# REPORT OF THE
# UNIVERSITY INITATIVES FUND
# REVIEW COMMITTEE
University of Washington

Submitted to President Richard L. McCormick and Dr. Mary Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate

**May 2001**

Dean Nancy R. Hooyman, UW School of Social Work, Committee Chair
Dr. Rita Colwell, Director, National Science Foundation
Mr. James Faulstich, Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board
Mr. Görkem Kuterdem President, Graduate and Professional Student Senate
Professor Gregory R. Miller, UW Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Dr. William Richardson, President and Chief Executive Officer, W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Professor James D. West, UW Department of Slavic Language and Literature

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# UIF REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UIF Review Committee unanimously endorses the priority of a fund for interdisciplinary innovation that benefits both the University of Washington and the state of Washington. We are uniformly impressed by the excellence of the proposals funded and commend them for their transformative impact and critical role in creating a "culture of possibilities." Given the priority that must be placed on innovation and excellence at our University, the committee recommends continuing the UIF. It shall be a pool of permanent funding from which awards are made through a competitive application process to innovative research, teaching and service projects designed by faculty, staff and students. Nevertheless, all units, regardless of their size or whether they have received UIF funds, have felt the costs of the one-percent reduction over three biennia. Although we recommend that the interdisciplinary collaboration and innovative goals of the UIF be sustained on a permanent basis, two problematic aspects – the source of funding and the unit-specific UIF – should be changed. Our recommended changes are as follows.

1. **Funding:**

- Discontinue the 40 percent unit-based component of the UIF, effective with UIF-3. This component should be returned to each unit for their management of potential state reductions and increasing costs. Although an original premise of the unit-specific funding was that it would serve as a useful management tool, experience has found otherwise.

- Continue the interdisciplinary UIF-3 at the level of 0.6 percent of the operating budget in each unit.

- Generate and diversify the ***permanent*** funds for the ***interdisciplinary*** component of the UIF through:

  (a) Implementation of a levy of 0.6 percent of the operating budget of each unit in UIF 4, 0.4 percent in UIF-5, 0.2 percent in UIF-6, with no levy in UIF-7 and thereafter. This incremental approach is intended to reduce the cost to units over time. The exception to this incremental funding through reallocation is that the percentage should be adjusted in any biennium when the University faces significant financial pressure due to increasing costs, reductions in state appropriations or both. It should be noted, however, that President McCormick, in 1996, stated that the UIF funds will not be used to "fix" problems in the regular budget, but to support new and existing programs…(February 6. 1996, letter announcing the UIF Program). This commitment needs to be considered in future decisions about the interdisciplinary portion of the UIF.

  (b) Development of a package of ***permanent funding for innovation*** from a variety of sources, with a target of providing by UIF-7 at least the equivalent of 0.6 percent of the operating budget of units. The overall goal will be to achieve permanent funding of approximately $5 million each biennium through a variety of funding sources to support interdisciplinary innovation and excellence. Support for innovation will be a priority line item in the university's budget funded from sources that would include: private donations, endowment funding, state funds, tuition and any other resources available to the university.

**2. Process**

- Require every project proposed for UIF funding to have a component of outreach and publicity designed to make the public aware of the innovation and its benefits to the University's external constituencies.

- Review and improve the distribution of information about all aspects of the UIF, including the accomplishments of funded projects to faculty, students and staff, providing if necessary special funding for this component of the UIF process.

- Introduce more effective screening of proposals for compatibility with the long-range planning goals of the units, and more effective communication of those planning goals to applicants during the preparation of proposals.

- Give additional weight to projects in which the unit in question provides some of the required funding through internal reorganization and resource reallocation and/or partial awards from other sources.

- Develop ways to encourage and facilitate proposals from subject areas where there is limited experience of proposal writing, or where units are characteristically small and their potential projects are on a relatively small scale.

- Include students on all committees reviewing UIF proposals or the UIF program in general.

This review represents a very effective partnership between the President's Office and the Faculty Senate and the committee commends them for initiating and supporting it. In the committee's judgment, this comprehensive review, which has involved all key constituencies has been extremely valuable, and it is expected that such reviews will again be undertaken at appropriate intervals**.**

## 2. CHARGE AND COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE

### 2.1 CHARGE

The UIF Review Committee, appointed by President McCormick and Dr. Mary Coney, Chair of the Faculty Senate, was asked to take "the broadest view possible of the UIF" in its examination of the UIF, with three particular questions of interest.[1]

1. Is the UIF an effective approach to reallocation in order to support imaginative new investments?
2. Is it achieving the purposes for which it was established?
3. How can the accomplishments of the UIF be weighed against the losses experienced by the units from which the resources have been taken?[2]

The appointment letter also noted that in consultation with faculty leadership and deans, President McCormick will "endeavor in good faith to use [these] recommendations regarding the future of the UIF."[3]

This report is the result of the Review Committee's extensive data gathering over a four-month time period in order to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the UIF as a whole.

### 2.2 COMPOSITION OF THE UIF REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Committee, composed of both internal and external members, was intended to represent a range of viewpoints and constituencies. Internal members included a faculty member from the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, a faculty member from the Department of Slavic Language and the Dean of the School of Social Work as Chair. External members, unaware of the UIF, brought a fresh perspective to the review and site visit. The internal members met from January to April in an effort to gather as much information as possible, given the time constraints of the site visit on April 5-6.

## 3. METHODS

### 3.1 SURVEYS

#### Faculty and staff survey

A survey was distributed by the Faculty Senate via an email notification to approximately 26,902 faculty and staff. This represents all faculty and staff who had a viable University of Washington email address in the database maintained by UW Computing and Communications. This number is estimated by Computing and Communications to represent approximately 85 to 90 percent of UW faculty and staff. Some bias is due to the probability that many of the faculty and staff without viable email addresses ending in "u.washington.edu" are members of departments with their own email suffixes. This was remedied somewhat by sending a reminder notice using a different list to all faculty and a notice to a voluntary email list of professional staff at UW.

There were 2,089 respondents to the survey within the approximately three-week period that the survey was available. This represents a response rate of approximately 7.8 percent of the recipients of the email notification and 7 percent of the estimated population of faculty and staff. The estimation of response rates is complicated by the discrepancy between the count of email addresses and the estimated numbers

---

[1] Correspondence from Richard L. McCormick, President, and Mary C. Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate, to members of the UIF Review Committee. January 4, 2001.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

of faculty and staff. Approximately 5 percent of UW staff (non-student), 9 percent of UW faculty and 21 percent of UW librarians responded to the survey. The estimate of response rate by librarians is more accurate as this population is smaller and easier to define.

The survey could be completed by one of three methods: on the web, via email, or by printing out and mailing it to the Faculty Senate. Of the surveys, 301 (14.4%) were returned via email, 149 (7.1%) by campus mail, and 1639 (78.5%) were submitted on the web.

### *Survey design*

The survey was organized to elicit information on (1) respondent characteristics, (2) the structure of the UIF, (3) the implementation of the UIF, and (4) the impact of the UIF on colleges, schools and administrative units. In the first section of the survey, respondents were asked questions about themselves in relation to their duties at the University, and their levels of experience, involvement, and familiarity with the UIF. There were 44 questions in total, with four of them open-ended with space for comments. The remaining 40 questions were closed-ended. The majority of the closed-ended questions were either: (a) information about respondents, (b) yes/no choices about their experience and familiarity with the UIF, or (c) opinions about components or effects of the UIF with either a four or five point answer scale.

### *Methodology*

The surveys that were submitted by email and campus mail were entered into a Microsoft Access Form by a single researcher. The quantitative portions of the email and campus mail responses to the survey were merged with the web-submitted responses. The quantitative analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics.[4]

Written comments were loaded into Nudist, a qualitative analysis software package. The four potential responses to the four open-ended questions were linked to a unique identifier for the respondent, and attached to information about the respondents' position, administrative duties, college, school, or administrative unit, participation in a UIF proposal or funded project, and familiarity with the UIF. This allowed for the content analysis to take place in the context of the respondents' pertinent information along with their responses to all four open-ended questions. Over 1,000 of the survey respondents answered at least one of the open-ended questions, adding up to over 100 pages of single spaced text.

The development of the themes (codes) was based on the elements that informed the design of the survey instrument as well as responsiveness to the text itself. The entries were coded in three ways. The first coding scheme identified whether the comments were basically supportive of the UIF, supportive of the concept of the UIF, critical of the UIF, had questions about the UIF, or none of the above. The second way identified the themes that emerged from the written comments, based on iterative readings. The third coding method was applicable to the answers to questions 26 and 43 that asked respondents to elaborate on how they thought the UIF, as implemented thus far, has affected the UW as a whole (26) and their college, school, or administrative unit (43). Sixteen categories were provided in section 4 of the survey. These were used as codes when they occurred in the responses to the open-ended questions, with an indication of the direction of the effect (positive or negative) as a modifier.

---

[4] The software package for the majority of this analysis was SPSS Version 9.

**Student Survey**

In the absence of an undergraduate student representative on the UIF review committee, the Associate Students of the University of Washington (ASUW) and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS) created a separate committee to gauge student opinion of the UIF program. This committee was composed of four undergraduate and two graduate student representatives.

The student UIF review committee developed a short survey to determine student opinion. This survey gauged student awareness and opinions of the program. Seven hundred and forty two students responded to the survey either over email or via the Internet.   A general question regarding student awareness of the UIF was first asked. Then a series of more normative questions were posed that were designed to elicit students' opinions and general impressions about the UIF. The content of these responses ranged from strong support to the program to a bitter opposition to the idea altogether. In relation to the total number of completed surveys, only a few students took the time to include written comments with their form response. The major themes in these written comments are identified under 7.4, *Reactions to and Perceptions of the UIF among Students.*

### 3.2 INTERVIEWS

Prior to the April site visit, the internal members of the UIF Review Committee met with 14 staff members, five faculty members and two deans to speak directly with faculty and staff who had various perspectives on the UIF and its impacts.  Meetings with the internal review members were also held with President McCormick, Provost Huntsman, Regent Shelly Yapp, Faculty Senate Chair Mary Coney and Miceal Vaughan, who was Faculty Senate Chair when the UIF was first conceptualized. The meetings with faculty were held individually with the internal members of the committee. Faculty members were invited to meet with the committee based on recommendations from committee members, Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Senate Chair Mary Coney. The committee deliberately chose faculty who would represent a range of opinions.  To elicit responses from staff, an email announcement was sent to approximately 1,700 staff regarding two staff hearings held with the internal members of the committee.  Students were invited to meet with internal members of the review committee, but chose to meet with the total committee during the site visit.

### 3.3 COMMUNITY INPUT AND FACULTY SENATE FORUM

#### UW Community Input

A letter from President McCormick and Mary Coney, Chair of the Faculty Senate was sent to deans, principle investigators of the UIF projects and selected faculty, requesting their assessments of the impact of the UIF on the UW. Approximately twenty-two staff, faculty, or administrators submitted letters either in response to the request from the President and Chair of the Faculty Senate, prompted by the survey, or as part of the general conversation regarding the evaluation of the UIF.

A similar letter from President McCormick and Mary Coney, Chair of the Faculty Senate was sent to two Washington State Representatives, one Washington State Senator, and the Chair of the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board.  No responses were received from these individuals.

#### Campus Perspectives on the UIF: An Open Forum

An open forum, Campus Perspectives on the UIF, was held February 22, 2001, on the Seattle campus. Open to faculty, staff, and students, this forum allowed approximately 25 people to communicate their experiences, questions, and concerns about the UIF. The majority of speakers at this forum were either faculty or students, with fewer contributions from staff. The students largely provided testimonials of the

benefits that had accrued to themselves and others from opportunities created by UIF-funded projects. Several of the faculty speakers were directly involved with UIF funded projects and gave similar testimony to the benefits of these initiatives. The balance of the speakers was unaffiliated with UIF projects and voiced their opinions on the relative benefits and costs of the UIF program. The speakers' comments were transcribed from a tape and then coded based on repeated themes. This transcription is available on the Faculty Senate Website.

### 3.4 SITE VISIT

The members of the review committee spent two days at the Seattle campus meeting with representative members of the UW community, including faculty, Deans, Faculty Senate leadership, students, staff, and participants in UIF projects. The schedule of the meetings is included in the appendix. The participants in the scheduled meetings were provided in advance with questions as a guide for topics of conversation that might be addressed (See appendix for a list of questions). The categories for questions were:

1. Intent of the UIF
2. Communication
3. Responses to the UIF
4. Actual effects of the UIF
5. The future of the UIF: Goals and mechanisms

## 4. DEFINITION OF UIF AND ITS GOALS, STATED OR UNDERSTOOD

In introducing the UIF, President McCormick stated that the UIF program is intended to enable the University "to seize opportunities that would otherwise be lost, and in particular to invest in those that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries."[5] In its original intent, the purpose of the fund was not to substitute for initiatives that can be pursued through existing biennial budgetary channels.[6]

More specifically, some of the articulated goals include:

- to address programmatic needs that stretch across several schools, colleges, and departments, including interdisciplinary programs that involve joint proposals from more than one dean
- to provide funds centrally as "leverage" for proposals that are largely supported by outside sources of income
- to initiate promising developments that may occur within a college or school after a biennium has begun and resources have been allocated, when failure to do so would risk losing them altogether.[7]

The UIF was also conceived as "a strategic tool, a means of guiding our evolution even as resources shrink".[8] An implicit assumption held especially by the Faculty Senate leadership and Deans was that five iterations of budget reductions would provide an incentive to budgetary discipline and strategic planning at the academic and administrative unit levels. The Faculty Senate leaders who first discussed the UIF in 1994-95 and the reallocation working group (1995-96), appointed by President Gerberding and chaired by Dr. Arthur Ferrill also emphasized the need for strategic budgetary decision-making. The

---

[5] The University Initiatives Fund, University of Washington, Office of the President, May 1996.
[6] President Taps Budgets for Special Fund to Encourage Innovation, February 8, 1996.
[7] A Letter From the President to the University Community, February 8, 1996.
[8] A Letter From the President to the University Community, June 5, 1997.

concept of budgetary discipline was also part of the special committee chaired by Executive Vice President Trask and appointed by President Gerberding, who recommended reallocation processes.

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION OF UIF

### 5.1 HISTORY AND MODIFICATIONS OVER PREVIOUS ROUNDS (UIF1 AND 2)

The fund as currently designed is supported by a 1- percent assessment on UW operating budgets every two years between 1997 and 2007. In the original round, UIF funds were designated for programs that were multi-disciplinary, but in the second round of funding (1999-2000), unit-specific awards were also implemented. The unit-specific awards are based on proposals by Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts and Deans for uses of 30 percent (or 40 percent in UIF 3) of their UIF reduction that would to benefit directly their individual units.

#### How the funding has been generated

The 1- percent budget reduction has been supported by a 1-percent assessment on most state appropriated operating budgets and on many locally funded operating budgets. The assessment is made at the start of each of 5 biennia, beginning in 1997. Approximately 32 or 33 percent of the funding for the UIF has come from administrative (non-academic) units, with the remaining 67 to 68 percent from units classified as academic (Table 1). In the following table, the reductions in the amounts of total FTE are listed by cost category, where applicable.

#### Reductions in Academic Budgets, UIF 1 and 2

Approximately one third of the funding came from reductions in faculty cost categories (33.7 percent or 15.6 FTE) in UIF-1 with a similar amount in UIF-2 (32.8 percent, 16.2 FTE in UIF-2). Less than 1 percent came from reductions in TA/RA cost categories in UIF-1 and UIF-2. The percent drawn from the staff cost category increased from 13.4 percent to 20.5 percent from UIF-1 to UIF-2. Hourly/operations comprised 9.6 percent of reductions in UIF-1, and 13.2 percent in UIF-2. In the UIF-1, 10.7 percent was drawn from the benefits cost category, while in the remaining rounds, costs in benefits were included in the salary cuts in other categories.

#### Reductions in Non- Academic Budgets, UIF 1 and 2

In UIF-1, 16.7 percent of the funding was from staff, and 12.8 percent was from hourly/operations. In UIF-2 the percentage drawn from staff was less (6.4 percent), while the cut to hourly/operations increased (26.8 percent).

Table 1. UIF-1 and UIF-2, Distribution of 1% Cut by Cost Category, for Academic and Non-academic Units

|  | Faculty | TA/RA | Staff | Hourly/Operations | Benefits |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UIF-1 Percent | 33.7% | 0.1% | 13.4% | 9.6% | 10.7% | 67.6% |
| Total FTE | 15.6 | 0.4 | 14.9 | 1.2 |  | 32.1 |
| UIF-2 Percent | 32.8% | 0.3% | 20.5% | 13.2% |  | 66.8% |
| Total FTE | 16.2 | 0.7 | 19.9 | 0.0 |  | 36.7 |
| Non-academic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UIF-1 Percent | 0.1% |  | 16.7% | 12.8% | 2.9% | 32.4% |
| Total FTE |  |  | 11.1 | 5.0 |  | 48.2 |

| | | 6.4% | 26.8% | | 33.2% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UIF-2 Percent | | | | | |
| *Total FTE* | | *5.7* | | | *42.4* |

Academic and non-academic units have distributed the budget reduction in various ways. In general, academic units distributed the budget reduction in four ways, with variations as they progressed through the rounds (See

Figure 1). Some units took most of the reduction from faculty cost categories (typically faculty vacancies), although the number doing so decreased in UIF-2 and UIF-3. Another group of academic units absorbed most of the reduction in staff categories. The remainder either relied on a mixture of all four categories, or took the reduction in a mixture of staff and hourly/operations. This latter category was increased in the second and third rounds of the UIF.

The majority of the reductions from non-academic units have come from staff and hourly/operations cost categories, with most units relying on a mix of the two categories throughout the three rounds of budget reductions to date.

Figure 1. Academic units, by how the 1-percent reduction was distributed among cost categories, UIF 1 through UIF 3

| | Mostly from Faculty | Mostly from Staff | Mixture | Mostly from Staff & Hourly/Operations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| UIF-1 | Arch. & Planning<br>Arts and Sciences<br>Business Admin.<br>Forest Resources<br>Nursing | Evans School<br>Ocean & Fishery<br>Social Work<br>Grad School<br>Undergrad Educ.<br>Dentistry | Education<br>Engineering<br>Law<br>Medicine<br>Pharmacy<br>Public Health &<br>Comm. Medicine | Educ. Outreach<br>Health Sci. Admin.<br>UWMC Instr. Support<br>Harborview Instr. Support |
| UIF-2 | Arts and Sciences<br>Forest Resources<br>Nursing | Arch. & Planning<br>Grad School<br>Evans School<br>Social Work<br>Dentistry | Business Admin.<br>Engineering<br>Law<br>Ocean & Fishery<br>Undergrad Educ<br>Medicine | Education<br>Educ. Outreach<br>Health Sci. Admin.<br>UWMC Instr. Support<br>Harborview Instr. Support<br>Pharmacy<br>Public Health &  Comm. Medicine |
| UIF-3[9] | Arts and Sciences<br>Law | Evans School<br>Social Work<br>Nursing<br>Public Health &<br>Comm. Medicine | Arch. & Planning<br>Grad School<br>Education<br>Educ. Outreach<br>Engineering<br>Undergrad Educ.<br>Medicine | Business Admin.<br>Forest Resources<br>Ocean & Fishery Sciences<br>Dentistry<br>Health Sci. Admin.<br>Pharmacy<br>UWMC Instr. Support<br>Harborview Instr. Support |

---

[9] Proposed as of April 6, 2001.

**How the funding has been distributed**

In the first round of UIF funding, awards were made to eight academic proposals and one support service proposal. The awards and the participating units are listed below. The total funding for academic and non-academic awards is included in the following lists of UIF awards.

**UIF-1**
Academic Proposals ($6,808,500)
       Graduate School of Library and Information Science
       Center for Nanotechnology (Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Medicine)
       Research, Teaching, and Public Programs in the Humanities (Arts and Sciences, UW Libraries)
       Health Sciences Interdisciplinary Partnerships in Clinical Education (Nursing, Dentistry, Medicine, Pharmacy, Public Health, Social Work)
       Undergraduate Program in Neurobiology (Medicine, Arts and Sciences)
       Public Health Genetics in the Context of Law, Ethics, and Policy (Public Health, Arts and Sciences, Medicine, Pharmacy, Law, Public Affairs, Nursing)
       The Puget Sound Regional Synthesis Model (PRISM) (Ocean and Fishery Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Public Affairs, Forest Resources, Education, UW Libraries, Architecture and Urban Planning)
       Partnerships for a Seamless Education (Office of Minority Affairs et. al.,)

Support Services Proposals ($1,000,000)
       Streamlining Support Services through Web-Based Technologies (Executive Vice President)

In the second round of UIF funding (1999-2000), four interdisciplinary awards were distributed, with two to academic units and two to support service projects. Of the unit-specific awards, 16 were to academic units, and ten were to administrative (support) units.

**UIF-2 Interdisciplinary awards**
Academic Proposals ($3,359,000)
    The Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences (Arts & Sciences, Engineering, Medicine, Nursing, Public Affairs, Public Health & Community Medicine, Social Work)
    The Graduate Program in Biomedical and Health Informatics (Dentistry, Engineering, Library & Information Science, Medicine (Medical Education and Radiation Oncology), Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health & Community Medicine)
Support Services Proposals ($2,336,592)
    The Grant and Contract Initiative (Executive Vice President, Computing and Communications, Office of Research)
    The Program for Educational Transformation Through Technology (PETTT) (Computer Science & Engineering, Engineering, Education, Educational Partnerships, Forest Resources, Medicine)

**UIF-2 Unit-specific Awards**
Academic Units ($1,737,414)
    College of Architecture and Urban Planning:  CAUP Net
    College of Arts and Sciences:  Center for Astrobiology and Early Evolution
        Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center
    School of Business Administration:  Program in Electronic Business
    School of Dentistry:  Tenure-track Salary Support
    College of Education:  Recruiting Undergraduates in Teaching Careers
    College of Engineering:  College Enhancements
    College of Forest Resources & College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences: Coordinated Curriculum in GIS, Remote Sensing and Spatial Analysis for Earth Sciences and Natural Resource Planning

The Graduate School:  MyGradProgram
School of Law:  Funds to support the Center for Law, Commerce, and Technology
School of Medicine and Medical Centers:  Multi-site Cancer Data Collection System
School of Nursing:  Support for Director, Developing and Sustaining Rural Venues for Teaching Nursing
School of Pharmacy:  Mechanisms Underlying Individual Variation in Drug Response
Evans School of Public Affairs:  Certificate Program in International Development Policy and Management
School of Public Health and Community Medicine:  Integrated Web-Database Project
School of Social Work:  Intergroup Dialogues (IGD)
College of Undergraduate Education:  Large Class Initiative for Improving Undergraduate Instruction

Academic Support (Administrative) Units ($917,266)
Computing and Communications:  Investment in MyUW
Office of Development:  Finding New Donors: Prospect Research Assistant
Office of Educational Partnerships:  Supporting K-12 Education Reform
Office of the Executive Vice President:  Data Warehousing & Document Imaging
Health Sciences Administration:  Further Development of HealthLinks WebPages
University Libraries:  University of Washington Information Learning Lab (UWILL)
Office of Planning and Budgeting:  Customer Interactive Space Inventory Management System
Office of the Provost:  Web-based Faculty Hiring Process
Office of Research:  Creation of Development Position to Support Fundraising Efforts
Office of Student Affairs:  Assistant Director of Admissions for Marketing and Recruitment

The lead units for submitted proposals, finalists and awards for UIF-1, UIF-2, and submitted proposals and finalists for UIF-3 are presented in Table 2. The number of proposals, finalists, and awards for all three rounds are listed collectively, by unit.

Table 2. Lead units, submissions, finalists, and awards, summed over UIF-1 to UIF-3

| **Academic:** | Submitted | Finalists | Awards (UIF1-2) |
|---|---|---|---|
| College of Architecture and Urban Planning | 12 | | |
| College of Arts and Sciences | 20 | 8 | 2 |
| Business School | 5 | 1 | |
| School of Dentistry | 3 | 1 | |
| College of Education | 2 | | |
| College of Engineering | 14 | 7 | 1 |
| College of Forest Resources | 8 | 1 | |
| The Graduate School | 3 | | |
| School of Law | 5 | | |
| School of Medicine | 11 | 7 | 2 |
| School of Nursing | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| School of Pharmacy | 3 | | |
| Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs | 2 | | |
| School of Public Health and Community Medicine | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| School of Social Work | 7 | 1 | |
| Undergraduate Education | 2 | | |
| **Total** | 111 | 30 | 8 |

| Administration: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Attorney General | | | |
| Computing and Communications | 4 | | |
| Development | 1 | | |
| Executive Vice President | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Educational Partnerships | 1 | 1 | |
| Libraries | 4 | 3 | |
| Planning and Budgeting | | | |
| Minority Affairs | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| President | | | |
| Provost | 1 | 1 | |
| Research | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Student Affairs | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| University Relations | 1 | | |
| Total | 23 | 11 | 4 |

The lead units for awards for UIF-1, UIF-2, and participating units for awards (UIF1-2) and finalists (UIF-3) are in Table 3.

Table 3. Lead unit awards (UIF1-2), Participating unit awards (UIF 1-2), Participating unit finalists (UIF-3).

| Academic: | Lead Unit Awards | Participating Unit Awards, UIF-1,2 | Participating Unit Finalists, UIF-3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| College of Architecture and Urban Planning | | 1 | 2 |
| College of Arts and Sciences | 2 | 6 | 7 |
| Business School | | | 3 |
| School of Dentistry | | 2 | |
| College of Education | | 2 | 1 |
| College of Engineering | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| College of Forest Resources | | 2 | |
| The Graduate School | | | 1 |
| School of Information | | 2 | 2 |
| School of Law | | 1 | 1 |
| School of Medicine | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| School of Nursing | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| School of Pharmacy | | 4 | |
| Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs | | 3 | 1 |
| School of Public Health and Community Medicine | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| School of Social Work | | 2 | 2 |
| Undergraduate Education | | | 2 |

## 5.2 CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION (UIF-3)

The current implementation, UIF-3, includes a slight modification on the division between interdisciplinary and unit-specific awards. The split for this round of awards was altered from 66 percent interdisciplinary, 33 percent unit-specific (UIF-2), to 60 percent interdisciplinary, 40 percent unit-specific (UIF-3).

**How the funding is being generated in UIF-3**

Approximately 32 percent of the funding for the UIF has come from administrative units, with the remaining 68 percent from units classified as academic (Table 4). In the following table, the reductions in the amounts of total FTE are listed by cost category, where applicable.

Table 4. UIF-3, Distribution of 1% Cut, by Cost Category, for Academic and Non-Academic Units

| DRAFT | Faculty | TA/RA | Staff | Hourly/Operations | Benefits |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic | | | | | |
| UIF-3 Percent | 31.5% | 1.2% | 22.6% | 12.3% | 67.6% |
| *Total FTE* | *15.5* | *1.9* | *22.0* | | *36.7* |
| Non-academic | | | | | |
| UIF-3 Percent | | 0.1% | 5.8% | 26.5% | 32.4% |
| *Total FTE* | | *0.1* | *7.1* | | *46.8* |

*Reductions in Academic Budgets, UIF 3*

In UIF-3, 31.5 percent of the funding is from reductions in faculty cost categories (15.5 FTE). The amount from TA/RA categories increased to 1.2 percent (1.9 FTE). The percent drawn from the staff cost category has increased to 22.6 percent. In UIF-3, 12.3 percent of the funding is derived from reductions in hourly/operations. The 2001-2003 budget reductions are being met by greater reductions in staff and hourly/operations cost categories in general, while faculty reduction are fairly consistent at 32 to 34 percent of the contribution from the academic units compared to rounds one and two.

*Reductions in Non-Academic Budgets, UIF 3*

In UIF-3, 5.8 percent of the funding is from reductions in staff, and 26.5 percent is from reductions in hourly/operations. Overall, the trend has been to rely on hourly/operations cost categories for an increasing amount of the reductions.

**How the funding is being distributed in UIF-3**

Nine UIF pre-proposals have been selected for submission as full proposals in the third round of interdisciplinary UIF competition. Out of 27 pre-proposals submitted from schools, colleges, and administrative offices across the University, eight academic initiatives and one administrative initiative will be considered for funding.

**UIF-3 Interdisciplinary proposals selected to submit full proposals**
Academic Proposals
    Center for Photonics (Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Engineering, Medicine)
    Social Justice in a Multi-Ethnic Society (Social Work, Arts & Sciences, Education, Nursing, Public Health & Community Medicine, Undergraduate Education)
    Climate Change and the Global CO2 Cycle (Arts & Sciences, Ocean & Fishery Sciences)
    Center for Technology Entrepreneurship and Innovation Studies (Business Administration, Engineering)
    Masters Program in Genetic Counseling (Arts & Sciences, Social Work, Medicine)
    A Center for Digital Arts (Architecture & Urban Planning, Arts & Sciences, Engineering)

Textual Studies Program (Architecture & Urban Planning, Arts & Sciences, Information School, Law, Libraries)

Program on Values in Society (Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Graduate School, Information School, Medicine, Public Affairs, Undergraduate Education)


Support Services Proposals

University Web-Enabled Financial Desktop (Computing & Communications, Executive Vice President, Planning & Budgeting)


# 6. EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION

## 6.1 INTENDED EFFECTS

The effects of the implementation of the UIF can be characterized in several ways. The gains from the awards are described in Section 8 of this document, based on the individual reviews of the first round of UIF awards. This section focuses on the consequences of the one-percent budget reductions, based on how the units applied the reduction/reallocation. Section 6.2 discusses the unintended effects, both at the unit level and more broadly.

It was recognized that the budget reductions would inevitably have consequences for the units. As discussed earlier, the reductions were distributed across faculty, staff, TA/RA, and hourly/operations cost categories differently, according to decisions by the various academic and administrative units. In Figure 2, the consequences the UIF budget reductions had on academic and administrative units are briefly listed, grouped into broad categories. This list is based on descriptions of how the reductions were distributed and their effects on the units for the first two rounds of budget reductions.


Figure 2. Consequences of the UIF budget reductions for academic and administrative units, UIF-1 and UIF-2.

- Reduced ability to respond to opportunities in: faculty hiring, diversity
- Reduced ability to respond to opportunities in: research, existing initiatives, new initiatives, innovation – decreased flexibility and lost opportunities
- Refocusing of faculty priorities (e.g., more emphasis on federal priorities), due to decreased levels of university support
- Decreased ability to retain faculty
- Reduced ability to respond to and/or create development opportunities and pursue fund raising
- Reductions in alumni relations efforts
- Reductions in community outreach and public relations
- Decreased ability to engage in strategic planning
- Reductions in instructional support
- Reductions in operations support, equipment, computing facilities
- Reductions in periodicals and other print resources in libraries
- Reductions in student services
- Increases in workload, decreases in efficiency, decreases in levels of customer service
- Increases in faculty workload, inefficiency due to reduced staff support
- Increases in student fees
- Reduced ability to recruit graduate students

- Increased reliance on temporary funds
- Reductions in unit reserve funds

## 6.2 UNFORESEEN AND/OR UNINTENDED EFFECTS

In addition to the effects of the UIF implementation, which were consciously recognized as part of the decision-making process, there have been unforeseen and/or unintended effects, occurred at both at the unit level and university-wide. Some of those effects are listed below.

**Unintended effects of UIF-1 and UIF-2 budget reductions, at the unit level**
- Decline in faculty and staff morale
- Lost opportunities to seek external funding for innovation
- Increased faculty and staff workload, and cumulative negative effects of workload on meeting educational and research missions

**Unintended effects of UIF-1 and UIF-2, University-wide**
- Transfer of resources across departments
- Creation of mini-departments, outside the organizational structure, that are not subject to the usual approval procedures
- Undermining of strategic planning efforts, since not all UIF's were congruent with unit plans
- Lack of budgetary discipline in how reductions were made
- Smaller units disadvantaged, and have low levels of success in competing for UIF awards
- Redistribution of resources from units with fewer resources to relatively wealthier units
- Redistribution of resources from existing units to new units

## 7. REACTIONS TO AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE UIF

Overall, the members of the UW community reacted fairly consistently to the UIF. The similarities of perceptions about the UIF among faculty, staff, and administrators were greater than were their differences. Not surprisingly, recipients of UIF awards and participants in those projects/programs were supportive of the UIF, its concept and implementation. The greatest level of support among faculty, staff, and administrators was for the concept of innovation within the UIF itself. The greatest concerns focused on the (perceived) negative consequences of its implementation, and its continued viability. In addition, a significant number of members of the UW community (faculty, staff, and administrators) object strongly to the UIF's concept and/or structure, and tend to be very vocal in their criticism. Some of the perceptions specific to particular groups are discussed briefly in the following sections.

### 7.1 AMONG REGENTS
Overall, the Regents who met with the site team identified primarily benefits accruing from the UIF. They view it as a way for change and innovation to come from the faculty, fostering interdisciplinary work, and essential to the future of the University. Recognizing that funded UIF's have not always been congruent with strategic plans, they think this can be improved in subsequent rounds. They state clearly that permanency is the key to program success. At the same time, they recognize that hybrid or mixed models to funding the UIF may be necessary, rather than relying on the 1- percent levy on state budgets. For example, some Regents suggested permanent money for start up costs, endowment funds for temporary components of UIF's. Given widely held misperceptions about the UIF (e.g., only graduate

education benefits), the Regents recognize the need for better communication about both the UIF process for proposal development and the outcomes of the UIF projects.

## 7.2 AMONG ADMINISTRATORS

Concerns raised by academic administrators regarding the consequences of the UIF implementation, and its continued viability include:

- The infrastructure that is needed to support innovation has eroded, and there is an associated lack of permanent equipment to foster innovative information technology utilization in teaching and research.
- The UIF has accomplished a great deal, but the costs are now greater than the benefits, which are only marginal at this point.
- Small units have cut into the core support that is central to their teaching and research missions.
- Units can no longer sustain horizontal budget reductions.
- The original intent was to be flexible and nimble in order to ensure a strong future for the University. But funds have not been spent as intended to maximize cutting-edge new opportunities external to the university.
- The one percent cut was intended to be a way to assist making strategic changes in units, but reductions have not occurred in that manner.
- Faculty are angry, discouraged, demoralized by cuts; faculty in units that have not received funding no longer think the effort to apply is worthwhile. The time needed to apply is viewed as taking time away from their core teaching and research, including seeking external funding.
- The current model/decision-making process does not foster what is really needed for the University as a whole but rather what is needed for specific projects only.
- Unit-specific UIF's are redundant. Units as a whole are losing their ability to plan their own vision.
- The process for obtaining unit-specific UIFs is time consuming and somewhat demoralizing (e.g., units return funds centrally, then prepare a proposal subject to Provost approval to try to obtain those funds for innovations within the unit)
- Rules have not been uniformly applied, which is contrary to the UIF's intent

## 7.3 AMONG FACULTY

Perceptions range from 1) the UIF presented a welcome and much needed incentive to the blurring of interdisciplinary boundaries, to 2) the UIF has the potential to weaken the disciplinary strengths critical to the UW and higher education. A relatively small number of academic administrators and faculty raised issues explicitly about the relationship between the UIF and the tenure/promotion process. Concern is expressed about the potential for conflict between the more traditional mechanisms of tenure and promotion, which are viewed as rewarding departmental (non-interdisciplinary) efforts and faculty's affiliation with UIF projects that emphasize interdisciplinary research and education.

A related issue, with widely varying views, is the relationship between the UIF and interdisciplinarity and innovation. Many argue that the UIF provides a key incentive to surmounting the institutional barriers to engaging in interdisciplinary education and research. Alternatively, others are concerned that the presence of current faculty at UW who are already innovators, involved in interdisciplinary efforts, is endangered by the cumulative effects of the UIF on departmental budgets and faculty morale.

Faculty perceptions can be divided between those who are affiliated with UIF projects and those who are not. Among those who are not, there is greater concern that the benefits of the UIF for innovation and interdisciplinary research and education are outweighed by the risks posed to the core educational and research missions by the current funding mechanism. Even those faculty associated with UIF projects attest to troublesome costs to their home departments. Although there is considerable support for the benefits derived from the UIF awards, this recognition is tempered by continued affirmation that the underlying cost to units is a serious concern which cannot, and should not be dismissed.

## 7.4 AMONG STAFF

Issues raised by staff generally echo those of the larger University community. Staff are particularly concerned about the increased workloads created or contributed to by several aspects of the UIF. The creation of new and distinct organizational entities, with their attendant, separate budgets increased the complexity and duration of budgetary and administrative tasks, without necessarily providing more resources for such tasks. The UIF budget reductions are perceived to have disproportionately impacted staff positions, as many units eliminated or reduced staff support to meet their one- percent budget reductions. These reductions in staff FTE in some units exacerbated the workload increases associated with the new UIF programs; they also contributed to perceived reductions in staff abilities to fulfill their role in providing support services to students, faculty, and the UW community (including alumni and the public). One staff member pointed out that the cumulative effect of reductions in positions and redistribution of the workload, when repeated too many times, can seriously erode infrastructure. Another issue raised by staff is that the central funding of benefits obscures the actual cost of budget reductions to the units.

In addition to the general perceptions of the benefits of the UIF for innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration, staff are consistently positive about the benefits provided by the USER Project (UIF-1) in terms of efficiency, innovation, and usefulness. In fact, benefits of the USER Project are perceived by almost every segment of the University community.

## 7.5 AMONG STUDENTS

Students share many of the concerns outlined above. The student survey, conducted over a period of two weeks, shows that students who do not know about the UIF and its effects on units are nevertheless pleased with the outcomes. They appreciate the new disciplines and learning opportunities made available to them through the UIF, such as the undergraduate Neurobiology program.

A striking number of students expressed the concern that the UIF was funding science-based initiatives while ignoring innovation in the arts and humanities. They are also concerned about the use of the term, "innovative" with respect to the UIF. Some students worry that the University is funding programs deemed "innovative" simply because they are science and technology related. Other students have pointed out that department budgets do not need to be reduced by one percent in order to encourage innovation. Departments can and have initiated innovative programs on their own, which have benefited students.

Students support the idea of implementing new projects, but not at the cost of current programs that already benefit them. They are uneasy about the detrimental effects of the UIF on departmental budgets and their education through the one- percent budget reallocation. In their written comments to the survey, students refer to untaught courses, crowded lectures, and decreasing personal interaction with professors. In addition, some point to the proliferation of courses taught by teaching assistants as a consequence of the UIF budget reductions. Although it may not be an accurate perception of reality, the students'

concerns do reflect one shared by faculty and staff alike: the core missions of the departments are threatened by the on-going 1- percent budget reductions.

Another widely held concern among the students is the lack of communication about the UIF program and its success to students. The student survey found that a vast majority of respondents did not know about the UIF, or the programs funded. Even students in highly successful UIF endeavors, such as the Neurobiology program, are usually unaware of how the program is funded or the nature of the UIF. To ensure students' participation in and support of this program, the accomplishments of the UIF projects must be widely disseminated to students.

### 7.6 AMONG THE PUBLIC

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the Higher Education Coordinating Board and some legislators view the UIF positively. No data, however, were obtained from those external constituencies.

## 8. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

### 8.1 SUCCESSFUL INNOVATIONS FUNDED, AND 'SECONDARY STIMULUS' EFFECT

As with any program, the real measure of success is its outcomes; in this case, UIF funded programs. A separate effort has been underway since December 2000 to evaluate the successes of the UIF-1 funded programs. The reviews indicate that most of the programs funded in the first round of the UIF awards have been extremely successful in what they accomplished. The Center for Nanotechnology , for example, has "been effective in the coordination and stimulation of nanotechnology research and education efforts… [and] has placed the University in a good position to educate the next generation of scientists and engineers in nanotechnology and to lead research efforts in this rapidly growing area,".[10] Likewise, the undergraduate program in Neurobiology "provides highly qualified undergraduates with specialized, high level training in neurobiology, from the molecular level to behavioral systems and neuropathology,". [11]

An added benefit of the UIF proposal process appears to be the 'secondary stimulus' effect. Faculty and academic administrators hold a perception that some proposals not funded by the UIF selection process have been modified and funded through other sources, particularly the Tools for Transformation funds.

### 8.2 EFFECTS OF UIF ON INTERDISCIPLINARY AND INTERDEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATION

Interdisciplinary research and teaching are the UIF's most important impact on the University. Much of the testimony heard during the hearings indicate that the UIF has transformed the University's culture regarding interdisciplinary collaboration. Respondents state that the University generally is "at best indifferent to interdisciplinary collaboration, at worst hostile." They point out that by providing a source of permanent funding for interdisciplinary work, the University has prompted conversations that would never have occurred without the UIF. In the initial reviews of the UIF-1 funded projects, the benefits from the UIF for interdisciplinary collaboration are often repeated. To illustrate, the Simpson Center for the Humanities is fostering research collaboration at a much earlier stage in faculty careers.[12] PRISM, similar to other UIF-1 projects, is credited as being a catalyst to interactions with scientists in other

---

[10] Center for Nanotechnology Report, as part of a review of UIF-1 projects, February 13, 2001.
[11] Report of the Review Committee for the Undergraduate Program in Neurobiology, as part of a review of UIF-1 projects, January 10,2001.
[12] UIF Three-Year Review of the Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities, as part of a review of UIF-1 projects, February, 24, 2001.

disciplines, and fostering a multi-disciplinary research culture.[13]   The committee believes that the transformation of the culture is permanent, but that without encouragement in the form of UIF or some other financial incentive, this could wither away.

The Committee heard many different definitions of the concept of interdisciplinary.  The UIF proposal criteria define interdisciplinary as collaboration between at least two different colleges or schools.  In large diverse colleges and schools, such as the College of Arts and Sciences, getting different departments from the College to participate in a proposal could also be defined as interdisciplinary. Another flaw in the UIF definition of interdisciplinary is that faculty from similar disciplines in different colleges could participate in a proposal, but this is not really interdisciplinary in a traditional sense.  The Committee encourages the Provost to clarify the notion of interdisciplinary as it applies to the UIF and enable inter-college or inter-school level proposals.

## 8.3  LEVERAGING EFFECT OF UIF AWARDS

Another positive effect of the UIF is its ability to leverage additional external funds for the projects that have UIF funding. Two examples of this capability are: 1) the Simpson Center for the Humanities, which received an endowment by the Simpson family after its receipt of permanent UIF funds; and 2) the Center for Nanotechnology which has $4.3 million in gifts and grants after its successful UIF proposal, including an Integrated Graduate Education and Research Training (IGERT) grant funded at the rate of $500,000 per year for five years.  The Center for Nanotechnology is also effective in seeding new research efforts by advancing existing research programs.

## 8.4  ACTUAL EFFECTS OF UIF ON PLANNING

The budget discipline that the UIF would bring to schools and colleges was another desirable stated effect. To realize this discipline, it was assumed that units would undertake strategic planning to prepare for the ongoing UIF reductions.  Furthermore, on the award side of the process, it was explicitly stated in UIF-2 and UIF-3 that the proposals forwarded to the Provost for his consideration would be aligned with the strategic plans of the units that supported the proposals.

The testimony received by the Committee indicates otherwise on both counts.  Both the interviewees and the faculty survey indicate that strategic planning has not been furthered by the UIF process.  Instead, it has been either unconnected or even hampered. The interviewees state that the budget discipline and the strategic planning that was intended to accompany UIF never happened, since making vertical cuts is extremely difficult. The across-the-board budget reductions did not relate to strategic planning, but distributed the effects of the reduction in a shallow manner to minimize the pain experienced by the units. The Faculty Senate survey found that faculty and staff perceive strategic planning as most negatively affected by the UIF.

The proposals submitted for UIF funding did not necessarily conform to the units' strategic plans. The proposals submitted for the deans' consideration reflected the goals of faculty or staff, but these proposals were not necessarily congruent with the overarching strategic plan goals of the college or the school. Rather, many proposals reflected the interests of a relatively small number of individuals.

Overall, the Committee found that strategic planning is not helped and perhaps hindered by the reductions due to the UIF process. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that greater attention be paid to the congruence of the proposals submitted for consideration with the college and unit level strategic plan goals.

---

[13] PRISM Review Report, as part of a review of UIF-1 projects, March 1, 2001.

### 8.5 DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF SCALE AND OTHER FACTORS ON IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS AND OUTCOMES

One of the most commonly raised concerns about the UIF is the biases that are perceived as inherent in the award process. While some respondents believe that biases are intentionally built into the process, others think that these are unintentional and are the result of the disciplinary cultures of the participants or other factors that are not necessarily controllable.

A bias stated by almost every respondent, and validated by the available data, is the advantage enjoyed by the larger departments/schools/colleges over smaller ones. The Committee found that the current system of across-the-board budget reductions disproportionately affects the smaller departments that have less budgetary flexibility over how to reduce their budgets. This is especially the case in the College of Arts and Sciences, where the UIF reductions are taken from the vacant faculty lines which are pooled at the Dean's level and may mean that the loss of one faculty member from a small department can impede their core teaching and research missions. Furthermore, the data indicate that smaller departments have less chance of being a lead in a successfully funded proposal. Thus, the Committee recommends that the Provost remain alert to possible differential effects on smaller units.

Another commonly held belief by the interviewees is that the UIF process discriminates against humanities, arts and the professional schools, and that it favors the sciences and the medical schools. The data show that the College of Arts and Sciences has been a highly successful applicant for the UIF funds, but the currently funded proposals do not show a bias toward either the sciences or the arts. However, the professional schools, such as Law and Architecture, have not yet succeeded in obtaining UIF funds as proposal leaders. The proponents of the perspective that the UIF is inherently biased against the professional schools assert that this record supports their argument. If, after UIF-3, the same pattern of awards obtains, the Provost should consult with deans of those units about a possible plan of action in anticipation of UIF-4.

### 8.6 PERMANENCE OF AWARDED FUNDING

The permanence of the UIF funding is probably one of its distinctive characteristics. This very characteristic also makes UIF funds a highly valuable resource. The Committee heard primarily positive testimony about the permanence of the funding. Many point to the seed nature of other available funds, and how the permanence of UIF funds helped establish the funded programs as credible ventures to external donors. Those critical of the UIF assert that if the money were temporary, it would support more proposals in the subsequent years, as it could be reallocated.

The Committee recommends that the current permanent nature of the UIF be continued. The permanence of funds is, however, contingent upon the successful review of the individual programs receiving the funds.

### 8.7 DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS AND REALITIES

The data do not support several perceptions about the UIF data. Some of the most often repeated misperceptions are discussed here. One perception is that only certain units are benefiting as UIF award recipients. The perceived beneficiaries vary according to the speaker but some of the common ones are the "south campus", medicine and the health sciences, engineering and technology, and the sciences. A review of the lead and participating units (Table 3) shows that while engineering and units in the health sciences have received multiple awards, they are not the only UIF leads and participants. The College of

Arts and Sciences has been a recipient of two UIF awards as a lead, and 6 awards as a participant, for example. Of those, a major award was for the Simpson Center for the Humanities. Lead units for UIF 1 and 2 have consisted of the College of Arts and Sciences (2), the College of Engineering, School of Medicine (2), School of Nursing, College of Ocean and Fisheries Sciences and the School of Public Health and Community Medicine. The list of participating units, however, is even more inclusive, with only the Business School not participating in any UIF.

Another perception is that the UIF favors the new over the old, based on the UIF's explicit criteria for supporting innovation and interdisciplinary work. Yet some of the awards expanded or built on existing centers or initiatives (i.e., the Simpson Center for the Humanities, Graduate School of Library and Information Science), although considerable restructuring of the original unit took place. Another example is the Undergraduate Program in Neurobiology that complements the existing graduate program in Neurobiology and thus broadens the reach of that specialization at UW.

Another criticism of the UIF is based on the perception that it provides money to initiatives that were already fundable through other mechanisms (grants, federal dollars, and private donations). We heard repeatedly from award recipients that this was not the case. Instead, they emphatically state that their innovation could not have happened without the UIF. The UIF provided funds critical to (a) surmounting organizational or institutional barriers or (b) providing an initial investment of permanent money on which to base grants applications for further (often temporary) funds, or to attract further investment.

A frequent comment about the budget reductions is that the UIF is decimating departments through the biennial budget reductions. While the UIF budget reductions are certainly causing pain, it is important to remember that the current level of state funding, as well as other factors also underlie current budget limitations. At the same time, some units have benefited from increased funding for access and undergraduate education, and have increased in faculty and/or staff FTE's during the past two biennia. Nevertheless, state-funding growth is highly unlikely in the future, which intensifies concerns about the UIF budget reductions.

A related complaint is that staff and faculty positions are being lost to UIF budget reductions. Yet there is actually a net gain in staff FTE's university-wide for both UIF 1 and UIF 2. For faculty, there was a net gain university-wide in UIF 1; however, when UIF 1 and 2 are considered together, there is a loss of 1.8 FTE in UIF 2. In terms of faculty positions, most of the budget reductions in faculty FTE's have taken place through vacant faculty positions (unfilled positions, retirements, or resignations, for example). This represents a relatively small loss of faculty positions as a result of UIF-2, and a net gain overall for both staff and faculty.

These misperceptions, along with the relatively low level of familiarity overall with the UIF, indicate a need for dispersing accurate information about both the budget reductions and the UIF awards to the campus community. An ongoing effort to educate faculty, staff, and students about the both the benefits and costs of the UIF is one means by which to address these misperceptions and their effects on morale.

## 8.8 COMMUNICATIONS

The communications to the UW community regarding the UIF (exclusive of this review process) have thus far, consisted of the following: articles in *University Week*, letters from the President to academic and administrative unit heads, several announcements by the President and the UIF Website. Most of these communications are archived (http://www.washington.edu/uif/). This review process has also generated further information about the UIF, via the forum, the faculty, student and staff surveys, and

invitations for feedback by the President and Chair of the Faculty Senate. The individual UIF-funded programs have promoted themselves to varying degrees, but have not necessarily explicitly emphasized their UIF connection.

The communications aspect of the UIF may be the most under appreciated yet essential component. . Almost all the constituencies who participated in this UIF review indicate that their level of knowledge of the UIF is minimal. Eighty percent of the students, and 49 percent of the faculty and staff combined state that they have no knowledge of the UIF.

A program with such ambitious goals and far-reaching effects on those concerned needs to be embraced by the community it serves. The University community needs to be informed of the funding decisions, the reviews of the programs and other details about the UIF process itself. In addition, students and their representatives should be invited to participate in all phases of the UIF, including the next review of the UIF program overall or the process by which programs are selected.

More importantly, the successes of the UIF funded programs must be disseminated as widely as possible to all internal and external constituencies. The Committee found that some of the UIF funded programs have remarkable accomplishments, yet these are barely known outside of their immediate constituency. The University should direct its efforts to publicizing the positive impacts of the UIF both within and outside the University. In addition, program applicants should be asked to include an outreach component in future proposals.

## 8.9  SUMMARY

In undertaking this review, the Committee readily recognized the wide range of viewpoints about the UIF, which, as reflected in the survey data, are fairly evenly divided along the continuum of strongly support/support and oppose/strongly oppose. We were also appreciative of the fact that the current state budget situation has exacerbated concerns about the UIF funding mechanism and the future funding viability of smaller units. Throughout the surveys, hearings and site visit, the committee strived to listen carefully, record accurately and be as open and objective as possible. Written records were kept of every interview. In developing our recommendations, the survey results and the hearing notes were carefully reviewed and coded into themes.

Despite our thoroughness, we recognize that our recommendations will be criticized by some members of the UW community. From the beginning of the review, we were cognizant that no outcome could satisfy the diverse and oftentimes conflicting perspectives held by faculty, staff and students. Throughout our deliberations, the institutional good was the primary criteria by which we measured our recommendations. We unanimously agreed that the continuation of the interdisciplinary UIF through permanent funding is essential to the ongoing excellence of this University.

Comments on the report are welcome and may be directed in writing to President McCormick, rlm@u.washington.edu.

## APPENDIX

### QUESTIONS FOR THE UIF SITE VISIT

1. Intent of the UIF
   - Has the UIF allowed the University to seize opportunities that otherwise would have been lost?
   - Is the UIF critical to the ongoing success of the University?
   - Do you think the UIF is essential to innovation at the UW on a general campus wide) scale? On a local (unit wide) scale?
   - Are the articulated goals of the UIF feasible?
   - Are these goals far-reaching and ambitious enough?
   - Have they been realized? If so, can you give some examples of how the UIF has benefited the University as a whole?
   - One of the originally intended secondary effects of the UIF was the budget discipline that it would bring to units and that the budget reductions would be "healthy". Do you think this assumption still holds true? Has UIF been an effective tool in strategic planning?

2. Communication
   - Do you feel that the goals and the processes of UIF have been clearly communicated to you and to others?
   - How does your constituency perceive the UIF?

3. Responses to the UIF
   - How did your unit and college deal with the UIF budget reductions? Do you think this particular method has been an appropriate one? Has it been effective in achieving a disciplined approach to planning?

4. Actual effects of the UIF
   - In your opinion, what are the greatest benefits of the UIF to you, your unit and to the campus community?
   - What have been the greatest detriments?
   - Have you observed any process improvements or organizational restructuring because of the UIF? Have these been positive?
   - Has the UIF affected your department's strategic planning and merit / promotion / tenure review processes? If so, have these changes been positive?
   - Is it your perception that the UIF shifting resources from particular categories of units in campus to others in a significant way (such as from undergraduate education to graduate education, from the sciences to the humanities etc.)? If so, is this effect seen as desirable?
   - Is the UIF over emphasizing the new and initiatives full of promise over ongoing successful programs?

5. The future of the UIF: Goals and mechanics
   - Should the UIF be continued in its current form? If not, what changes might be made to its structure, funding source or allocation? Should it be entirely discontinued?

Supporting questions were provided in addition to the main questions above. These included:
   - Have the originally stated goals of the UIF (especially the ability to innovate and strategic planning) been achieved? Should they be revisited?

- Should the UIF be equally assessed at each unit or should departments be able to opt-out (and not be able to apply for funds)?
- Should the UIF funds be permanent, one-time and/or renewable?
- The proponents of the UIF budget reductions have stated that the UIF program is even more worthwhile in tough budget times such as the one we are experiencing right now (with a minimum 2% state budget cut in the near future) to give flexibility to the University. The opponents claim that the budget reductions are unbearably deep, and are cutting to the core of the mission of the University, especially on top of a state mandated cut. Which statement do you agree with and why?
- Is the 'proposal submission and competition' system the best and the most fair way of allocating UIF funds? Should certain categories of units be favored in the process? (Such as favoring those units that have less access to external funding)
- Do you think the unit specific UIF is a good idea? Should the administrative portion of the UIF not be returned to the units?
- Could you suggest other ways of fostering innovation? interdisciplinary collaboration (one of the originally suggested goals of the UIF)?
- Would it be more desirable to make fractional reductions in existing positions to satisfy the UIF mandated budget reductions rather than completely eliminating currently vacant or (sometimes filled) positions?
- Do you have any other ideas about how innovation could be realistically funded in the University?

**UIF REVIEW SITE VISIT SCHEDULE**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Wednesday, April 4, 2001* | *The Dahlia Lounge* |
| 7:15pm – 9:15pm | Dinner, opportunity to review charge and agreed upon procedures. |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Thursday, April 5, 2001* | *Mary Gates Hall, Room 224* |
| 7:30 – 8:00am | Provost Lee Huntsman |
| 8:00 – 8:45am | Regents – Jon Runstad, Shelly Yapp |
| 9:00 – 9:30am | President Richard McCormick |
| 9:30 – 10:00am | Dean Arthur Nowell, Ocean and Fisheries; Dean Sidney Nelson, Pharmacy; Dean Marc Lindenberg, Evans School of Public Affairs |
| 10:15 -11:00am | Dr. William Catterall, Dr. Bill Moody and colleagues, Neurobiology |
| 11:15 –12:00pm | Dr. Kathleen Woodward and colleagues, Center for the Humanities |
| 12:00 – 1:00pm | LUNCH SESSION with Dr. Mary Coney, Chair, Faculty Senate and colleagues, |
| 1:15 - 2:15pm | Jasmine Weaver, President, ASUW and other ASUW representatives; GPSS Student Representatives |
| 2:30 - 3:00pm | Dr. Kathryn Barnard, Center on Human Development and Discovery |
| 3:00 – 3:30pm | Staff representatives: Sue Camber, Grants & Contract Acct. |
| 3:30 – 4:15pm | Dean Paul Ramsey, Medicine, Dean Denice Denton, Engineering, Dean David Hodge, Arts and Sciences |
| 4:15 – 4:45pm | USER group – Executive Vice President, Weldon Ihrig, Patricia Woehrlin and Ed Lightfoot |
| 4:45 – 5:15 | Ross Matsueda, Faculty, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences |
| 5:15 – 6:00pm | Debriefing of day and plans for Friday |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Friday, April 6, 2001* | *Mary Gates Hall, Room 224* |
| 7:30am | Drafting of report |
| 11:30am | Meeting with President McCormick, Dr. Mary Coney and Provost Huntsman, Gerberding Hall, Regents Room |
| Adjourn | |

## University of Washington     University Initiatives Fund
## Distribution of 1% Cut Effective 1997/99
## By Cost Category (Object/Sub-Object)

| | Faculty | | TA/RA | | Staff | | Hourly/ Operations | | Benefits | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | Amount | FTE |
| **Academic** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture & Urban Plan. | (73,278) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (592.0) | 0.0 | (16,670) | (90,540) | 0.0 |
| Arts & Sciences | (1,438,572) | (9.6) | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 0.0 | (307,422) | (1,745,988) | (9.6) |
| Business Admin. | (200,178) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (42,778) | (242,956) | 0.0 |
| Education | (59,204) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (44,766) | (1.1) | (15,207) | 0.0 | (25,298) | (144,475) | (1.1) |
| Educational Outreach | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (81,288) | (1.0) | (49,362) | (0.7) | (20,930) | (151,580) | (1.7) |
| Engineering | (241,808) | (3.4) | (2,016) | 0.0 | (166,728) | (2.7) | (42,931) | 0.0 | (95,356) | (548,839) | (6.1) |
| Forest Resources | (85,896) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (18,356) | (104,252) | 0.0 |
| Graduate School | | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (75,768) | (1.3) | 47 | 0.0 | (21,404) | (97,125) | (1.3) |
| Law | (96,084) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (11,144) | (0.1) | (35,102) | 0.0 | (23,682) | (166,012) | (0.1) |
| Ocean & Fishery Sci. | (11,574) | (0.1) | 0 | 0.0 | (114,456) | (1.7) | (770) | 0.0 | (30,538) | (157,338) | (1.8) |
| Public Affairs | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (24,864) | (0.4) | (4,708) | 0.0 | (5,868) | (35,440) | (0.4) |
| Social Work | (16,632) | (0.2) | 0 | 0.0 | (38,976) | (0.7) | (38) | 0.0 | (14,570) | (70,216) | (0.9) |
| Undergraduate Ed. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (62,856) | (0.9) | 0 | 0.0 | (14,834) | (77,690) | (0.9) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dentistry | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (116,932) | (1.0) | (48,684) | 0.0 | (27,920) | (193,536) | (1.0) |
| Health Sciences Admin. | (10,500) | (0.1) | 0 | 0.0 | (59,160) | (0.9) | (39,463) | 0.0 | (18,956) | (128,079) | (1.0) |
| Medical Affairs | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (6,897) | 0.0 | 0 | (6,897) | 0.0 |
| Medicine | (330,072) | (2.1) | (36) | 0.0 | (185,592) | (2.3) | (153,263) | 0.0 | (115,424) | (784,387) | (4.4) |
| Nursing | (101,122) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (12,308) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (25,088) | (138,518) | 0.0 |
| Pharmacy | (6,432) | (0.1) | (9,528) | (0.4) | (25,776) | (0.4) | (13,688) | (0.5) | (9,678) | (65,102) | (1.4) |
| Public Health & Comm. Med | (21,192) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (51,504) | (0.4) | (22,384) | 0.0 | (17,814) | (112,894) | (0.4) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UWMC Instl Support | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (168,262) | 0.0 | 0 | (168,262) | 0.0 |
| Harborview MC Instl Support | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (163,780) | 0.0 | 0 | (163,780) | 0.0 |
| **Total Academic** | (2,692,544) | (15.6) | (11,580) | (0.4) | (1,072,118) | (14.9) | (765,078) | (1.2) | (852,586) | (5,393,906) | (32.1) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Non-Academic** | | | | | | | | | | | 0.0 |
| Attorney General | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (9,472) | 0.0 | 0 | (9,472) | 0.0 |
| Computing & Comm. | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (422,712) | 0.0 | 68,716 | 0.0 | (112,798) | (466,794) | 0.0 |
| Development | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (76,677) | 0.0 | 0 | (76,677) | 0.0 |
| Executive Vice President | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (518,040) | (6.5) | (515,771) | 0.0 | (37,466) | (1,071,277) | (6.5) |
| Libraries | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (65,976) | (1.2) | (397,908) | 0.0 | (17,504) | (481,388) | (1.2) |
| Minority Affairs | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (21,020) | (0.4) | (21,272) | 0.0 | (7,370) | (49,662) | (0.4) |
| Planning & Budgeting | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (228,792) | (2.0) | 216,906 | 0.0 | (23,994) | (35,880) | (2.0) |
| President | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (26,624) | 0.0 | 0 | (26,624) | 0.0 |
| Provost | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (44,472) | (0.6) | 0 | 0.0 | (10,496) | (54,968) | (0.6) |
| Research | (5,520) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (29,616) | (0.4) | (38,641) | (0.2) | (9,410) | (83,187) | (0.6) |
| Student Affairs | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (159,422) | (4.8) | (13,064) | (172,486) | (4.8) |
| University Relations | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (62,424) | 0.0 | 0 | (62,424) | 0.0 |
| **Total Non-Academic** | (5,520) | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | (1,330,628) | (11.1) | (1,022,589) | (5.0) | (232,102) | (2,590,839) | (16.1) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | (2,698,064) | (15.6) | (11,580) | (0.4) | (2,402,746) | (26.0) | (1,787,667) | (6.2) | (1,084,688) | (7,984,745) | (48.2) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 1 | |

# University of Washington    University Initiatives Fund
## Distribution of 1% Cut Effective 1999-01
## By Cost Category (Object/Sub-Object)

| | Faculty | | TA/RA | | Staff | | Hourly/ Operations | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE |
| **Academic** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture & Urban Plan. | | | | | 100,760 | 1.5 | | | 100,760 | 1.5 |
| Arts & Sciences | 1,819,724 | 11.0 | | | | | 6,626 | | 1,826,350 | 11.0 |
| Business Admin. | 66,918 | 0.5 | | | 149,194 | | 44,051 | | 260,163 | 0.5 |
| Education | | | | | 79,194 | 1.2 | 68,696 | | 147,890 | 1.2 |
| Educational Outreach | | | | | | | 193,289 | | 193,289 | 0.0 |
| Educational Partnerhips | | | | | | | 29,800 | | 29,800 | 0.0 |
| Engineering | 153,410 | 0.9 | 12,364 | 0.3 | 340,408 | 3.2 | 53,490 | | 559,672 | 4.3 |
| Forest Resources | 83,096 | 0.7 | 232 | 0.0 | 8,858 | 0.3 | 14,464 | | 106,650 | 1.0 |
| Graduate School | 26,586 | 0.1 | | | 101,584 | 1.8 | | | 128,170 | 1.9 |
| Law | 125,312 | 0.5 | | | 48,228 | 0.7 | 5,722 | | 179,262 | 1.2 |
| Ocean & Fishery Sci. | 52,206 | 0.5 | 4,328 | 0.2 | 75,010 | 1.1 | | | 131,544 | 1.7 |
| Public Affairs | | | | | 41,188 | 0.3 | | | 41,188 | 0.3 |
| Social Work | | | | | 66,306 | 0.8 | (6) | | 66,300 | 0.8 |
| Undergraduate Ed. | 22,908 | 0.1 | 10,368 | 0.2 | 23,586 | 0.4 | 44,056 | | 100,918 | 0.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dentistry | | | | | 193,836 | 2.7 | 7,236 | | 201,072 | 2.7 |
| Health Sciences Admin. | 1,744 | 0.0 | | | 37,676 | 0.5 | 86,491 | | 125,911 | 0.5 |
| Medical Affairs | | | | | | | 7,233 | | 7,233 | 0.0 |
| Medicine | 244,139 | 1.2 | | | 352,466 | 4.8 | 124,389 | | 720,994 | 6.0 |
| Nursing | 139,218 | 1 | | | | | | | 139,218 | 0.7 |
| Pharmacy | | | | | 16,638 | 0.2 | 60,020 | | 76,658 | 0.2 |
| Public Health & Comm. Med | 1,540 | 0.0 | | | 72,294 | 0.8 | 19,928 | | 93,762 | 0.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| UWMC Instl Support | | | | | | | 169,294 | | 169,294 | 0.0 |
| Harborview MC Instl Support | | | | | | | 162,142 | | 162,142 | 0.0 |
| **Total Academic** | 2,736,801 | 16.2 | 27,292 | 0.7 | 1,707,226 | 19.9 | 1,096,921 | 0.0 | 5,568,240 | 36.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 32.8% | | 0.3% | | 20.5% | | 13.2% | | 66.8% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Non-Academic** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attorney General | | | | | | | 9,632 | | 9,632 | 0.0 |
| Computing & Comm. | | | | | | | 494,701 | | 494,701 | 0.0 |
| Development | | | | | | | 82,895 | | 82,895 | 0.0 |
| Executive Vice President | | | | | | | 1,135,531 | | 1,135,531 | 0.0 |
| Libraries | | | | | 206,891 | 1.3 | 296,744 | | 503,635 | 1.3 |
| Minority Affairs | | | | | 54,216 | 0.7 | 182 | | 54,398 | 0.7 |
| Planning & Budgeting | | | | | | | 40,685 | | 40,685 | 0.0 |
| President | | | | | | | 26,072 | | 26,072 | 0.0 |
| Provost | | | | | 68,110 | 0.7 | | | 68,110 | 0.7 |
| Research | | | | | 84,176 | 1.0 | 2,268 | | 86,444 | 1.0 |
| Student Affairs | | | | | 99,324 | 1.8 | 83,780 | | 183,104 | 1.8 |
| University Relations | | | | | 19,930 | 0.3 | 62,584 | | 82,514 | 0.3 |
| **Total Non-Academic** | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 532,647 | 5.7 | 2,235,074 | 0.0 | 2,767,721 | 5.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 0.0% | | 0.0% | | 6.4% | | 26.8% | | 33.2% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | 2,736,801 | 16.2 | 27,292 | 0.7 | 2,239,873 | 25.6 | 3,331,995 | 0.0 | 8,335,961 | 42.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 32.8% | | 0.3% | | 26.9% | | 40.0% | | 100.0% | |

*Benefits Included in Salary Amounts

# University of Washington    University Initiatives Fund
## Distribution of 1% Cut Effective 2001-03
## By Cost Category (Object/Sub-Object)

| | Faculty | | TA/RA | | Staff | | Hourly/ Operations | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE | Amount | FTE |
| **Academic** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture & Urban Plan. | 37,290 | 0.4 | 2,000 | 0.0 | | | 74,100 | | 113,390 | 0.4 |
| Arts & Sciences | 2,098,546 | 10.0 | | | | | 6 | | 2,098,552 | 10.0 |
| Business Admin. | | | | | 249,404 | 2.0 | 53,295 | | 302,699 | 2.0 |
| Education | 52,244 | 0.3 | | | 59,454 | 0.7 | 66,658 | | 178,356 | 1.0 |
| Educational Outreach | 51,564 | 0.5 | 13,042 | 0.2 | 29,056 | 0.3 | 139,690 | | 233,352 | 1.0 |
| Educational Partnerhips | | | | | | | 34,834 | | 34,834 | 0.0 |
| Engineering | 171,990 | 1.2 | 46,874 | 1.0 | 310,314 | 3.3 | 124,685 | | 653,863 | 5.5 |
| Forest Resources | | | | | 117,950 | 0.5 | 1,906 | | 119,856 | 0.5 |
| Graduate School | | | 47,204 | 0.7 | 73,643 | 0.8 | 18,227 | | 139,074 | 1.5 |
| Law | 175,658 | 1.0 | | | | | 18,506 | | 194,164 | 1.0 |
| Ocean & Fishery Sci. | 17,618 | 0.3 | | | 130,576 | 1.4 | | | 148,194 | 1.7 |
| Public Affairs | | | | | 40,986 | 0.4 | 4,271 | | 45,257 | 0.4 |
| Social Work | 3,334 | 0.0 | | | 76,996 | 1.0 | 15 | | 80,345 | 1.0 |
| Undergraduate Ed. | 46,210 | 0.1 | | | 35,840 | 0.5 | 33,606 | | 115,656 | 0.6 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dentistry | | | | | 197,456 | 2.6 | 25,145 | | 222,601 | 2.6 |
| Health Sciences Admin. | | | | | 40,226 | 0.4 | 93,379 | | 133,605 | 0.4 |
| Medical Affairs | | | | | 4,322 | 0.0 | 3,320 | | 7,642 | 0.0 |
| Medicine | 278,094 | 1.6 | | | 453,330 | 4.1 | 46,670 | | 778,094 | 5.7 |
| Nursing | | | | | 167,964 | 2.0 | | | 167,964 | 2.0 |
| Pharmacy | 1,768 | 0.0 | | | 9,000 | 0.1 | 79,873 | | 90,641 | 0.1 |
| Public Health & Comm. Med | 4,148 | 0.1 | | | 109,864 | 1.9 | | | 114,012 | 2.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| UWMC Instl Support | | | | | | | 170,558 | | 170,558 | 0.0 |
| Harborview MC Instl Support | | | | | | | 160,522 | | 160,522 | 0.0 |
| **Total Academic** | 2,938,464 | 15.5 | 109,120 | 1.9 | 2,106,381 | 22.0 | 1,149,266 | 0.0 | 6,303,231 | 39.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 31.5% | | 1.2% | | 22.6% | | 12.3% | | 67.6% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Non-Academic** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attorney General | | | | | | | 10,046 | | 10,046 | 0.0 |
| Computing & Comm. | | | | | | | 564,032 | | 564,032 | 0.0 |
| Development | | | | | | | 104,452 | | 104,452 | 0.0 |
| Executive Vice President | | | | | | | 1,231,767 | | 1,231,767 | 0.0 |
| Intel Prop & Tech Trsf | | | | | 14,316 | 0.1 | | | 14,316 | 0.1 |
| Libraries | | | | | 210,218 | 2.0 | 317,357 | | 527,575 | 2.0 |
| Minority Affairs | | | | | 59,708 | 0.8 | | | 59,708 | 0.8 |
| Planning & Budgeting | | | | | 49,224 | 0.4 | 38 | | 49,262 | 0.4 |
| President | | | | | | | 48,196 | | 48,196 | 0.0 |
| Provost | 666 | 0.2 | | | 61,683 | 0.8 | 15,663 | | 78,012 | 1.0 |
| Research | | | 9,366 | 0.1 | 58,518 | 0.8 | 11,400 | | 79,284 | 0.9 |
| Student Affairs | | | | | 67,876 | 2.0 | 130,134 | | 198,010 | 2.0 |
| University Relations | | | | | 18,266 | 0.2 | 34,324 | | 52,590 | 0.2 |
| **Total Non-Academic** | 666 | 0.2 | 9,366 | 0.1 | 539,809 | 7.1 | 2,467,409 | 0.0 | 3,017,250 | 7.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 0.0% | | 0.1% | | 5.8% | | 26.5% | | 32.4% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | 2,939,130 | 15.7 | 118,486 | 2.0 | 2,646,190 | 29.1 | 3,616,675 | 0.0 | 9,320,481 | 46.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of total cut for UIF | 31.5% | | 1.3% | | 28.4% | | 38.8% | | 100.0% | |

*Benefits Included in Salary Amounts

# University of Washington
# UIF Cut Comparisons

| College Name | UIF Cuts | | | % Change | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 97 - 99 | 99 - 01 | 01 - 03 | UIF 1 - UIF 2* | UIF 2 - UIF 3** |
| President | $26,642 | $26,072 | $48,197 | (2.1%) | 84.9% |
| Attorney General | $9,472 | $9,632 | $10,046 | 1.7% | 4.3% |
| Provost | $54,971 | $68,110 | $78,011 | 23.9% | 14.5% |
| Planning & Budgeting | $35,880 | $40,685 | $49,261 | 13.4% | 21.1% |
| Minority Affairs | $55,512 | $54,398 | $59,680 | (2.0%) | 9.7% |
| LIbraries | $481,388 | $504,085 | $527,576 | 4.7% | 4.7% |
| Executive Vice President | $1,071,277 | $1,135,531 | $1,231,767 | 6.0% | 8.5% |
| Computing and Communications | $468,970 | $494,701 | $564,031 | 5.5% | 14.0% |
| Student Affairs | $172,481 | $183,104 | $198,010 | 6.2% | 8.1% |
| Uniersity Relations | $62,424 | $82,514 | $52,591 | 32.2% | (36.3%) |
| Development | $76,777 | $82,895 | $104,452 | 8.0% | 26.0% |
| Research | $83,179 | $86,445 | $79,278 | 3.9% | (8.3%) |
| Office of TT and IP | | | $14,315 | N/A | N/A |
| **Total Administration:** | **$2,598,973** | **$2,768,172** | **$3,017,215** | **6.5%** | **9.0%** |
| | | | | | |
| Architecture and Urban Planning | $90,540 | $100,760 | $113,389 | 11.3% | 12.5% |
| Arts and Sciences | $1,745,987 | $1,826,350 | $2,098,550 | 4.6% | 14.9% |
| Educational Outreach | $151,582 | $193,289 | $233,344 | 27.5% | 20.7% |
| Bus Admin | $243,586 | $260,163 | $302,699 | 6.8% | 16.3% |
| Education | $144,411 | $147,890 | $178,354 | 2.4% | 20.6% |
| Educational Partnership | | $29,800 | $34,833 | N/A | 16.9% |
| Engineering | $562,118 | $559,672 | $653,861 | (0.4%) | 16.8% |
| Ocean & Fishery Sciences | $159,608 | $131,544 | $148,194 | (17.6%) | 12.7% |
| Forest Resources | $104,753 | $106,650 | $119,856 | 1.8% | 12.4% |
| Dean - Graduate School | $92,278 | $128,170 | $139,073 | 38.9% | 8.5% |
| School of Law | $167,034 | $179,262 | $194,166 | 7.3% | 8.3% |
| Grad School Public Affairs | $35,440 | $41,188 | $45,257 | 16.2% | 9.9% |
| School of Social Work | $70,215 | $66,300 | $80,345 | (5.6%) | 21.2% |
| Undergraduate Education | $81,417 | $100,918 | $115,659 | 24.0% | 14.6% |
| Health Science Admininistration | $127,951 | $125,911 | $133,686 | (1.6%) | 6.2% |
| Dentistry | $195,328 | $201,072 | $222,601 | 2.9% | 10.7% |
| Medical Affairs | $6,897 | $7,233 | $7,649 | 4.9% | 5.8% |
| Medicine | $810,375 | $720,994 | $778,121 | (11.0%) | 7.9% |
| Nursing | $141,516 | $139,218 | $167,981 | (1.6%) | 20.7% |
| Pharmacy | $65,252 | $76,658 | $90,641 | 17.5% | 18.2% |
| Public Health & Community Medicine | $112,797 | $93,762 | $113,975 | (16.9%) | 21.6% |
| Medical Centers | $332,042 | $331,436 | $331,080 | (0.2%) | (0.1%) |
| **Total Non-Administration:** | **$5,441,127** | **$5,568,240** | **$6,303,314** | **2.3%** | **13.2%** |
| | | | | | |
| **Grand Total:** | **$8,040,100** | **$8,336,412** | **$9,320,529** | **3.7%** | **11.8%** |

* Due to a change in the policy regarding Research Cost Recovery, there was a shift in funding which affected the underlying UIF based subject to the 1% cut beginning 7/1/99.

** Due to the following changes in organizational structure there were changes in the underlying UIF base subject to the 1% cut: Government Relations moving from University Relations to the President's Office, Office of Intellectual Property & Technology Transfer becoming independent from the Office of Research.

| College Name | UIF Cuts | | | % Change | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 97 - 99 | 99 - 01 | 01 - 03 | UIF 1 - UIF 2* | UIF 2 - UIF 3** |
| President | $26,642 | $26,072 | $48,197 | (2.1%) | 84.9% |
| Attorney General | $9,472 | $9,632 | $10,046 | 1.7% | 4.3% |
| Provost | $54,971 | $68,110 | $78,011 | 23.9% | 14.5% |
| Planning & Budgeting | $35,880 | $40,685 | $49,261 | 13.4% | 21.1% |
| Minority Affairs | $55,512 | $54,398 | $59,680 | (2.0%) | 9.7% |
| LIbraries | $481,388 | $504,085 | $527,576 | 4.7% | 4.7% |
| Executive Vice President | $1,071,277 | $1,135,531 | $1,231,767 | 6.0% | 8.5% |
| Computing and Communications | $468,970 | $494,701 | $564,031 | 5.5% | 14.0% |
| Student Affairs | $172,481 | $183,104 | $198,010 | 6.2% | 8.1% |
| Uniersity Relations | $62,424 | $82,514 | $52,591 | 32.2% | (36.3%) |
| Development | $76,777 | $82,895 | $104,452 | 8.0% | 26.0% |
| Research | $83,179 | $86,445 | $79,278 | 3.9% | (8.3%) |
| Office of TT and IP | | | $14,315 | N/A | N/A |
| **Total Administration:** | **$2,598,973** | **$2,768,172** | **$3,017,215** | **6.5%** | **9.0%** |
| | | | | | |
| Architecture and Urban Planning | $90,540 | $100,760 | $113,389 | 11.3% | 12.5% |
| Arts and Sciences | $1,745,987 | $1,826,350 | $2,098,550 | 4.6% | 14.9% |
| Educational Outreach | $151,582 | $193,289 | $233,344 | 27.5% | 20.7% |
| Bus Admin | $243,586 | $260,163 | $302,699 | 6.8% | 16.3% |
| Education | $144,411 | $147,890 | $178,354 | 2.4% | 20.6% |
| Educational Partnership | | $29,800 | $34,833 | N/A | 16.9% |
| Engineering | $562,118 | $559,672 | $653,861 | (0.4%) | 16.8% |
| Ocean & Fishery Sciences | $159,608 | $131,544 | $148,194 | (17.6%) | 12.7% |
| Forest Resources | $104,753 | $106,650 | $119,856 | 1.8% | 12.4% |
| Dean - Graduate School | $92,278 | $128,170 | $139,073 | 38.9% | 8.5% |
| School of Law | $167,034 | $179,262 | $194,166 | 7.3% | 8.3% |
| Grad School Public Affairs | $35,440 | $41,188 | $45,257 | 16.2% | 9.9% |
| School of Social Work | $70,215 | $66,300 | $80,345 | (5.6%) | 21.2% |
| Undergraduate Education | $81,417 | $100,918 | $115,659 | 24.0% | 14.6% |
| Health Science Admininistration | $127,951 | $125,911 | $133,686 | (1.6%) | 6.2% |
| Dentistry | $195,328 | $201,072 | $222,601 | 2.9% | 10.7% |
| Medical Affairs | $6,897 | $7,233 | $7,649 | 4.9% | 5.8% |
| Medicine | $810,375 | $720,994 | $778,121 | (11.0%) | 7.9% |
| Nursing | $141,516 | $139,218 | $167,981 | (1.6%) | 20.7% |
| Pharmacy | $65,252 | $76,658 | $90,641 | 17.5% | 18.2% |
| Public Health & Community Medicine | $112,797 | $93,762 | $113,975 | (16.9%) | 21.6% |
| Medical Centers | $332,042 | $331,436 | $331,080 | (0.2%) | (0.1%) |
| **Total Non-Administration:** | **$5,441,127** | **$5,568,240** | **$6,303,314** | **2.3%** | **13.2%** |
| | | | | | |
| **Grand Total:** | **$8,040,100** | **$8,336,412** | **$9,320,529** | **3.7%** | **11.8%** |

* Due to a change in the policy regarding Research Cost Recovery, there was a shift in funding which affected the underlying UIF based subject to the 1% cut beginning 7/1/99.

** Due to the following changes in organizational structure there were changes in the underlying UIF base subject to the 1% cut: Government Relations moving from University Relations to the President's Office, Office of Intellectual Property & Technology Transfer becoming independent from the Office of Research.