Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, February 9, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Absent: President Young
Guests: Diane Latteman, Benjamin Marwick, Juliya Ziskina, Tim Jewell, Aaron Vetter

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair O’Neill called the meeting to order at 2:33pm. The agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Senate Chair – Kate O’Neill [Exhibit A]

Chair O’Neill pointed members to her written report. O’Neill mentioned the upcoming resignation of President Young and the process to identify and appoint a replacement. The group briefly discussed the matter.

   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: Update provided at meeting.
   d. Report of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. [Exhibit D]

   JoAnn Taricani provided a brief update on the legislative session and apologized for her lack of a written report. Taricani indicated that lawmakers in Olympia were focused on student financial aid and affordability. The legislature was also hearing a bill regarding tuition setting authority. The cutoff for policy bills to advance out of committees was soon approaching and would significantly decrease the number of bills impacting the university. Budget discussions were largely occurring behind the scenes, so it was unclear if any budget enhancements were on the table.

   Patricia Kramer, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, attended to seek input regarding curriculum redundancy, specifically that there were increasing numbers of courses traditionally already offered by one unit being proposed by other schools and colleges. Members expressed concern that ABB funding was driving this practice. Provost Cauce asked the ABB committee to look into discounting the amount new equivalent courses get from ABB and urged the committee to prioritize student needs. Kramer emphasized the importance of ensuring that all equivalent courses are of the same quality.

   A second item Kramer shared was that FCAS had been considering a goals statement requirement as part of admissions. If the proposal were to move forward it would be in the form of Class B legislation.

   Jeff Wilkes, chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, asked the SEC for input about adding course evaluations to MyPlan and said he was working with FCAS. Duane Storti was concerned that evaluations could be viewed as a personnel record.

   There were no further questions or reports.

4. Report of the Provost and Executive Vice President – Ana Mari Cauce.

Provost Cauce attended on behalf of President Young. She shared that the process of notifying deans of the need to begin merit reviews had begun. Cauce hoped there would be funds for faculty and staff salary increases of 2-4%, but this would not be known until late spring or summer. She planned to consult SCPB about parameters for any raises. All signs were pointing to a long legislative session, which would affect timing of salary increases because they are tied to the state budget.
Cauce commented that President Young was absent because he was beginning the transition to Texas A&M. When asked if he was still being paid by UW, she said she believed that was the case. Cauce was making decisions on his behalf and acknowledged that she was in an awkward position. Her goal was to be transparent and she had advised the Regents that she was willing to serve in any capacity they asked her to. Cauce ended by commenting positively on her relationship with President Young and his collaborative style. Members expressed their appreciation for her candor and transparency.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the January 12, 2015, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
   b. Approval of the January 29, 2015, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   c. Approve the 2015-2016 Vice Chair Nominations for Faculty Senate Vote. Charles Hirschman, Professor, Sociology, UW Seattle; Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor, Migard School of Business, UW Tacoma.

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Discussion item: UW Open access initiative. [Exhibit E]
   Ben Marwick, member, Faculty Council on Research and Juliya Ziskina, GPSS Executive Liaison for the Faculty Council on University Libraries.

Ben Marwick attended to discuss the initiative to increase open access of scholarly writing generated at the UW. He highlighted that the UW ranked very high in research but that our openness rankings were very low. He emphasized the benefits of creating a repository. Marwick hoped to create a system that would automate the process and make it as simple as possible for faculty members to use. Members were generally supportive of retaking faculty rights to production of scholarly work. Marwick was in the process of estimating costs and was working with other faculty council members to come up with creative solutions. Duane Storti asked for more consideration of the compulsory nature of the proposal. Diane Latteman, chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, expressed interest in working to advance the initiative.

Ben Marwick asked that additional feedback be sent to his email.

8. Discussion item: Faculty Salary Policy Legislation – Joe Janes, Chair, Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. [Exhibit F]

The February 4th town hall meeting was attended by over 100 faculty and a variety of issues were discussed. The audio recording of the discussion is available on the Senate website.

Joe Janes, chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, attended to bring draft language of the proposed new salary policy for initial input from the Senate Executive Committee. He reported that FCFA had been through the revised language once and would review the language again to address issues identified at the meeting. He asked SEC for their preliminary feedback on the draft. Some revisions to the Salary Policy Working Group had already been made. He stressed that while significant concerns about funding the transition were raised, that had little to do with Faculty Code language.

Questions and comments followed:

Q: Can the draft be shared with faculty?
A: Yes, but please emphasize that it is a draft.

Q: Has there been any progress on an executive order?
A: The possibility of an EO had not been discussed by FCFA. Jack Lee pointed to a comment from SCPB that the option for a college or department to change the formula would be subject to a binding vote of its faculty according to Faculty Code Section 24-72. B.
C: Significant concern about funding, the effects of having an interim president, and the ‘off-ramps’ of the new policy.

C: FCTL concerned with how the salary policy would be funded and how it may affect future resources for teaching other than faculty salaries.

C: Chair O’Neill expressed concern about the vagueness of 24-35 H., specifically the standards of high expectation and continued productivity. Janes responded that he hoped to craft language that would be sufficient but not so burdensome that the hurdles to promotion would become too much to overcome. FCFA discussed at length how best to translate standards into language, and they were open to suggestions for language.

Q: Astley asked what the President and Provost thought about the proposal.
A: Cauce indicated that President Young’s departure was a setback that might affect a presidential signature. She indicated that the Board of Regents would be very interested in the proposal and may raise questions, especially about the “off-ramps.”

C: Units aren’t aware of their inequities and need data.
A: The proposed language intends to help units access and utilize equity data.

C: Significant opposition among faculty in the School of Medicine and the Foster School of Business. Opposition may not be about minor details, rather about the overall proposal.

C: Provost Cauce asked that faculty members consider the overall consequences of the policy in terms of funding, specifically what tradeoffs could result in increased funding for faculty salaries.


There was no unfinished business.


   Approval of the February 26, 2015, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit G]

   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

There was a motion to remove a Class C Resolution regarding open access from New Business because the resolution was not ready. The motion passed and the agenda was approved as amended.

11. Good of the Order.

There was no good of the order.


The meeting was adjourned at 4:59pm.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien
Approved by: Kate O’Neill, Chair
Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate
Since the SEC met rather recently, I feared I would have little new to report. As I write, however, we received the news that President Michael Young will be leaving UW for Texas A&M University. While we certainly wish Mike all the best in his new endeavor, we will also certainly miss his stewardship. I want to take this occasion to thank Mike for his service to UW, for his respect for faculty and the value of shared governance, and for his commitment to the core research and educational missions of the institution. He has, as well, been a good colleague – kind, ready to laugh, a good listener. So, on behalf of the faculty, thank you, Michael Young!

Now, in this time of transition, it will be especially important for faculty to step up – to protect our core values and to manage the future direction of the UW. In addition to the ongoing challenges posed by the state budget and constraints on research funding, we are also launching a capital campaign. It will be critical to secure strong, experienced, and competent leadership for the UW during the interim period until a national search can be completed. As Senate Chair, I will be emphasizing repeatedly to the Board of Regents that faculty must be widely consulted and deeply involved at every step of the search for a new President.

One of President Young’s key initiatives has been to try to develop better partnerships with private industry. Some groups of faculty are more aware and more active in these initiatives than others. Now, with President Young’s departure, might be a good time for us to engage more faculty in considering the scale and parameters for public-private research and educational enterprise here at the UW. In particular, I think it is key that the faculty develop a better understanding of the financial, intellectual property, and management issues involved and that we articulate transparent principles and practices before rather than after new initiatives are launched.

As one small step in our effort to define our UW intellectual property policies, we will have today a presentation about an “Open Access” initiative, supported by GPSS, to increase the amount of faculty – authored research articles that are available for free, on-line to anyone. This is not yet an action item, but I thought that it could be a useful place for us to begin a discussion of how and to what extent we wish to disseminate our research. There are, in addition, budget implications, especially for the Libraries. As you are no doubt aware already, the 20th century research university became a “free” content provider to private publishers, who in turn have charged increasing subscription fees for access to journals. This Open Access initiative is one way in which we can begin a conversation about whether we want to try to alter that system.

Finally, I’m happy to report that we achieved two good things in the last Senate meeting. First, the Class C Resolution you approved last time, which was brought to us by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and which recommended that the UW require diversity training for faculty hiring committees, was unanimously approved by the Senate. Before the vote, many senators voiced strong support and advocated for doing more – such as extending the training to promotion and tenure committees. It was an inspiring discussion. The key task now is to get the message out to deans and chairs and to ensure that all faculty are aware of the training resources available.

Second, Jerry Baldasty reported on the work of the Learning Spaces Taskforce. Senators responded with numerous, detailed feedback and suggestions. I am quite sure that the feedback will be useful to the task force – and I thought that the presentation represented a great use of the Senate and senators time. They had engaged with their constituents on the issue, alerted them to pending changes, and reported back with specific recommendations and requests. Norm Beauchamp and I hope to keep this kind of interaction going – using the Senate as a mechanism for disseminating information at an early stage and obtaining information back that is useful for planning.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. **Election of Senators for 2015-17.** Nominations from the elected faculty councils (EFC) of schools, colleges, and campuses holding Senate elections this year will be due to the Secretary of the Faculty on February 11, 2015. Further information about the election process and deadlines has been sent to those EFC chairs.

2. **Changes to the Online Roster.** In response to requests for representation information, we recently updated the Faculty Senate roster to reflect units represented, as opposed to appointing unit of the faculty senator. Senators representing an entire school or college are now labeled as at large, and senators representing multiple departments are now labeled with each unit they represent. The updated roster can be found [here](#).

3. **University Lecturer Nominations.** The University Faculty Lecture Award Selection Committee is now accepting nominations. The purpose of the award is twofold: to honor UW faculty members whose scholarship or creative work is widely respected by their colleagues as original and important and to share those accomplishments with the community, both on and off the campus, through a public lecture. Each year since 1974, a distinguished member of our faculty has been chosen. Nominations should be received by February 19, 2015. Go [here](#) to make a nomination.

4. **Conciliation Board seeking members.** The Conciliation Board is seeking new members. Conciliators work through the office of the University Ombud as part of the informal dispute resolution processes outlined in Chapter 27 of the Faculty Code. If you are interested in learning more about this opportunity for service, please contact the Secretary of the Faculty ([secfac@uw.edu](mailto:secfac@uw.edu)).
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

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

Here are the topics that SCPB has discussed since my last report to the Senate. We plan to start posting documents and data related to all of these discussions on the SCPB website soon.

Report from the College of the Environment

SCPB invited representatives from the College of the Environment to report on the college’s goals, challenges, budgets, and governance structures. We spoke with Lisa Graumlich (Dean), Professor Rick Gustafson (Chair of the College Council), Jaclyn Saunders (co-chair of the Student Advisory Council), and Darlene Feikema (Director of Finance and Administration).

The COE was founded in 2009, bringing together a diverse collection of units studying Earth’s atmosphere, land, and water systems with those studying human dimensions of the environment, the application of engineering and technological solutions to environmental problems, and the impact of policy on environmental change. One of the early challenges for the college was how to integrate the diverse research and teaching cultures of its various units, and to understand and adapt to differing expectations regarding promotion and tenure. We learned that the college has been quite successful in developing a shared understanding of these different cultures, and that the hopes for new collaborative research and teaching opportunities have been amply realized. The college has experienced robust enrollment growth since its inception. The student, faculty, and administrative representatives agreed that the college has developed a transparent and well-functioning process for developing budget recommendations.

RCEP request: elimination of the Comparative Islam option in NELC

We considered a request from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations to eliminate the undergraduate degree option in Comparative Islam, as part of a comprehensive restructuring of the department’s offerings. This option had already been suspended (with approval of FCAS and President Young). Because the program’s content has become part of a new Comparative Civilizations option, SCPB agreed to recommend to the provost that this be treated as a “limited RCEP” in accordance with the faculty code.

Report from the provost on faculty salary adjustments for 2015-16

Provost Ana Mari Cauce gave us a preview of the process of establishing standards for faculty salary raises for next year. The process will be particularly difficult this year because the legislature is not likely to finalize the state budget until summer, and the university could receive anything from a modest increase to outright cuts. Provost Cauce expressed a commitment to ensuring that faculty are given raises in any but the worst imaginable budgetary situation. We will be talking more about this.

Administrative Review of Services

Ruth Johnston (Chief of Staff for Planning & Management) reported to us on an initiative underway in her office to review all administrative services provided by the university, and explore whether some might be more efficiently organized, or more effectively provided by outside agencies. The project is in its infancy so far, but we will make sure that SCPB is involved in the ongoing conversation as it develops.
Administrative Provost Reinvestment Requests

We continued our study of the requests for Provost Reinvestment Funds for 2015-2016, this time focusing on requests from administrative units. Realizing that the university’s ability to fund any of these requests will depend on what funding decisions emerge from the legislative session, members of SCPB agreed that the following requests should be treated as high priority:

- One-time funds for the Office of Public Records ($1.3m, UW Advancement)
- Three attorneys (undetermined amount, Attorney General’s office)
- Executive Assistant to support the AG Division Chief ($61,296, Attorney General’s office)
- Office Assistant ($48,168, Attorney General’s office)
- 0.5 FTE Southeast Asian recruiter ($35,000, OMAD)
- Instructional support for URM students in STEM ($75,000, OMAD)
- Permanent funding for Assistant Ombud ($70,000, President’s office)
- Permanent funding for positions currently supported by temp funding ($600,000, Student Life)

Here are some topics we plan to discuss in future meetings. For agendas, see [http://uw.edu/faculty/senate/scpb/agendas](http://uw.edu/faculty/senate/scpb/agendas).

- Report from the College of Engineering
- Financial aid
- Undergraduate and graduate tuition setting process
- Faculty retention, recruitment, & separations
- Global Innovation Exchange
- Transportation services and UPass
- Unit adjustments
- Intercollegiate athletics: effects of new NCAA rules
- Capital campaign update
- Sponsorships and branding
- North Campus Housing Plan
- Childcare planning
- EO & online degrees
- Libraries
- Research funding, RRF
- Activity Based Budgeting
- Infrastructure costs in the operating budget
- Sustainable Academic Business Plan
- Tri-campus planning
- C4C
- Intellectual Property Policy
- Learning Spaces Project
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Patricia Kramer

Overlapping courses and nonresident admissions.

1. There is an emerging issue associated with courses and/or programs (majors, minors) that are being developed, particularly by schools/colleges other than A&S, which overlap with existing courses/programs. The motivation for these new courses/programs is not obviously clear, but the consequences for undergraduates are clear and potentially adverse. FCAS is not, however, primarily interested in motivation; rather, facilitating undergraduate education is our prime focus.

An example might help clarify the situation: the College of the Environment has proposed a new course FISH 270, which is essentially the same as BIOL 220 (Physiology). The primary difference between the 2 courses is that the FISH version will use aquatic/marine examples. Both College of the Environment and Biology agree that the content is so close that students should not be allowed to get credit for both the FISH and BIOL versions, but the courses are not exactly the same and consequently they are not equivalent. (“Equivalent” courses substitute for each other in all instances – as prerequisites, admission requirements, and or graduation requirements. We typically establish equivalency between campuses or with courses that are transferred in from another college or university. Within a campus courses are usually joint-listed.) If a student takes FISH 270, they won't be able to get credit for BIOL 220, but they also won't have the prerequisites for some other courses. These courses are typically taken relatively early in a student's career, when the possibility of the students changing their mind about their major is still quite high. We can easily imagine a scenario where a student thought they wanted to major in Marine biology, but decided after a few courses that they were really more interested in plant ecology or biochemistry. There is another pairing (FISH 370 and BIOL 354) that also has similar problems.

This is an example, but there are several others and it is my feeling that more are on the way. We do not have a policy to address what I am calling "redundant" courses, so my plan is to not approve any of these courses until we develop some guidelines. We would greatly appreciate any insight in how to deal with this situation.

2. The work of the Enrollment Management Advisory Council (EMAC) continues at a rapid pace and I've reached the conclusion that given all the problems that we currently face with enrollment management, we have to think seriously about considering a student's intended major in admissions, particularly for nonresidents (out of state or out of country). Currently, the admissions process for residents, domestic nonresidents and international students is informed by virtually identical criteria and is governed by student regulations chapter 101.2.A. The implementation is overseen by FCAS. This policy has led the University to a situation where many of our competitive majors have a disproportionately high percentage of nonresident students in them. This has many adverse consequences and we (both EMAC and FCAS) have been quite concerned about this for some time. Although I would really prefer not to be in this position, I believe that we need a change in student regulations.

Consequently, I need to consult with SEC in preparation for Class B legislation to add something like “academic goals” (or whatever euphemism for major we decide to use) to the list of things we are allowed to consider for admission. We are ham-strung now with how to deal with non-resident applications.
I see two possibilities or paths:

A. Change the non-resident part of the Scholastic Regulations (101.2.G). Currently it says:

G. Out-of-State and International Students

The University recognizes the academic and educational benefits of a geographically diverse student body. In order that the University meet its primary obligation to residents of the state, the admissions requirements for out-of-state and international applicants are more restrictive than those of resident applicants. All successful international applicants shall have demonstrated English language competency.

I suggest that we add a sentence before the last sentence that says: In addition to the requirements specified in 101.2.A and 101.2.B, the academic goals of out-of-state and international students may be considered in their admission review. (Or something like that)

or

B. Change holistic review (101.2.A). Currently it says:

A. Holistic Review

Undergraduate programs offered by the University lead to a bachelor’s degree. Admission is competitive. In making admissions judgment, the University uses a holistic review process. This process considers such factors as high school grade-point average, courses taken, grade-point average in transferable college level course work, institution(s) attended, level of entry, scores on an acceptable admissions test when required, and personal factors such as school and community service, leadership, overcoming adversity, and family educational and socioeconomic background. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards shall periodically review and approve the holistic review process.

We would need to add "academic goals" after "...scores on an acceptable admissions test when required, ..."
Open access information

Note on an Open Access Policy for the University of Washington

Ben Marwick, UW Anthropology (a longer version of this document is online at http://bit.ly/UW-OA-FCR-notes).

OA in general
Open access in general refers to public online access to scholarly products that is unrestricted by financial barriers (http://bit.ly/oa-overview)

- OA takes many forms, the two major types are
  - **Gold**: publication in OA journals (PLOSOne, PeerJ, eLife, also many predators)
  - **Green**: publication in any journal, but with the author submitting their refereed, revised final draft to an open access repository (aka self-archiving), see the database of journal OA policies at http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/ This is what we’re proposing for UW

Problems that OA solves

From http://www.richardpoynder.co.uk/Aspesi.pdf

- Allows more researchers to read their articles, leading to more citations and – ultimately – to better dissemination of knowledge. This has been empirically demonstrated (http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html)
- Allows small and medium sized companies which do not have access to the latest research to do so, furthering the growth of the economy and job creation.
- Allows researchers and doctors in poor countries to have access to leading research.
- Can deflate the margins of capitalist exploitation of public spending.

Problems that OA creates


- Need to educate faculty about OA policies and answer questions about what it applies to and what it required for compliance. We have an excellent FAQ already: http://uwopenaccess.com/policy-faq/
- Burdens faculty with task of depositing author-accepted-manuscripts to the institutional repository (UK estimates c. 45 min per paper). This can be made easier by publication harvesting software: https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/display/OAPI/Automated+Publication+Harvesting+System+Progress
- Burdens the library with the need for funds and staff to obtain and maintain software to run an institutional repository. In the UK the staff cost is one FTE per institution. (http://www.researchconsulting.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Research-Consulting-Counting-the-Costs-of-OA-Final.pdf)
- The UW’s current repository software (dspace) is free, but has a staff burden for maintenance and imposes a time-burden on faculty submitting their work. A comparison of the five most widely adopted IR platforms: Digital Commons, Dspace, Eprints, Fedora, and Islandora: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/news/institutional_repository_software.pdf Another comparison: http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/pdf/OSI_Guide_to_IR_Software_v3.pdf Desirable features include anything that reduces the library staff burden and the faculty time burden, and article-level metrics/altmetrics (http://opus.bath.ac.uk/30226/1/or12-138-final.pdf, cf. data provided by researchgate.com and academia.edu, which are popular in some disciplines because of the article level impact data they provide).
OA in universities

- 238 Institutional policies for open access (http://roarmap.eprints.org/), all are green (no gold), 48 have unanimously voted in favour, (http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Unanimous_faculty_votes), more stats: http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_by_the_numbers

- First US mandates appeared in 2004, the rate of institutions adopted OA doubled in 2008 (20-40/year during 2008-2014) when various Harvard colleges and MIT adopted OA mandates and when the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 was passed, which instituted a mandate for research projects funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH)

- Best model for UW is the UC policy, since it’s fixed many of the problems of the earlier policies (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-text/ & http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-faq) Here is the UC policy with minor changes to be a first draft UW policy:

1. **Preamble** The Faculty of the University of Washington is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of Washington and the world. Furthermore, the Faculty recognizes the benefits that accrue to themselves as individual scholars and to the scholarly enterprise from such wide dissemination, including greater recognition, more thorough review, consideration and critique, and a general increase in scientific, scholarly and critical knowledge. Faculty further recognize that by this policy, and with the assistance of the University, they can more easily and collectively reserve rights that might otherwise be signed away, often unnecessarily, in agreements with publishers. In keeping with these considerations, and for the primary purpose of making our scholarly articles widely and freely accessible, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

2. **Grant of License and Limitations** Each Faculty member grants to the University of Washington a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository. Any other systematic uses of the licensed articles by the University of Washington must be approved by the Academic Senate. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of Washington policy.

3. **Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out)** The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. Upon express direction by a Faculty member, the University of Washington will waive the license for a particular article or delay access to the article for a specified period of time.

4. **Deposit of Articles** To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, Faculty commit to helping the University obtain copies of the articles. Specifically, each Faculty member who does not permanently waive the license above will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of Washington by the date of its publication, for inclusion in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of Washington if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open access publication. Faculty members who have permanently waived the license may nonetheless deposit a copy with the University of Washington or elsewhere for archival purposes. Notwithstanding the above, this policy does not in any way prescribe or limit the venue of publication. This policy neither requires nor prohibits the payment of fees or publication costs by authors.

5. **Oversight of Policy** The Academic Senate and the University of Washington will be jointly responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and
application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. Any changes to the text of this policy will require approval by both the Academic Senate and the University of Washington. The Academic Senate and the University of Washington will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty and the University of Washington. The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of Washington to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.

- **Scope:** “scholarly article” means something accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals and conference proceedings. It will not apply to monographs, book chapters, other long-form publications, working papers, creative or practice-based research outputs, or data (although researchers are may submit these materials to the repository if they wish).

- **Detailed notes on implementation:**
  - [http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies](http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies)
  - [http://library.med.cornell.edu/Guides/openaccess.html](http://library.med.cornell.edu/Guides/openaccess.html)

**OA at UW**


- There is an ‘Open Access initiative’ of UW students that have drafted a proposal to the GPSS to call for UW to adopt an OA policy ([http://uwopenaccess.wordpress.com/policy-proposal/](http://uwopenaccess.wordpress.com/policy-proposal/)), minutes of an early GPSS discussion of the issue: [https://depts.washington.edu/gpss/sites/default/files/ExecutiveApril16th2014.pdf](https://depts.washington.edu/gpss/sites/default/files/ExecutiveApril16th2014.pdf)

- UC policy (based on Harvard model) and tools ([http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/](http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/)) are highly regarded by UW library staff on OA project, they have strong personal connections, this is probably the best way forward for UW. The harvesting tool and DOI/ORCID integration promise to reduce the faculty burden greatly by streamlining manual deposit ([https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/display/OAPI/Streamlined+Manual+Deposit+Progress](https://wiki.library.ucsf.edu/display/OAPI/Streamlined+Manual+Deposit+Progress))
Subscription cost increases of many scholarly journals have substantially outpaced inflation and library budgets.

For-profit publishers profit greatly, at our expense.

History of OA at UW

- **2007**: UW Research Office issued a Statement of Position supportive of OA and encouraging researchers to publish OA
- **2008**: FCR discussed OA and formed the Scholarly Communication Committee to draft class C legislation
- **2009**: Senate approved a recommendation that faculty adopt OA practices
- **2015**: the GPSS approved a resolution to encourage faculty to adopt an OA policy

History of OA at UW

- **2015**: drafted OA policy, and have consulted with...
  - FCR, FCUL, IPMAC, SCIPC & AGO
  - Various UW departments & faculty experts
  - UC & Harvard OA policy authors
Open Access to research has concrete public benefits

I am grateful to Open Access for making available Shaye Cohen's article on "The Ways That Parted." I am preparing a presentation for a church on the years 60-100 CE and do not have easy access to materials like this in a library. Having it available when I needed it and where I can access it is wonderful. Thank you.

Open Access to research has concrete public benefits

I teach in a public high school and lack of internet access to research articles in a non-university setting can be very limiting. I need to stay up on research myself as well as prepare my students for the challenges of locating appropriate research, understanding it, and evaluating its limitations. This particular article is useful as our school site wellness coordinator. I expect to use some of this data to overcome barriers to staff participation in our district wellness program.

Open access articles are cited 25-500% more than non-open access articles from the same journal and year

As a parent with a child diagnosed on the autism spectrum disorder, I am grateful for free access to scholarly research that allows me to learn more about ASD without diverting resources that can be better applied to serve the needs of my child.
Subscription cost increases of many scholarly journals have substantially outpaced inflation and library budgets.

For-profit publishers profit greatly, at our expense.

History of OA at UW
- 2007: UW Research Office issued a Statement of Position supportive of OA and encouraging researchers to publish OA
- 2008: FCR discussed OA and formed the Scholarly Communication Committee to draft class C legislation
- 2009: Senate approved a recommendation that faculty adopt OA practices
- 2015: the GPSS approved a resolution to encourage faculty to adopt an OA policy

History of OA at UW
2015: drafted OA policy, and have consulted with...
- FCR, FCUL, IPMAC, SCIPC & AGO
- Various UW departments & faculty experts
- UC & Harvard OA policy authors
What now?
- Make the OA process automatic and efficient for faculty
- Introduce policy and repository infrastructure to minimize faculty effort to increase the impact of their research

Crux of the proposed policy
"Each Faculty member grants to the University of Washington a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository. Any other systematic uses of the licensed articles by the University of Washington must be approved by the Faculty Senate. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of Washington policy."

Other details of the proposed policy
- **Scope**: limited to peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings accepted for publication. Not retroactive
- **Opt-out waivers**: granted without question to authors where OA is not an option
- **Deposit of Articles**: in the institutional repository or other repository by date of publication
- **Oversight**: to be held by Faculty Senate, policy review to occur in three years.

- Many of UW’s peer institutions & funders already have similar policies
- 118 universities, departments, and research funders in the US have similar policies
Open Access FAQs

Q. Can I still publish in any journal I choose?

A. Yes! Most journals allow self-archiving of peer-reviewed author-accepted manuscripts.

For those that require full transfer of copyright, the library will give you an author addendum to modify the publisher’s terms to recognize the license to UW.

If completely forbidden, you can request a waiver to opt-out of making your author-accepted manuscript OA in the UW open access repository.

Open Access FAQs

Q. What do publishers think about this?

A. Publishers are familiar with OA and many are converting their journals to OA models. Retention of rights by authors is becoming a mainstream choice. Approximately 70% of academic journals allow some form of OA archiving.

If not, the you can request an opt-out waiver from the UW and publish in any journal without any complications.

Open Access FAQs

Q. Will small society journals survive having their articles freely available in the repository?

A. Yes! There is no empirical evidence from the last ten years that even when all articles are freely available, journal subscriptions are canceled.

Society journals typically offer high quality, at reasonable cost, and there’s no reason that they shouldn’t continue to be highly competitive as publishing economics change. Society publishers also have the means to protect themselves in their own hands - they can ask faculty to obtain waivers.

Open Access FAQs

Q. Can the UW afford this?

A. Yes! Library staff have estimated that enhancing the existing repository is within their current capacity, and would create employment opportunities for students.

UW iSchool faculty are eager to contribute to the development of the repository as a research project to implement world-class features to enhance the visibility and discoverability of UW research.
**Open Access FAQs**

**Q. Will this OA policy allow me to keep my rights to my own writings?**

Yes! This policy grants specific, limited and nonexclusive permissions to UW. You still retain ownership and complete control of the copyright in your writings, subject only to this prior permission. You may exercise the copyrights in any way you see fit, including transferring them to a publisher if you so desire. However, if you do so, UW would still retain its license and the right to distribute the article from its repository.

**Open Access FAQs**

**Q. Why make this an automatic license? Why not suggest that faculty individually retain a license for open access distribution?**

Evidence has shown that "opt-in" systems (such as UW currently has) have little effect on authors’ behavior. Without an automatic license, faculty would only have a license if they negotiated with their publisher to get one. But that kind of negotiation is very difficult. Many faculty are intimidated by the prospect and will not do it. Even if they try it, some will succeed and some will fail. Some will get the out of rights and some will get another. That will make access uneven and multiply implementation headaches.

Individual faculty benefit from a different policy because it makes it possible for UW to work with publishers on behalf of the faculty to simplify procedures, broaden access, and magnify impact.

**Open Access FAQs**

**Q. How is me granting the UW non-exclusive license compatible with the UW being able to exercise “all rights under copyright”?**

The legal framework for copyright is that you can’t give away what you don’t have. UW will have been granted nonexclusive rights, and will not be able in turn to grant exclusive rights. UW, however, will be able to exercise all of the other rights under copyright, including reproducing, displaying, distributing, and making derivative works of articles covered by the policy, as long as these activities are not done for profit.

**Open Access FAQs**

**Q. Is this OA policy consistent with state and federal copyright law and UW copyright policy?**

Under copyright law (and UW’s E036), you automatically retain copyright of your works. OA policies utilize a prior nonexclusive license for distribution. You retain all rights subject only to this nonexclusive license. This is not the same as transferring copyright or ownership. Complete author choice is also maintained through the waiver.

OA policies have been in place for > 7 years at other institutions in the US and there have not been any lawsuits or threats of legal action.
Open Access FAQs

Q. What is the time burden for faculty and library staff?

For faculty: just email the pre-print to nworks@uw.edu. If you want to enter the metadata yourself, you can (30 min/year for productive scholar)

For the library: estimates from the UK suggest 1.0 FTE staff per institution to manage an institutional repository

Key take-aways

- Key take-aways

Having an OA policy enable the UW to increase the impact of its research by expanding the audience for our published works.

- Key take-aways

This OA policy would put UW among an elite group of peers. Of the 17 US institutions ranked ahead of UW in global rankings, 9 (50%) have institution-wide policies and 2 more have those within parts of their institution.

- Key take-aways

We remain in control of what to publish, when to publish, where to publish, and how audiences can gain access to our published research.

- Key take-aways

The policy would not be a financial burden or a burden on faculty or library staff.

Next steps...

- Next steps...

• Seek feedback from faculty
• Explore ways to enhance the current library repository

We welcome your questions & feedback

- We welcome your questions & feedback

Please send them to us at openaccess@uw.edu

More answers to FAQs at http://uwopenaccess.com/policy-faq/
For discussion: excerpts from the draft salary policy legislation.

Section 24–35 Tiers and Tier Advancement

New section

A. Tiers are levels within ranks that reflect continuing excellent performance in scholarship and research, teaching, and service, commensurate with the expectations for faculty members with a given rank and title in a given field.

B. Within the professorial ranks the following tiers are established:
   - Assistant Professor 1,2
   - Associate Professor 1,2,3
   - Professor 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9

C. Within the Lecturer ranks the following tiers are established:
   - Lecturer 1,2
   - Senior Lecturer 1,2,3
   - Principal Lecturer 1,2,3,4,5,6

D. Within the Artist in Residence ranks the following tiers are established:
   - Artist in Residence 1,2
   - Senior Artist in Residence 1,2,3

E. To be eligible for tier advancements, a faculty member must be tenure-track, or tenured, or without tenure by reason of funding, or appointed to a job classification that is eligible for multi-year appointments (whether or not the individual’s current appointment is multi-year); and must be appointed at least 50% of full-time status for a duration including the current academic year.

F. An initial appointment or promotion for a tier-eligible faculty member is ordinarily to Tier 1 within the given rank. However, an individual with significant prior experience who is initially appointed to a rank of Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer, Senior Artist in Residence, or higher should be assigned an initial tier that is commensurate with his or her career stage and salary compared to market conditions and to the other members of the unit at the same rank. The initial tier shall be assigned by the chair (or, in an undeptartmentalized college, the dean), subject to approval by the dean in consultation with the elected faculty council.

G. An Assistant Professor who is reappointed for a second three-year term (as described in Section 24-41, Subsection A) shall be advanced to Tier 2, effective at the start of the second three-year term.

H. For all tier-eligible faculty members other than Assistant Professors, to receive an advancement from one tier to a higher tier (with the exception of advancement to Professor Tiers 7 and higher, described in subsection H below) depends on a finding that the individual faculty member’s record of performance, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the last previous appointment, promotion, or tier advancement, reflects continued achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and service at a level that is commensurate with the high expectations of the university and of the faculty member’s unit for a faculty member at a similar stage of his or her university career. The relative weights of these criteria for each individual faculty member may be adjusted from time to time as described in Section 24-2. A tier advancement should be awarded when a faculty member's accomplishments since the most recent previous appointment, promotion, or tier advancement are commensurate with that of a typical UW faculty member in the field over the course of about four years. Because this is a performance-based system, the rate of tier advancement will differ from one individual to the next, with some being advanced more frequently than the average and some less. For the same reason, individuals may experience different
frequencies of tier advancement at different times during their career.

I. Advancement to Professor Tier 7 is based on an evaluation of the faculty member’s cumulative record of performance, and depends on evidence of exceptional scholarly distinction, as attested by the judgment of the individual’s departmental colleagues at the rank of Professor and by external letters of review. Advancement to Professor Tier 8 or higher depends on evidence of continuing exceptional scholarly distinction, as attested by the judgment of the individual’s departmental colleagues at the rank of Professor. (External letters of review are not required for tiers higher than 7.) A Professor who has advanced to Tier 7 or higher shall be entitled to the designation “Eminent Professor.”

J. In unusual circumstances, a department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may recommend that an individual be advanced to a tier higher than those listed in subsections A, B, and C above. Such an advancement requires explicit permission of the Provost.

A faculty member serving at least 50% of full-time status in an administrative appointment (such as chair or dean) shall not be eligible for tier advancements during the period of administrative service, unless granted an exception by the Provost. When the faculty member’s administrative appointment ends or becomes less than 50%, the faculty member shall be assigned a tier that is commensurate with his or her career stage and salary compared to market conditions and to the other members of the unit at the same rank. The tier shall be assigned by the Provost, in consultation with the faculty member’s chair, dean or chancellor, and elected faculty council.
Section 24–62 Collegial Performance Review

New section

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this section, to evaluate their performance and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase the timing of promotions and tier advancements. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, University, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities. In all these contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included.

The purpose of a collegial performance review is:
- To determine whether the performance of a faculty member is satisfactory or unsatisfactory;
- To consider a faculty member for a possible tier advancement;
- To consider reappointment of faculty members eligible for promotion and tier advancement;
- To consider recommending a faculty member for a possible promotion in rank.

A collegial performance review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Reviewers must be voting members of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) of the individual being reviewed.

B. Reviewers must be superior in academic rank or title to the individual being reviewed, except that professors and principal lecturers shall be reviewed by members of equal or greater rank and title.

By request of FCFA, we’ve added participation of Principal Lecturers in review of other P.L.’s.

C. Following a policy approved by the voting faculty of the relevant unit, a committee of faculty members who are eligible to review the individual under consideration may be appointed by the unit head to conduct an initial review and provide a written report and recommendation. This policy shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially.

D. The unit shall develop guidelines for the collegial performance review. The guidelines shall specify responsibilities for assembly of the record, including a self-assessment.

E. In assessing whether an individual's performance is satisfactory, reviewers shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24–32, 24–33, 24–34, and 24–35, and Executive Order 45 for the various academic ranks and titles. Performance shall be measured upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service and shall consider the whole record of the individual's qualifications described in Section 24–32, including:

1. The most recent assessment of teaching effectiveness, as provided in Section 24–57, Subsection A;
2. The individual's most recent activity report, as described in Section 24-57, Subsection B;
3. Documentation of the regular conference, as provided in Section 24–57, Subsection D.
4. The individual's self assessment

F. For units where an initial report is produced by a committee, the head of the unit or a designee shall provide the individual being reviewed with a written summary of the committee's report and
recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the summary given to the individual being reviewed. The individual being reviewed may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The head of the unit shall forward any such response, together with the committee’s report, to all qualified reviewers.

G. The faculty members who are eligible to review the individual under consideration shall then consider the individual’s record. Following the consideration, there shall be a vote on whether the individual’s performance is satisfactory and on whether one or more of the following actions should be taken.

1. The faculty member should be given one or more tier advancements based on the criteria of Section 24-62;
2. The faculty member should be considered for a possible promotion in rank and title, following the procedures of Section 24–54;
3. The faculty member should be reappointed, following the procedures of Section 24-53.

H. The department chair (or the chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean’s designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

I. If the recommendation is for tier advancement, the chair shall transmit it to the dean or chancellor with the candidate’s response, if any, and any supporting data the dean or chancellor may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation for tier advancement he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

J. Final decisions on tier advancement shall be made by the Dean or Chancellor, after review by the Elected Faculty Council. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

K. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to review the performance of faculty members who are not tier-eligible (according to Section 24-62 D) to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank or title requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Notwithstanding the procedures described in this section, faculty members serving part-time or full-time in administrative positions shall have their administrative performance evaluated by their administrative supervisors.

Some of the preceding language duplicates language in the Code sections on promotion and some from the current merit review language but for practical purposes we are considering it all “new” language.

Section 24–63 Consequences of Unsatisfactory Performance

Formerly 24-55 H

In the event of a finding of unsatisfactory performance, the individual shall not be eligible for market adjustments or variable adjustments under Section 24-72 or 24-73 below; and the individual shall have a conference with his or her chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) every year until the
finding has been reversed; and the individual shall receive a collegial performance review every year until the finding has been reversed.

At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit determinations of unsatisfactory performance (as a result of reviews under this section Section 24-62), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit performance of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking collegial performance evaluation of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit performance and make adjustments to correct any associated salary inequity decisions. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.
Section 24–71 Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles (Formerly 24-70)

A. The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit, retain, motivate, and reward the best faculty. To accomplish these objectives, the faculty must have confidence that their continuing and productive contributions to the goals of their units and to the University's missions of teaching, research, and service will be rewarded throughout their careers. To compete for the best faculty, the University must be competitive with its peers. To retain the best faculty requires a similarly competitive approach. Therefore, the University places as one of its highest priorities rewarding faculty who perform to the highest standards and who continue to do so throughout their appointments at the University. This policy is designed to provide for a predictable salary progression for faculty members whose performance continues to reflect achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and/or service, commensurate with the expectation for faculty members with a given rank and title in their appointing unit, as fully described below.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward faculty, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University's Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among units. This provides the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, acknowledges existing and future differentials in unit performance and contribution, and also recognizes that differing funding sources and reward structures exist among schools and colleges. The policy must ensure that equity considerations and compression are also addressed as needed. The University's Salary Policy is founded upon the principle that individual salary decisions must be based on performance reviews conducted by faculty colleagues.

Much of the language above comes from the introduction to the old version of EO 64.

B. Advancement in salary can be effected in several distinct, but not mutually exclusive, ways. A salary increase:

1. Shall attend promotion in rank (approved in accord with Section 24–54), unless such increases are delayed as described in Subsection C below;
2. Shall attend each tier advancement (approved in accord with Section 24–60), unless such increases are delayed as described in Subsection C below;
3. Shall be provided to raise individuals' salaries to the minimum salary for each faculty rank (in accord with Section 24–74);
4. Shall be provided as part of a market adjustment (in accord with Section 24-72), except as described in Subsection 24-72C or Subsection E below;
5. May be provided as part of a variable adjustment (in accord with Section 24-73);
6. May be offered in response to a potential or actual external offer of appointment (upon review in accord with Section 24-75);
7. May be offered at any time to a non-tier-eligible faculty member (including faculty members who are not tier-eligible by virtue of serving at least 50% of full-time status in an administrative appointment as described in Section 24-62 J).

Section 24–72 Procedures for Allocating Salary Adjustments Increases

Formerly 24-71

A. The President shall establish formulas for the determination of salary increases to accompany promotions in rank and title; salary increases to accompany tier advancements; and market adjustments.

B. If the dean of a particular school or college, after consultation with the elected faculty council, that a
formula established in accordance with Subsection A would be inappropriate for one or more units within the school, college or campus based on considerations of budgetary conditions and average salaries in comparable units in other universities, the dean may request permission from the provost to use a different formula for those units. The consultation with the elected faculty council shall include making available to the council detailed information about salaries in each unit of the college, school, or campus, as well as information about salaries in appropriate units at peer institutions. The provost may, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, approve, deny, or modify the requested change.

C. If at any time, distributing salary increases according to the formulas established in accordance with subsection A would, in the judgment of the President, impose financial hardship on the university, the President may change one or more of the formulas permanently or temporarily, or may temporarily delay tier advancement increases or rank promotion increases, or may extend a previously established delay, by following the procedure below.

- The Provost presents a recommendation for a new formula, or for a delay in tier advancement increases or rank promotion increases for a specified time, to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, together with detailed budgetary data to support the recommendation. The recommendation shall specify when the change is to take effect, whether the change is temporary or permanent, and if temporary for how long.
- The SCPB votes to endorse, reject, or modify the Provost’s recommendation.
- The Provost’s recommendation and the result of the SCPB’s vote are then made available to the faculty for comment for a period no less than 30 days.
- The President then decides whether and how much to modify the salary formulas, or whether and how long to delay tier advancement increases or rank promotion increases, and reports the decision and its justification to the Faculty Senate.

If tier advancement increases and/or rank promotion increases are delayed, units may proceed to award tier advancements and rank promotions as usual, but the accompanying salary increases shall not be awarded until the delay period expires. At that time, faculty members who received tier advancements or rank promotions during the delay period shall receive non-retroactive salary increases according to the formula in effect at that time.

D. Promotion Raises

Each tier-eligible faculty member who receives a promotion in rank shall receive a salary increase, to be effective on the same date as the promotion, in an amount determined by the formula in effect on the date the promotion takes effect. Promotion raises can be delayed by following the procedures described in Subsection C.

E. Tier Advancement Raises

Each tier-eligible faculty member who receives a tier advancement shall receive a salary increase, to be effective on the same date as the tier advancement, in an amount determined by the formula in effect on the date the advancement takes effect. Tier advancement raises can be delayed by following the procedures described in Subsection C.

F. Market Adjustments

1. A market adjustment is a salary increase to mitigate the effects of general economic and price escalations in the region. A market adjustment formula, reflecting these escalations, shall be
established by the President.

2. **Except as provided in subsection C above or in subsection E of Section 24-70, each year all faculty members who were deemed to be performing satisfactorily in their last collegial performance reviews shall receive a market adjustment determined by the market adjustment formula.**

3. **If, in any given year, the market adjustment formula would produce a market adjustment that is zero or negative, no market adjustment shall be given.**

G. Variable Adjustments

1. **Variable adjustments are salary increases used to partially or wholly correct inappropriate salary differences.** Typical uses for variable adjustments include, but are not limited to, the following:

   a. **To address salary compression or inversion within a unit;**

   b. **To address a "salary gap" between a unit and its academic peers inside or outside the university;**

   c. **To correct inappropriate salary differences among individual faculty members whose accomplishments and career stages are comparable;**

   d. **To provide an additional increase to all satisfactorily performing faculty at a time when the market adjustment is not sufficient to keep pace with average salary advances at peer institutions.**

2. **In any given year, after consulting with the elected faculty council and department chairs, a dean may propose the allocation of certain funds for variable adjustments in a college or school and may propose such requirements, conditions, and limitations on their distribution as he or she deems appropriate.** The consultation with the elected faculty council shall include making available to the council detailed information about salaries in each unit of the college, school, or campus, as well as information about salaries in appropriate units at peer institutions.

3. **The Provost, after consulting with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, may authorize or deny the variable adjustment allocation proposed by a given college, school, or college, or may modify it or make it subject to such requirements, conditions, and limitations as he or she deems appropriate.**

4. **Variable adjustment funds need not be distributed as equal percentages to all units, or to all individuals within a unit.**

5. **If variable adjustments are authorized in a department or an undepartmentalized school or college, the voting faculty members of the unit shall vote on the procedure and principles to be applied in distributing the funds consistent with the purpose of the allocation described in paragraph 2 above.** This may include delegating the distribution to a committee appointed by the chair, or to the chair. This policy must be renewed or amended by the voting faculty in each year during which variable adjustments are authorized for the unit.

6. **A new collegial performance review is not required for the awarding of a variable adjustment. However, a faculty member whose performance was found to be unsatisfactory in his or her last collegial performance review is not eligible for a variable adjustment.**
H. Minimum Salaries

Formerly 24-71 A 3

Every two years, the Provost shall, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, determine the minimum salary for each faculty rank. This determination shall take account of the recent salaries of beginning assistant professors at the University of Washington, and shall endeavor to reflect in the floors for other ranks the general expectation of salary advancement for faculty.

I. Retention Increases

Formerly 24-71 B 3

To A department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized college) may at any time propose a salary increase to retain a current faculty member, based on subject to the recommendation approval of the dean. Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. The The voting faculty of each academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to cast an advisory vote on the recommend an appropriate response; alternatively, the voting faculty may establish, consistent with the procedures of Chapter 23, Section 23–45, a different policy regarding the level of consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This policy shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this policy biennially.
Section 24-73 Transition to the New Salary Policy

New temporary section.

A. Once the new faculty salary policy has been approved by the faculty and signed by the president, the President shall establish a Transition Period, to start no later than the beginning of Autumn Quarter of the second academic year after the academic year during which the President signs the enabling legislation. In this section, the following terms are used:

1. The Pre-Transition Period is the period from the time the new salary policy is signed by the president until the start of the Transition Period.

2. The Transition Period begins on a date determined by the president, and ends at the start of the next Autumn Quarter after that.

3. The Implementation Date of the new salary policy is the beginning of the next Autumn Quarter following the start of the Transition Period; and the Implementation Year is the academic year starting on the Implementation Date.

4. This timeline may be extended for up to one year by the President, with the consent of the SCPB.

B. The university’s faculty salary policy shall be governed as follows:

1. During the Pre-Transition Period, faculty salaries shall be governed by the Pre-Transition Salary Policy, described in Sections 24-74 through 24-76 below. During the Pre-Transition Period, there shall be no Market Adjustments, no Tier Advancements or Tier Raises, and no Variable Adjustments.

2. During the Transition Period, faculty salaries shall be governed by the Transition Salary Policy, described in Section 24-77 below. During the Transition Period, there will be no tier raises and no market adjustments.

3. Starting from the Implementation Date of the new salary policy, Sections 24-73 through 24-77 shall be deleted from the Faculty Code and shall cease to be effective, and the salary policy shall be governed by the remaining provisions of Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code.

Section 24-77 Transition Period Salary Policy

New temporary section.

During the Transition Period, there will be no market adjustments and no tier advancement raises. Instead, meritorious faculty members may receive Transition Raises as described below. During the Transition Period, units will make three assignments for each tier-eligible faculty member: (1) an initial tier; (2) the time for the individual’s next mandatory collegial performance review; and (3) a transition raise.

A. Assignment of Initial Tiers

During the Transition Period, each tier-eligible faculty member shall be assigned an initial tier, which will become the person’s tier as of the Implementation Date of the new salary policy. The following is designed to assign each individual to an initial tier that is, as far as practicable, commensurate with the individual’s career stage, accomplishments, and current salary.
There will be no tier advancements during the Transition Period. The assignment of an initial tier, in itself, has no effect on any individual's salary.

For all tier-eligible continuing faculty members except Lecturers, Artists in Residence, and Assistant Professors, two integer values shall be calculated:

1. **Career-based tier**, determined by taking the number of years at current rank (including the Transition Period) and dividing by four, discarding any fractional remainder, and adding 1.

2. **Salary-based tier**, determined by comparing the current salary of each current faculty member to a salary schedule created for the individual's primary appointing unit, and choosing the tier at the individual's current rank which has a corresponding salary closest to the individual's actual salary.

The salary schedules to be used in calculating the salary-based tier will be created by the Office of Planning and Budgeting in consultation with the Provost, SCPB, deans, and chairs.

Once the seniority-based and salary-based tiers have been calculated, each individual's initial tier shall be assigned as follows (subject to the exceptions noted below):

- If the two calculated tiers are equal, that becomes the individual's initial tier.
- If the salary-based tier is higher than the career-based tier, the salary-based tier becomes the individual's initial tier.
- If the salary-based tier is lower than the career-based tier, the individual may choose any initial tier no lower than the salary-based tier and no higher than the career-based tier.

**Exception 1:** No Professor shall have an initial tier of 7 or higher. If either the salary-based tier or career-based tier would be 7 or higher according to the above instructions, that calculated tier will be replaced by Tier 6 for the purposes of this assignment.

**Exception 2:** Except for Assistant Professors, no faculty member shall be required to begin at the highest tier for their rank, or at Professor 6. Thus if an individual's salary-based tier is higher than the appropriate tier in the following list, the individual shall have the option of choosing an initial tier no lower than the tier in this list:

- Associate Professor 2
- Professor 5
- Senior Lecturer 2
- Senior Artist in Residence 2
- Principal Lecturer 5

For tier-eligible Lecturers and Artists in Residence: The initial tier shall be 1.

For tier-eligible Assistant Professors, the initial tiers will be determined by whether they will be in their first or second appointment during the Implementation Year of the new salary policy:

- If the Implementation Year occurs during the initial three-year appointment or a terminal fourth year, the initial tier shall be Assistant Professor 1.
- If the Implementation Year occurs during the second three-year appointment or a terminal seventh year, the initial tier shall be Assistant Professor 2.
In no event shall the assignment of a tier be construed as the conferral or denial of tenure or promotion.

B. Assignment of Next Mandatory Collegial Review

Each tier-eligible faculty member will be assigned a time for next mandatory collegial review. Except for Assistant Professors, the next mandatory collegial review year shall be computed as follows: Starting one full year before the first Autumn Quarter during which the individual’s last appointment or promotion became effective, determine the least multiple of four years from that date that occurs on or after the Autumn Quarter during which the new salary policy takes effect. The individual’s next mandatory collegial review shall occur during the academic year starting at that time.

For Assistant Professors [and whoever else is an affected party], the next mandatory collegial review year shall be determined based on the effective date of the individual’s last appointment or promotion review, and based on a nominal four-year review cycle.

C. Transition Raises

During the Transition Period, there will be no tier raises and no market adjustments. Instead, each tier-eligible faculty member who was declared meritorious in his or her last merit evaluation shall receive a transition raise to take effect on the July 1 preceding the Implementation Date of the new salary policy.

For a faculty member who was declared meritorious in his or her last evaluation, a new collegial review is not required in order to receive a transition raise. However, a collegial performance review following the procedures of Section 24-60 of the revised Faculty Code shall be initiated for any individual faculty member if requested by the chair, dean, or his or her designee or the faculty member; or if it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment. Such a review may be used, for example, to determine satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance, or to consider recommending a faculty member for a possible promotion in rank, or to provide evidence for distribution of Variable Adjustments if they are available. If a collegial review is carried out during the Transition Period, then eligibility for a transition raise is determined by whether the review results in a finding of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance.

Each individual's transition raise shall be determined by his or her next mandatory review year.

Default Plan: For each unit that does not choose to use the Alternative Plan described below, the transition raises shall be as follows:

- For those whose mandatory review year is the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 2%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is one year after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 4%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is two years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 6%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is three years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 8%.

In each case, the percentage above is a percentage of the individual’s salary if that salary is less than or equal to the average UW full professor’s salary during the Transition Period; otherwise it is a percentage of that average salary.

Under the Default Plan, there will be Variable Adjustments only if allocated by the college, school, or campus and approved by the provost, in accord with Section 24-73 of the revised Faculty Code.
Alternative Plan: By vote of a majority of its eligible voting faculty, a department or an undepartmentalized college may choose to use the following Alternative Plan. Such a decision must be reported to the Dean.

- For those whose mandatory review year is the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 1.5%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is one year after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 3%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is two years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 4.5%.
- For those whose mandatory review year is three years after the Implementation Year, the transition raise is 6%.

In each case, the percentage above is a percentage of the individual's salary if that salary is less than or equal to the average UW full professor's salary during the Transition Period; otherwise it is a percentage of that average salary.

Under the Alternative Plan, 1.25% of the continuing faculty salary pool shall be available to the unit for Variable Adjustments, in addition to any amount allocated for Variable Adjustments by the college, school, or campus and approved by the provost. All Variable Adjustments shall be distributed in accord with Section 24-73 of the revised Faculty Code.
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, February 26, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor Kate O’Neill.

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

4. Report of the Provost and Executive Vice President – Ana Mari Cauce

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of February 9, 2014.
   a. Approval of the January 12, 2015, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the January 29, 2015, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.

9. **Discussion item:** Faculty Salary Policy Legislation.

10. Unfinished Business.

    a. Nomination of Candidates for 2015-16 Faculty Senate Vice Chair.
    b. 2015-16 Faculty Senate Vice Chair Candidates’ Presentations.

   *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.*

12. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Marcia Killien
Approved by: Kate O’Neill, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, March 5.