1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.
The meeting was called to order at 2:33 pm. The agenda was approved.

2. Report of the Chair – Professor James Gregory. [Exhibit A]
Gregory announced the very recent Washington State Supreme Court decision that found the 2/3 majority rule to be unconstitutional. This is good news for higher education initiatives as well as other matters.

He then gave a brief lesson on the history of academic freedom. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is considering legislation that would clarify academic freedom protections in our faculty code, which currently are not well specified. The best known example of the abrogation of academic freedom at UW happened in 1948 when under pressure from the legislature the Regents decided to fire six tenured faculty members accused of ties to the Communist Party. This followed a yearlong investigation by a committee of the legislature headed by Rep. Albert Canwell and full day of public hearings into alleged subversive activities at the University. In one form or another, the principle of academic freedom has a very long history, perhaps back to ancient and medieval schools and universities where some brave scholars claimed the freedom to teach as they saw fit. Modern academic freedom claims come out of the German universities of the 19th century which set the standards for American educators. But American universities acknowledged no such freedom and routinely fired professors for expressing political or religious views deemed inappropriate. A number of dismissals in the first decade of the 20th century caused a group of prominent scholars, led by the Philosopher John Dewey, to come together in 1915 to launch a new organization, the American Association of University Professors, which issued a Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure in its first year. The document defined academic freedom as “freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the University or college; and freedom of extra-mural utterance and action.” AAUP’s principal mission over the past 98 years has been to establish and defend these principles. For much of the 20th century faculty faced persecution mostly for reasons of unpopular political or religious views, especially left-wing views. In the last 40 years as often as not it is unpopular racist views or right wing positions that have needed to be defended. And in the last 20 years, many of the cases have to do with scientific inquiry. AAUP has asked universities to examine their faculty codes for statements on academic freedom.

Gregory announced that Kate O’Neill was elected Senate Vice Chair for 2013-14. He thanked Joe Janes for his candidacy and suggested that we would hopefully see more of Joe in future elections. He also provided updates on work of SEC and working group on Faculty Salary Policy, discussed in his written report. Lecturer appointments were discussed at the last Senate meeting. Subsequent to that meeting the Provost has asked each campus to form a committee to examine the lecturer issues on each campus with a report to her at the end of this quarter.

3. Report of the Provost and Executive Vice President – Ana Mari Cauce.
Provost Cauce provided the report in place of President Young who is meeting with Governor Inslee. She addressed her beliefs and activities in the past year related to shared governance, since assuming role of Provost. She stated she is a strong believer in shared governance and the value of human capital, including hiring and retaining the best faculty. She chaired the special committee on minority faculty affairs (precursor to Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs) and sat on the cabinet of some former Senate Chairs. She has asked questions about shared governance and involvement with the faculty councils (and ASUW & GPSS) in Dean renewals and budget meetings. If no involvement is reported, she has asked the dean to go back and get this involvement. She is excited about new deans that have been appointed and has asked them about their experience in working with faculty. She doesn’t delegate working with Faculty Senate to anyone. She cited her involvement and work with faculty in the retirement plan changes and her belief that, in retrospect, the change
went well. She expressed a belief that slowing down led to a better process. Intellectual property discussions are also going slowly but moving ahead. She believes there is a need to better align the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee and the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. A letter about faculty raises is coming out under her signature but represents collaborative efforts with the faculty salary advisory group. Extra additional merit can be used to deal with compression. Other areas of working together include the task forces on contingent faculty/lecturers on all three campuses. She admitted to getting frustrated when shared governance processes aren’t nimble enough, but also is aware that sometimes we can work too quickly and end up with unintended consequences.

Sequestration is going to happen. The effects will not be experienced immediately in March. There will be no effects on students this year (e.g. Pell grants). Cuts to the work-study program will be absorbed by the university. Stafford loan interest will go up slightly. Effects will unfold over subsequent years. Research revenues are expected to decrease by $83 million over the next year; NIH will award the same number of grants but reduce funds by 10%; this is already happening. NSF will likely award 10% fewer grants. The impact may be hardest on new investigators. Long term effects could be very difficult if other remedies are not found in the next few months.

Questions were raised by faculty about sequestration and budget:
Q. Why is the NIH website information not consistent with information provided by the Provost? Will the University assist in some way with retention of research staff?
A. Each NIH institute may handle cuts differently. University has some funds set aside to help investigators, but not enough to keep all grants whole. She is working with Vice Provost Mary Lidstrom on a plan to address these issues.
Q. Will educational benefits of active duty military personnel be affected?
A. Not to her best understanding.
Q. In the area of development/fundraising, is there an emphasis on funds from non-federal sources?
A. Most donors prefer giving to a specific project. But, realistically, if sequestration continues we will lose funding for research projects. In hiring, stay focused on the best candidates to be competitive in obtaining funding for research projects. If you need funding to do research and you can’t get funding, you likely will not get tenure.
Q. Will unit adjustments be available this year?
A. Most likely in the fall rather than this year because we won’t know the status of available funds in time to make these adjustments for this year.

4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the January 14, 2013, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the January 31, 2013, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Code interpretation defining “units.” [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit D]
   d. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

There were no questions.

5. Consent Agenda.

There were no items on the consent agenda.

6. Memorial Resolution.

The memorial resolution was read by Senate Vice Chair Jack Lee and approved by a standing vote of the faculty.

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:
Professor Emeritus Robert Phelps of Mathematics, who died on January 3, 2013, after having served the University since 1956.

Professor Donald Calsyn of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, who died on February 3, 2013, after having served the University since 1981.

Affiliate Professor J. Donald Ostrow of Medicine, who died on January 10, 2013, after having served the University since 2001.

Clinical Associate Professor Robert H. Colfelt of Neurology, who died on February 1, 2013, after having served the University since 1961.

7. Announcements.
Killien called attention to the deadline of March 1, 2013 for receipt of nominations for the 38th University Faculty Lecturer.

8. Unfinished Business.
a. Class A Legislation – Second Consideration. [Exhibit E]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Title: Changes to “Without Tenure” Appointment Term Length.
   Action: Conduct review of proposal to submit legislation amending the Faculty Code to the faculty for approval or rejection.

   The background and rationale for the proposed legislation, as amended by the SEC in response to comments from the President’s office and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Legislation, was presented by Stygall. The legislation passed unanimously.

b. Online Social Science undergraduate degree initiative.
   Discussion: Update on process.

   Provost Cauce indicated the initiative is going slowly forward. It is going well because it is going slowly. The hope is to have something ready to begin Fall 2014. Factors related to the slower than anticipated start includes the absence of a formal social science faculty department and that the evening degree was not as appropriate to duplicate as originally anticipated. In contrast the early childhood education online degree program does have a “day” equivalent that is moving more rapidly forward. The program has received preliminary approval from the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) and SCPB pending successful Class B legislative changes. Cauce asked the program director, Gail Joseph, College of Education, to describe the program plans. Joseph cited access as a barrier for many people in the field who need a bachelor’s degree to keep working in their jobs in early childhood education. The UW’s program will be supplemented by a Headstart grant of $44 million to study the effectiveness of these education programs. The current onsite program already uses some online activities. Maximum enrollment is expected to be about 300 FTEs. Gregory indicated that the plan is to enroll students in the fall and begin advertising shortly. He indicated that he had raised to the Dean of the College of Education his concern that the involvement of tenured and tenure track faculty in the programs (onsite and online) was lower than desirable.

   Professor Joseph summarized in response to questions the kinds of differences between the onsite and online program. For example, a service learning project might be occurring in different sites beyond Seattle. Also, elective choices may be more limited for online students since currently there are fewer online course offerings. Cauce indicated that the UW transcript will not differentiate this degree from the onsite degree. Joseph indicated that the class size is expected to be about 50 students per course. Technology is being piloted now. The program will be monitored and evaluated closely. UW wants this to be a high quality program with strong outcomes. Holt described the FCAS review process; it is now ready to go through the tri-campus review process and then back through FCAS. All online programs are required to be reviewed in six years. Joseph gave an example of how online practical supervision occurs. Questions were asked about what kind of evaluation will be done to show the online and onsite degrees are the same quality. Joseph indicated she and none of the
faculty wish to have their reputations associated with a lesser quality degree. She described specific evaluation measures already in place that will continue and expressed interest in a comparison study. She described how sites for service learning for out of area students will be identified and supervised. Teaching will initially be done by faculty currently here with new hires occurring in the future. It is expected that most student spots will initially be filled by applicants in the I-5 corridor.

Discussion: Faculty Retention Offers. [Exhibit F]

Giebel indicated he had asked for this agenda item, “faculty retention offers during austerity”. He described EO64, the history of insufficient raises to “loyal faculty” and his concern that this history was repeated due to the increase in number of retention raises over the past 3 years. He described the series of meetings and discussions he had been involved in with the Provost, the Senate chair, the SEC, and the Senate. He cited the number of responses and comments he had received from fellow faculty who indicated that these retention offers was a negative influence on faculty morale.[Exhibit G] He indicated he was not against retention offers but is disappointed that especially pre-emptive offers are growing, not being curtailed. He urged faculty to express their opinions and that it is discussed further in the Senate. He thanked the Provost for her openness to engaging in these difficult discussions.

Cauce indicated that she might dispute some of Giebel’s figures, and that she agrees this is not the best way of giving raises but that right now it is the only mechanism. She indicated that the majority of these retentions are in the medical school and she has come to understand their situation differently since she has been in the Provost role. She emphasized that all retention offers are to follow the process required by the Faculty Code for a faculty vote or alternative approved by the faculty. Is this money that could be used for other faculty? For the most part, the raises are from non-state funds so could not be used for raises for other faculty. She also discussed the financial impact of replacing existing faculty who leave. In response to questions from the faculty she indicated that she does not have data on how many faculty actually leave the UW to pursue other offers. She indicated that faculty from other public and private universities may receive raises because they are unionized. Currently, all salaries are “locally” funded from tuition funds, state support or extramural funds.

There was an extensive discussion about the policy that unit faculty are required to vote on retention offers unless they have adopted and renewed an alternate policy every two years. Differing unit practices on retention offers and votes were shared along with a discussion of why faculty vote as they do. There was widespread comment from faculty that chairs and deans were not following policies on retention offers as outlined in the Faculty Code. Cauce indicated that she would ask chairs/deans to provide more documentation of their policy for retention votes. Faculty commented that the lack of transparency in this area leads to reproduction of the existing social order with respect to gender and race. Cauce responded that data shows that women and minorities get retention offers at higher rate.

10. Good of the Order.
No topics were raised for comment and discussion.

11. Adjournment.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:09pm.

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

Meeting agenda: Class A legislation to change the term of Without Tenure initial appointments has been approved by the Senate, amended by the President and Executive Committee, and now returns to the Senate (Exhibit E). If approved it will be sent to the voting faculty as an email ballot. In addition the Senate will consider retention policies, online degree proposals, and salary issues.

Executive Committee actions February 11 meeting: Part of the meeting was devoted to clarifying the definition of “units” in the salary policy sections of the Code. SEC is officially empowered to interpret the Code. On the advice of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (“Code Cops”) the Executive Committee ruled that “units” means departments except in non-departmentalized colleges. There are several other aspects to the ruling (Exhibit B).

SEC also reviewed data on the number and types of retention offers made over the past four years and discussed the role of retentions in the salary policy sections of the Faculty Code. Senator Christoph Giebel questioned whether retention offers violate code provisions that mandate across-the-board merit raises before any other salary adjustments. He also challenged the large number of pre-emptive offers that have been made in the past year. This issue now comes to the full senate under New Business. These tables are included in Exhibit F.

Online degree completion initiative: A new degree proposal has been formulated in the College of Education which currently offers a BA degree with a major in Early Childhood and Family Studies and now wants to offer a fully online version of that degree to non-traditional students. SCPB has reviewed the budget and Faculty Council on Academic Standards is currently reviewing curriculum issues. Provost Cauce will explain the proposal and review progress toward the proposed online degree with a major in Social Science. This will come under Old Business.

Salary: After consulting with SCPB, Provost Cauce has distributed instructions to deans and chancellors about salary adjustments and merit reviews in the year ahead. She accepted the advice of that committee and the Salary Advisory Committee that if the money available for raises next year is less than 5%, it should mostly be distributed across the board to all meritorious faculty. Her formula calls for 2% to be distributed as “regular merit” and some further amount to be allocated as “additional merit.” Three-quarters of that additional merit amount should be awarded to all meritorious faculty. Thus if a total of 4% is available for faculty raises, individual meritorious faculty will each receive 3.5% raises. The residual will be used by departments to fund selectively higher raises.

The Joint Faculty Salary Working Group has met several times since the last Senate meeting and continues to discuss a proposal for a significant revision of the salary system that would add “steps” to the promotion ladder at the full professor rank (and possibly at the associate professor rank). In one version of the proposal full professors would be eligible for 7.5% step raises following rigorous merit reviews at roughly five year intervals. The goal is to combat compression and demoralization at the full professor level by providing predictable opportunities for raises. The Senate will be consulted as this proposal takes shape.

Lecturer appointments and promotions: At the last meeting, the Senate engaged in a vigorous discussion about lecturers who are hired year after year without any hope of longer contracts. Provost Cause signaled a desire to look at policies and practices and see what steps might be taken to insure that most lecturers are hired through a competitive search and thus become eligible for promotions and to also consider how to move forward with those who have already served for years without having been hired in a competitive process. She has since authorized the creation of three taskforces, one for each campus, to evaluate these issues and report back at the end of the quarter.
Senate Executive Committee’s official Faculty Code interpretation of sections of the Faculty Salary Policy, February 11, 2013.

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

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

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

REPLY: The term “unit” or “academic unit” is used consistently throughout the Faculty Code to refer to departments and undepartmentalized schools and colleges and not to departmentalized schools and colleges. The term “unit” is specifically distinguished from departmentalized colleges in Sections 24-54.B (“the candidate's college and unit”), 24-55.A (“department (unit) chairs, and deans”) and 24-71.B.3 (“Prior to preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit’s chair.”).

This section of the Code does not specifically mention campuses. However, Executive Order V.2 indicates that “the campuses of . . . UWB and . . . UWT are designed and operated similarly to a departmentalized collegiate unit.

Therefore Section 24-71.B.1 requires that the distribution of “additional merit” funds must be made in equal-percentage amounts to all undepartmentalized schools and colleges and to departmental “units” in a departmentalized college and school (and campus). “Units” are those created by the Board of Regents as “appointing units.”

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

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

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

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

Since there is no demonstrable use of “unit” to refer to individual faculty, or to subdepartmental groups of faculty, the Provost, or deans with delegated allocation authority, may not allocate unit adjustment funds differentially to individual faculty or subdepartmental groups of faculty. But the units to whom such funds are allocated may distribute them to individuals or to groups of their faculty as they deem appropriate.
While we are not officially the responsible for interpreting Executive Orders, we do comment here on the related matters in EO 64:

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

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

4. Does the Code’s salary policy limit faculty with appointments (e.g. WOT, Research professorial appointments) funded in whole or in part from external funds (e.g. grants or contracts) to the same level of salary increases as state-funded or tuition-funded (i.e., tenure-track) faculty. That is, for example, does the faculty code allow a faculty member appointed as a Professor WOT or Research Professor funded by external sources to receive a higher percentage increase than the amount set for regular and/or additional merit for tenure-track faculty? Under what provision would this occur and would there be any restriction/limit to the amount of increase?

REPLY:

The Faculty Code does not distinguish "source" of funds as a qualifying feature for salary increases, therefore the Code does not allow a "higher percentage increase" (under regular and/or additional merit) for faculty based solely on their source of funding.

However, since assessments of merit depend on a consideration of the entire record of colleagues, the awards to individuals might consider the record of success in obtaining extramural funds as a relevant factor in determining his/her merit.

Finally, since the grounds for awarding a unit adjustment to a particular department (or undepartmentalized school/college) might well be because of the Provost's judgment about local or external "market" considerations affecting a particular unit—and be directed toward relieving any perceived inequities—that judgment may in turn mean that a particular group of faculty (e.g., WOT faculty, Research faculty, or Senior Lecturers, or tenured Professors) could be the ones deemed to merit these salary enhancements.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The process of electing Senators for the 2013-15 term is underway. Those schools/colleges/campuses who are due to elect new senators have been notified and will be soliciting nominations. We are hoping to complete the elections by the end of Winter Quarter. The following units will be conducting elections: Arts & Sciences, Business, Dentistry, Engineering, Environment, Nursing, Public Health, Social Work, UW Tacoma.

2. Nominations are being accepted for the 38th University Faculty Lecturer. Nomination materials should be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty no later than March 1, 2013.

3. Council Support Analyst, Jay Freistadt, has taken a position with the Seattle School District. Applications for this vacant position in the Office of University Committees are currently being accepted. Susan Folk, former Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty, is providing temporary assistance to the office until the position is filled.

4. Chairs of Faculty Councils/Committees should note the following final deadlines for submitting legislation to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for consideration during the 2012-13 academic year. The April 8, 2013, SEC meeting is the last opportunity for Class A legislation to be introduced. The May 6, 2013, SEC meeting is the last opportunity for Class B legislation to be introduced. Materials need to be submitted to the Faculty Senate Office one week prior to each of these deadlines.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Susan Astley, Professor of Epidemiology and Pediatrics

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

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

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

**Intellectual Property (IP):** As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate’s attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. This discussion led to the discovery that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, IPMAC has been reinstated by the President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In September 2012, Ana Mari established a work group to revise the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. The workgroup revised the Compensation Form and submitted it to the Senate Leadership on November 14, 2012, for
their review. The revised Compensation Form was addressed at the November 26, 2012, SCPB meeting and was reviewed by the newly established Special Committee on IP and Commercialization (SCIPC) on November 27, 2012. The establishment of the SCIPC was approved by the SEC on November 5, 2012. SCIPC is charged to review all University of Washington policies and practices related to faculty Intellectual Property, including its management and commercialization. These policies are broadly outlined in EO 36 and APS 59.4, and managed in part through the Center for Commercialization (C4C).

Any proposed changes to such policies/practices shall be brought to this Special Committee as a part of shared governance. This special committee shall report to the Senate Executive Committee. The committee consists of five faculty members (voting) and a presidential designee (nonvoting). One of the faculty members will be the Chair of the Faculty Council on Research. Members will normally serve a three year term, but the initial terms will be staggered. Members include: Susan Astley, School of Public Health (serving as Chair); Kate O’Neill, School of Law; Matthew Sparke, Art and Sciences; Duane Storti, College of Engineering; Tueng Shen, School of Medicine; and Gerald Miller, Physics and Chair of the Faculty Council on Research, and Jack Johnson, Chief of Staff, Office of President (serving as the Presidential designee). SCIPC meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes are posted on the SCIPC website. SCIPC’s proposed revisions to the revised Compensation Form are posted on the SCIPC website.

We learned at our January 29, 2013, SCIPC meeting that our recommendation to remove the IP language from the Compensation Form has been followed. We will now focus our attention on the C4C’s proposed IP Agreement form.

**Gender Equity in Faculty Promotion and Tenure:** In my final report to the Regents in June, 2012, I addressed the topic of gender equity at the UW. The timing of my report coincided with the week Congress failed to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act; an Act requiring equal pay for comparable work. Overall, women in the U.S. make 77 cents to a man’s dollar. I shared with the Regents that I could not help but notice some compelling statistics presented in the University of Washington [2011 Facts for Academic Personnel](#), included in their meeting notes for the day. While 53% of students (undergraduate through professional) are female, only 38% of the faculty is female. This statistic becomes more troubling as you compare the proportion of female faculty across the ranks (Lecturer 58%, Assistant Professor 45%, Associate Professor 43%, Full Professor 27%). There are even a handful of departments at the University of Washington that have never promoted a woman to full professor in the history of the department. Among the [Tenure/Tenure Track faculty](#), the proportion of women has increased by only 5 percentage points over the past ten years (2001 29% women, 2011 34% women). The New Hire statistics for 2011 may help explain, in part, why so little progress has been made in the past ten years. Only 44% of Professional Faculty new hires were female. The percentage of female hires drops precipitously as one advances up the ranks (47% of Assistant Professors hired were female; 36% of Associate Professors hired were female; and only 18% of Full Professors hired were female). Of the 3,899 professional faculty in 2011, 52% are tenure/tenure track, 38% WOT, and 10% Research. Of the tenure/tenure track positions across the schools in 2011, many schools had less than 25% of their tenure positions held by women (Public Health 23%, Pharmacy 25%, Medicine 21%, Environment 25%, Foster 19%, Engineering 20%). The proportion of assistant, associate, and full professors who are female within each department in 2012 is posted on the Senate website. These statistics do not bode well for gender equity in faculty rank and underscore the importance of a thorough review of gender equity in salary compensation. It will be important to identify and minimize factors that may be impeding women from advancing to or being hired into full professor positions. This topic was addressed at the November 29, 2012, Senate meeting and the January 7, 2013, SCPB meeting. The Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed [A Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographics](#) that requested all units and departments “make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year.” Resources to help that discussion are posted on the Senate website under [Issues Under Consideration](#).
Changes to “Without Tenure” Appointment Term Length
Class A Legislation Proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Justification Statement and Proposed Language

Appointment as associate or full professor “without tenure” as provided for in the Faculty Code §25-32 is a method used to hire a small number of tenure track faculty. The “without tenure” appointment is used to hire faculty from other universities who are near a tenure decision, or where the university does not grant tenure, and also to hire persons from industry at a similar stage in their careers. The “without tenure” appointment presently has a mandatory tenure review in the next to last year. The “without tenure” faculty will then either become a tenured associate or full professor or depart after a terminal year. The number of “without tenure” appointments has been small, no more than five at any time out of the two thousand tenure track/tenure faculty on campus. This number is unlikely to grow, as faculty and industry people who are more junior receive assistant professor offers, and faculty who are tenured and more senior industry people will in general not accept a “without tenure” offer.

The Faculty Code §25-32 presently provides that appointment as associate or full professor “without tenure” is for a term of not more than three years. While this term has proven sufficient for faculty hired from other institutions who have existing academic research programs, some units (specifically Engineering, and possibly some others) find that “without tenure” hires from industry need more time to transition to academic research and properly establish their research program. “Without tenure” hires from academia have students and research funding in the pipeline, and experience and course notes for teaching. “Without tenure” hires from industry, while they have a publication record and research plan, have no students, no teaching experience and must transition to academic funding processes. In this respect they are more like new assistant professors than “without tenure” hires from academia.

Recognizing the value to the University of faculty with significant industrial experience, the proposed change to the Faculty Code will allow “without tenure” faculty appointments to be made for a term of three years with a possibility of renewal for another three years. The Council initially proposed that the appointment could be made in one of two ways: a three year term, or three plus three. This has proved too confusing, and the Council now recommends three plus three for all “without tenure” hires. The expectation is that “without tenure” hires from academia will continue to be expected to achieve tenure promptly, and will not be renewed for the second three year term unless there are exceptional circumstances. The first three year term protects the university from hires who prove ill-suited to teaching or university research. The second three year term protects the faculty member by ensuring sufficient time to achieve tenure.

The change provides for a mandatory tenure decision in the sixth year of the appointment. This is consistent with the timing for assistant professor tenure decisions.

The change ensures that appointments “without tenure” receive an annual progress review.
Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

A. Unless he or she is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:

1. He or she is a professor or associate professor; or

2. He or she has held full-time rank as assistant professor in the University for seven or more years and has not had his or her term of appointment extended by the Provost or received the prescribed notice terminating his or her appointment.

B. Generally, recommendation for tenure (Section 25-41) is made concurrently with recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor (except in the circumstances listed in the subsequent paragraphs of this section.) Only under exceptional circumstances may a faculty member with the rank of assistant professor be recommended for tenure without promotion.

C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:

1. An acting appointment, or

2. A visiting appointment, or

3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, principal lecturer, or

4. An appointment as teaching associate, or

5. Any initial appointment specified to be without tenure, or

6. An adjunct appointment, or

7. A research appointment, or

8. A clinical appointment, or

9. An affiliate appointment, or

10. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment. Each appointment governed by this provision shall contain notice whether tenure may or may not be acquired.

D. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor "without tenure," as specified in Subsection C.4 C.5 above, are limited to not more than two consecutive appointments, each of three years' duration appointments. The first appointment is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. During the second year of the initial appointment, the appointment will be considered for renewal consistent with the provisions of Chapter 24, Section 24-41, Subsection A for assistant professors. If the associate professor or professor is reappointed, the three-year period of reappointment must include a tenure decision and terminal year in the event that tenure is not granted. To meet this expectation, the tenure review must be conducted no later than the second year of the second three-year appointment; during this second term of appointment, postponement of the tenure decision is not an option. In the case where tenure is not granted in the mandatory fifth year, the sixth year will be the terminal year of appointment. The part-time renewal periods provided for assistant professors in Chapter 24, Section 24-45, Subsection D do not apply to associate professors and professors without tenure.
Appointments to the rank of associate professor or full-professor "without tenure by reason of funding," as specified in Subsection C.9 - C.10 above, are continuing appointments governed by Chapter 24, Section 24-4140.

E. A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of his or her appointment with the agreement of his or her department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in his or her part-time appointment.

F. A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Chapter 24, Section 24-45 accumulates eligibility for tenure under Subsection A of this section.

G. Time spent on leaves of absence from the University does not count in the accumulation of time toward tenure.

Section 25-41 Granting of Tenure: Policy and Procedure

[For "Documentation for Recommendations for Promotions, Tenure, or Merit Increases," see Executive Order No. 45]

A. Tenure should be granted to faculty members of such scholarly and professional character and qualifications that the University, so far as its resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a policy requires that the granting of tenure be considered carefully. It should be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, which is exercised only after careful consideration of the candidate's scholarly and professional character and qualifications.

B. Not later than the end of the academic year prior to that in which an assistant professor would acquire tenure under the provisions of Section 25-32, Subsection A.2, or in which the appointment of an associate professor or a full professor without tenure would end under Section 25-32, Subsection D, or in which a review for tenure is required pursuant to Section 25-45, Subsection D, a decision shall be made in the following manner. Consistent with the timelines set in Section 25-32, Subsection A.2 for full-time assistant professors and Chapter 24, Section 24-45 for part-time assistant professors, and Section 25-32, Subsection D for associate professors or professors "without tenure," a decision shall be made in the following manner:

A recommendation that the assistant professor faculty member be granted or denied tenure shall be sent to the dean of the school or college. This recommendation shall be based upon a majority vote of the eligible professors and associate professors of the department, or of the school or college if it is not departmentalized. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation she or he may also submit his or her own recommendation.

The dean, advised as prescribed in Chapter 24, Section 24-54, Subsection C shall then make his or her recommendation to the President, and if tenure is to be granted it shall be conferred by the President acting for the Board of Regents.

If the assistant professor's faculty member's tenure is granted, the President shall so notify him or her in writing. If tenure is denied, the dean shall notify the individual in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the succeeding academic year.

A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings described in Chapter 27, and may file a petition for review as provided in Section 25-64.
If a tenure decision is postponed for reconsideration, the assistant professor’s dean shall cause him or her to be notified in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the second succeeding academic year unless reconsideration in the meantime shall have resulted in the granting of tenure.

C. If it is desired to appoint to a position with tenure other faculty members referred to in Section 25-32, the procedures for recommendation and granting described in Subsection B above shall be followed, except that a denial of tenure shall not of itself lead to termination of appointment.

Section 24–57  Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit–Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit–based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University’s obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24–32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor “without tenure” under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D, or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.
C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean, or his or her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, and assistant professors, and associate professors and professors “without tenure” appointed under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D. The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors and principal lecturers at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24–55.
From: Christoph Giebel [mailto:giebel@uw.edu]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 5:17 PM
To: SecFac
Subject: Fwd: [Arts_sciences] Alert and update: salary freeze and retentions

------------------------------
I also know that some of my colleagues think that the department has been "gamed" in the past. By that I mean that the department has urged the divisional dean to make a retention offer on the belief that an outside offer was imminent when, in fact, an outside offer either wasn't going to come or that the faculty member wasn't likely to take an offer if it did arrive.

------------------------------
Of course, everyone votes on the offers themselves, but when it's being pushed by the chair and some senior professors it can be difficult to oppose it. Second, I know that not all offers are being made in response to SERIOUS negotiations underway . . .

------------------------------
In our Dept., this has been going on for years. It started a couple of years... It would come down from the Dean's office. Here's $30K... Give it to 5 people! It's a special gift the Dept. chair got to hand out to change people's salaries.

One year, we tried to have the whole Dept. faculty vote; the result . . . The Dean told our chair that we didn't pick the correct people... Please try again.

The only way we track this problem is to keep a salary record. When we try to put our current chair on the spot, he gets very defensive . . .

It's the "new" system of management . . .

The whole process is a complete morale killer. "What you didn't get the hit this year? Well are you a loser."

------------------------------
The whole preemptive/competitive offers situation has become a bit of a farce. As you note, the criteria for them have changed dramatically. A few years they required coming up with written evidence; now, as you rightly observed, the slightest mention can lead to responses from administrators. What this new salary framework in effect has done is grant more power to deans to make these special salary adjustments for those they and unit heads consider favorably. Unfortunately, this doesn't make for an equitable system...

------------------------------
thank you for voicing this situation loudly and in detail. Usually, everyone remains very hush about all this and that doesn't serve us well, collectively.

In my department, I would say a conservative estimate is that 2/3 of the faculty have benefited from counter-offers - the vast majority preemptive. What's more a one-time course teaching reduction is a rather standard component of these offers. This has the "loyal faculty" carrying more of the burden in more ways than one. To compound matters further, a unit that has had 2/3 of the faculty receive so-called competitive offers during a "salary freeze" is not likely to qualify for consideration when and if unit adjustments occur.

The trifecta of insults!

------------------------------
we've had some outrageous examples of the very thing you talk about where a friend from elsewhere writes a little letter about how much they'd love to hire you when in fact there is absolutely no job!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Campus</th>
<th>Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form</th>
<th>A/B Retentions</th>
<th>% Retention Pool</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan’s School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean and Fishery Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. Acad. Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Totals:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Totals:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan’s School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean and Fishery Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Totals:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Campus</th>
<th>Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Pre-Emptive Competitive Offers</th>
<th>Locally Funded Pre-Approved Retention Form</th>
<th>A/B Retentions</th>
<th>.5% Retention Pool</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>95 (12*)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-11 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>324</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 (2*)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan's School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>97 (4*)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (1*)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1*)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-12 Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Note:**
*In response to competitive offer
Revised 10/31/12
2011-12 Retentions

141 retention salary adjustments were effective between July 1, 2011 and October 31, 2011
24 (17.0%) funded with State funds
114 (80.9%) funded with Non-State funds
3 (2.1%) funded with a combinations of State and Non-State funds

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

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $2,519,916
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $21,355
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $12,732
Mean % increase – 13.79%; Median % increase – 10.0%
20 (14.2%) in response to known competitive offer

105 retention salary adjustments were effective between November 1, 2011 and January 31, 2012
44 (41.9%) funded with State funds
61 (58.1%) funded with Non-State funds

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

Annualized value of Non-State funded retentions - $1,583,238
Mean value of Non-State funded retentions - $26,387
Median value of Non-State funded retentions - $15,960
Mean % increase – 11.97%; Median % increase – 10%
14 (13.3%) were in response to known competitive offer
2011-12 Retentions

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

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

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

62 (32.3%) funded with State funds

128 (66.7%) funded with Non-State funds

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

Annualized value of State funded retentions - $812,749

Mean value of State funded retentions - $12,699

Median value of State funded retentions - $10,710

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

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

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

Mean % Increase – 13.00; Median % Increase – 10.01

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

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

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

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

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

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

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