Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, April 6, 2015, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding

Absent: Stroup, Gharib
Guests: Dianne Lattemann, Bruce Balick, Rich Christie, Ann Mescher, Marjorie Olmstead

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair O’Neill called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. 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 indicated that work is continuing on the salary policy, but that no legislation will be presented to the SEC or Senate this year.

As an addition to her written report, O’Neill mentioned that she and Nancy Bradshaw attended a meeting of the PAC12 Academic Leadership Coalition the previous week. Issues being addressed by other PAC12 university senates are remarkably similar, including faculty salary policy and Title IX compliance.

Christina Fong asked who will be appointed to the salary policy task force. O’Neill responded that a task force had not yet been appointed, but would be within the purview of the Senate leadership. Code drafting would occur in FCFA. Negotiations with the President and Provost regarding feasible solutions and budget constraints are ongoing.

   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]

Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani provided additional comments. She reported that the budgets from the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives were released and both gave positive attention to higher education. The versions, however, were very different in their approach to funding, especially for financial aid programs. The Senate version provided a flat salary increase for all employees, but that would likely not hold up since the legislature does not have the right to amend bargaining agreements. Taricani said that a tuition decrease was unlikely, though a freeze was still on the table. It seemed improbable that the legislature would finish their work without at least one special session. Significant new revenue seemed unlikely, though some modest proposals, including a sales tax on internet goods, were still viable.

There were no questions.


President Cauce added to the report from JoAnn Taricani and indicated that under most circumstances she would feel good about both budgets. She echoed Taricani’s statement that the architecture of the budgets differed greatly. Cauce was concerned that the budgets were to gain press attention and that at the end of the session the final budget would not be as good for higher education.

Husky Promise would be greatly affected by the Senate proposal. With low tuition and less aid available with the cut from the State Need Grant, a good portion of the money available to fund Husky Promise would be gone. Cauce wanted to avoid moving toward a system that could end up reducing aid to lower income students to pay for middle class students.
Another criticism of the Senate budget was that it essentially ends WWAMI. Cauce was adamant with legislators that the UW could not continue WWAMI without appropriate funding and that Spokane would lose the only medical school they have, resulting in no new doctors for almost a decade. She did testify in favor of new revenues, not specifically in favor of capital gains or any others. Either way, Cauce hoped the UW would move toward having a long-term legislative strategy.

Cauce commented about the minimum wage and the UW’s position; the UW was meeting the minimum wage for employees but minimum wage for students was still under discussion. She was concerned about the future of ever increasing housing costs in the university area and its impact on faculty and students, which she discussed with Seattle Mayor Ed Murray.

Lastly, Cauce mentioned an email to be sent to the campus community. It was clear that in many ways, issues around race, religion, etc. are popping up all over the country. She said that we needed to have conversations about what we could do as individuals and as a community. Her announcement will be for a talk on April 16th launching an initiative on issues of equity.

Interim provost Jerry Baldasty announced that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC) is moving ahead to conduct a first-principles review of UW IP policy and have announced listening sessions from April to June. Phase 2 will be distilling overarching principles; policy recommendations will occur starting in September. Duane Storti expressed concern that IPMAC had been secretive and that the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC) was not adequately involved. Tueng Shen, chair of SCIPC, indicated that the group had been consulted and was comfortable with the amount of collaboration. Chair O’Neill expressed her support for the process.

Alice Popejoy asked for an electronic copy of the timeline and inquired as to if the listening sessions would be open to the public. Baldasty responded that they were open discussions and encouraged attendance.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of the February 9, 2015, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
   b. Approval of the February 26, 2015, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   c. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]
   d. Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, JoAnn Taricani, Professor, Music History, as the 2015-16 Faculty Legislative Representative.

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements

7. Discussion item: Faculty Demographic Data Access – Susan Astley, member, SEC. [Exhibit F]

Astley introduced the topic and referred SEC members to the two questions posed in the exhibit, 1. When will the faculty receive access to their demographics data, 2. Why is the demographic data missing from the Academic Personnel Appointments with Demographics report? She asked the Provost about the feasibility of faculty gaining access to gender, race, and age data in Tableau and Excel formats. Provost Baldasty voiced continuing concern about protecting data of individuals in small units. Astley countered that the data are already available but not in easily analyzable formats.

Astley argued that data will allow departments to analyze if policies regarding demographics and equity were making any difference over time. Popejoy indicated that graduate students have an interest in the data and more generally in the open access of information.

O’Neill said the Senate was interested in the data and that at the department level, information to see if policies are working over time, would result in more robust faculty governance. Astley added that sharing data between departments would be an important strategy.
Cheryl Cameron commented that as a federal contractor, the UW makes regular reports on affirmative action. These reports, however, were in .pdf format due to federal format requirements. Cameron voiced concern that providing these data would be a violation of confidentiality requirements. Prior reports were not intended, according to UW policy, to be accessible more widely. The university’s data management committee has discussed this issue.

There were additional questions about the regulations restricting access. The problem of inadequate access to aggregate data for addressing questions of demographics and equity would persist, but Provost Baldasty agreed to work with faculty leadership on attempting to resolve this issue.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

   a. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit G]
      Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
      Title: Resolution concerning childcare.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Rich Christie, chair of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) introduced the resolution as passed by his council. Ann Mescher, member of FCUFS, provided information and rationale on the resolution and provided graphs to support her remarks.

Referring to the graphs, a member asked about the relationship between the UW’s rankings and the lack of adequate childcare slots. Mescher indicated that in the context of large expansions in sports facilities, acquisition of the UW tower, and other major facilities expansions, the UW has not increased child care spaces. President Cauce responded that funding stagnated and has resulted in a shortage of slots. She added that the UW may be at an all-time low as far as demand for childcare because our faculty has been aging. As we hire younger faculty, we need to make those investments and decide where we find the financial resources. Assuming we don’t have unlimited funds, we would be considering redistributing dollars.

Fong asked why the resolution calls for increasing UW administrative staff to work on childcare issues instead of increasing childcare providers or space. Mescher indicated that other institutions have multiple staff members to implement and expand childcare resources.

Q: What is the best solution to the problem of childcare access?
A: Mescher answered that space is the key issue. President Cauce suggested several possible sites on or near campus that are currently being investigated. Marjorie Olmstead mentioned that space has been promised for years but seems to never come to fruition.

Alice Popejoy mentioned that GPSS has been working on this issue since the 1970s and previously passed a resolution asking for on-site childcare centers. She stressed the importance of looking for ways to integrate childcare into other spaces.

Storti called the question. It was seconded. The motion failed.

Paul Hopkins asked if the UW is providing an appropriate percentage of money overall, in comparison to other institutions, since many institutions with more childcare slots have significantly more resources. Mescher argued that the UW was behind peers in childcare funding.

Cauce argued that there was little support to make this a top budget priority, but a statement from the Faculty Senate on this matter would certainly move it up the list.

There was a motion to amend the first whereas clause to read “WHEREAS, the University of Washington has fallen behind its peer institutions in providing flexible on-site childcare; and.” The motion passed.

The resolution was approved as amended.
b. **Class C Resolution.** [Exhibit H]
   Faculty Council on Research.
   **Title:** Resolution concerning the UW open access repository & request for advice on an open access policy.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate Consideration.

Benjamin Marwick was not able to attend to speak to the resolution. Others familiar with the issue, including GPSS President Alice Popejoy, spoke to the issue. Popejoy indicated that the GPSS had passed a similar resolution. Tim Jewell, from UW libraries, attended to speak to the current repository and what improvements could be made. Diane Latteman, chair of the Faculty Council on University Libraries, spoke in favor of the resolution.

Members discussed the cost of journals and the importance of open access to scholarly work.

Storti expressed concern about an opt-out repository. Sean O’Connor, chair of the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), sent comments to Chair O’Neill before the meeting. He applauded the effort and argued that it would be critical to find funding. He was concerned about faculty leverage in granting access and that the resolution presumed an opt-out system.

There were two amendments:
1. Line 44: Strike remainder of WHEREAS clause after “repository.” The motion removed the specific policy recommendations and the assumption of an opt-out system. The motion passed.

The resolution was approved as amended.

c. **Approval of the April 23, 2015, Faculty Senate Agenda.** [Exhibit I]
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.

10. **Good of the Order.**

There was no good of the order.

11. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.

Prepared by: [Signature]
Marcia Killien
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: [Signature]
Kate O’Neill, Chair
Faculty Senate
I am delighted to announce that Zoe Barsness has been elected Vice Chair of the Senate for 2015 – 2016. Zoe is an associate professor in the Milgard School of Business at UW Tacoma. This is the first time that a vice chair has hailed from Tacoma, and I think that’s a wonderful milestone for all three campuses. Her scholarly expertise in organization and her long service in shared governance bring valuable skills to the senate leadership team. Norm Beauchamp and I look forward to working with her next year.

The big outstanding issue remains the salary policy. As you will recall, at the last Senate meeting, the vote was evenly split on a motion to postpone presentation of a proposed new policy to the Senate at this meeting. The proponents of the motion objected to certain features of the proposal and wanted more time to find a solution. At the end of that Senate meeting, I promised the senators that I, and others including Jack Lee, would work hard to find compromise, to bring the compromises to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA), and to review with the FCFA and with the administration whether we were ready to present viable proposed legislation to this body today and, ultimately, the Senate this spring.

Shortly before spring break, I decided that we were not ready. I had three basic reasons. First, although many people – senators, members of the salary policy task force, Joe Janes, and Jack Lee – worked very hard and found many points of agreement, the suggested compromises would increase the policy’s flexibility so that units could adopt different raise formulas. That added complexity generated new financial and administrative issues that we could not analyze or resolve properly in the short time available. Second, even without any new provisions, the code provisions in which any new policy must be expressed are quite long and complex and require careful attention to precise wording and reconciliation of multiple sections. FCFA’s members have worked diligently to embody the proposal in code language, but there were still substantive clauses that needed review, as well as technical drafting work that remained. Third, I understood from the administration that the UW could not implement a new salary policy in the coming biennium even if the legislation were enacted this spring. Thus, on balance, I decided that it would be better to continue to work this spring and summer and aim to present the Senate with viable, and hopefully simpler and more polished, salary legislation next year.

I did not reach this decision easily. I know that many, many faculty strongly supported the proposal and will be deeply disappointed. I also know that the proposal represents years of thoughtfull work by many people – the members of the task force, of FCFA, and of course our former Senate chair Jack Lee. All deserve our heartfelt thanks.

Their work will not be wasted. I am committed to improving the UW’s salary policy, if not this year, then next. Everyone who has participated in the discussions of the salary policy – including the discussions of the problems with our existing policy – has learned a lot. There is wide consensus that the existing policy is too rigid and has outlived its usefulness. There is wide consensus that loyal, productive faculty deserve predictable salary growth over the course of a career.

So, what to do? The senate leadership and, I believe, the administration are both committed to implementing a fair and effective salary policy as soon as possible. I will ask a small group to work very hard this spring and summer from the information we have learned from this process to finalize a policy – hopefully somewhat simpler – that can garner broad support. That group will then polish the proposed legislation and report its work back to the FCFA by the start of autumn quarter 2015. The SEC and Senate can then deliberate carefully and still have ample time to enact the legislation before the end of the 2015 – 2016 academic year.

In the meantime, this spring FCFA, the SEC, and the Senate can turn their attention to other issues that need the faculty’s attention. Those include review of the RCEP process, development of a more robust open access repository for UW research and scholarly papers, and the need for childcare facilities for students, staff and faculty. We may also be asked to review proposed changes to the Student Conduct Code, including changes designed to deal with Title IX issues.
Finally, Norm Beauchamp and I will be seeking your advice on planning and setting agendas for next year’s work. In particular, at the next SEC and Senate meeting we will be asking SEC members and senators to review the Sustainable Academic Business Plan and discuss whether it reflects the needs and goals of their constituencies. We would like to encourage a robust discussion of those issues, including the question of whether the structure of the senate’s councils and committees is properly aligned with and supportive of diverse faculty’s needs and goals.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The election of the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate has been completed; Associate Professor Zoe Barsness was elected for a term beginning in August 1, 2015.

2. The process of electing Senators for the 2015-17 term is underway. Those schools/colleges/campuses that are due to elect new senators have been notified and most have completed electing senators. We are hoping to entirely complete the elections by late April.

3. Six nominations were received for the 40th University Faculty Lecturer and a recommendation has been sent by the nominating committee to the President.

4. Nominations are being accepted for appointments to university faculty committees and councils for the academic year 2015-16. If you are interested in serving on a faculty council, or would like to nominate a colleague, please contact me at 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. Documents and data related to these discussions are posted on the SCPB website, www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/scpb.

RCEP Request: Molecular Medicine Certificate Program

We considered a request from the Graduate School and the School of Medicine that the Molecular Medicine Graduate Certificate, located administratively in the Graduate School, be transferred to the Department of Pathology in the School of Medicine. This certificate program shares its educational mission, leadership, and administrative staff with the Molecular Medicine and Mechanisms of Disease PhD Program, which is housed in the Department of Pathology. The transfer will not be accompanied by any change in administrative oversight or curriculum, and will have no impact on current students. SCPB recommended to the provost that this be treated as a “limited RCEP” under the Faculty Code.

Appointment of an Interim Provost

Provost and Interim President-Designate Ana Mari Cauce informed us that she was considering appointing Senior Vice Provost Jerry Baldasty as Interim Provost. Members of SCPB responded very positively to the suggestion.

Transportation Services and U-Pass Planning

We were joined by Josh Kavanagh and Ann Gigli from Transportation Services, to talk about budgeting challenges faced by Transportation Services as parking revenues decline. We learned that while the student U-Pass program is self-funding, there have been challenges to the funding of the faculty U-Pass program. The challenge is to set the price high enough to cover costs, while not so high as to dissuade faculty members from purchasing the pass. Members of SCPB expressed considerable interest in the idea of making the U-Pass a universal charge to faculty, as it is to students. We will be meeting again later this quarter with Transportation Services, and in particular will be discussing proposed changes to parking rates.

Global Innovation Exchange

We received a report from Professor Dan Schwartz of Chemical Engineering about a new Global Innovation Exchange (GIX) Master’s program being developed in collaboration with prospective partners at Microsoft and Tsinghua University. This fee-based interdisciplinary Master’s program would be housed in a new GIX facility in Bellevue, Washington, and would aim to graduate entrepreneurial design and technology leaders. Initially, the program will be targeted to students who already have basic programming experience or coursework, but later they hope to open it to a broader range of students from the business and design communities. The proposed program consists of three phases: a “scaffolding phase” including orientation and basic instruction; a “prototyping phase” focusing on entrepreneurship, hardware, prototyping, and project management; and a “launching phase” during which a project is brought to completion. The goal is to admit the first small class in 2016.

Report on Recruitments and Separations

Vice Provost Cheryl Cameron joined us to answer questions about the data regarding faculty recruitment and separations, available on the Academic Personnel website: ap.washington.edu.
Report from the College of Engineering

SCPB invited representatives from the College of Engineering to report on the college's goals, challenges, budgets, and governance structures. We spoke with Michael Bragg (Dean), Gregory Nelson (Chair of the Student Advisory Council), and Tom Sparks (Fiscal Administrator). For at least the past five years, the college has experienced significant growth in enrollment, numbers of degrees awarded, and faculty size. The growth has been somewhat accelerated in recent years due to targeted funds provided by the legislature to increase the numbers of engineering degrees awarded by UW. The college administration is concerned about the fiscal effects of the proposed new salary policy, in particular whether it will be affordable and leave sufficient flexibility to attract and retain top faculty members. The biggest immediate need for the college seems to be a second CSE building, to accommodate the expected increases in enrollment.

OPB Salary Policy Analysis

Carol Diem, Director of Institutional Data Analysis in the Office of Planning and Budgeting, presented OPB’s modeling analysis of the costs of the proposed new salary policy, compared against continuing with the present policy. The projected costs depend, of course, on many assumptions; but based on some fairly reasonable assumptions regarding inflation, retirements, and hiring, the upshot is that the mandated costs of the proposed policy would be approximately 0.4% higher than the current policy during the transition year, and thereafter would probably be comparable to or somewhat lower than the costs of the current policy. It should be noted that this analysis covers only the mandated minimum costs, as a way of ascertaining whether the new policy would impose unaffordable costs. In practice, we would hope that in most years, more than the minimum amount of funding could be allocated to the new system, in order to begin addressing our compression and market gap problems.

Legislative Updates

Since the legislative session started, SCPB has been receiving regular weekly legislative updates from Assistant Vice Provost Sarah Hall and Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani. After the release of the House budget proposal on March 27, we received an extensive report on the details of the proposal and its likely effects on UW. The general consensus was that, while it falls somewhat short of the level of funding the university has requested to pay for a tuition freeze, it goes a long way in that direction, and is overall a good budget for the university. Now we need to wait and see what the Senate budget proposal looks like, and how the two will be reconciled.

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

- 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
- Co-Motion
- Intellectual Property Policy
- Learning Spaces Project
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor and Chair, Music History Program
olympia@uw.edu

Legislative session 2015:

On March 27, the House Appropriations Committee released its proposed budget for 2015-17, Substitute House Bill 1106, followed the proposed Senate budget on March 31, Substitute Senate Bill 5077.

The two chambers are negotiating toward a budget they can both agree to pass, and which the Governor will agree to sign. At the end of this report are links to information on the details of the budget and ways to contact legislators. This report focuses on the operating budget; the Senate had not yet released its capital budget at the time of preparing this report. As you read the news and this report, please bear in mind that what is called a “tuition freeze” is actually state reinvestment in higher education, to make up for the significant cuts during the recent recession, when the university needed to raise tuition at a much higher level than usual to compensate for the cut of state funding. The tuition freeze in the current biennium and the proposed freeze or reduction of tuition for resident undergraduates in the next biennium is the Legislature’s attempt to restore a better balance of state funding to the university. Legislators have made this reinvestment in higher education a top priority in this session.

What to watch: I had been saying that our sight should be focused on the differences between the House and Senate proposed budgets. On the House side, there is something new and emerging to watch, a separate and significant revenue bill that would provide new and dedicated funding for education. Many investments in the House budget would be funded by this new revenue source. Once it passes out of the House, it will be considered by the Senate, which is reluctant to create any new tax revenue.

Where we are going: The Legislature needs to arrive at the end of the session with a budget containing a plan for expenditure and revenue that is balanced and agreed to by House, Senate, and Governor. Both chambers have expressed strong interest in reinvesting in higher education, but identifying the funding to support that reinvestment will be a divergent discussion point in the next month.

How do we get there: If Point "Y" is the final budget and we are standing on Point "X" today, there is no way to graph the path from "X" to "Y". The variables will be funding (expenditure) levels and what types of revenue will support those levels. The new capital gains tax proposed by the House Democrats will need Senate approval, but the Senate budget is staked on the position that no new revenue sources will be needed in the 2015-17 budget.

Comparison of proposals for tuition and financial aid: The House budget provides a tuition freeze for resident undergraduate tuition, staff/faculty salary increases and funding via a proposed capital gains tax, along with a significant increase, $53 million, in the State Need Grant for students with financial need. The Senate budget proposes a tuition reduction, from the current $10,740 down to $7560 in 2016-17, and cuts the State Need Grant by $17 million. Both budgets propose a significant amount of “backfill” to cover the tuition revenue that would be lost; neither comes to the level the university had requested, but each budget does contain significant funding for this purpose.

Comparison of compensation proposals: The big difference between the legislative compensation plans and the governor’s plan is that the House and Senate would fund increases via state funds; the Governor’s plan only funded 30% of the amount needed, with the rest to be provided by the university (an arrangement unprecedented in anyone’s memory). The House offers faculty/staff salary increases at 3% in 15-16 and 1.8% in 16-17; the second-year raises would be funded by the new capital gains tax. The Senate proposes to offer all full-time state workers a $1000/year salary increase, and also assumes that collective bargaining agreements negotiated already for 2015-17 would not be honored.
These are just the overview large-ticket costs in the budget; there are many smaller but important items in the budget also, such as funding for the WWAMI-Spokane UW Medical School program (much better in the House budget) and funding for new degrees in computer science and engineering or STEM areas (better for the UW in the House budget). You can read details of the comparison of the budgets at this site of the Office of Planning and Budgeting:

http://opb.washington.edu/sites/default/files/opb/Policy/Senate_Chair_Budget_2015-17.pdf

**Revenue:** The House relies on increasing state revenue through the creation of a capital gains tax (HB 2224) and the closing of certain tax loopholes; the Senate proposes no new taxes, and in higher education, saves money by offering lower salary increases and by proposing $70 million less than the House for the State Need Grant.

It is generally accepted that the State of Washington has a highly regressive tax system, with reliance on the sales tax imposing a high tax rate on the lowest income population of the state. I provide several links below to recent articles that delve into the background of the tax system of our state, in case you want to read more about the current system. Taxes such as a capital gains tax or income tax (not being considered in this bill) spread the tax burden to more layers of income.

The tax proposed in HB 2224 would apply to individuals who earn more than $25,000/year in profits on the sales of stocks and bonds, or married joint filers earning more than $50,000/year in profits, who would pay a 5 percent capital gains tax under the proposal. Exemptions, modeled on federal tax law, are provided for certain types of capital gains, such as sale of a primary residence or gains in a retirement account.

The proposed House revenue plan hopes to generate $570 million per year through the capital gains tax, and is counting on $400 million for the first year, which would go to K-12 needs, with revenue above that amount going into a fund for higher education. There is concern about the predictability of this revenue stream, and that discussion will continue as the bill is debated in the House and moves to the Senate.

Here is an overview provided by the House Appropriations Committee:

http://housedemocrats.wa.gov/tmp/2015/03/The-Fair-Share-Tax-FINAL.pdf

And here is a link to the bill language (Sections 501 through 514 apply to the new capital gains tax):


For additional background on the tax system in Washington State, this recent series aired on KPLU, March 23-27, 2015 (additional links are provided within these articles):

http://www.kplu.org/post/wash-voters-once-passed-income-tax-wider-margin-vote-legal-booze

http://www.kplu.org/post/washington-republican-and-democrat-agree-if-only-we-had-idaho-s-tax-system

You may write to your own legislators or other members of the House at any point from your personal email account to comment on or advocate for portions of the budget. Information on how to contact legislators and guidelines regarding state ethics law on the use of state resources can be found here: http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia-legislators -- and information on legislative committee membership and contacts for individual legislators is at http://leg.wa.gov/legislature/Pages/MemberInformation.aspx

Key legislators for current House budget issues:

Chair of the Finance Committee (will approve the revenue package in HB 2224):

Representative Reuven Carlyle, reuven.carlyle@leg.wa.gov
Chair of the House Higher Education Committee (developed the higher education portion of the budget):
Representative Drew Hansen, drew.hansen@leg.wa.gov

Chair of the Appropriations Committee (will approve the budget):
Representative Ross Hunter, ross.hunter@leg.wa.gov

Chair of the Capital Budget Committee (will approve the capital budget):
Representative Hans Dunshee, hans.dunshee@leg.wa.gov

Speaker of the House, Representative Frank Chopp, frank.chopp@leg.wa.gov

Other committee members:
http://app.leg.wa.gov/rosters/CommitteeMembersByCommittee.aspx?Chamber=H
2014 – 2015 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

- David Goldstone, ASUW, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 9:30)

- Elyse Janzen, ASUW, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.

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

- Alexis Nelson, GPSS, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.
Faculty Access to Faculty Salary and Demographic Data

Questions:

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

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

Background

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

Senate Resolutions call for efforts to advance racial and ethnic diversity and achieve gender equity.

Class C Resolution: Resolution Concerning Equity, Access, and Inclusion in Hiring, Jan 2015
Class C Resolution 525: Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographic Concerns, Nov 2012

Access to Data

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

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

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

2. **Interactive visualization of annual salary and demographic data via the Tableau platform.** Tableau allows the User to select parameters (race, age, gender, dept, rank, etc) via dropdown menus. Within seconds the data requested is presented graphically (Figs 2, 3).

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

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

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

![Fig 4](#)

The UW has made tremendous progress providing faculty and students with access to UW data.
- Visit the UW Business Intelligence Portal for UW Enterprise Data Warehouse Reports and Analytics. [https://biportal.uw.edu/](https://biportal.uw.edu/) Its impressive.

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

![Fig 5](#)

It’s time to post the faculty demographics via Tableau.
Resolution Concerning Childcare

WHEREAS, the University of Washington has fallen behind peer institutions in providing flexible, on-site childcare; and,

WHEREAS, the faculty recognizes the administration’s efforts to address this issue by appointing a full-time director for Childcare Development & Access; and,

WHEREAS, the University of Washington continues “to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, promoting access, opportunity and justice for all.” (UW Diversity Mission Statement 2014).

BE IT RESOLVED, that the faculty endorses the administration’s appointment of a director and a permanent advisory committee on Childcare Development and Access; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that through the permanent advisory committee the faculty will continue working with the administration to develop a family friendly environment at the University of Washington by the following actions:

- Develop accessible, near / on-site university childcare centers.
- Support collaborations between new campus childcare centers, affording access for families and ensuring excellence and quality programs for those served.
- Provide leadership in the field of early education, family relationships, and early mental health, essential to developing a qualified and informed workforce in meeting the varied needs of our graduate and professional school students, faculty, and staff.
- Strengthen family relationships by providing support and educational services that are based on research and best-practice methodology.
- Create flexibility whenever possible to adjust and respond to the changing needs of campus families, the workforce, and our environment.
- Develop productive partnerships to facilitate access by the University of Washington community to a full range of childcare support.
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Concerning the UW Open Access Repository & Request for Advice on an Open Access Policy

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, dissemination of academic research by deposit of authors’ copies of published articles in Open Access repositories (that enable anyone with internet access to read the articles without financial, legal, or technical barriers) is associated with increases in the impact, visibility and use of that research [view a bibliography of relevant studies]; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington Libraries has established an online, freely accessible and searchable Open Access repository, ResearchWorks at the University of Washington (ResearchWorks), for the dissemination and preservation of scholarly works published by members of the University community [view ResearchWorks]; and

WHEREAS, use of ResearchWorks by University of Washington researchers to disseminate their research is currently obstructed by the limited functionality of the repository, and by the absence of a University-wide Open Access policy; and

WHEREAS, University of Washington Faculty, Students and Staff have a long-standing interest in enabling Open Access to scholarly articles produced by University Faculty, for example

- 2007: The University of Washington Office of Research issued a Statement of Position encouraging faculty to work towards rapid, free, voluntary dissemination of scholarly works to their peers and the public-at-large through open-access publications [view the Statement of Position];

- 2009: The University of Washington Faculty Senate approved Class C Bulletin No 481 recommending that the University of Washington (1) prepare for a future in which academic publications are increasingly available by open access (2) maintain and further develop ResearchWorks and related services to enable faculty to disseminate their scholarly work without financial or copyright barriers [view the Class C Bulletin];

- 2015: The Graduate and Professional Student Senate resolved to encourage faculty to adopt an open access publications policy that facilitates free and public access to the scholarly peer reviewed articles produced by University of Washington students, staff, and faculty [view the resolution]; and

WHEREAS, there is scope for enhancing ResearchWorks to provide a world-class Open Access repository to support the dissemination of University of Washington research, and raise the impact and visibility of the University’s research; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for a University-wide policy to enable the University to work with publishers and other universities to simplify procedures to enable deposit of scholarly articles in an Open Access repository; and

WHEREAS, among University of Washington Faculty and Staff there is substantial scholarly expertise of international renown on Open Access issues, including economics, bibliometrics, recommendation systems, and legal analysis; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests the following:

That the Provost direct the Vice Provost of Digital Initiatives, Dean of the University Libraries to develop an open access publication policy for recommendation to the University. In doing so, the following shall be among the issues considered:
1. The University of Washington Libraries and UW IT conduct a needs and integration assessment to determine what resources are necessary to enhance ResearchWorks to the level of a world-class Open Access repository.

2. The Provost’s Office provide resources to the University of Washington Libraries to support this needs and integration assessment, and when the assessment is complete, further support the expeditious implementation of the recommendations.

3. The Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee and the Senate’s Special Committee on Intellectual Property promptly investigate and report to the Faculty Senate on options for implementing a robust and sustainable Open Access policy that is both sensitive to Faculty needs and concerns, and consistent with existing University policies and state and federal legislation.

4. Faculty and staff with expertise in Open Access economics, human-centered design, bibliometrics, recommendation systems, legal expertise and other specializations relevant to building a world-class Open Access repository and implementing an Open Access policy contribute to the enhancement of ResearchWorks and contribute to the implementation of a policy via the relevant University committees.
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Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 23, 2015, 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.


5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of April 6, 2015.
   a. Approval of the February 9, 2015, Senate Executive Committee Minutes.
   b. Approval of the February 26, 2015, Faculty Senate Minutes.
   c. Faculty demographic data access.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Confirm JoAnn Taricani, Professor of Music History, as 2015-2016 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term beginning August 1, 2015 and ending July 31, 2016.

8. Announcements.

9. Discussion item: Faculty Senate and Council agenda setting for 2015-16.

10. Unfinished Business.

   a. Class C Resolution.
      Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
      Title: Resolution concerning childcare.
      Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.
   b. Class C Resolution.
      Faculty Council on Research.
      Title: Resolution concerning the UW open access repository & request for advice on an open access policy.
      Action: Approve for distribution to faculty.

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
Marcia Killien
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, April 30.