Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, October 3, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: Zoe Barsness, Thaisa Way, Paul Hopkins, Mike Townsend, JoAnn Taricani, President Cauce, Susan Astley, Max Lieblich, Jan Whittington, George Sandison, Chris Laws, Sarah Stroup, Kurt Johnson, Casey Mann, Kelly Edwards
Absent: Mark Pendras, Duane Storti, Jerry Baldasty
Guests: Rolf Johnson, Kaitlyn Zhou, Cheryl Cameron

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Chair Barsness called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Barsness revised Exhibit F in the agenda to include Paul Hopkins as a member and Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017. The agenda was approved.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Zoe Barsness. [Exhibit A]

The Senate Leadership is continuing to work on the salary policy with the administration and Board of Deans and Chancellors. Work will also continue on the rights and responsibilities of lecturers in order to create a culture that values and rewards their contributions, diversity and inclusion—including the new diversity blueprint, and reducing friction/increasing collaboration among the three campuses.

Barsness referred to Susan Astley’s work on making the Faculty Demographic Tableau Dashboard available. The user interface is slated to be completed in mid-October and a final report to be given to the SEC in November.

A proposal to merge the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization and the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee was passed by the SEC in April, 2016. The new committee will have dual reporting to the SEC and the President. The proposed name is the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice. The charge and membership are being finalized and will be an action item for approval at the next SEC meeting on November 14.

   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]

JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative, spoke to her report.

It is campaign season, and citizens have the most impact at this time. The State House and Senate could swap control or even tie. We will probably have a democratic governor.

With respect to McCleary, the legislature must act on the big issues. The $100,000/day fine remains in effect. The legislature is working to restore funding to higher education that was cut during the recession.

Taricani gave a preview of the faculty-priorities survey and will provide a full report at the first Senate meeting. Work continues on the faculty-regent proposal. Past attempts have failed, but the hope going forward is to work jointly with other higher-education institutions, particularly WSU and EWU. The best that might be hoped for with some of the other institutions is non-opposition. The discussion now is very fluid.

Taricani noted an Olympia city referendum that would institute an “income tax,” with the proceeds going to a college-education fund. Any such referendum would be challenged on Constitutional grounds.
Questions followed.

Susan Astley asked if the website covers McCleary.
Taricani replied that it is not updated on McCleary at the present time but she will look into updating.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

President Cauce is working to present Olympia with a united voice that includes the other state institutions of higher education, particularly the community and technical colleges. Important issues include compensation (UW will ask for 4% and 4%) and financial aid (including fully funding the state need grant–UW back fills the shortfall and 40% of students who qualify for the grant do not receive state money) and President Cauce is in favor of a faculty representative who can vote on the Board of Regents, but needs to see the bill before determining how strongly in favor.

With respect to Faculty Senate priorities, Cauce believes that the administration and faculty leadership are very much on the same page. Last year, the faculty spoke quite clearly about a particular salary-policy proposal, but we also learned a lot from the discussions that took place at that time. We don't want our raises determined by competitive offers. The executive order tries to spell out the degree to which there is room in the faculty salary policy as it stands for doing some more creative things. We are going to make clearer the latitude that exists. Cauce noted that is important to address lecturer issues, including career path, treatment, and compensation.

With respect to tri-campus issues, Cauce said we must recognize that the branches are real campuses. They are each bigger than Evergreen, and more and more students choose them as a first choice. We want to manage things so that we have a win-win situation. We want to find ways to say yes that work for everybody. Duplication is not a concern per se, but we must make sure it is feasible to run parallel programs. We need a venue to talk about this.

Cauce is in the process of hiring an Executive Vice President (EVP) who will be in charge of day-to-day operational-level decisions. One goal is that administrative units become more customer-friendly places for faculty and students.

The public launch of UW campaign will be October 21. The administration and the faculty leadership would like more faculty involvement in the campaign. The top two campaign priorities are student scholarships and professorships/chairs for faculty. The UW does not let gifts drive our agenda or put their hands into, or interfere with, our academic mission. The time we spend on the campaign is important; the truth is that we don’t get enough money from the state. In addition, the campaign provides a real opportunity to talk about the university.

Cauce is worried about the humanities and social sciences, which face the twin problems of the growing popularity of STEM and the declining popularity of law school. But this has budget implications beyond the humanities and social sciences in part because of the relative costs of instruction.

Cauce noted that the Race and Equity Initiative is moving forward.

Cauce described two emerging issues involving freedom of speech on campus. One is the treatment of controversial speakers. The second is finding the correct balance for faculty members as both private intellectuals, who publish in academic journals, and public intellectuals, who speak in the public arena.
Questions and discussion followed.

Astley wanted to know if a report could be made to the senators about the results of the faculty salary policy vote. Understanding how turnout was spread out could be used to help us move forward. Barsness said there might be concerns about releasing raw data especially with respect to small units. Astley said she is interested in an aggregated analysis, rather than raw data. Cauce said an analysis might be useful, and the ultimate decision on how to proceed is up to the Faculty Senate, but her idea now is to move forward by making changes and not spend the entire year working on the policy.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Announce Electronic Approval of the May 2, 2016, Senate Executive Committee, and May 19, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes.
   b. Results of the Secretary of the Faculty election. [Exhibit E]
   c. Summer approved nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]
   d. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

7. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

   a. Executive Order 64: Faculty Salary Policy. [Exhibit G]
      Review and receive input on proposed revisions to Executive Order 64.

Chair Barsness explained the process for executive orders described in EO 3.

President Cauce stressed that the administration worked with Senate leadership to develop this EO. There are two main parts of the EO: increase in promotion raises from 7.5% to 12%, and clarification of the flexibility with respect to additional allocation categories.

Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic HR, highlighted the importance of consultation with Elected Faculty Councils by Deans/Chancellors. President Cauce echoed the importance of the consultative process.

Astley liked the flexibility envisioned by the EO, but found language confusing in regards to whether unit adjustments can only go to all faculty or particular faculty. Cauce remarked that additional merit could always be applied differentially.

Cameron noted that additional merit procedures are described in the Faculty Code. Cauce said that the EO clarifies that unit adjustments can be applied differentially without using the additional merit pool, you can use that on top of additional merit if you have the funds.

Astley remarked that most of the faculty in her department have no idea who has the authority or whether/when it was delegated.

Cauce noted that delegated authority for retention raises must be voted on every two years. Barsness said that this highlights a faculty failure and the need to develop a stronger culture and standard practices with respect to faculty consultation. As a first step, this will be discussed at the first meeting of the Elected Faculty
Council Chairs. The SCPB might develop toolboxes to help Faculty Councils carry out their part. Astley agreed on the importance of educating Elected Faculty Councils.

Cauce suggested raising this in the Faculty Senate as well as making sure that the Elected Faculty Council Chairs are aware. Communicating to a faculty this size is a huge challenge, perhaps some education can take place on promotion from assistant to associate.

Max Lieblich described a concern about long-term compression and funding for unit adjustments. Barsness replied that the EO is not a silver bullet, but incremental in nature. Faculty are able to make decisions that will affect the amount of money available for unit adjustments. Faculty need to accept responsibility. Cauce added that one might have to consider a smaller faculty but without decreasing teaching loads. Beginning salaries may have to go up to deal with inflation in the housing market; this will also create compression problems. This EO is an attempt to give units the tools to deal with this.

Astley said she would like to see the 12% raise mathematically modeled for its effect on compression. Moreover, gender inequality will mean that more men will get the 12% raise to Professor than women. Cauce said that there is no question that this will cost more money.

Paul Hopkins noted that we are in the 60-day comment period now. The Provost ran the salary policy until the mid-2000s, but they are too busy to know salary issues in each unit. It would be a good thing for Deans to have responsibility, authority, and the tools (or knobs) to increase or decrease raises in their unit. The EO should be written to make clear that the tools can be used not only to address problems that have emerged, but also to prevent problems from emerging. The language should reflect the spirit of flexibility, and include language of prevention.

Barsness said that specific comments/language should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty for eventual communication to the administration.

Cauce said that even though this is an EO, the administration wants the faculty to have control of this policy.

Hopkins asked whether a Dean could use this on an annual basis to adjust salaries at peer or market rates. Cauce didn’t see why not.

Thaisa Way, Faculty Senate Vice Chair, added that the Dean would have to cover that in their own budget and get it approved. Cauce said that problems might not be dealt with in one year, but over a period of years.

Cauce said there are two main tools here: hiring junior, not senior, faculty as senior faculty retire and making faculty smaller. Olympia will not save us. Barsness added another tool: doing other things such as curriculum differently. These are all hard choices.

Astley noted the difficulty on getting salary, especially retention, information from the Deans. This is a huge challenge in transparency and makes it difficult for faculty to be involved in making sound decisions.

Barsness wanted to use unit adjustments to move away from retention. Taricani suggested that these concerns be written up and submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty. Way noted that there is language in the EO about consultation. Barsness said there is similar language in the Provost’s budget letter. Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, added that the Faculty Code already gives the faculty a lot of this power.


Cauce said that there was not a policy that explicitly called out faculty or employee/student relationships. It was all under more general conflict-of-interest policies. This EO spells it out. There are universities that have flat out prohibitions. That would be difficult and undesirable in a university of our size and complexity. So the EO requires that a conflict of interest be disclosed and a process created to address that conflict of interest.
Cameron noted the Faculty Code deals with faculty-student relationships and that the EO broadens that to employee-student relationships.

Kelly Edwards asked if the employee unions been consulted. Cauce said that they had been consulted, and they are strongly in favor.

Lieblich asked how one assess what could be perceived as a conflict of interest and how any disciplinary process would work. Cauce replied that any disciplinary process is not unilateral to the administration. Cameron added that the specific process would depend on the status of the employee.

Cauce said that these policies, especially those related to disclosure, are for the protection of all parties, including the employee.

Barsness asked whether we need the Code language given the EO. Cameron said that there is no apparent conflict in the language. Moreover, removing language may send the wrong message. Astley suggested there be a reference to the EO in the Code. Cameron said that would agree with past practice. Barsness agreed that should be done.

c. Approval of the October 20, 2016, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit I]
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.


**Prepared by:** Mike Townsend  
Secretary of the Faculty

**Approved by:** Zoe Barsness, Chair  
Faculty Senate

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, October 10 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
I begin by thanking you for the opportunity to serve. I arrived at UW Tacoma 16 years ago, enticed by the opportunity to develop a different approach to business education and excited by the institution building challenge offered. It has been a rich and rewarding journey since. My goal as Chair of the Faculty is to work in collaboration with others to contribute back. Just as my own scholarship has been motivated by a pragmatic desire to figure out how we, as members of organizations, can work together to “make things better”, so too must be our efforts on behalf of shared governance.

As faculty, we play a critical institutional role. Not only are our discovery and teaching efforts core to the institution’s mission, but we serve in partnership with the regents and administration as stewards of the institution and its core values. Our expertise; our passion for ideas, knowledge creation and learning; our willingness to exercise our voice and engage in dialogue with other key stakeholders; our commitment to excellence and willingness to invest our energies and efforts on behalf of the organization provide invaluable service as we work collectively to meet the diverse challenges facing us today. Together we can assure that the biggest challenges for the faculty are identified and the best solutions are found. The call for shared governance could not be greater and to my observation the receptiveness to partnership has never been stronger.

In observing closely the work of the chairs that have preceded me including Jack Lee, Kate O’Neill, and Norm Beauchamp, in discussions with the chairs of the faculty councils, in conversations with many of you, and in considering challenges faculty at our peer institutions are facing, a number of priorities have been identified for the coming year.

1. **The Faculty Salary Policy**: Our first priority is to sustain our momentum and continue our efforts to implement a salary policy that minimizes compression, compensates faculty commensurate with peer institutions, and accommodates the flexibility deemed necessary by faculty in different schools, colleges and campuses. While, the particular salary policy proposal that was brought forward last spring for a vote did not prevail, it’s critical to understand that the multi-year effort around the faculty salary policy which culminated in that vote was not wasted. There was a robust, transparent, and widely engaged process. As a consequence of that process we have developed a much clearer understanding of the concerns any changes to the faculty salary policy need to address. Our focus this coming year will be to leverage the insights we’ve gained and momentum we’ve achieved to address these concerns more incrementally, working to strengthen the tools we have available to us in the existing faculty salary policy and identify areas where the current policy might be tweaked to extend and redirect its focus more appropriately.

2. **The Role of the Lecturer**: Teaching is a core part of our mission. Lecturers play an absolutely central role in this mission. Establishing a track for advancement, a mechanism for job security, competitiveness of compensation and a voice in decision making have been areas of focused effort for the Senate. Ultimately, the goal must be to create a culture that values the role of lecturers. We will continue our efforts bringing forward resolutions and initiatives needed to more fully support our colleagues.

3. **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**: Creating and sustaining a diverse faculty is the only way we will continue to excel as a faculty. The Faculty Councils on Multicultural Affairs and the Faculty Council on Women in Academia are maintaining their great momentum by considering issues such as equity in compensation, researching and developing an actionable-agenda for overcoming the barriers women and faculty of color face in academic advancement, and sustaining our efforts, in collaboration with the administration, to provide training in best practices for faculty hiring committees and ultimately tenure and promotion committees. In addition to these efforts, we will continue work through our faculty councils, and in partnership with the administration, to enhance sexual assault policies at the UW. We will also seek to align the efforts of our faculty councils with the other great work that is occurring across our three campuses under the auspices of the university’s Diversity Blueprint and Race and Equity Initiative.
4. **Tri-campus Relations:** This coming year we will be directing our attention to the relationship between our three campuses. The UW is now a true multi-campus system. The two smaller campuses, which might have been launched as "interesting experiments" in response to a legislative mandate, have become thriving and substantial institutions in their own right, each with its unique character. In order for the UW as a whole to sustain its ability to respond effectively to the changes buffeting higher education today, continued strategic growth is required not only for the UW Seattle, but also the UW Bothell and the UW Tacoma, indeed it is expected and anticipated. A pressing question then is how we build upon the respective strengths and leverage the unique character of the UW’s individual campuses to create something that delivers greater returns to the institution and our stakeholders at every level—both local and global. Several new initiatives focused on addressing these broader institutional needs and the challenges associated with collaboration and coordination across our three campuses will be undertaken.

5. **Shared Governance:** Although last year’s effort to adopt a new faculty salary policy was unsuccessful, we saw mobilization of faculty voices that was unprecedented in recent history. A key goal for this year is to build on this energy to ensure that the Senate and Faculty Councils are identifying the issues that are most important to sustain the missions of the faculty. We will also focus on strengthening shared governance at every level of the institution by enhancing coordination with and the support we provide to our School, College and Campus Elected Faculty Councils. Most important, every senator must come to the meetings informed and prepared to represent the concerns of the faculty they represent and committed to bringing back needed solutions.

Importantly, this is not a comprehensive list. Each of our Councils is also reflecting on what they have identified as core issues for the faculty, seeking to identify at least three areas of focus for the upcoming year. We will be listing those initiatives on the Faculty Senate website. I really welcome your input on the initiatives above defined and the goals identified by each of the Councils.

Do not hesitate to contact me at zib@uw.edu. My commitment is to do the very best I can in serving your goals.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. The Secretary position changed hands from Marcia Killien to Mike Townsend formally on July 16, 2016. In conjunction with the support staff, the incoming and outgoing Secretaries have worked over the summer toward a smooth transition. In addition, the incoming Secretary has met with individual faculty and administrators to seek advice on the changeover.

2. With the exception of the Chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, all Faculty Councils have full membership and Chairs appointed. Welcome to all returning and new members! The list of members, along with meeting minutes and schedules can be found on our website at http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/about/.

3. To aid the Secretary in administering of the Office of University Committees (Faculty Code Sections 22-56.E, 22-58), the Secretary and support staff are working to set up an internal Advisory Committee on Committees.

4. The Senate Leadership will be meeting regularly throughout the year with Faculty Council Chairs and Chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils of Schools, Colleges, and Campuses (i.e. “college councils”) for coordination and information sharing. Specific invitations to these meetings will be forthcoming.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Paul Hopkins, Professor, Chemistry

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

In August I was asked and agreed to substitute for the departing Professor Norm Beauchamp. I have since then been scrambling to come up to speed. The Autumn Quarter schedule for SCPB is not yet finalized, but is likely to mirror plans already organized by Norm, Provost Baldasty, and Sarah Hall, Assistant Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting.

Prior to my coming on board, Norm had arranged that SCPB would move its meeting schedule from weekly for 1.5 hours to every other week for up to 2 hours. His goal as I understand was to drive more focused conversations concerning items on which a decision or advice is needed. Norm’s goal was to minimize time spent on informational presentations. I concur with all of these goals.

As soon as SCPB has a full slate of committee members (we are still seeking two), I intend to probe the membership concerning their interest (or lack thereof) in taking on a larger “project” or two during the course of the year. The Provost was already working with Norm to establish some candidate projects. SCPB has typically been involved with many subjects (operating budget, capital budget, development, tuition, debt load, risk management, and on and on…) but has in my experience rarely “dived deep” into any subject. We will no doubt again this year spend much time, probably the majority, on topics from that lengthy list, but we will in addition at least consider whether it is appropriate for us to focus on just one or a small number of topics on which we might make major progress. Time will tell.

SCPB will as always endeavor to ensure that the Provost receives meaningful input on topics of interest to him and that the Senate leadership, Senators, Council Chairs, and Elected Faculty Council Chairs are well-informed and also empowered to provide input on significant planning and budget choices. If you have topics that you would like SCPB and the Provost should review, please let me know.
Greetings – and welcome to an exciting election season, to be followed by a very challenging legislative session in January.

**Majorities for 2017-19:** As I have noted several times last year, both the House (Democratic majority) and Senate (Republican majority) have very slim majorities, meaning that just a few elections could change the majority of either chamber. Only a few races in each chamber are truly in question, and both parties are focusing their resources on those few races in order to maintain or to gain the majority. There is also the possibility that the House could end up in a 98-98 tie, which last occurred in 1999-2001.

**Campaigns:** This is the time of the political cycle when faculty members, as citizens, can have the most influence on legislators, by attending forums, fundraisers, and other events that are intended to allow legislators to hear from their constituents. Town hall meetings also occur throughout the year, but it is in this season, leading to the election, that the stakes are highest for candidates for office. Even if your legislators are unchallenged, they still need to fundraise for the party, so contributing to your local legislator is beneficial to the majority status of whatever party you support. You can find your district and links to your legislators at [http://app.leg.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/](http://app.leg.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/) -- they must maintain their campaign sites separately from the government site, but searching the name of your legislators online will quickly take you to their campaign site. As always, we must use non-UW email accounts when contacting legislators about campaigns, fundraising, or lobbying. On this UW site, I provide links to articles about legislative issues: [http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia](http://tinyurl.com/uwolympia) -- please let me know if you have suggestions for additions. I try to link particularly to articles outside Seattle, which you might not otherwise see.

**Funding issues:** We say every year that the biggest challenge is funding all the priorities of the state, and we have been saying for the past few years that the McCleary mandate to fully fund K-12 education without reliance on local levies would create a large draw on available funding. This biennium, the bill finally comes due, and the previous punting on a path forward will need to instead become a funded solution to fully funding K-12 education. Since August 2015, the Legislature has been the subject of a $100,000 per day fine, imposed by the State Supreme Court. The legal team for McCleary again took the Legislature to court and had a contentious hearing in early September, asking for more significant sanctions, because the current fine did not result in action. We are waiting for the court ruling on this latest hearing, which could result in more severe sanctions. The revenue forecast for 2017-19 continues to be on a slight upward trend: [http://www.thelympian.com/opinion/editorials/article103551512.html](http://www.thelympian.com/opinion/editorials/article103551512.html)

**Faculty priorities:** We have been polling the Faculty Senate since last spring regarding faculty priorities; I will provide an update, and will have a final report on the priorities by the Faculty Senate meeting in a few weeks. I am prodding more senators to respond; we currently have about 60% participation.

**Reinvestment in higher education:** If you talk to a state legislator, he or she would appreciate being thanked for the support provided to higher education, particularly the University of Washington. There has been a significant increase in the state appropriation over the past few years, with the Legislature restoring the funding that had been cut after the 2008 recession. To the public, this appears as a tuition cut – but in fact the lowered tuition is the result of the state reinvesting in higher education. Taking credit for this investment, and for lower tuition, has become a point of pride in legislative campaigns around the state. As a reminder, below is a list of the increases in the annual state appropriation over the past six years; the large increases in the past four years are the result of restoring the cuts made in the recession, while holding tuition steady or reducing tuition. So, these are not total UW budget increases, but the state appropriation increases, shifting the cost for resident undergraduates back to the state budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$332,343,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$292,933,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$246,471,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$254,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$209,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$212,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 – 2017 Appointments to University and Senate Committees
Appointments approved by the SEC over the summer

Faculty Code Section 22-60.B.12: The Executive Committee of the Senate: (12.) Shall act for the Senate during the period from the last Senate meeting in the Spring Quarter until the first meeting in the Autumn Quarter, and shall report such actions at the first Senate meeting in the Autumn Quarter.

Secretary of the Faculty

- Mike Townsend, School of Law, elected Secretary of the Faculty by the Senate Executive Committee for a five-year term beginning July 16, 2016.

Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30)

- Trent Hill, Information School, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Richard Furman, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)

- Mariam Moshiri, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
2016 – 2017 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Meets Fridays at 1:30)
- Ann Huppert, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)
- Jason Nixon, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Charles Chamberlin, UWRA, University Libraries, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (Meets Tuesdays at 11:00)
- Joseph Janes, Information School, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Gordon Watts, College of Arts & Sciences, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Míceál Vaughan, UWRA, College of Arts & Sciences, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (Meets Mondays at 12:30)
- Joseph Rajendran, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Bill Covington, School of Law, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Bill Covington, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (Meets Thursdays at 10:30)
- Mark Zachry, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00)
- Marcy Stein, UW Tacoma, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Marcy Stein, UW Tacoma, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Meghan Eagen-Torkko, UW Bothell, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (Meets Thursdays at 10:00)
- Ashley Emery, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Steve Goldblatt, UWRA, College of Built Environments, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
Faculty Council on Women in Academia (Meets Wednesdays at 3:30)

- Elizabeth Umphress, Foster School of Business, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.

Faculty Council on University Libraries (Meets Wednesdays at 2:30)

- Kate O'Neill, UWRA, School of Law, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

- Bill Bender, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Dan Grossman, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Mary Hebert, School of Pharmacy, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Edward Rice, Foster School of Business, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2017.

Adjudication Panel

- Ashley Emery, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Cynthia Dougherty, School of Nursing, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Todd Herrenkohl, School of Social Work, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Marc Binder, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Jonathan Bernard, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Lisa Kelly, School of Law, as chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.
- Karen Boxx, School of Law, as vice chair for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2017.

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

- Theo Myhre, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Sandra Silberstein, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016 and ending September 15, 2019.
- Karen Boxx, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
- Mícheál Vaughan, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2016, and ending September 15, 2019.
September 29, 2016

Zoe I. Barsness, Chair, Faculty Senate
Michael E. Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty 36
Gerberding Hall
Box 351271
Seattle, WA 98195

Re: Executive Order No. 64 (Faculty Salary Policy)

Dear Zoe and Mike:

On behalf of President Cauce, enclosed please find a revised Executive Order (EO) for review by the Faculty Senate pursuant to EO No. 3. This revised EO is numbered 64 and titled “Faculty Salary Policy.”

As you know, last spring a record number of faculty participated in a robust shared governance process and vote on proposed changes to faculty salary policy. Despite the concerns that led to the proposal’s defeat, President Cauce and Provost Baldasty believe that the work that went into the policy, the discussions leading up to the vote and the significant percentage of people who voted for it made clear that there was room for improvement in our current policy.

This revised EO is the outcome of President Cauce and Provost Baldasty’s pledge to work with the Faculty Senate on substantive faculty salary policy improvements. The salary discussions of the past few years have included proposed increases to promotion adjustments. As you know, consistent with last year’s proposal, this year’s promotion adjustments increased to 9 percent. The proposed revision to EO 64 would increase the promotion adjustment to 12 percent beginning in 2017-18. Further, the revisions are intended to clarify and expand the scope of use of unit adjustments, including the ability to proactively address unit-wide, rank specific, and individual compensation needs.

In line with an ongoing commitment to meaningful shared governance, this revised EO is the result of a collaborative process between the administration, faculty senate leadership, and the Board of Deans.

We look forward to the Faculty Senate’s review within the EO No. 3 timeline, and please do not hesitate to contact me if there is further information or assistance I might provide.

Very truly yours,

Rolf B. Johnson

CC: Ana Mari Cauce, President
Gerald Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President
Cheryl D. Cameron, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel
Rebecca G. Deardorff, Director, Rules Coordination Office
University of Washington

Presidential Orders

Executive Order No. 64

Faculty Salary Policy

1. Introduction

The fundamental purpose of the University of Washington Faculty Salary Policy is to allow the University to recruit and retain the best faculty. To accomplish these two 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 and continuing salary progression for meritorious faculty.

Salary funds must be used to attract, retain, and reward those faculty whose continuing performance is outstanding, while recognizing that disciplinary variations exist in the academic marketplace. Accordingly, the University’s Salary Policy must allow for differential allocations among individuals and units. This provides includes the necessary flexibility to address the market gaps that develop between UW units and their recognized peers, to 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, and campuses. 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 merit as assessed by a performance review conducted by faculty and administrative colleagues. Salary adjustments for performance and retention, as well as salary awards stemming from differential unit performance and marketplace gaps, are based upon a consultative process of faculty and administrative evaluation. Merit/performance evaluations are unit-based and reward the faculty for their contributions to local units as well as to the University’s goals.

This policy is built on an expectation of meaningful deliberations between the administration and faculty. As such, the policy seeks to manifest shared governance that is at the core of the Faculty Code.

The Faculty Salary Policy is also founded on a clear understanding that the final decision on the University budget, including salaries, rests with the Board of Regents. Therefore, salary progression as envisioned in this policy, including the award of minimum equal-percentage merit salary increases for eligible faculty members, is conditioned on specific approval by the Board of Regents as part of the annual budget.

2. Regular Merit Allocation Procedure

Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Provost will consult with the Board of Deans and
Chancellors, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and the University Budget Committee to formulate a recommendation for a salary distribution plan, including providing an opportunity for input into the criteria to be considered in formulating the plan. If, in times of severe fiscal stress short of a declared financial emergency, the salary distribution plan to be recommended by the Provost includes a minimum equal-percentage salary increase less than a 2% regular merit increase, an explanation of the basis for the recommendation will be provided to the Board of Deans and Chancellors, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and the University Budget Committee, with an opportunity to provide comment and feedback, based on the best available information about the University’s fiscal situation, before a final recommendation is forwarded. The Provost shall then make a recommendation to the President for faculty salary allocations. The President shall then make a budgetary recommendation to the Board of Regents, which will include any proposed faculty salary allocations for the fiscal year.

3. Additional Allocation Categories

Consistent with the stated objectives, the first priority shall be to support regular merit and promotion awards to current faculty. Further, each biennium the minimum salaries by rank will be reviewed and, if adjusted, support will be provided to ensure those minimum levels are achieved for adjustment. Other funds, as available, may be allotted among the following faculty salary adjustments:

A. Additional merit to all faculty;

B. Differential distributions by unit to correct salary gaps created by changing disciplinary markets, or assessments of unit quality, determinations of gaps resulting from compression or inversion, or identification of inappropriate differences among individual faculty members within the unit whose accomplishments and career stages are comparable;

C. Retention;

D. System-wide adjustments to raise the salaries of all meritorious faculty.

4. Merit Principle and Review

The University commits to support salary adjustments based on performance evaluations for those faculty deemed meritorious after a systematic review by faculty colleagues, department chair or academic appointing unit head, dean/chancellor, and Provost. In order for these performance evaluations and merit salary recommendations to be meaningful, they must be done systematically and over an appropriate length of time to be able to make true quality assessments about performance and progress, considering the cumulative record of faculty.

All faculty shall be evaluated annually for merit and for progress towards reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate. Subject to the conditions of this policy, a faculty member who is deemed to be meritorious in performance shall in the following academic year be awarded the 2% or the minimum equal-percentage merit increase that has been approved for that year according to the allocation procedures above. Higher levels of performance shall be recognized by higher levels of salary increases as permitted by available funding.
Any faculty member whose performance is not deemed meritorious shall be informed by the chair or dean of the reasons. If deemed meritorious in the next year’s review, and subject to the conditions of this policy, the faculty member shall in the following academic year receive the 2% or the minimum equal-percentage merit increase that has been approved for that year according to the allocation procedures above. A departmental advisory committee, appointed consistent with Chapter 24, Section 24-55, Subsection H of the Faculty Code, will consider the development needs of faculty members not receiving regular merit salary increases for two consecutive years.

When additional merit funds are available the distribution should take into consideration factors of merit, compression, and equity. The additional merit pool must be distributed by departmentalized schools, colleges, and campuses as equal percentage increases to each academic appointing unit.

5. Promotion

Each faculty member who is promoted in rank shall be awarded a 7.5% promotion salary increase beginning on the date the promotion is effective; July 1st for twelve-month appointees, and September 16th for nine-month appointees.

6. Unit Adjustments

Additional salary funds may be allocated by the Provost to be used by colleges, and schools, and campuses at any time during the biennium academic year, after appropriate consultations with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, to address differentials occurring in the academic labor markets and to reflect assessments of the quality, standing, and contributions of units to college, school, campus and University goals. The differentials may include determinations of salary compression or inversion and inconsistencies in salaries among individual faculty members within a unit whose accomplishments and career stages are comparable. Such authorization should be informed by an assessment of market gags and availability of funds by deans and chancellors in consultation with the elected faculty council and unit leadership.

Unless specifically allocated by the Provost for a particular unit or purpose, the Deans and chancellors shall consult with their elected faculty councils before distributing anywhere developing distribution proposals for additional salary increase funds among their constituent units. The procedures of Chapter 24, Section 24-55 of the Faculty Code will be followed in distributing funds allocated to adjust faculty salaries based on merit.

7. Retention Adjustments

With approval from the Provost, college-administered or University funds may be used to adjust faculty salaries as a means to retain faculty members at the University of Washington either at the time of merit reviews or at other times as necessary throughout the academic year. Assessments of a faculty member’s quality and unit contribution are essential elements in decisions to make retention adjustments. Consultative processes to recommend retention adjustments shall be established at the unit level following the procedures set forth in Chapter 24, Section 24-71 of the Faculty Code.

September 29, 2016

Zoe Barsness, Chair, Faculty Senate
Michael E. Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty 36 Gerberding Hall
Box 351271
Seattle, WA 98195

Re: Executive Order No. 54 (Employee–Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest)

Dear Zoe and Mike:

On behalf of President Cauce, enclosed please find a proposed new Executive Order (EO) for review by the Faculty Senate pursuant to EO No. 3. This EO is numbered 54 and titled “Employee–Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest.”

As you know, EO No. 54 is an extension of a policy which was passed by the Senate as Class C legislation in 1992, and then ultimately placed in a footnote to Faculty Code, Chapter 24, Section 24-33 (Section 24-33). In March 2016, the footnote was moved to Faculty Code, Chapter 24, Section 24-50 (via Class A legislation) in order to, among other reasons, ensure that the policy not be lost altogether in the event the Faculty agreed to proposed revisions to the faculty salary policy (FSP), which would have eliminated Section 24-33 and the accompanying footnote.

The potential elimination of the Section 24-33 footnote was recognized during the process of drafting proposed revisions to the FSP, and a workgroup was formed to evaluate whether a policy should be developed. The workgroup recommended both that a policy should indeed be developed and, moreover, that the policy set out in the Section 24-33 footnote—which covered only romantic relationships between faculty and students—should be extended to cover all University employees. In other words, all University employees would be prohibited from engaging in a consensual relationship with a student if it creates a conflict of interest.

During the course of EO No. 54’s development, other provisions not covered by the Section 24-33 footnote were identified and addressed, including: clarification of such terms as “student,” “romantic relationship,” and “conflict of interest”; explanation as to the new policy’s intersection with EO No. 31 (Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action); explanation as to how potential conflicts may be disclosed; identification as to whom is authorized to determine whether a conflict can be avoided; description of potential consequences for violations of the policy; prohibition against retaliation for those who raise concerns under the policy; and referral to resources for additional information.

The list of administrators who have reviewed draft EO No. 54 is long and includes: Rebecca Aanderud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning, Graduate School; Karen Baebler, Assistant Athletic Director, Intercollegiate Athletics; Jerry Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President; Shannon Bailie, Director, Health and Wellness; Beth Beam, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Organizational Excellence & HR, UW Bothell; Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel; Richard Cordova, Executive Director, Internal Audit; Peter Denis, Assistant Vice President, Labor Relations; Shelley Kostrinsky, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel; Jill B. Lee, Executive Director, Compliance Services; Nicki D. McCraw, Assistant Vice President, Medical Centers Human Resources; Bruce F. Miller, Senior Policy Analyst, HR Administrative and Information Systems; Alison M. Navarrete, Director of Academic Human Resources, UW Tacoma; Lawrence W. Paulsen, Assistant Attorney General; Jon A. Payne, Conflict Resolution Specialist, Medical Centers Human Resources; Jennifer J. Petritz, Director, Medical Centers Human Resources; Erin F. Rice, Assistant Vice President, Campus HR Operations; George Theo, Dean of Student Affairs, UW Bothell; and Richard Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor, UW Tacoma.

We look forward to the Faculty Senate’s review within the EO No. 3 timeline, and please do not hesitate to contact me if there is further information or assistance I might provide.
Very truly yours,

Rolf B. Johnson

C: Ana Mari Cauce, President
   Cheryl D. Cameron, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel
   Amanda L. Paye, Deputy Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Compliance Services
   Rebecca G. Deardorff, Director, Rules Coordination Office
Employee–Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest

1. Principles

Romantic relationships between University of Washington employees and students can lead to a conflict of interest that is detrimental to the functioning of the University because, if present, the professional authority under which employees’ decisions are made may be called into question. The following are examples of why the University’s responsibilities to the public and to individual members of the University community may be compromised if employees do not avoid such conflicts of interest:

- The possibility of allegations of sexual harassment may arise when an employee in a position of authority over a student has a romantic relationship or makes romantic advances toward that student and if the employee’s immediate power to influence the student’s access to educational programs and services, academics or professional progress, and/or work experience or opportunities brings into question the ability of the student to consent to the relationship;

- The possibility of a hostile or offensive academic or work environment may arise if the employee’s romantic interests or advances are or become unwelcome by a student and the employee fails to separate personal interests from his or her professional decision-making;

- The possibility of impeding a student’s access to educational programs and services, academics or professional progress, and/or work experience or opportunities may also arise if the employee is already in a position of decision-making authority with respect to the student or may be so in the future, since the employee must then abstain from participation in such decisions, thereby denying the student access to the employee’s professional assessment and/or decision-making authority; and

- Romantic relationships between employees and students may also infringe on the rights of other students or colleagues because there may be actual or perceived bias, partiality, or influence.

This policy does not restrict employees’ legal rights as citizens, including those of association and expression and protection from discrimination based on marital status. However, when the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions, the University may take corrective action in accordance with the terms and conditions of employment governing the employee’s employment relationship with the University.
2. **Policy**

All University employees or appointees, including faculty and other academic personnel, staff (e.g. coaches and academic advisors), temporary staff, Academic Student Employees, and student employees (e.g. Resident Advisors) are prohibited from:

- Engaging in a romantic relationship with a student that creates an actual conflict of interest or could be perceived to create conflict of interest; or
- Exercising authority over a student with whom the employee has or has had a romantic relationship that creates an actual conflict of interest or could be perceived to create conflict of interest.

This policy is in addition to Executive Order No. 32, Employee Responsibilities and Employee Conflict of Interest.

3. **Definitions**

   A. **Conflict of Interest**

   A conflict of interest arises when an employee’s objectivity and decision-making in his or her professional role relating to students is or has the potential to be compromised because of a romantic relationship the employee has with a student. This professional role encompasses decisions or recommendations that may affect the student’s access to educational programs and services; academics or professional progress; and/or work experience or opportunities. The role also includes voting on actions that involve the student, contributing to or evaluating scholarly work, evaluating academic status or progress, providing career recommendations or references, making hiring or termination decisions or otherwise making decisions that substantially affect academic status or employment.

   B. **Romantic Relationship**

   A romantic relationship includes intimate, sexual, dating, and/or any other type of amorous encounter or relationship, whether consensual, casual or serious, short-term or long-term.

   C. **Student**

   A student under this policy includes, but is not limited to, any individual enrolled in any course, whether matriculated or nonmatriculated, in any University program of study.

4. **Complaint Reporting**

   Those who have concerns about potential violations of this policy may report them to their supervisor, department chair or director, dean or chancellor, administrative head, and/or Human Resources Consultant or Academic Human Resources Consultant. Reports will be evaluated in order to determine an appropriate institutional response.

5. **Conflict of Interest and Sexual Harassment**

Upon receiving a report of a potential conflict of interest arising from an employee–student romantic
relationship, in addition to any other investigatory or corrective action that is taken, the University may be obligated to evaluate whether there is or has been a violation of Executive Order No. 31, Non-discrimination and Affirmative Action. The matter may be referred to the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO) for investigation in accordance with Administrative Policy Statement 46.3, Resolution of Complaints Against University Employees and/or the Faculty Code.

6. Consequences of Violation of Policy

University employees who violate this policy may be subject to corrective or disciplinary action, including, but not limited to, termination of employment and/or if student employees, subject to Chapter 478-120 WAC, Student Conduct Code for the University of Washington.

7. Disclosure of Conflict

Employees who suspect that their romantic relationship with a student may create an actual or perceived conflict of interest must notify their supervisor, department chair or director, dean or chancellor, or administrative head. The purpose of this notification is to evaluate whether a plan can be created that will avoid the conflict or potential impact on the student or others. Supervisors, department chairs or directors, and administrative heads should consult with their human resources consultant, dean’s or chancellor’s office, the Office of Student Life, or other appropriate offices in evaluating the plan. Whether the University is able to create an acceptable plan is within the discretion of the relevant University administrative authority.

Disclosure of a potential conflict does not preclude the University from taking appropriate measures to address any behavior that may have occurred before or after the disclosure that is in violation of University policy.

8. Retaliation Prohibited

This policy prohibits taking adverse action against any individual who reports (or is perceived to have reported) concerns under this policy or who cooperates with or participates in any investigation related to this policy.

9. Additional Information

For additional information about this policy, contact the following:

- Academic Human Resources (for complaints involving academic personnel); phone: 206- 543-5630
- UCIRO (for complaints involving any University employee, including student employees); phone: 206-616-2028
- Human Resources:
  - Campus Human Resources (for complaints involving UW Seattle, UW Bothell, and UW Tacoma campus staff employees, including student employees); phone: 206- 543-2354
  - Harborview Medical Center (HMC) Human Resources (for complaints involving HMC staff employees, including student employees); phone: 206-744-9220
  - UW Medical Center (UWMC) Human Resources (for complaints involving UWMC staff employees, including student employees); phone: 206-598-6116
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, October 20, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
Savery Hall, Room 260

2:00 p.m. — Faculty Senate Orientation: Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda. [2:30 p.m.]

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Zoe Barsness.

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

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   a. Electronic approval of the May 2, 2016, SEC minutes.
   b. Electronic approval of the May 19, 2016, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Senate Executive Committee nominees for faculty councils and committees approved over the summer.
   d. Proposed changes to Executive Order 64.
   e. Proposed Executive Order 54.

6. Memorial Resolution

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.

8. Announcements.


    a. Campaign Launch — Ana Mari Cauce, President.
        Information item.
    b. Diversity Blueprint — Rickey Hall, Vice President for Minority Affairs and Diversity; Chad Allen, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement.
        Information item.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Zoe Barsness, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, October 27 at 2:30 p.m. in Savery 260.