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]

Chair Gregory gave a brief historical report on the most exciting Senate Executive Committee meeting ever when there was a sit in in the President’s office in 1968. Gregory then reported that the SEC established the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization, chaired by Susan Astley. The group had its first meeting this past week to discuss revisions of a form on outside work. The SEC also is discussing athletics with Scott Woodward at the next SEC meeting. Gregory explained that he shared with the Regents the need for improved classroom technology. Gregory reminded Senators of his email sent on the topic of faculty compensation at other universities in Washington State.

Sandra Silberstein (A&S) inquired about the status of a childcare facility at Husky Stadium. Gregory said that it was discussed at the last SEC meeting. At that meeting, Provost Cauce indicated the demand for and the cost of building such facilities is great.


President Young gave a brief legislative update. Several new and returning legislators have been especially responsive to our message about higher education needs for funding and increased management flexibility. Governor-elect Inslee has also been responsive but less clear on how to provide revenues. At the federal level, the UW has been active in arguing against sequestration that would have a great negative impact on the UW, Pell grants, medical care, and research. Four dean searches (A&S, Nursing, Engineering, and Graduate School) are in progress; President Young expressed sincere thanks to the entire faculty who have participated in these processes. The interest of candidates in these positions has re-confirmed the high regard with which the University is regarded.

Leroy Searle, (A&S) asked about the defeat of the constitutional amendment that would allow the University to invest in more types of funds. The President shared his disappointment and some political insights as to why it may have failed. He indicated that this might reflect citizen unease about the health of Wall Street and also the complexity of the measure.

Steve Buck, (A&S) asked how the University should move forward. The President believes they learned a lot, including how the state feels about the University, and may try again in the future. We learned what the citizens misunderstand about the University, such as tuition levels, number of out of state and international students, access and affordability. Parents of students and potential students have less understanding of higher education than they do of K-12 public education. We send mixed messages: the sky is falling and yet we are one of the best universities in the world. He feels that the University needs to do a better job connecting how the University relates to the State. He also expressed a need for the University to develop more allies. Is higher education a public or private good? Polls indicate the belief is that it is a private good and thus they question why the public should pay for public higher education. Messaging is critical and especially messaging from sources outside the UW.

4. Opportunities for Questions and Requests for Information.
      i. Approval of the October 8, 2012, SEC minutes.
      ii. Approval of the October 25, 2012, Faculty Senate minutes.
      iii. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. [Exhibit B]
      iv. Creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. [Exhibit C]
   b. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit D]
c. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting. {Exhibit E}

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:

Lecturer Leon Bensadon of Spanish and Portuguese Studies, who died on November 4, 2012, after having served the University since 1989.

Professor Emeritus Robert M. Blumenthal of Mathematics, who died on November 8, 2012, after having served the University since 1956.

Associate Professor Emerita Nada Estes of Psychosocial & Community Health, who died on October 19, 2012, after having served the University since 1961.

Dean and Professor Robert S. Leventhal of the Graduate School of Business, who died on October 22, 2012, after having served the University since 1989.

The Senate approved the resolution by a standing vote.

7. Announcements.
Senators were reminded of the invitation to attend a reception after the meeting hosted by President and Mrs. Young at their residence, Hill-Crest.

8. Unfinished Business.
UW Educational Outreach Online Undergraduate Degree Completion Initiative. {Exhibit F}

There was one item of unfinished business, continued discussion on the Social Science online undergraduate degree completion initiative. David Szatmary, Vice Provost, UW Educational Outreach corrected the title of the agenda item to indicate UWEO is collaborating with A&S on a degree in Social Science. He provided information about the budget and business plan for this initiative. Points included:

- The program overhead is similar to ABB, but based on usage.
- The program is not expected to generate revenue until FY16.
- Direct expenses are predominantly for faculty salaries.
- Includes two months of faculty salary for course development.
- Expects a mix between new hires and buy out of existing faculty.

Arts & Sciences Social Science Divisional Dean Judy Howard indicated that new faculty would be hired (i.e. new lines) but they wouldn’t necessarily be teaching the online courses. She provided an update on the steps that the College of Arts & Sciences (A&S) is taking to develop a social science major. She meets regularly with social science department chairs to consider what a divisional degree would be intellectually to be articulated in a draft working document; learning goals will be completed by the end of this quarter. An implementation committee is being formed from faculty members and advisors that were recommended by department chairs and endorsed by the elected faculty council of A&S. This committee will be working, beginning in Winter 2013, on admissions criteria, curricular design, course development, advising, graduation requirements, and program governance. They hope to have materials ready for submission to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) by spring; however she is committed to spending whatever time is essential to assure quality of the
degree program. Governance ideas are being explored; one example is potential development of a new academic unit that becomes a home for supervision of and faculty of college-wide degrees.

The presentation was follow by Q&A:

Q: What are the opportunities for involvement of faculty from UWB & UWT?
A: (Howard) Once learning goals are established, there is the intent to reach out to other academic units and campuses.
A: (Cauce) Also there may be interest in other campuses developing additional online degree offerings.

Q: Are there any benchmarks for evaluation of the program?
A: (Howard). She is concerned about space and adding 60 new FTEs and the realism of projected growth. She concurs that it is essential to have benchmarks and evaluation along the way.

Q: Would education about online teaching be available to faculty outside A&S?
A: Intent is to do so, but will need to work out the details with UWIT. (Howard & Stacey)

Q: Will faculty growth continue?
A: It will be important to first see how this goes. (Howard)

Q: Projections now go to 3500 students, is that sustainable and realistic?
A: (Szatmary) It is realistic; community colleges in Washington have 31,000 online students with no place to go afterwards. We don’t really know much about what populations will be interested. UW may want to target some underrepresented populations, working with Luis Fraga, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement.

Q: Will cost models be appropriate given the amount of infrastructure needed to support the initiative?
A: (Szatmary) Yes.

Q: Will international students be eligible for enrollment? How will this work?
A: (Howard). There is no answer at this time. Expect them to be eligible as they are now.

Q: Scheduling and fee issues have occurred for students currently taking online courses in the School of Medicine and taking in person examinations (special fee).
A: (Howard) Will need to explore this further.

Comment: Stroup (A&S) expressed concern about the rapidity of moving ahead with such a radical change in the University. She also expressed concern and outrage about equity of these projected salary figures and salaries for course development for new faculty that is less compensation than that available to current faculty with higher teaching loads
A: (Howard). She is also concerned about the original timeline; lots of logistical challenges but she believes they can be addressed. She acknowledged the concerns about equity.

Q: Integrated science degree has been in planning stages for about five years. How does this compare and why the difference in timeline?
A: (Howard). Integrated science degree has its own history; these are very different programs. Lessons have been learned that can be applied to this degree.

Q: Will this be a UW degree or branded differently?
A: (Cauce) Seeking guidance from A&S & faculty in general. It is too early to decide.

Q: What future role will Senate take? Gregory proposed that Cauce, Howard, Szatmary return regularly with reports to the Senate; Senate will take a monitoring role. SCPB will be involved in monitoring the budget. FCAS will review curriculum.

Q: Would Senate vote on approval?
A: (Gregory) Senate can set up whatever roadmap they want.
A: (Taylor, A&S) This is why it is important to settle governance issues within A&S.

C: Would be a good idea to start soon, but at pilot level so adjustments can be made.
A: (Howard) That is in essence the plan of starting with fewer students.

C: (Stroup) We have problems with our messaging, as Young said. We need to be careful with our messaging so that if graduation rates are different or if perceived as ‘mercenary.’
A: (Howard) Agree that messaging is critical. But it is not mercenary, it’s about improving access.

   a. Discussion: Improving Faculty Demographics. [Exhibit G]

Gregory turned over the chair to Vice Chair Jack Lee so Gregory could act as a presenter for the next discussion.

Gregory introduced the topic by indicating that the Senate Leadership has set this topic as a priority for the coming year and has met with the Faculty Council on Women in Academia (FCWA) & Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) to discuss this topic. He presented information about the decline in recent years of the proportion of tenure track faculty at the UW, largely due to an increase in WOT faculty and lecturers (full time and part time). This is especially true at UW Tacoma (UWT) and UW Bothell (UWB) and in the School of Medicine (SOM). He expressed alarm that, especially at UWB and UWT, that this reliance on lecturers is untenable and threatens sustainability at a research university. The SOM should also discuss this topic

Alexes Harris, (A&S), FCMA presented data on racial/ethnic distribution of faculty; the racial/ethnic distribution among UW faculty differs substantially from the US population & Washington state population, and also from the student body, with faculty who are white greatly overrepresented. We need more accessible data and understand current recruitment and retention practices.

Marjorie Olmstead, (A&S), Chair of FCWA, presented data on faculty distribution by sex. Clinician-educator faculty in SOM has a larger proportion of women than research track faculty. Hiring decisions get made locally; patterns may be hidden when data are aggregated; for example, the majority of female hires in A&S are in ethnic studies & women studies departments. Data we have isn’t fully adequate to help us understand the issue. Females are underrepresented among leadership positions, especially among department chairs. She drew our attention to the UW Diversity blueprint.

Astley commented that the unequal gender distribution among full professors likely contributes to the inequitable distribution among leadership and administrative roles.

Janelle Taylor (A&S) asked for clarification about different categories of faculty, particularly WOT and clinical faculty. Cauce responded that while the titles may differ across universities, the trends are similar. She also clarified that WOT track faculty are not supported by state funds, but rather by grants or practice. There was also mention of different ways “clinical” titles are used.

Killien suggested that there are many faculty titles within the UW and an explanation of them and how they are used might be a useful topic for a future meeting.

b. Class C Resolution. [Exhibit H]

Title: Addressing Faculty Demographic Concerns.
Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

After the presentation, a Class C resolution on the demographic concerns was presented. There was discussion on the resolution, during which an amendment was proposed and passed. The amended resolution was passed.

10. Good of the Order.

Provost Cauce commented on the current dean searches and cited the due diligence of search committees to identify diverse candidates. A member of one of the search committees agreed. There
was also diversity in the membership of the search committees. Foreman thanked Gregory for day lighting the lecturer distribution at UWB and UWT and commented that it affects workload and quality of the campuses.

Gregory implored Senators not to let the Class C resolution end here; to take the information to the departments and to ask the Provost to also take a role in this action. Astley commented on the difficulty obtaining data on diversity. Cauce strongly urged faculty to take a strong role in this initiative.

11. Adjournment.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm.

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

Since last month’s meeting, the Senate leadership has been working on several issues.

**Intellectual Property:** The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) met November 8 and voted to create a Special Committee on Intellectual Property (IP) and Commercialization to provide a vehicle for consultation on IP issues. Susan Astley will chair the committee. One of the first concerns will be consideration of new version of the Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation form.

**Athletics:** SEC also heard from Faculty Athletics Representative Pete Dukes who reported on academic performance. On average student athletes are performing well in classes as well as on the field. SEC hopes to meet with Athletics Director Scott Woodward in January to discuss the Intercollegiate Athletics budget and growth plans. The athletics program has been aggressively borrowing and spending on new facilities. The Regents have twice this quarter approved enhancements to earlier facility designs: first an additional $10 million dollars for an upgraded scoreboard system (upgraded over the originally approved design), then $6 million to upgrade the locker room design in the new baseball facility, a design that had been approved only six months earlier. The Regents responded with sympathy to my comment that classroom facilities could use a little enhancement too, that many classrooms lack the most basic audio-visual and other teaching equipment.

**Online degree completion program:** Discussion of this issue will continue under Unfinished Business at Thursday’s meeting. At the October meeting, some Senators were enthusiastic about the proposal, but there seemed to be a near consensus that the program should not be rushed; that more planning is needed along with continued consultation. One key point of concern was the fact that the proposed interdisciplinary major (Social Science) does not yet have a faculty able and ready to design curriculum, teach classes, and oversee the program. At Thursday’s meeting we expect to learn more. Vice Provost David Szatmary will provide information about the budget and business plan. Social Science Dean Judy Howard will speak about steps that the College of Arts & Sciences is taking to develop a social science major.

**Faculty demographics:** Under New Business we will consider a resolution addressing three dimensions of faculty demographics. After four years of severe budget constraints, we are beginning to hire new faculty. That makes this a good time to take a look at the composition of our campuses. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have declined as a percentage of all faculty over the past decade, while the number of WOT faculty and part-time lecturers has increased. Diversifying the faculty has long been a goal, but the data show very little change in recent years. Gender equity also remains an elusive promise. Women continue to be under-represented among tenured faculty and seriously under-represented at the full professor rank and in academic leadership roles. We will hear three brief reports and consider a class C resolution that recommends steps to restore the tenure track, advance racial and ethnic diversity, and promote gender equity.
FACULTY SENATE HIGHLIGHTS
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FACULTY SENATE HIGHLIGHTS
Autumn Quarter is well underway, and UW intercollegiate athletic competitions are in full swing. My most central focus this Fall has been to understand and watch for possible ramifications of the new Pac-12 event scheduling that is affecting all of our teams. With the advent of the new Pac-12 Network, we have incredible media exposure to virtually all our teams. Fans can watch more Football than ever, but also can watch “live” on TV many matches involving our Men’s and Women’s Soccer teams, and our Volleyball team. I do not think Men’s and Women’s Cross Country teams have gotten quite the exposure, but they will be broadcast at some time.

The immediate consequence of this increased media exposure has been a re-vamping of the scheduled dates and times for competitions so that they can be shown “live” on the network. Thus the University of Washington teams are competing on more different days of the week. Mondays and Wednesdays are the new dates – we have always competed Thursday through Sunday. At a minimum these changes result in student athletes missing days of class than they would have in the past, and might result in missing more class time than in the past. Also, competitions are scheduled at different times during the day, with some competitions starting as early as 1 PM and as late as 8 PM on days when classes are held. Weekend competitions start as early as 11 AM, and again start as late as 8:30 PM. These midweek competitions will be a part of the scheduling for all our teams through the academic year.

My concern is what impact these schedule changes will have on the academic performance of our students. My fellow Pac-12 FARs and I are all monitoring this and sharing concerns and observations with each other. We are focused on “protecting” the student athlete in that we do not want his or her academic performance to suffer because of these changes. The UW Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is prepared to provide the support needed to ensure the academic performance of student athletes is not negatively impacted, but exactly how to do that is unclear.

Annually the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) and the Student Athlete Advisory Services (SAAS) group review the academic performance of our special and our priority admits. The special admit group continues to do well academically in terms of staying eligible and graduating. The priority group does well, but on a relative basis, the special admit group seems to be more successful (relative to expectations) than the priority admit group.

The NCAA, under Mark Emmert, continues to actively try to improve the setting for intercollegiate athletes and the environment in which they compete. Mark and his senior leadership team are leading this effort. That is, many proposed changes are being initiated at either the CEO level of the NCAA, or at the NCAA staff. This is a change from the status quo, where changes were primarily initiated by the institutional and conference members of the NCAA, and were more of a “grass roots” source of rule changes. The efforts by Mark with a kind of “top down” approach to rule changes is meeting considerable resistance, and is not proceeding at the pace President Emmert might have expected. Reviewing all the proposed rule changes, the recommended or proposed amendments to them, and all the comments supporting or opposing the change takes considerable time.
## Priority Admit Data Snapshot By Year

### Entering Class of 2008-2009  (70 priority admits)
- 1 Withdrew from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 0 Was cut from the team
- 1 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)/program discontinued
- 5 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 25 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 1 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
- 31 Earned UW degree

### Entering Class of 2009-2010  (52 priority admits)
- 2 Withdrew from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 3 Was cut from the team
- 2 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 1 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 34 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 0 Below 2.0 or are academically ineligible
- 4 Earned UW degree

### Entering Class of 2010-2011 (65 priority admits)
- 0 Withdrew from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 1 Was cut from the team
- 1 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 3 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 51 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 0 Went pro (left school early)
- 0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
- 3 Earned UW degree

### Entering Class of 2011-2012 (58 priority admits)
- 1 Withdrew from UW (personal/family/financial reasons)
- 0 Was cut from the team
- 0 Quit the team or was dismissed from the team
- 1 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
- 1 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
- 50 Remain at UW in good academic standing
- 1 Went pro (left school early)
- 4 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
- 0 Earned UW degree
Special Admit Data Snapshot By Year

Entering Class of 2008-2009 (27 special admits)

0 Withdrawed from UW
3 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
8 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
0 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
1 Remains at UW in good academic standing
2 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
13 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2009-2010 (21 special admits)

2 Withdrawed from UW
2 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
0 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
11 Remain at UW in good academic standing
0 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2010-2011 (30 special admits)

0 Withdrawed from UW
0 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
6 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
0 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
23 Remain at UW in good academic standing
1 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree

Entering Class of 2011-2012 (31 special admits)

0 Withdrawed from UW
0 Quit the team or were dismissed from the team
0 Transferred from UW (athletic reasons)
0 Dismissed from UW (academic reasons)
30 Remain at UW in good academic standing
1 Went pro (left school early)
0 Below 2.0 or academically ineligible
0 Earned UW degree
Creation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

Committee Charge:

The Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization 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 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 will consist of five or more 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.

Faculty Member Appointments to the
Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization

- Susan Astley, School of Public Health, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.
- Susan Astley, School of Public Health, as chair for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Jaime Olavarria, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
- Kate O’Neill, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.
- Matthew Sparke, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2015.
- Duane Storti, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2014.
- Tueng Shen, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2013.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. Nominations are currently being received for candidates for Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate for a term beginning in 2013. To make a nomination, contact Nancy Bradshaw at bradsn@uw.edu.

2. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting reviewed on October 15, 2012, a proposal from Chancellor Kenyon Chan, for the Computing and Software Systems and the Science and Technology Program to reorganize as a School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, under the Procedures for Limited Reorganization and Consolidation of Programs (Faculty Code, Section 26-41.C). No petition was received by the Provost by the November 13, 2012, deadline, and no formal objection about the reorganization of these programs into a School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics have been received by the Secretary of the Faculty. Therefore, the reorganization process proposed under Section 26-41.D. of the Faculty Code will proceed.

3. At its meeting of November 5, 2012, the SEC approved the formation of a Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization.
The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (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 Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the Senate on matters of policy. The Fall 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 serve as the Co-Chair of this committee. 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. The SPWG has reached consensus on question 1 and is embarking on question 2. Our progress to date will be shared with the SPWG Advisory Group on 11/19/12. The purpose of the meeting is to solicit comments/advice from this larger body of faculty. The 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 Senate will be updated soon after the Advisory Group meeting.

**Online Learning:** One need only read the headlines to see the impact online learning will have (is having) on all forms of education across this country, not just higher education. Jan Carline, chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, shared the Council’s year-long evidence-based review of the strengths and limitations of online learning with the Senate in December, 2011. The implications of online education on access, quality of instruction, faculty time, class size, cost, even intellectual property are broad. The potential benefits of online learning are unlimited, if implemented strategically and guided by an evidence base. This year (starting with the Oct 15 SCPB meeting and Oct 24 Senate meeting) 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 Oct 15 SCPB meeting and Oct 25 Senate meeting. Discussions will continue as the details of this proposed program coalesce.

**Intellectual Property (IP):** As we move into the 21st century, intellectual property takes on a whole new meaning, as every aspect of our lives and careers move online. The playing field is rapidly changing and policies are needed to address these changes. In February 2012, Professor Storti brought to the Senate’s attention the need to review new language regarding assignment of IP recently inserted in the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. This discussion led to the discovery that the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee (IPMAC), established 15 years ago through EO 36, held its last meeting in March 2010. As of April 2012, IPMAC has been reinstated by the President. The committee is charged with reviewing the policy set forth in EO 36 and recommending such changes to the President as deemed desirable. The committee will also advise the President on broader IP issues that arise in the promotion and protection of research. IPMAC will have a very full agenda over the ensuing years and I recommended IPMAC present annually to the Faculty Senate. In September 2012, Ana Mari established a work group to revise the “Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation” form. Professor Breidenthal is a member of the work group. The workgroup revised the Compensation Form and submitted it to the Senate Leadership on 11/14/12 for their review. I have placed this topic on the November 26 SCPB agenda. It will also be the first item of business for the newly established Special Committee on IP and Commercialization (SCIPC), 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
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%). 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%). 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 will be addressed by the SCPB in January 2013. It will also be presented at the November 29, 2012, Senate meeting.

Faculty Effort Certification (FEC) and allocation of non-sponsored funds to match effort: Over the years, considerable attention has been focused on how to handle funding and allocation of effort for university service or proposal-writing activities when faculty are funded primarily by sponsored grants or contracts. Up to 48% of the faculty (WOT and Research) receive their funding through sponsored grants or contracts. As outlined in Grants Information Memoranda GIM 35, Faculty Effort Certifications (FECs) are quarterly or semi-annual reports designed to track the effort of faculty who have been paid from and/or committed to sponsored project effort. The FEC is used to ensure compliance with the OMB Circular A-21 requirement to confirm that the distribution of effort "represents a reasonable estimate of the work performed by the employee during the period." Faculty review and certify their FEC to ensure it reasonably reflects their effort. Use of the UW institutional base salary and average faculty work week are necessary in proposing, charging, and certifying effort. The total UW institutional base salary must be distributed across all of a faculty member’s university research, instruction, administration, service and/or clinical activities. This requirement may not be avoided by characterizing true UW activities such as proposal writing, instruction (including service on thesis committees), university-related administrative duties, service or clinical activities as “unfunded” or “volunteer” activity for which no UW salary is paid. With few exceptions, salary support for teaching, administration, service, clinical activity, institutional governance and proposal preparation effort must come from non-sponsored funds. Appropriate funding sources include, but are not limited to department funds, research cost recovery, gifts and endowments. Considerable progress has been made over the years since this topic was first addressed in the SEC on January 9, 2006 (Exhibit B). A comprehensive FEC website has been established providing departments and faculty with guidance and training that include FEC Newsletters, School and College effort policies, FAQs (e.g., Q: How is my effort preparing my next grant proposal funded? A: During the effort reporting period in which you prepare the proposal, the percentage of your effort spent on proposal preparation must be funded by University sources other than sponsored projects.), and most recently the launch of
To assess the effectiveness of the University’s effort certification process, it will be important to confirm sufficient non-sponsored funds are available to match faculty’s non-sponsored University efforts. This topic was addressed, in part, at the October 29, 2012, SCPB meeting. Indirect Cost Recovery (F&A) is one potential source of funds to support faculty effort spent on proposal preparation. A brief presentation outlined how F&A rates are calculated and how ICR is distributed (Under ABB, 35% of ICR is returned to Schools and Colleges). Proposed and negotiated rates are always less than the actual F&A rates due to administrative caps and other negotiation adjustments. Effective F&A recovery also differs from actual F&A rates due to sponsor limitations and other waivers. Bottom line; ICR is insufficient to cover F&A costs associated with research including faculty effort on proposal preparation.
Online Undergraduate Degree Completion Initiative

Expense & Revenue

Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>$387,363</td>
<td>$10,701,108</td>
<td>$17,593,113</td>
<td>$23,035,774</td>
<td>$25,223,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Expense</td>
<td>$1,526,258</td>
<td>$4,200,396</td>
<td>$8,848,084</td>
<td>$13,276,951</td>
<td>$16,369,906</td>
<td>$17,815,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Overhead</td>
<td>$35,600</td>
<td>$544,095</td>
<td>$1,481,692</td>
<td>$2,449,594</td>
<td>$2,942,929</td>
<td>$2,973,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at 12.6% of gross revenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$1,361,858</td>
<td>$4,744,491</td>
<td>$10,329,776</td>
<td>$15,726,545</td>
<td>$19,512,236</td>
<td>$20,788,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FTE & Net Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Enrolment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>3,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Net Revenue</td>
<td>$(1,005,854)</td>
<td>$(668,199)</td>
<td>$371,332</td>
<td>$1,964,969</td>
<td>$3,574,538</td>
<td>$4,734,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Net Revenue</td>
<td>$(1,005,854)</td>
<td>$(1,674,053)</td>
<td>$(1,302,721)</td>
<td>$(662,249)</td>
<td>$(4,236,787)</td>
<td>$(8,971,096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Overhead: 27.26%
UW faculty Demographics 1997-2011
Selected charts

These charts and tables are based on data collected by the Office of Planning and Budget, Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Office, and Human Relations Office. Marjorie Olmstead, Alexes Harris, Luis Fraga, Susan Astley, and Jim Gregory produced the slides.

Please note that the charts are not fully consistent because of variation in job category definitions and because some report FTE, others faculty head counts.

Core faculty* by category, all campuses 1997-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOT Professorial</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professorial</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers (full time)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time/Adjunct</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>3665</td>
<td>3749</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>3976</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>4039</td>
<td>4151</td>
<td>4161</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>4338</td>
<td>4483</td>
<td>4493</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>4751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Tenure/Tenure Track

*Headcount core faculty, all campuses. Data: Carol Diem, UW Office of Planning an
### Core faculty by campus and School of Medicine 1997-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOT &amp; Research</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure Track</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOT &amp; Research</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure track</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOT Professorial</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/tenure track</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOT Professorial</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race & Ethnicity in U.S., WA State, and Seattle

- **U.S. Population, 2011**
- **WA State Population, 2011**
- **Seattle Population, 2010**

- **White, Non Hispanic**
- **Black**
- **Latino**
- **Asian**
- **American Indian**
- **Pacific Islander**
- **Two or More Races**
Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty, Fall 2011

- American Indian: 0.5%
- Black: 2.5%
- Asian: 12.0%
- Latino: 4.0%
- Two or More Races: 1.3%
- Not Reported: 4.7%
- White: 75.0%

Race & Ethnicity in U.S., WA State, and UW

- U.S. Population, 2011
- WA State Population, 2011
- UW Undergraduate Enrollment, 2011
- UW Tenure Track Faculty, 2011

- White, Non Hispanic
- Black
- Latino
- Asian
- American Indian
- Pacific Islander

- 80.0%
- 70.0%
- 60.0%
- 50.0%
- 40.0%
- 30.0%
- 20.0%
- 10.0%
- 0.0%
Change in Total Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, 1997-2010

Racial and Ethnic Distribution of New Faculty Hires, 2000-2010
Achieving and Maintaining Faculty Diversity

Need for regularly collected and accessible data

Better understanding of current department practices

- Do they have diversity goals?
- How are they defined and measured?
- What are the established processes to reach these goals?
Nearly half the women of color in SS are in 3 depts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Not White or Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sci</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sci</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM Basic Sci</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sci</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 2 of the 6 are US

Pipeline and Utilization
Female Under-representation at Higher Ranks

% Female by Rank
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Career Satisfaction

I am satisfied with how my career has already advanced at UW

Male LT
Female LT
Male FT NTL
Female FT NTL
Male PT NTL
Female PT NTL

I am satisfied with my prospects for career advancement at UW

Male LT
Female LT
Male FT NTL
Female FT NTL
Male PT NTL
Female PT NTL

I could move into a leadership role at UW if I wanted to do so

Male LT
Female LT
Male FT NTL
Female FT NTL
Male PT NTL
Female PT NTL
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UW Diversity Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4. Attract and retain a diverse faculty and staff</td>
<td>URM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Percent of UR faculty</td>
<td>URM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Percent of UR administrators</td>
<td>URM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URM: Factor of 2
Women: 10%

Goal 6. Create and sustain a welcoming climate for diversity

6a. Difference in percent of URM and non-URM undergraduates who agree UW has a supportive climate | * | 0.0 |
6b. Difference in percent of URM and non-URM graduate students who agree UW has a supportive climate | * | 0.0 |
6c. Difference in percent of URM and non-URM faculty who agree UW has a supportive climate | -21.9 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
6d. Difference in percent of URM and non-URM staff who agree UW has a supportive climate | -11.8 | 0.0 | 11.8 |

* Baseline data not yet available

Target met; trends to be monitored
Target has not been met.

Moving our faculty forward

- Each department is unique, but each resides within a larger context
- Proactive searching CAN make a difference
- You can’t monitor improvement without measurements
- Faculty and administration working together
RESOLUTION ADDRESSING FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC CONCERNS

WHEREAS, available data show that the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty has declined, that the number of faculty of color remains too small, and that women are under-represented among tenured faculty, especially at the full professor rank, and in academic leadership roles; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington has endured four years of budget stress during which normal patterns of faculty replacement have been suspended; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate requests the following:

1. that each department or academic unit make an effort to evaluate and discuss faculty demographics during this academic year and in doing so consult the updated criteria for promotion detailed in Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code;

2. that the deans and Provost ensure each search committee discuss appropriate ways to broaden search pools;

3. that the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) resume the practice of making demographic trend data accessible to the faculty. Annual reports and past reports should be available in Excel and portable document format (pdf);

4. that the Provost make an annual report to the Senate about efforts and progress in restoring the tenure track, advancing racial and ethnic diversity, and achieving gender equity.