Minutes  
Executive Committee Meeting  
Monday, January 14, 2013, 2:30 p.m.  
142 Gerberding

Present: Gregory, Lee, Astley, Killien, Young, Joseph, Baird, Evans, Treser, Morrison, Taricani, Giebel, Shen, Stygall, Dillon, Olmstead, Cauce, Smith, Sherman  
Absent: Stern, Turns, Fridley  
Guests: Scott Woodward, Pete Dukes, Miceal Vaughan, Cheryl Cameron, Elise Randall, Zosha Millman

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Meeting started at 2:36 PM and the Agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – James Gregory [Exhibit A]

Chair Gregory reported that he has been emphasizing the need for faculty and staff pay raises for the upcoming academic year, which was the focus of his remarks to the Regents last week. Gregory and indicated the regents were supportive of plans to provide raises to meritorious faculty and professional staff this year. It is expected that 2% in regular merit will be distributed and if additional merit funds are available the majority will be distributed across the board to meritorious faculty unless an explanation is provided. A target of 4% for merit and additional merit is expected at this time; units may also request permission for unit adjustments. The state legislature opens today with Faculty Legislative Representative (FLR) Jim Fridley present. Update on SPIPC; Jack Johnson, chief of staff to President Young, has been added to the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SPIPC) as the presidential designee to this committee. Gregory also highlighted the Senate’s resolution on faculty demographics and subsequent need for ongoing follow up.


Efforts are underway to try to generate additional resources to address the use of technology in teaching. The current state legislative agenda is focused on the proposed budget. The Council of Presidents has proposed that tuition would be held flat for the next biennium if there is a specified state investment in higher education; this has made the relationship between state funding and tuition increases more transparent. At this time the outlook for this proposal is unclear. More information about the budget will be forthcoming in February. At this time the prospect is for no cuts to the UW’s budget but there is little optimism for significant increases. The UW is continuing to advocate for additional flexibility in managing its resources.

The president was asked when incoming Governor Inslee’s budget is expected. He responded that he was unsure; for now former governor Gregoire’s budget is under discussion but not defining the debate in the legislature. There has been significant turnover in membership of the legislature; this may provide an opportunity to educate them about higher education.


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

Senate chair Gregory commented that FLR Jim Fridley wishes to ask faculty to be “on call” to him when his needs advice or input based on their expertise. If he calls, he will need a quick response (eg. Hours, not days).

5. Consent Agenda.

a. Approval of the November 5, 2012, SEC minutes and November 29, 2012, Faculty Senate Minutes.  
b. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]
c. Approve the 2013-2014 Vice Chair Nominations for Faculty Senate Vote. 
Professor Joseph Janes, the Information School; Professor Kathleen O’Neill, School of Law. 

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements. 
There were no announcements.

7. Unfinished Business. 
There was no unfinished business.


a. Secretary of the Faculty Election. [Exhibit G] 
**Action:** Elect Secretary of the Faculty for Faculty Senate confirmation.

Chair of nominating committee, Gail Stygall, described the search process and presented the nomination of Marcia Killien to the SEC for election. When seeking applicants, the committee learned that many wanted Killien to continue.

Killien presented brief remarks and responded to questions from the SEC. Killien shared that she is thankful for being entrusted in this position by the faculty and has enjoyed the opportunity to better understand the University as a whole from working with all the different school and colleges. Astley commented that she was quite pleased that Killien is running for a second term and is thankful for her guidance.

Killien was excused during the discussion and vote by the SEC. Treser shared that Killien is a very well qualified candidate. Stygall emphasized that Killien is a collaborative person that looks out for everybody’s best interest. Shen is very impressed by her knowledge. Gregory pointed out her technical expertise and the position’s need for a complicated skill set; he believes that Killien has done very well.

Killien was elected unanimously for a new five year term as Secretary of the Faculty, to commence immediately following the conclusion of her current term in 2013.

b. **Discussion:** Intercollegiate Athletics Budgets and Building Plans. [Exhibit H] 
Scott Woodward, Director of Athletics.

Gregory welcomed Director of Athletics Scott Woodward. Woodward thanked the SEC for having him. Woodward emphasized the three tenants of the Department. One is that the student athletes’ education is foremost and the graduation rates are third in the Pac-12. Second is success on the playing field, and he is proud how well the teams are doing. Third is ethics and playing by the rules. Woodward then presented information about the Department’s budget. The budget has gotten much better over the last four years since he took over. When he started, he had to make some difficult decisions, cut a few teams, and initiate a number of layoffs. The funds must continue in a positive direction to pay the debt service and fund the savings account for debt service should something catastrophic occur. Woodward then opened up the floor for questions.

Gregory asked about the salary and benefits category, which is a predominant part of the budget. Woodward said that it is pretty standard when compared with peers. He understands that coaching salaries are the focus of the news, and he believes the UW salaries are within the current market. He plans on giving salary increases if the rest of the campus has salary increases. Smith asked about positives and negatives about the new TV contract. Woodward explained that the Pac-12 used to have the worst TV contract among the major conferences. The Pac-12 now has one of the best TV contracts and is catching up with the rest of the country. The department will basically have no debt other than the stadium renovation. The budget will look much different next year with debt service on the stadium, and additional revenue from the stadium coming on-line. Stygall expressed that there has been discussion that with the new TV contracts the athletic department should help...
out the budget of the rest of the University. Woodward responded that athletics does contribute to the general good of the University. He is concerned, based on experiences in other universities, about worries, about the problems that occur when athletics subsidize on-going non-athletic programs and athletic revenues decrease because revenue producing teams experience decline. He suggested that, alternatively, targeted one-time contributions could make sense. He emphasized, and President Young concurred, that he and the president are having ongoing discussions along those lines. There was a question about the overhead Athletics pays the University compared to other parts of campus. It became clear that it can be difficult to compare with other units on campus. Gregory asked about future building plans; Woodward shared that they are exploring building a basketball operations facility. There was also discussion about the baseball stadium which is set to break ground soon. Olmstead asked about the possibility of housing a childcare facility in the new stadium. Woodward shared that he proposed the idea, but it will likely be cost prohibitive. Lee asked how much of the salaries and benefits were for coaches. Woodward shared that he wasn’t sure but he thinks it is roughly 15-20%. There was discussion about how coaches were able to receive raises when others on campus could not.

Gregory, shared that he perceives while faculty are excited for what athletics brings to campus, faculty and students would feel better if athletics contributed more to overhead or helped the rest of campus in other ways. Woodward shared that he is open to the idea, but that it is not a panacea to University budget problems. Only three members of the Pac-12 do not receive subsidies from the rest of campus. There is also a need to remain competitive and if you are no longer competitive, the seed money disappears. Gregory said this is the year the university could use such a subsidy with the budget problems, and the athletic revenues increasing. Woodward shared that UW athletics pays areas such as overhead, parking, and the rate paid on the debt service, where many of their competitors in the rest of the conference don’t pay. Smith asked about the Title IX provision that help subsidize women’s athletics. Woodward shared that his predecessors, particularly Barbara Hedges, developed women’s programs on campus. Lee agrees that the University must be competitive, and pointed out that Woodward said that coaches are paid market rates, while many faculty are near 15% below market. Woodward shared that he is concerned about that as well. Woodward emphasized that the University is an educational institution first and foremost, and he believes in and promotes this. Astley indicated that she is worried about the perception that the athletic department is flush with money while the University is having a hard time. She explained that the perception would change dramatically if the athletic department were to endow a professorship or scholarships. Woodward explained that if the Athletic Department were a top-five revenue department, it would more of an obvious decision. Woodward also commented that if athletics were to subsidize academics when revenues were good, there would be pressure to have the academics subsidize athletics when revenues were down. Smith shared that students are happy that athletics does not receive a subsidy and are very competitive. Woodward pointed out that athletic donors give 1.5 times more to the academic side than to athletics. Astley encouraged publicizing this. Gregory concluded the discussion by thanking Woodward for being a good steward and having a competitive program. He hopes there are more things the Athletic Department can do for the whole university. He also said that there could be push back on the basketball facility, but again reiterated that Woodward is doing a great job.

c. Official Request for Code Interpretation. [Exhibit I]

**Action:** Decide whether or not to approve findings of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

In terms of distribution of salary monies, when and if differential amounts/percentages can be distributed to 1) schools/colleges/campuses and/or 2) departments/programs (vs. equal percentage distribution to all units of the UW);

Gregory reviewed role of Advisory Committee on Faculty Code & Regulations and SEC on code interpretations; he then introduced the committee chair, Miceal Vaughan. Vaughan explained the committee's interpretation that the definition of "unit" is "department" in departmentalized schools and colleges, and is "school or college" in non-departmentalized units. There was a question about how these definitions should be applied at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. Vaughan indicated that the questions the committee were asked did not specifically address the application
to these campuses. Provost Cauce indicated the definition being presented is a good place to start and indicated that she will ask the Chancellors of UW Tacoma and UW Bothell about their past practices of distributing additional merit funds on their campuses.

Astley moved that the SEC accept the advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code & Regulations.

During the discussion that followed Vice-chair Jack Lee indicated that he had concerns about the advisory opinion as it relates to UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. Discussion ensured about whether or not these campuses were considered departmentalized units and who makes that determination. A motion was made to defer Astley’s motion to the next SEC meeting and to refer the question about application of the code interpretation to UW Bothell and UW Tacoma to a subcommittee of Lee, Joseph, and Baird. The motion passed.

Does the Code’s salary policy limit faculty with appointments (e.g. WOT, Research professorial appointments) funded (in whole or in part) from external funds (e.g. grants or contracts) to the same level of salary increases as state-funded (tenure-track) faculty?

Vaughan presented the interpretation that the source of funds is not mentioned in the code and is therefore irrelevant. The discussion that followed suggested that individual achievements in obtaining extramural funding could be considered in the evaluation of individual merit. A question was raised about whether a unit adjustment could go to faculty who were paid from non-state funds. A motion was made to refer the question to the same subcommittee just established, with the addition of Killien. The motion passed.

d. **Discussion: Faculty Retention Offers. [Exhibit J]**

Gregory introduced the SCPB report on faculty retention offers. The headings on the charts were explained by Cameron. Giebel requested time to further discuss the matter. He has received a number of letters from constituents who are concerned about how these raises were approved in a time of austerity. The Provost reminded the SEC that faculty in each unit determine the process for approving retention offers. Giebel shared concerns that retention raises are affecting faculty morale. Cauce agreed that these raises affects morale, but believes morale would be worse if retentions were not made. Giebel voiced his concern that his request to discuss EO64 and retention raises has been postponed multiple times. After brief discussion about when and at what meeting best for further discussion it was decided to place the topic on the February 11, 2013 SEC agenda under unfinished business.

e. **Approval of the January 31, 2013, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit H]**

**Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.


The meeting was adjourned at 5:04pm.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: James Gregory, Chair of the Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair  
James Gregory, Professor of History

Please be sure to print and bring with you exhibits H and I if not this whole agenda packet. We have a long and complicated agenda and it will become even more complicated if we have not reviewed these documents in advance. Here are the highlights:

Senate elections will be the first item of business at Monday’s meeting. SEC will hear from the committee charged with nominating candidates for the Secretary of the Faculty. SEC will then elect the new Secretary of the Faculty and forward nominations for the Vice Chair to the Senate. (Exhibit G)

SEC has been asked to resolve a Faculty Code issue having to do with the definition of “units” in the salary policy sections of the Code. We have received an advisory opinion from the “Code Cops,” the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations. Please read this and bring your copy. SEC is officially empowered to interpret the Code. The body can make a ruling or choose not to answer the inquiry. (Exhibit H)

We will hear from Athletics Director Scott Woodward about the Intercollegiate Athletics budget and plans for new facilities and programs. This follow’s last month’s discussion with Faculty Athletics Representative Pete Dukes and questions raised at Senate meetings last year about ICA finances and potential contributions to the academic enterprise.

Lastly, Christoph Giebel has requested information about the volume of retention offers in recent years. Tables showing the number and types of retention offers over the past four years are Exhibit I. Please bring them to the meeting.

Other issues that the Senate leadership has been following:

Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization: Authorized at the December SEC meeting, the committee has met once and prepared a response to a proposed revision of the permission form required for outside professional work. Jack Johnson has joined the committee as the presidential designee. Susan Astley provides more details in her report to SEC (exhibit C).

Faculty demographics initiative: At the November 29 meeting, the Senate voted unanimously in favor of a resolution that, among other provisions, asked departments to “make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year.” The resolution followed presentations that identified three areas of concern: restoring the tenure track, advancing faculty diversity, and achieving gender equity. The Senate resolution triggered a vigorous and emotional discussion on the AAUP listserv and has led, we understand, to some department level conversations. We are looking for ways to keep the initiative alive.

Joint Faculty Salary Working Group: The committee met December 18 and helped the Provost draft instructions for the upcoming merit reviews and salary increases in FY14. SCPB is now reviewing the instructions. The working group also discussed a proposal for a significant revision of the salary system that would add “steps” to the promotion ladder at the full professor rank (and possibly at the associate professor rank). In one version of the proposal full professors would be eligible for 7.5% step raises following rigorous merit reviews at roughly five year intervals. The goal is to combat compression and demoralization at the full professor level by providing predictable opportunities for raises. SEC will be consulted as this proposal takes shape.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The nominating committee interviewed 5 candidates for Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2013. The Committee will present two nominees, Professor Kate O’Neill and Professor Joe Janes, to the Senate Executive Committee on January 14, 2013. If approved, these candidates will address the Senate on January 31, 2013.

2. The Senate Leadership has been meeting with the chairs of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to clarify and facilitate the process of discussion of an undergraduate diversity requirement.
Astley SCPB Chair: Report to the Senate
Jan 2013

The SCPB advises the administration and informs the Faculty Senate on long-range planning, preparation of budgets, and distribution of funds, with a particular focus on faculty concerns. The Committee consults with the Executive Committee and the Senate on matters of policy. The Winter Agenda is posted on the Senate website. A number of issues came before the Senate last year that will continue to be addressed in the SCPB this year. And new issues will arise as the year progresses. Below is a summary of the key issues we are currently addressing. For each issue, I will present a brief history followed by the most recent updates.

**Faculty Salary Policy:** At our first Senate meeting in October, 2011, Senator Giebel proposed a Class C Resolution “Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy” that was approved by the Senate in December and led directly to the establishment of the Salary Policy Working Group (SPWG) in March 2012. I served as the Co-Chair of this committee from March-Dec 2012. As I approach the end of my 3-year Senate leadership role, Jack Lee, Senate Vice Chair was selected to serve as Co-Chair starting Dec, 2012. I will remain a member of the SPWG. The group’s charge is to examine the following questions: 1) over the next 6-12 months, how should we proceed with wage increases under the current salary policy and revenue expectations, and 2) in the longer term, are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade? These topics are paramount as we slowly move out of this recession, face our 4th and hopefully final year of salary freezes, and fully implement Activity Based Budgeting. Working under the presumption that salary increases will be awarded in 2013-14, the SPWG spent March-Oct 2012 drafting guidelines for the allocation of these funds. Drafts of these guidelines were shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on 11/19/12 and the SCPB on 01/07/13 and 01/14/13 to solicit comments. The SPWG Advisory Group includes all faculty members of the SCPB, SEC, Jim Gregory's Cabinet, Faculty Council Chairs, and Chairs of the Bothell and Tacoma Faculty. The Provost will compose a final set of guidelines in Jan-Feb 2013 which will be shared with the faculty senate shortly thereafter. The SPWG’s next meeting is January 17, 2013 at which time we will turn our attention to question 2: “Are there entirely new salary models that might be more sustainable and flexible over the next decade?”

**Online Learning:** One need only read the headlines to see the impact online learning will have (is having) on all forms of education across this country, not just higher education. Jan Carline, chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, shared the Council’s year-long evidence-based review of the strengths and limitations of online learning with the Senate in December, 2011. The implications of online education on access, quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, even intellectual property are broad. The potential benefits of online learning are unlimited, if implemented strategically and guided by an evidence base. This year we will address the most recent developments in online education at the UW: the Proposed Online Undergraduate Degree Completion Program Pilot, MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses), and Coursera (a platform to offer MOOCs). The Degree Completion proposal was discussed at length at the Oct 15, 2012 SCPB meeting and Oct 25, 2012 Senate meeting. Discussions will continue as the details of this proposed program coalesce.

**Intellectual Property (IP):** As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate’s attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. This discussion led to the discovery that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, IPMAC has been reinstated by the President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In
September 2012, Ana Mari established a work group to revise the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. The workgroup revised the Compensation Form and submitted it to the Senate Leadership on 11/14/12 for their review. The revised Compensation Form was addressed at the Nov 26, 2012 SCPB meeting and was reviewed by the newly established Special Committee on IP and Commercialization (SCIPC) on Nov 27, 2012. The establishment of the SCIPC was approved by the SEC on November 5, 2012. SCIPC is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty Intellectual Property, including its management and commercialization. These policies are broadly outlined in EO 36 and APS 59.4, and managed in part through the Center for Commercialization (C4C). Any proposed changes to such policies/practices shall be brought to this Special Committee as a part of shared governance. This special committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members (voting) and a presidential designee (nonvoting). One of the faculty members will be the Chair of the Faculty Council on Research. Members will normally serve a three year term, but the initial terms will be staggered. Members include: Susan Astley, School of Public Health (serving as Chair); Kate O’Neill, School of Law; Matthew Sparke, A&S; Duane Storti, College of Engineering; Tueng Shen, School of Medicine; and Gerald Miller, Physics and Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, and Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff, Office of President (serving as the Presidential designee). The SCIPC will have a webpage posted on the Senate website. Meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes will be posted. Our review of the revised Compensation Form on Nov 27, 2012 is attached below. Our next meeting is scheduled for January 29, 2013.

Gender Equity in Faculty Promotion and Tenure: In my final report to the Regents in June, 2012, I addressed the topic of gender equity at the UW. The timing of my report coincided with the week Congress failed to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; an Act requiring equal pay for comparable work. Overall, women in the U.S. make 77 cents to a man’s dollar. I shared with the Regents that I could not help but notice some compelling statistics presented in the University of Washington 2011 Facts for Academic Personnel, included in their meeting notes for the day. While 53% of students (undergraduate through professional) are female, only 38% of the faculty is female. This statistic becomes more troubling as you compare the proportion of female faculty across the ranks (Lecturer 58%, Assistant Professor 45%, Associate Professor 43%, Full Professor 27%). There are even a handful of departments at the University of Washington that have never promoted a woman to full professor in the history of the department. Among the Tenure/Tenure Track faculty, the proportion of women has increased by only 5 percentage points over the past ten years (2001 29% women, 2011 34% women). The New Hire statistics for 2011 may help explain, in part, why so little progress has been made in the past ten years. Only 44% of Professional Faculty new hires were female. The percentage of female hires drops precipitously as one advances up the ranks (47% of Assistant Professors hired were female; 36% of Associate Professors hired were female; and only 18% of Full Professors hired were female). Of the 3,899 professional faculty in 2011, 52% are tenure/tenure track, 38% WOT, and 10% Research. Of the tenure/tenure track positions across the schools in 2011, many schools had less than 25% of their tenure positions held by women (Public Health 23%, Pharmacy 25%, Medicine 21%, Environment 25%, Foster 19%, Engineering 20%). The proportion of assistant, associate, and full professors who are female within each department in 2012 is posted on the Senate website. These statistics do not bode well for gender equity in faculty rank and underscore the importance of a thorough review of gender equity in salary compensation. It will be important to identify and minimize factors that may be impeding women from advancing to or being hired into full professor positions. This topic was addressed at the November 29, 2012 Senate meeting and the January 7, 2013 SCPB meeting. The Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed A Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographics that requested all units and departments “make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year”. Resources to help that discussion are posted on the Senate website under Issues Under Consideration.
Dear Jack Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the November 2012 draft of the revised “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. The newly established SCIPC held its first meeting on November 27th. The focus of the meeting was the review of this form.

The group as a whole felt the revised form was an improvement over the current (Rev. Oct 2011) form. We felt the work group succeeded in creating a form that was clearer, more informative, more focused, and easier to complete.

Our discussion of the form centered primarily on Section D. Intellectual Property.

We felt the three bulleted paragraphs in Section D were clear.

Regarding the assignment of intellectual property, we considered three alternatives:

1. No assignment (consistent with the Compensation Form prior to the Oct 2011 revision)
2. Narrow assignment (as conceptually described in the Nov 2012 draft)
3. Broad assignment (as conceptually described in the Nov 2012 draft)

After considerable deliberation, SCIPC unanimously concluded that assignment language should not be included in the Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation form. Assignment of an invention prior to its invention cannot take into consideration the unique and complex issues that may be inherent in an invention. For example, what if this outside work activity is to be conducted by a group of faculty from different departments/schools? Who is the inventor? Who has the authority to assign rights? How can these questions be answered if the invention has not yet been invented?

The committee felt a more appropriate approach for dealing with assignment of inventions at this very early stage in an outside work effort is the approach conveyed in the Notice paragraph on page 2 and copied below.

NOTICE: You should carefully review any agreements with the outside organization to be certain you make no promises that are inconsistent with this assignment or your other UW obligations. Your agreement with the outside organization should contain the provision “To the extent the consulting agreement is inconsistent with any of the UW employee’s obligations to the UW, the employee’s obligations to the UW shall prevail.”

If the statement “To the extent the consulting agreement is inconsistent with any of the UW employee’s obligations to the UW, the employee’s obligations to the UW shall prevail.” is not sufficient to legally protect/prevent a faculty member from entering into an agreement inconsistent with the faculty member’s obligations to the UW, then we suggest this language be further refined to ensure such protection.

It is imperative faculty are in compliance with Administrative Policy Statement 59.4 (Technology Transfer) and EO57 (Outside Professional Work Policy) when engaged in outside professional work. We feel the best way to ensure this is to derive language that legally notifies the outside organization that the faculty member cannot engage in an agreement that is inconsistent with the UW employee’s obligations. This notice should be shared with the outside organization prior to the signing of any contracts or agreements with the faculty member. And any signed contract/agreement that fails to honor this prior notification would be considered legally not binding.
Once again, thank you for the opportunity to review this draft and provide comment. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

Susan Astley Ph.D. Chair SCIPC  
Professor of Epidemiology and Pediatrics

Enclosure

cc: Secretary of the Faculty
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL WORK FOR COMPENSATION

The UW's Outside Professional Work Policy requires faculty members, librarians, and all other academic personnel to obtain University approval before engaging in outside professional activities for any type of compensation. Purely voluntary work for which no financial payment, property rights, or other tangible benefit of any sort will be received does not require approval. Approval of each outside work activity for compensation must be obtained each academic year before you engage in the requested activity.

NOTICE: Your compliance with the Outside Professional Work Policy provides you significant protection from potential complaints under the Washington State Ethics Act, RCW 42.52.

Submitting the Request

1. Fill in the blanks below and print and sign the request form.
2. Send the request to your department chair or program director for review and recommendation.
3. The department chair or program director will evaluate the request, make a recommendation, and submit the request and recommendation to the appropriate dean, chancellor, or vice provost, for further action. Under some circumstances, review by the Provost’s Office may also be necessary.

A. Applicant Information

Name ______________________________________ Employee ID No. _______________
Campus Box _______________ College/School/Department _______________________
Job Title ______________________  % FTE _______  Service Period (e.g., 9 or 12 months) _______
Are you here on a work visa?  no ☐ yes ☑ (type ________________)
Have you read the Outside Professional Work Policy within the past year?  yes ☑ no ☐
If not, please do so before continuing, since failure to comply with the Policy puts you at individual risk. The Policy contains specific exemptions, conditions, and limitations.

B. Information About the Outside Organization

Name of Organization ______________________________________________________
Type of Organization (e.g., For-Profit, Not-For-Profit; Public (Federal, State, Regional, or Local agency)) __________

- Do you or a member of your immediate family (including any significant other) have ownership, management, day-to-day participation, or other significant or continuous involvement with the outside organization that is deeper than a usual consulting relationship? yes ☐ no ☐
  If so, please describe the involvement
  __________________________________________________________________________
  __________________________________________________________________________
  __________________________________________________________________________

C. Information about the Outside Work

Brief description of the activities to be performed

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Period of Work during the Academic Year (July 1 – June 30) _________________
Number of Days Requested for Activity _________________
- Will other UW employees or students be involved in this work? yes ☐ no ☐
- Are you receiving or do you anticipate receiving any UW research funding from the organization? yes ☐ no ☐
If the answer to either question in this Section C is “yes,” please explain here, including any eGC1 numbers for any existing research funding:

_____________________________________________________________________________

D. Intellectual Property (Please refer to Administrative Policy Statement 59.4.7)

- Is there any possibility that this work will result in the transfer or use of information that is not publicly-available or any technology or invention or software of commercial value developed at the UW that is not in the public domain? yes □ no □
  If the answer is “yes,” please describe the non-public information, technology, or invention, or software:

_____________________________________________________________________________

- Is there any possibility that you will make more than de minimis use of any UW equipment, supplies, facilities, or non-public information while performing this outside work? yes □ no □
  If the answer is “yes,” please describe the equipment, supplies, facilities, or non-public information:

_____________________________________________________________________________

- In this outside work, will you be participating in activities that are likely to result in inventions, novel technologies, or software of commercial value? yes □ no □

  VERSION 1: NARROW ASSIGNMENT [Conceptually described below]
  [This version would provide that if the answer to any question in this Section D is “yes,” the applicant would please initial a paragraph that assigned to the UW all the applicant’s rights to any inventions developed as a consequence of, or in any way related to this outside work, the rights to which the UW would be entitled under the UW Patent, Invention, and Copyright Policy]
  OR
  VERSION 2: BROAD ASSIGNMENT [Conceptually described below]
  [This version would provide that if the answer to any question in this Section D is “yes,” the applicant would please initial a paragraph that assigned to the UW all the applicant’s rights to any inventions to which the UW would be entitled under the UW Patent, Invention, and Copyright Policy.]

NOTICE: You should carefully review any agreements with the outside organization to be certain you make no promises that are inconsistent with this assignment or your other UW obligations. Your agreement with the outside organization should contain the provision “To the extent the consulting agreement is inconsistent with any of the UW employee’s obligations to the UW, the employee’s obligations to the UW shall prevail.”

Applicant’s Signature

In submitting this request, I certify that the Statements above are truthful to the best of my knowledge.

__________________________
Signature                              Date

Chair/Director and Dean/Vice Provost Approval

I am confident on the basis of the information provided that the proposed outside work:

- Is not within, or a duplication of, the UW duties of the Applicant or under the Applicant’s supervision;
- Does not fall within the scope of the Applicant’s grant or contract funding at the UW;
- Will not interfere with the Applicant’s primary obligations to the UW;
• If it involves consulting with another state entity, RCW 42.12.120 has been followed;
• If applicable, a conflict management plan has been prepared and implemented; and
• If applicable, a deeper involvement review has been completed pursuant to Executive Order 57, Section 6.C.

I □ approve □ do not approve this request. I □ approve □ do not approve this request.

Chair/Director Signature Date Dean/Vice Provost Signature Date

Provost Approval (where needed)

I □ approve □ do not approve this request.
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jim Fridley, Professor, Environmental and Forest Sciences and Mechanical Engineering

The 2013 Washington State Legislature convenes on Monday, January 14, 2013, for a 105 day session that is scheduled to adjourn on Sunday, April 28. The 2013-2015 biennial budget will be developed and approved this session and doing so will most likely be the legislative action with the greatest impact on us at the University of Washington. But reaching agreement on our state’s increasingly complicated budget has become difficult enough that extra time, in the form of a 30 day special session, seems to have become an accepted requirement. This year the fiscal committees will look different from recent sessions due to a combination of structural changes, the widely publicized leadership changes in the Senate, and committee membership changes in both the House and the Senate. Another change from not too many years ago is that higher education has become a marquee issue in the legislature because of its acknowledged importance to the people and businesses of the state, concerns about the state’s ability to support it, and the cost of attending college and the implications of that cost on students and their families.

As we know, for public higher education to best do the work it does to accomplish its public mission it needs substantially greater state financial support and to maintain or increase the freedom to chart its own course and conduct its own business. But the upcoming conversations in the legislature, and probably many of their proposals, will likely seem counter to those things. Rather than enthusiastically discussing how higher education can be empowered to best fulfill its public mission and reach ever higher levels of excellence, the conversations will inevitably be about becoming more “lean” and efficient, being more accountable, better controlling costs, making college more affordable, reducing student debt, increasing access and opportunity, and focusing us on degrees that are believed to be most desirable to employers. So one of the higher education community’s biggest challenges over the coming weeks will be to use those inevitable conversations to help our state’s leaders and policy makers understand how well we already address their desires and needs through our work and how we can do even more good, change even more lives, better strengthen our communities and, yes, be even more efficient, more transparent, more affordable to more students, and more accessible to more citizens and businesses – when we in higher education are more empowered and better supported by the state we serve.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns you have. And, as always, I appreciate your help during the legislative session and I thank you for letting me serve you in the Faculty Legislative Representative role.

Jim
fridley@uw; 3-6993; 206-914-8454
Report of Faculty Council Activities

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

In addition to normal business reviewing curriculum changes, major topics that FCAS is undertaking are:

1. Implementation of revised satisfactory progress policy.
2. Enrollment restrictions imposed on students in fee-based programs.
3. Potential diversity graduation requirement.
4. Review of Distance Learning Supplement for Course Change and New Course forms.
5. Student Effort versus Credits Earned in courses.
6. UW Educational Outreach Degree Completion Initiative.
7. Proposed Humanities Major in the College of Arts and Sciences.
8. Proposed Bachelor of Science degree in Integrated Sciences from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

1. Advocate changing increased faculty contributions at age 50 from “opt-in” to “opt-out.”
2. Provide through the faculty senate process information to faculty regarding benefits and retirement.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

1. P&T Issues – Openness and consideration of collegiality in the P&T process.
2. Consideration of proposed Class A Legislation to strengthen Academic Freedom in the Faculty Code.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Last year, FCMA drafted and proposed changes to the Faculty Code in order to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions. Currently, FCMA is working with the ASUW regarding their proposed Diversity Requirement for Undergraduates and assisted the Faculty Senate Leadership to address concerns on faculty demographics.

Faculty Council on Research

FCR is continuing to monitor and promote activities strengthening the research environment at the University (our goal as stated in October, 2010). One of FCR’s activities is to review proposals from UW researchers containing restrictions of various sorts (publication policies, personnel, data transfer, etc). FCR dealt with two such proposals of this sort last year.

This quarter FCR will hear presentations regarding challenges for the Research at UW, an update on Federal Budget Sequestration, Human Subjects Division Post Approval Verification and Education Program, the impacts of Sound Transit’s tunnel below campus, and Intellectual Property issues.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

FCSA continues to conduct discussions on issues pertinent to students, including recent topics on admissions policies and standards, campus renovations, revisions of the Student Conduct Code, the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative, and the faculty appeal board.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

FCTL continues to discuss strategies for faculty development in the use of educational technology, issues of using technology to increase class size, and increasing student engagement. Current agenda items include technology priories across campus (Canvas, Tegrity, MyPlan and e-texts), efforts to assist faculty
in “flipping the classroom,” online course evaluations, working to resolve Classroom Support Services issues and discussion on the Online Undergraduate Degree Completion initiative.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

1. Conducting a review of tri-campus information dissemination and faculty member representation between the three faculty governance structures.
2. Reviewing issues related to student conduct code violations and how they are disseminated and treated if/when student seeks cross-campus enrollment.
3. Examination of processes related to cross-campus degrees/minors and role of UW Curriculum Committee.
4. Coordinated Faculty Senate communication of tri-campus awareness regarding governance, policies, new issues, budget, etc.
5. Budget and legislative representation related to tri-campus strategic planning.
7. Examination of variations/changes to faculty handbook that affect UWT/UWB faculty.
8. Cross-campus faculty research activities/opportunities – and an examination of selection processes related to limited submission research applications from the University of Washington.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services FCUFS continues to examine current construction projects, including the Stadium, housing west of 15th, childcare for the UW community, the Animal Research and Care Facility, and Fluke Hall. Other topics have included the impact of Sound Transit at the edge of campus, the UW Smartgrid Project, 520 bridge expansion, bicycles, and the Burke-Gilman Trail.

Faculty Council on University Libraries

1. Implementation of the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence, as approved by the Faculty Senate. Fund website is located at: https://www.washington.edu/giving/make-a-gift?source_typ=3&source=LIBFAC.
2. Facilitation of Open Access publishing at the UW. The FCUL will continue to seek to engage faculty and students in submitting documentation of their past, current, and future research (i.e., archival and grey literature) to the open access repository ResearchWorks.
3. Strengthening educational partnerships/ the development of a sustainable academic business plan. The FCUL will continue to investigate ways to bring emerging Libraries technologies and initiatives into UW courses. The strategic plan will consider a wide variety of issues, including fee-based and distance courses and programs.
4. Employment of multi-institutional approaches. The FCUL will provide input to continuing Libraries efforts to lead and leverage multi-institutional Libraries initiatives, related to e.g., the Hathi Trust, the Western Storage Trust, and Orbis Cascade activities.
5. Libraries issues related to capital projects. For example, the FCUL will continue to monitor the Odegaard renovation.
6. Inclusion of Librarians on the Senate. The FCUL will continue to follow up on the 2009-2012 discussions on representation of Librarians on the Faculty Senate, the SEC, and on the Faculty.
7. General planning for collections, services, and staff. The FCUL will advise the Libraries on changes in collections, services, and staff in support of its strategic plan and necessitated by continuing budget constraints. Initial topics include the subject librarian framework, physical and virtual space planning, etc.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

1. Efforts to inform and support the actions of the Faculty Senate regarding improving faculty demographics.
2. Survey of Non-Ladder Faculty – Dissemination of the report based on last year’s work of FCWA, and follow up with administration to pursue report recommendations.
3. Faculty Mentoring Program
a. Follow-up on creation of sub-committee on mentoring by Board of Deans, providing information gathered by FCWA in 2010-11 and supplementing that information as required
b. Development of “Faculty Matters” memos relevant to all faculty, with emphasis on women, garnered from issues raised in FCWA surveys of both ladder and non-ladder faculty
4. Review of issues relevant to women on campus.

Reminder: Approved council minutes are always available online at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/committees/councils.html
Member and Representative (Ex-officio) Faculty Council and Committee Nominations

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (Meets Mondays at 1:30)

- Audrey Peek, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as a member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30 p.m.)

- Elise Randall, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Michael Kutz, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesday at 9:00 a.m.)

- Julian Rees, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Jeffrey McNerney, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30 p.m.)

- Noralis Rodriguez, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Research (Meets Wednesdays at 9:00 a.m.)

- Jia Yin, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Kiehl Sundt, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 1:30 p.m.)

- Will Scott, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Michael Kutz, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30 a.m.)

- Elise Randall, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Michael Kutz, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00 a.m.)

- Elise Randall, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Maxine Sugarman, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.

Faculty Council on University Facilities & Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00 a.m.)

- Daniel Coslett, Graduate and Professional Student Senate, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Cody Vardy, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.)

- Gennie Gebhart, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
November 16, 2012

Secretary of the Faculty Nominating Committee
Faculty Senate Office
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Dear Nominating Committee:

I am honored to have been nominated for a second term as Secretary of the Faculty of the University of Washington (UW). The position offers the opportunity to advance the role of faculty in the shared governance of the University and to contribute to the ongoing excellence of the University. Since assuming the position of Secretary of the Faculty in July 2008, I have found the position to be stimulating, challenging, and deeply satisfying. I believe I have a record of success in the position and that my experience and insights gained during the past term would contribute to ongoing effectiveness should I be appointed for a second term. I am pleased to submit my name for consideration for this important position.

I have been a tenured faculty member in the School of Nursing (SON) since 1985, having completed both my MN (1974) and PhD (1982) at the UW. During my tenure as a faculty member I have held a number of informal and formal faculty leadership and administrative positions, as listed in my accompanying vitae. I served as department chair (Family and Child Nursing) from 1990-99. This administrative position provided me with experience in academic and budget planning, faculty and staff supervision and development, and university-wide collaboration. I had the good fortune to extend my inter-disciplinary and multi-campus university experience through leadership of several faculty councils and university committees including chairing the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy and the President’s Advisory Committee on Women.

These opportunities led me to my current position as Secretary of the Faculty, a position to which I was elected by the Senate Executive Committee in 2008. In this capacity I have had the privilege of learning deeply about the diversity and uniqueness of the schools, colleges, and campuses of the UW and about how shared governance is implemented within our university. I will briefly identify some of my accomplishments in major dimensions of the Secretary’s role:

1. *Administrator, Office of University Committees and Faculty Senate.* In this capacity I have had the responsibility for developing and overseeing the office budget and direct supervision of three professional staff that support the work of the Faculty Senate and its officers, 11 university faculty councils, and faculty governance in 18 schools, colleges, and campuses. When I assumed the position of Secretary of the Faculty, I learned that the office staff and leadership had a recent history of conflict and division that was interfering with optimal functioning and also that the office would be taking a 30% budget cut (similar to other administrative units on campus). A major accomplishment during the early phase of my tenure in this position was the restructuring of the office budget, the staff positions, and services, including upgrading support staff from classified to professional positions and overseeing the transition to a new faculty database, to improve quality and reduce costs. The office now is characterized by highly effective teamwork, positive and collaborative relationships, and more efficient office processes, including more environmentally sustainable practices.

2. *Management of faculty adjudicative proceeding, disputes, and concerns regarding faculty rights and responsibilities.* The Secretary of the Faculty plays a critical role in advising faculty and administrators about the rights and responsibilities of faculty as outlined in the Faculty Code. This role requires skills as an educator, mediator, and sensitive listener while maintaining a reputation for integrity, respect for all parties, and honesty. My philosophy is that all efforts should be made to resolve disputes at the lowest level possible. Implementing that philosophy requires a delicate balance between informing faculty of and supporting them in their rights to formal adjudication while also actively working to support informal processes for resolution. Effectiveness in this role includes establishing collaborative working relationships with the University Ombudsman, UCIRO,
Academic Human Resources, and Deans, Chancellors, and Department Chairs as well as respectful and caring interactions with faculty experiencing stress. I believe I have been effective in improving the use of informal dispute resolution options such as conciliation and have established positive working relationships throughout the university that I believe contributes to successful outcomes for faculty experiencing conflicts or disciplinary actions.

3. **Member of the Faculty Senate leadership team.** As noted in the call for nominations, the Secretary, “….assists in orienting new Faculty Senate and Faculty Council Chairs toward the most effective ways to work together with their colleagues in the faculty and the university administration…and acts as an advisor and provides counsel to the Senate and faculty leadership….” Because the term of office for the Secretary is longer than that of Senate and Council chairs and because the Secretary is charged to maintain records of faculty governance, the Secretary has the opportunity to provide guidance to the leadership team based on specific knowledge of the Faculty Code and its history as well as historical perspectives on faculty governance and practices. Each incoming Senate chair has his/her individual priorities and leadership style that provides ongoing opportunities for development of the role of faculty governance at the UW. I have made concerted efforts to build a leadership team that, while always changing in its composition, is collaborative and effective, inclusive of all the Senate officers and office staff and believe that I have become a respected and valued member of the leadership team as it evolves each year.

4. **Facilitate faculty governance in the University Faculty Committees/Councils and Schools/Colleges/Campuses.** I have worked extensively on several major initiatives with faculty councils, especially FCFA, including active involvement in 1) the proposal to and evaluation of the restructure the Faculty Senate, 2) evaluation and restructuring of the Faculty Councils that resulted in the formation of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning and strengthened the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, implemented an effective faculty council recruitment and scheduling plan, and 3) initiating proposals to promote increased openness in Promotion and Tenure procedures. I have also, in collaboration with several Senate chairs, promoted and facilitated the strengthening of elected faculty councils (EFC) in the 18 schools, colleges, and campuses by increasing opportunities for regular communication among the EFC chairs about best practices in shared governance and providing outreach to individual EFCs and their faculties.

One advantage of having a five year term of service is the ability to identify, over time, areas for improvement and strategies to tackle issues that may take an extended period to address. While I have completed several significant projects during my first term as Secretary, I have also identified several additional areas needing attention. These include the need to re-envision the RCEP process, to further enhance best practices in dispute resolution at the UW, and to work intensively with several identified schools/colleges/campuses to strengthen the status of shared governance in their units. These would be included in my priorities should I be successfully reappointed to serve a second term as Secretary of the Faculty.

I was very pleased to receive a highly positive evaluation of my effectiveness at the end of the third year of my five year term. I believe I’ve been successful because of my ability to build effective partnerships, collaborate across disciplines, cultures, and academic units and to communicate with sensitivity, compassion, and clarity. I am a good listener and enjoy working collaboratively with others to solve problems and advance goals, at the individual or the system level. I believe that leadership within an academic institution is fundamentally a service position, for the well-being of the unit, the institution, and the various stakeholders. I’ve learned valuable lessons in leadership from each of the positions I’ve held in my career to date and believe I am in a position to contribute to the further advancement of the Faculty Senate and Office of University Committees.

Thank you for your consideration of my application.

Sincerely,

Marcia Killien, PhD, RN, FAAN, Professor, Family and Child Nursing, Secretary of the Faculty, killien@uw.edu
University of Washington

Department of Intercollegiate Athletics

2012-2013 Budget Overview
University of Washington  
Department of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Financial Overview for 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenues</th>
<th>2012-2013 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gate Revenues</td>
<td>$20,508 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions (seat related and Husky Sports)</td>
<td>20,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA and Conference Distributions</td>
<td>21,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Rights (radio, signage, local TV)</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsorships, Donated Advertising and Supplies</td>
<td>4,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded Tuition Waivers</td>
<td>3,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions, Souvenirs, Parking, Boat Moorage</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income (endowment distributions)</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,562 k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$30,907 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>10,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team and Administrative Travel</td>
<td>5,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Game</td>
<td>4,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees Paid to Visiting Schools</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated Advertising and Supplies</td>
<td>3,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Overhead, Utilities, Repairs, Maintenance</td>
<td>4,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>7,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,395 k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Margin                                        | $7,167 k         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Operating Revenues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for Facilities</td>
<td>$1,000 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized Gain (Loss) on CBF</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,985 k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>$2,494 k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,628 k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Increase (Decrease) to Operating Fund Balance        | $5,524 k         |

| Projected Year End Unrestricted Operating Fund Balance   | $11,433 k        |

| Projected Year End Endowment Fund Balance                | $41,795 k        |
Operating Revenue Assumptions for the 2012-2013 Budget

Gate Revenues ($24,508k)
- $15,128k Football gate revenues less city taxes for six 2013 home games at Century Link Field
- $590 Visiting team share received for away non-conference football game at LSU
- $1,680k Football Subtotal

- $3,750k Men’s basketball gate revenues less city taxes for 2012-2013 home games
- $1,050 Women’s basketball home games
- $350 Olympic sports home events
- $65 Ticket handling fees
- $20,558k Total

Contributions Except for Facilities ($20,259k)
- $8,977k Football Type donor seat-related contributions for the 2013 football season
- $2,200 Men’s basketball seat-related contributions
- $25 Women’s basketball seat-related contributions
- $1,050 Gifts for scholarships in addition to any seat-related gifts
- $1,250 Building Fund for Excellence contributions ($75 for most non-student football season tickets)
- $3,362 Don James Center contributions received in advance for the 2012 through 2017 seasons
- $25 Other contributions (Alaska Airlines naming, Husky Sports contributions etc.)
- $20,259k Total

NCAA and Conference Distributions ($21,340k)
- $16,177k Pac-12 football and men’s basketball TV revenue
- $2,385 Rose Bowl/BCS and other bowl game share (equal share to all Pac-12 schools)
- $1,350 Men’s Basketball NCAA Tournament (equal share to all Pac-12 schools)
- $291 Pac-12 Basketball tournament revenues
- $777 NCAA distribution based on number of games played
- $308 NCAA distribution for the Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund
- $222 NCAA distribution based on number of sports sponsored
- $64 NCAA distribution for academic enhancement
- $11 Conference distribution of miscellaneous income
- $21,340k Total

Multimedia Rights ($4,000k)
- $4,000k Radio broadcast and scoreboard advertising (year 2 of 3 year contract with IMG)
- $4,000k Total

Other Sponsorships, Donated Advertising and Supplies ($4,754k)
- $840k Donated advertising value related to the IMG contract (offsets expense line item)
- $2,000 Donated athletic supplies value from contract with Nike. This is year 4 of 10 year contract, (offsets expense line item in the sports budget)
- $85 Trademarks and Licensing (ICA receives 70% after expenses)
- $650 Nike cash (year 4 of 10 year contract)
- $350 Others (Gateline, Whidbeyline, Affinity etc.)
- $4,754k Total
State Funded Tuition Waivers ($3,336k)  
$3,336k  Approved amount for 2012-2013

Concessions, Souvenirs, Parking, Boat Moorage ($305k)  
$225k  Food concession sales in year 1 of 5 year contract with Aramark (no food concession revenue this year from football games at Century Link Field)  
$100k  Souvenir concession sales at Team Shop, at events and online (year 1 of 5 year contract with fansites)  
$80k  Parking revenue from home football games  
$305k  Total

Investment Income from Endowment Distributions ($1,580k)  
$1,580k  Distribution of endowment income  
$1,580k  Total

Other Revenues ($880k)  
$650k  Facilities rental  
$60k  Laundry (IMA toweling)  
$160k  Other revenues (in-house football camp, sports medicine custodial, etc.)  
$880k  Total

Operating Expense Assumptions for the 2012-2013 Budget

Salaries and Benefits ($36,907k)  
- No salary increases for professional and contract staff except as per existing contract agreements  
- No salary increases for classified SFU and WISE staff except for automatic step increases  
- Performance and academic incentives for contract staff included  
- Benefits loading rates included

Financial Aid ($10,813k)  
- 268 total scholarships (133 out of state and 85 in state)  
- 16% increase for in-state tuition  
- 6% increase for out-of-state tuition

Team and Administrative Travel ($5,410k)  
- $4.5 million in team travel  
- $960k in recruiting and administrative travel  
- Balance for travel transaction fees, new employee relocation, job candidate travel, SeatMe parking, etc.

Day of Game ($4,434k)  
- Six home football games at Century Link in 2012-2013  
- Event costs for men’s basketball, women’s basketball and 18 Olympic Sports  
- Includes cost of buses for fans on football game days

Guarantees Paid to Visiting Teams ($1,802k)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football (two non-conference home games vs. San Diego State and Portland State)</td>
<td>$1,275k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball home games</td>
<td>50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sports</td>
<td>23k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,348k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Donated Advertising and Supplies ($234k)**
- $640k Donated advertising value related to IMG contract (offsets revenue line item)
- $2,500 Donated athletic supplies value from contract with Nike (offsets revenue line item)
- **$2,740k Total**

**Supplies and Equipment ($1,755k)**
- Includes athletic, office, institutional, general program, printing, custodial and video/audio supplies.

**Institutional Overhead, Utilities, Repairs, Maintenance ($4,455k)**
- $2,150k Projected institutional overhead paid to UW for centralized services
- 500 Electricity (based on past usage)
- 250 Steam (based on past usage)
- 190 Water (based on past usage)
- 1,365 Maintenance of facilities, maintenance contracts (computer, video, copies, etc.),
  telephone equipment (installation and lines) and waste disposal
- **$4,455k Total**

**Other Expenses ($7,450k)**
- The budgeted amounts are as follows:
  - $1,500 Pac-12 Conference Office assessment
  - 1,122 Training table, pre-season housing meals and break meals
  - 675 Credit card merchant fees
  - 398 Medical expenses (medical providers and supplies)
  - 458 Marketing outreach and website for renovated Husky Stadium
  - 438 Advertising and promotions
  - 394 Printing
  - 325 Insurance (property, travel, loss of revenue)
  - 302 Department relations
  - 272 Banquets and special events
  - 259 Visiting recruits (48-hour visits)
  - 237 NCAA Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund
  - 199 Postage
  - 166 Telephone (cellular and long distance)
  - 199 Shipping service
  - 193 Memberships, dues/fees, subscriptions
  - 44 Attorneys (financial audit and agreed upon procedures)
  - 40 Legal fees
  - 36 Freight
  - 165 Other (consultants, football camp, band misc. expenses, etc.)
- **$7,450k Total**
Code Interpretation Request to Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

On several occasions when distribution of salary monies has been discussed, I’ve had questions about when and if differential amounts/percentages can be distributed to 1) schools/colleges/campuses and/or 2) departments/programs (vs. equal percentage distribution to all units of the UW). It isn’t totally clear to me as I read the Faculty Code (and EO64) if the term “unit” is consistently used throughout. For example, in Chapter 24-71 B.1., “unit” appears to refer to schools/colleges/campuses but in 24-71-B.2. “unit” appears to refer to departments (in departmentalized schools/colleges). Past practice may also reflect this confusion. When unit adjustments were authorized under Provost Wise, the calculations and allocations were based on departments. But in “additional merit” allocations in past years some deans have distributed funds equally to all departments while others have not, which means that they assume the unit is the college.

I believe the question of interpretation is important to clarify before the Provost sends instructions to the Deans about allocation of salary monies to be sure the directions are consistent with the Code. Some of the questions are:

1. Can funds for “additional merit” be distributed differently to schools/colleges/campuses or must these funds go equally to all?
2. If funds for “additional merit” are distributed equally to all schools/colleges/campuses, can the deans differentially allocate these funds among constituent departments or must they be distributed equally to all departments?
3. If unit adjustments must be “self-funded” this year, can those unit adjustments occur (differentially) at the department level or must they be allocated to the whole college? And does a unit-adjustment go equally to all faculty within that unit, or differentially to individual faculty within the unit based on merit or some other criteria?

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations advisory opinion follows.

9 January 2013

From: Mícheál F. Vaughan, Chair, Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations
To: James Gregory, Chair, Faculty Senate

I have consulted with the Advisory Committee about the questions you posed and what appears below is a summary of our (collective) opinion about them.

1. Can funds for “additional merit” be distributed differently to schools/colleges/campuses or must these funds go equally to all?

REPLY: Section 24-71.B.1 indicates that funds for “additional merit” must be distributed in equal-percentage amounts to all units, however units are defined (see the reply to question 2). Minimally, therefore, these funds must be distributed equally to schools/colleges/campuses.

2. If funds for “additional merit” are distributed equally to all schools/colleges/campuses, can the deans differentially allocate these funds among constituent departments or must they be distributed equally to all departments?

REPLY: The term “unit” or “academic unit” is used consistently throughout the Faculty Code to refer to departments and undepartmentalized schools and colleges (and, at least inferentially, to campuses), and not to departmentalized schools and colleges (and, again inferentially, to campuses). The term “unit” is specifically distinguished from departmentalized colleges in Sections 24-54.B (“the candidate’s college and unit”), 24-55.A (“department (unit) chairs, and
Therefore Section 24-71.B.1 requires that the distribution of “additional merit” funds must be made in equal-percentage amounts to all departmental “units” in a departmentalized college and school (and campus).

3. If unit adjustments must be “self-funded” this year, can those unit adjustments occur differentially at the department level or must they be allocated to the whole college? And does a unit-adjustment go equally to all faculty within that unit, or differentially to individual faculty within the unit based on merit or some other criteria?

REPLY: The “self-funding” of unit adjustments is not discussed in the Faculty Code. Allocation of “self-funded” funds would appear to be within the authority of the President to allocate funds under 24-71.A and subject to the same requirements as allocated funds from other sources.

Section 24-71.B.2 authorizes the Provost to allocate and distribute unit adjustments, if any, to individual units—i.e. departments and undepartmentalized schools and colleges (and campuses)—and authorizes department chairs and the deans of undepartmentalized schools, colleges (and, by inference, the Chancellors of UWB and UWT) to further distribute those funds to their faculty, all with consultation of the appropriate faculty bodies.

Thus the Provost may differentially allocate unit-adjustment funds to specific departments, and need not allocate them to a whole college. Units receiving unit adjustment funds may differentially allocate these funds to individual faculty within the unit.

Since there is no demonstrable use of “unit” to refer to individual faculty, or to subdepartmental groups of faculty, the Provost, or deans with delegated allocation authority, may not allocate unit adjustment funds differentially to individual faculty or subdepartmental groups of faculty. But the units to whom such funds are allocated may distribute them to individuals or to groups of their faculty as they deem appropriate.

While we are not officially the responsible for interpreting Executive Orders, we do comment here on the related matters in EO 64:

Section 6 describes the Provost allocating unit adjustment funds to departmentalized schools and colleges, in addition to allocation to specific units, and the deans further allocating school and college unit adjustment funds to their departments, again after faculty consultation.

EO 64 and the Faculty Code can be reconciled by considering the Provost’s allocation of unit adjustment funds to departmentalized schools and colleges (and campuses for allocation by deans to be a delegation of the Provost’s authority to allocate unit adjustment funds to specific units under the Faculty Code).
Addendum:

On Monday, 7 January, the Secretary of the Faculty transmitted the following questions for us to consider:

In addition to the request sent previously, I've been asked if you could address whether or not the Code’s salary policy limits faculty with appointments (e.g. WOT, Research professorial appointments) funded (in whole or in part) from external funds (e.g. grants or contracts) to the same level of salary increases as state-funded (tenure-track) faculty. That is, for example, does the faculty code allow a faculty member appointed as a Professor WOT or Research Professor funded by external sources to receive a higher percentage increase than the amount set for regular and/or additional merit for tenure-track faculty? Under what provision would this occur and would there be any restriction/limit to the amount of increase?

Our response to these questions is the following:

We see nothing in the Faculty Code that distinguishes “source” of funds as a qualifying feature for salary increases, so we are inclined to answer that the Code does not allow (aside, of course, from individual retention offers) a “higher percentage increase” (under regular and/or additional merit) for faculty funded from “external sources.”

However, with ABB we can conceive of situations where the Provost's instructions about “additional merit” raises may declare a minimum University-wide percentage to be allocated, permitting individual schools/colleges (and campuses) who have the resources to make awards in excess of the minimum.

Since assessments of merit depend on a consideration of the entire record of colleagues, and the awards to individuals are often (as a result) quite varied, one might well factor in a colleague’s source of funding in determining his/her merit.

Finally, since the grounds for awarding a unit adjustment to a particular department (or undepartmentalized school/college) might well be because of the Provost's judgment about local or external “market” considerations affecting a particular unit—and be directed toward relieving any perceived inequities—that judgment may in turn mean that a particular group of faculty (e.g., WOT Assoc Pros, or Research Pros, or Senior Lecturers, or tenured Professors) could be the ones deemed to merit these salary enhancements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Campus</th>
<th>Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form</th>
<th>A/B Retentions</th>
<th>% Retention Pool</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan's School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean and Fishery Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. Acad. Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008-09 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>513</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>683</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009-10 Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan's School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean and Fishery Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009-10 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In response to competitive offer
Revised 10/31/12
## Retentions
**2008-09 to 2012-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Campus</th>
<th>Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form</th>
<th>A/B Retentions</th>
<th>.5% Retention Pool</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>95 (12*)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-11 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>324</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011-12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 (2*)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (1*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan's School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>97 (4*)</td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (1*)</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1*)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-12 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012-13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In response to competitive offer

Revised: /31/12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Campus</th>
<th>Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form</th>
<th>A/B Retentions</th>
<th>.5% Retention Pool</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan's School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012-13 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 individual rec'd both competitive and A/B

*In response to competitive offer

Revised 10/31/12
2011-12 Retentions

141 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2011 and October 31, 2011

24 (17.0%) funded with State funds

114 (80.9%) funded with Non-State funds

3 (2.1%) funded with a combinations of State and Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $412,817
Mean value of State funded retentions - $15,290
Median value of State funded retentions - $7,614

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $2,519,916
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $21,355
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $12,732
Mean % increase – 13.79%; Median % increase – 10.0%

20 (14.2%) in response to known competitive offer

105 retention salary adjustments were effective between November 1, 2011 and January 31, 2012

44 (41.9%) funded with State funds

61 (58.1%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $361,090
Mean value of State funded retentions - $8,024
Median value of State funded retentions - $7,470

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $1,583,238
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $26,387
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $15,960
Mean % increase – 11.97%; Median % increase – 10%

14 (13.3%) were in response to known competitive offer
2011-12 Retentions

141 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2011 and October 31, 2011

24 (17.0%) funded with State funds

114 (80.9%) funded with Non-State funds

3 (2.1%) funded with a combinations of State and Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $412,817

Mean value of State funded retentions - $15,290

Median value of State funded retentions - $7,614

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $2,519,916

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $21,355

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $12,732

Mean % increase – 13.79%; Median % increase – 10.0%

20 (14.2%) in response to known competitive offer

105 retention salary adjustments were effective between November 1, 2011 and January 31, 2012

44 (41.9%) funded with State funds

61 (58.1%) funded with Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $361,090

Mean value of State funded retentions - $8,024

Median value of State funded retentions - $7,470

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $1,583,238

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $26, 387

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $15,960

Mean % increase – 11.97%; Median % increase – 10%

14 (13.3%) were in response to known competitive offer
2011-12 Retentions

91 retention salary adjustments were effective between February 1, 2012 and April 30, 2012
4 (.40%) funded with State funds
87 (95.6%) funded with Non-State funds
Annualized value of State funded retentions - $66,537
Mean value of State funded retentions - $16,634
Median value of State funded retentions - $15,026
Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $1,798,440
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $20,672
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $16,428
Mean % increase – 15.63; Median % increase – 12.01
19 (20.9%) were in response to known competitive offer

36 retention salary adjustments were effective between May 1, 2012 and June 30, 2012
9 (25%) funded with State funds
27 (75%) funded with Non-State funds
Annualized value of State funded retentions - $122,571
Mean value of State funded retentions - $13,619
Median value of State funded retentions - $12,465
Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions – $505,785
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $18,064
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $15,756
Mean % increase – 14.50; Median % increase – 13.80
2 (5.6%) were in response to known competitive offer
2012-13 Retentions

192 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2012 and October 31, 2012

62 (32.3%) funded with State funds

128 (66.7%) funded with Non-State funds

2 (1.0%) funded with a combination of State and Non-State funds

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $812,749

Mean value of State funded retentions - $12,699

Median value of State funded retentions - $10,710

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $2,158,303

Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $16,476

Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $11,172

Mean % increase – 13.00; Median % increase – 10.01

25 (13.0%) were in response to known competitive offer
2011-12 Hiring Plan

Actions received and processed under the hiring plan 7/1/11 – 6/30/2012

Seattle campus was issued total of 242 hiring exemptions
UW Seattle: 95 hires or awards of tenure under hiring plan exemptions

Arts & Sciences 20
Business 9
College of Built Environments 0
College of Education 3
College of Engineering 6
College of the Environment 5
Evans School Public Affairs 1
i School 1
School of Dentistry 2
School of Law 2
School of Medicine 36
School of Nursing 2
School of Pharmacy 0
School of Public Health 6
School of Social Work 2

UW Bothell was issued total of 29 hiring exemptions
UW Bothell: 11 hires under hiring plan exemptions

UW Tacoma was issued total of 17 hiring exemptions
UW Tacoma: 11 hires under hiring plan exemptions

UW Libraries was issued total of 10 hiring exemptions
UW Libraries: 1 hire under hiring plan exemptions

11/14/2012

I:\groups\workgrps\acdpers\AHR\Hiring_Freeze\2009_11_Hiring_Plans\HFE_2011_Spreadsheets
Agenda  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Thursday, January 26, 2012, 2:30 p.m.  
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor Susan Astley.


4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the November 14, 2011, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the December 1, 2011, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Report of Faculty Council Activities.
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Confirm Secretary of the Faculty Position.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Announcements.

8. Unfinished Business.
   Class A Legislation – First Consideration.
   Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Title: Changes to “Without Tenure” Appointment Term Length.
   Action: Conduct review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

   a. Nomination of Candidates for 2012-13 Faculty Senate Vice Chair.
   b. 2012-13 Faculty Senate Vice Chair Candidates’ Presentations.
      The vice chair election will occur electronically within a week and will proceed unless there is an objection on the floor. Results will be announced via E-mail following the election certification.
      Motions involving Class C actions should be available in written form by incorporation in the agenda or distribution at the meeting. It is preferable that any resolution be submitted to the Senate Chair and Secretary of the Faculty no later than the Monday preceding a Senate meeting.

10. Invited Guests.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty  
Approved by: Susan Astley, Chair of the Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, February 2 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.