to quantify need/the number of stations necessary to serve a population. There was some discussion of what other universities use as a metric. There was a question relating to the US Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and how the law is enforced (as it is referenced in the resolution).

Members searched online during the meeting for various resources/guides relating to offering wellness rooms/nursing stations, and links were identified to be disseminated to the full council membership following the meeting. A member explained the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has a
guide online for offering wellness rooms, but does not specify an amount necessary to serve a certain population. It was noted a report from the University of California on nursing stations recommended there be at least one station in each campus building. It was noted population density presents a potential method for quantifying need.

The infographic viewed in the last FCWA meeting (created in data-analytics and visualization software, Tableau) was displayed and reviewed; Angotti explained new information had been added since the time of the last meeting (Exhibit 2). Members thanked Angotti for her work. It was noted the infographic should be displayed during the presentation of the Class C resolution in the Faculty Senate.

There was some discussion of access constraints relating to some of wellness rooms on the UW Seattle campus, as some rooms are closed during certain hours, require a key to access, etcetera. It was noted whole buildings close down on the UW Seattle campus (particularly at night), and nursing room hours may simply be a reflection of this. Members noted more nursing stations/wellness rooms could be placed in public buildings, such as a library, to avoid these constraints. It was noted as an example that Suzzallo Library does not have any wellness rooms/nursing stations. Members remarked the fact that UW’s libraries do not contain wellness rooms/nursing stations is an important emphasis for the initiative.

A member suggested the time it takes to walk to an available nursing station may be a better metric for assessing need than determining an exact number of rooms, or placing one in every building. Other members noted a distance (to an available station) might be used instead. It was noted the average human walking speed is 3 MPH, and therefore five minutes’ walk-time equals roughly a quarter mile in distance (for the average human). There was some discussion of electrical outlets, and the cost of adding them in new or retrofitted buildings.

*Follow-ups*

Paladin explained she would speak with Faculty Senate chair, Thaisa Way, and try to garner some best practices for Class C resolutions before the next meeting in order to inform continued development of the document. Camber (president’s designee) noted she would consult with Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) to try to gain information on how institutions quantify need (for nursing stations/wellness rooms) or for locating best practices for offering nursing stations. Paladin explained the council’s focus should be to have the resolution approved and to be persuasive, but its included recommendations needs to be manageable/feasible.

It was clarified there are nursing stations within the UW Husky Union Building (HUB). Bartelmann noted she would take pictures of the stations there and share them with the council following the meeting.

Paladin requested the entire council membership try to locate information on best practices for offering nursing stations on university campuses/at large institutions.

It was noted the council support analyst would send action items to members after the meeting.
4) Faculty 2050 update

Paladin presented a PowerPoint shown in a recent meeting of the Faculty 2050 Steering Committee headed by Faculty Senate Chair Thaisa Way (Exhibit 3). She explained Faculty 2050 is a joint-initiative between the Faculty Senate and the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BoDC), and its goal is to define what the UW “should look like” in the year 2050 (the date was chosen because it aligns with the current hiring of junior faculty). Paladin explained a consultant, who previously worked with large prestigious organizations on similar initiatives, has been hired to aid in strategic planning, and a final related document will be developed and disseminated before July of 2018.

Paladin commented that the BoDC met and developed their own categories of areas of importance in the Faculty 2050 initiative, and explained she would like to share and discuss those categories with the FCWA. Paladin continued to summarize the presentation from the 2050 meeting (Exhibit 3). Paladin noted she would send out the PowerPoint for members to review following the meeting.

Discussion

There was a question about gender make-up of the Faculty 2050 Committee and the breadth of diversity in the group. The body was noted to be racially diverse and balanced between male/female. It was noted the body includes members from each UW campus.

There was some discussion of the Non-Negotiables slides in the PowerPoint (Slide 18-19, Exhibit 3). Faculty recognition was discussed, especially as it relates to things other than research and faculty promotion processes. There was some discussion of the UW’s reputation on the national scale, as well as discussion of student expectations (employment vs. education for the sake of knowledge). A member noted large businesses are now beginning to house their own educational programs for high school-aged people.

The council ran out of time for discussion.

5) Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

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

Present: Faculty: Sarah Prager, Angelisa Paladin, Robin Angotti, Tyler McCormick, Whasun Chung  
Ex-officio reps: Anya Bartelmann  
President’s designee: Susan Camber
Absent: Faculty: Mariam Moshiri, Michael Fialkow, Geethapriya Thamilarasu, Bonnie Duran, Elizabeth Umphress, Margo Bergman
Ex-officio reps: Annie McGlynn-Wright, Jennifer Payne, Kendra Canton

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Class C Resolution regarding Wellness Rooms DRAFT.doc
Exhibit 2 – link_nursingstations_tableaudashboard_winter2018.pdf
Exhibit 3 – UW Faculty Strategy Workshop 2 OUTPUT.pdf
Class C Resolution regarding Wellness Rooms.

A wellness room is a private space that contains a sink with a water source, a plug, a small refrigerator, and a chair that can be utilized for breast pumping/feeding and/or medical interventions (injections and/or other medication).

Whereas the University of Washington employs women (7925 women faculty and non-faculty personnel) and admits women students (16,152 undergraduate women [Seattle campus]);

Whereas the United States Fair Labor Standards Act requires that employers provide “a place, other than a bathroom, that is shielded from view and free from intrusion from coworkers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk”;

Whereas the University of Washington employs individuals and admits students who require a space for medical interventions (such as those with diabetes, anemia, migraines);

Whereas Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act specifies that employers must provide “reasonable accommodations” for those with disabilities and that includes a private space for giving injections or testing;

Whereas the current availability of wellness rooms is drastically underrepresented (n = 14 [Seattle campus]) given the current size of the university and population of women within, and many parts of campus have no wellness room available within multiple blocks;

Whereas some of the current wellness rooms do not provide basic requirements necessary for breast pumping (i.e., a sink with a water source) such that women are required to use unsanitary conditions to wash breast pumping equipment;

Whereas we embrace our stated strategic priority of “UW Standard of Excellence: We recruit the best, most diverse and innovative faculty and staff from around the world...We hold ourselves to the highest standards of ethics, as a beacon for our community and the world.” We recognize that to continue to recruit the best and most diverse faculty and staff and hold to our standards of ethics that we need to also provide reasonable accommodation of wellness rooms for breast feeding mothers and those who require a space for medical interventions;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington strongly recommends that at least one wellness room is included as a requirement for all new buildings (or more based on population capacity of the building), and that wellness rooms be provided close enough to each building on campus not to provide undue hardship for those individuals who require access.
Link to nursing stations Tableau dashboard

https://public.tableau.com/profile/robin.angotti#!/vizhome/lactationstations/Dashboard1?publish=yes
University of Washington
Faculty 2050

Kathy Pearson, PhD
kpearson@wharton.upenn.edu
(215) 262-0159
Enterprise Learning Solutions
www.ELSLearning.com
Strategic Framework

- Institutional “Persona”
- External Trends
- Key Stakeholder Input
- Aspirational Strategic Objectives
- External Uncertainties
- Competitive Landscape
- Current Capabilities
- Strategic Choices

Exhibit 3
Organizations that “live long” have a balance of four characteristics, according to research conducted by Arie de Geus (The Living Company):

**Financially Frugal**
Operationally efficient, wise use of finances including leverage and cash

**Persona**
Cohesive with a strong sense of identity or Persona – a deep, uncompromising set of core values and purpose that do not change over time
Organizations that “live long” have a balance of four characteristics, according to research conducted by Arie de Geus (*The Living Company*):

**Adaptability**
Ability to adapt to a changing environment by carefully monitoring the external environment

**Tolerance**
Encouragement of experimentation and unconventional thinking – initially described as “decentralization”
A trend is a future force in which the outcome is very predictable - a known known or a “predictable”
Trends and Uncertainties

An **uncertainty** is a future force in which the outcome is unknown

*Unknown Unknown*

Black Swan

**Known Unknown**

Manage with Adaptability
An Organizational Mental Model

PRODUCTIVE PARANOIA!
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>U1</th>
<th>U2</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
<th>U5</th>
<th>U6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Red** = Vulnerable to the uncertainty
- **Green** = Invulnerable to the uncertainty
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Online Learning</th>
<th>Skills Needed in 10 years</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign MBA Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Exhibit 3]

- **Redesign MBA Curriculum**
- **Initiative 2**
- **Initiative 3**

- **Vulnerable to the uncertainty**
- **Invulnerable to the uncertainty**
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Online Learning</th>
<th>Skills Needed in 10 years</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign MBA Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Color Coding] = Vulnerable to the uncertainty

![Green Color] = Invulnerable to the uncertainty
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Online Learning</th>
<th>Skills Needed in 10 years</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign MBA Curriculum</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Green** = Invulnerable to the uncertainty
- **Red** = Vulnerable to the uncertainty
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>U1</th>
<th>U2</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
<th>U5</th>
<th>U6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Testing the Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>U1</th>
<th>U2</th>
<th>U3</th>
<th>U4</th>
<th>U5</th>
<th>U6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aspirational Objectives and Strategic Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Group Exercises

- UW Faculty ”Mental Model”
- UW Faculty “Persona” or Non-Negotiables
- Trends and Uncertainties
  - Between now and 2050
  - Distinguish between the two
- List of Possible Aspirational Strategic Objectives
OUTPUT
UW Faculty Mental Model

- All faculty have access to funding – students, research
- Loyalty – will stay here
- Rainier factor – worth $10K
- Top research institution – and that is enough
- We are collaborative
- We value interdisciplinary work
- Focused on affordability and access
- Research comes first (Seattle)
- We are good at both research and teaching
- Less status oriented
- We support work / family balance
Non-Negotiables / Persona for Faculty 2050

- Shared governance – faculty and administration share
- Public institution
  - We are a public good
  - Community engagement
  - Concentric circles – Puget Sound, state, pacific northwest, nation, global
- Human centered learning
  - Engagement
  - Empathy / community / social
  - Whole person / connection
- Co-creation of knowledge
  - Open access
  - Discussion of whether this should be listed under another heading
Non-Negotiables / Persona for Faculty 2050

- Inclusivity
  - Recognition in teaching
  - Faculty inclusivity
- Increasing access
- Academic freedom
- Critical thinking
  - Diversity of thought
- Inspire and innovate as top priorities
## Initial List of Trends

### Key Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental degradation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of family will be more diversified – move away from single wage earner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer tenure lines (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise of diverse faculty roles and positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of population increasing (race, SES, etc.) – majority non-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging of population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of big data increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of AI increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public de-funding of education (privatization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public de-funding of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratization of research and knowledge – demand for access to knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer lifespan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed transition to adulthood and independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial List of Uncertainties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Uncertainties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localization of goods and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition – local and global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics for assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of education – perceived and real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentialing / accreditation model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding model for students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Set of Aspirational Strategic Objectives

- Faculty, student and staff reflect the public in terms of diversity
  - Conversation about how to define “public”
  - Produce best, high impact scholars
- Be a model for inclusivity (and diversity)
- Reduce disparities to achieve equity
- Focus on social justice versus market justice
- Be a model of interdisciplinary breadth from basic scholarship to applied scholarship
  - “Creative practice”
- Be known as an innovative and adaptable body
- Offer broadening paths for career and professional development
NEXT STEPS
Next Steps

- **January 19 Meeting**
  - Repeat of January 4 with different participants
  - Use same introductory slides
  - Enlist January 4 participants to help facilitate small group discussions
  - Combine output from both

- **Determine Information Needed from Other Faculty**
  - Reaction / edits to “persona”?
  - Reaction / edits to trends?
  - Reaction / edits to initial list of aspirational strategic objectives
  - “How would you change Promotion and Tenure process?”
  - “What would you do if you didn’t need to worry about tenure?”
Next Steps

- **Determine Method of Engagement**
  - Faculty department meetings
  - Survey
  - “Creative practice” – artwork? Posters in various departments?
  - Focus group

- **Determine Common Message**
  - What is the Faculty 2050 project?
  - What is the output? Report to new provost?
  - “Decision rights” – body that will make the final decision

- **Schedule Date for Workshop 3**
  - Needs to occur after the data gathering from other faculty
  - Determine output